



universität
wien

DISSERTATION / DOCTORAL THESIS

Titel der Dissertation / Title of the Doctoral Thesis

Enhancing ELF communicative competence
in ELT classrooms in Italy:
An investigation of cognitive-experiential practices

verfasst von / submitted by

Donatella Chiaruttini

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doktorin der Philosophie (Dr. phil.)

Wien, 2021 / Vienna, 2021

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on the student
record sheet:

UA 792 343

Dissertationsgebiet lt. Studienblatt /
field of study as it appears on the student record sheet:

English and American Studies

Betreut von / Supervisors:

Univ. -Prof. Dr. Barbara Seidlhofer
Univ. Hon. -Prof. Dr. Henry G. Widdowson
Univ. -Prof. Dr. Maria Grazia Guido

Abstract

Over the past few decades the use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) has vastly increased on a global scale, following the growth of international travel and of cultural exchanges among people whose first language is not English. These circumstances demand that the English Language Teaching (ELT) pedagogy be substantially modified and updated worldwide. This thesis explores the dynamics of ELF discourse in the Italian school setting, ultimately attempting to devise guidelines for developing cognitive-experiential practices that may enhance ELF communicative competence in standard ELT classrooms.

In this work I investigate current ELF communication strategies through naturally occurring discussions in which school-age learners – blooming ELF users – talk about a challenging topic under unconstrained conditions, namely without the supervision of their English teacher and without English as a Native Language (ENL) requirements. This experimental activity was performed by observing and audio recording natural spoken ELF interactions among Italian students and students of ten different nationalities participating in intercultural exchange programmes in three upper-secondary schools of the Greater Rome area. The data were transcribed following the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) transcription conventions.

The analysis of qualitative data is conducted within a conversation analytic framework by means of a protocol based on conversational moves. It focuses on the cooperative strategies and pragmatic behaviours that school-age ELF users enact to achieve effective communication.

My main findings are (i) that the participants generally orient to their interlocutors, employing accommodative practices that are commonly used in ELF communication, and (ii) that they implement *linguaging* and interactional skills, showing their authentic involvement in the spoken activity as it was designed. The participants ‘play’ with English – but also with their co-participants’ languages – to make meaning and to build rapport, creating a communal atmosphere. They strive to make talk more transparent, resorting to measures that facilitate understanding and

enhance explicitness, such as the use of onomatopoeic sounds that strongly reinforce what they intend to deliver. Additionally, they show their proactive attitude in word searches and in jointly constructing meaning when – as in a dance of words – they step in to give their contribution, satisfactorily pursuing their shared communicative ‘enterprise’. All of these findings demonstrate that school-age ELF users put into play their language resources, but also themselves as individuals with their own identity, cultural background and experiences.

In conclusion, the results of this study may contribute to developing new teaching practices that enhance ELF-mediated communication, promoting language and intercultural awareness.

Acknowledgements

This thesis presents the research work conducted in co-tutelle between the University of Salento (Italy) and the University of Vienna (Austria). First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my Italian supervisor, Prof. Maria Grazia Guido, and to my Viennese supervisors, Prof. Barbara Seidlhofer and Prof. Henry G. Widdowson, whose guidance and support gave me confidence throughout my PhD journey. I am especially indebted to Prof. Widdowson for having guided me all along my teaching career with his milestone books and with the inspiring talks he delivered in Italy's English language teaching conferences. I cherish the memory of the valuable suggestions and kind words of encouragement he provided me with on a cold Friday afternoon in Vienna. He was just about to set off for his country retreat where – I suggested – he would find warm comfort in front of his *chimney*; I meant, his fireplace, but in Italian we call it “camino”, so *chimney* came out spontaneously.

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to the teachers of Liceo “G. Vailati”, Liceo “B. Touschek”, and Liceo “T. Gullace” who enabled me to conduct my work. Without their help this research would not have been possible. I am most grateful to all students participating in the speech events, who proudly and enthusiastically interacted in ELF for the sake of my research project. And, last but not least, I must thank my own colleagues of Liceo “G. Vailati”, Rita Curcio and Paola Franci – fellow teachers but also friends – for the emotional support they wholeheartedly provided all along my journey.

I also gratefully acknowledge the effort of the Italian Ministry of Education to allow me to conduct my research through a three-year study leave.

I would like to thank Prof. Donna Tatsuki for the insightful suggestions and the warm encouragement she offered at the very beginning of my doctoral journey, and Dr. Svitlana Klötzl, a dear friend and an ELF colleague at the University of Vienna, whose epiphanies about my work – but also her empathetic and intellectual support – helped me to be more confident and positive.

On a more personal note, special thanks go to my friends Violetta and Luisella who endowed me with much patience and reassurance, mostly over a cup of tea and a *Stück Sachertorte* during my Viennese semester.

This journey would not have been possible without the unwavering support of my family. I am grateful to my parents, Bruno and Tarsilla, who have been always participating emotionally in my often challenging academic and professional choices. I am deeply indebted to my beloved husband Luca for his profound belief in my work, for his encouragement to stretch my capabilities, and for his patience in the darkest moments. I thank him for his practical recommendations, for endlessly proof-reading the chapters of my thesis, and, most of all, for having supported and nurtured me during this three-year-long journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgements	III
Table of Contents	V
List of Tables	VIII
List of Abbreviations	IX
1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Background: ELF and ELT Implications	7
2.1. ELF and EFL: a normative divide	7
2.2. Communicative competence in the ELT classroom	11
2.2.1. Communicative competence: theoretical models	11
2.2.2. Communicative competence: pedagogical models	18
2.2.3. ELF and the reconceptualization of communicative competence	19
2.3. ELF and teacher education	24
2.4. ELF and pedagogical practices	30
3. ELF Discourse Analysis: Research Methodology	37
3.1. Beyond ELF Communities of Practice	37
3.2. CA and ELF: A viable approach	39
3.3. Accommodation in ELF	42
3.4. Adopted research approach	49
4. Research Design and Analysis	53
4.1. Data collection and setting	53
4.1.1. Participants	54
4.1.2. Activity design	57
4.2. Data transcription	58
4.3. Issues of data interpretation	60
4.4. Data analysis	62
4.4.1. Case study 1	62

4.4.2. Case study 2	83
4.4.3. Case study 3	113
5. Discussion	127
5.1. Prominent pragmatic strategies	129
5.1.1. Handling (non) understanding	129
5.1.1.1. <i>Self-repetition and self-rephrase</i>	130
5.1.1.2. <i>Requests for clarification and repeat</i>	131
5.1.1.3. <i>Topic negotiation and lexical replacement</i>	131
5.1.2. Boosting the <i>language</i> process	132
5.1.2.1. <i>Creative language</i>	132
5.1.2.2. <i>Onomatopoeic sounds</i>	133
5.1.3. Building comity and lightening the atmosphere	134
5.1.3.1. <i>Code-switching</i>	134
5.1.3.2. <i>Humour and laughter</i>	137
5.1.4. Signalling participation and engagement	139
5.1.4.1. <i>Other-repetition and other-paraphrasing</i>	140
5.1.4.2. <i>Backchannelling, latching and overlaps</i>	141
5.1.5. Challenging through prosody	142
5.2. ‘Doing being English learners’: a rare occurrence	143
5.3. Lesson learnt: a summary	144
6. Pedagogic implications and practical applications	147
7. Conclusions	159
7.1. Concluding remarks	159
7.1.1. Limitations of the study and open questions	160
7.1.2. Suggestions for future research	162
7.2. Autobiographical reflection	163
References	167
Appendices	191
Appendix 1 - Corpus details	191
Appendix 2 - First language and country abbreviations	201

Appendix 3 - Transcribed data	203
Appendix 4 - Abstract in German	249
Appendix 5 - Abstract in Italian	251

List of Tables

Table 3.1	Common cooperative strategies and pragmatic behaviours in ELF discourse.	44
Table 3.2	Structural moves adopted in the study.	50
Table 3.3	Most frequent ethnomethodological moves used in the study.	51
Table 4.1	Summary of data collection.	54
Table 4.2	Participants in terms of nationality, L1, number, gender, age, and CEFR levels.	56
Table 5.1	Most salient communication strategies employed by the school-age ELF users of my study.	128

List of Abbreviations

ACE	Asian Corpus of English
BELF	Business English as a Lingua Franca
CAF	Complexity Accuracy and Fluency
CAT	Communication Accommodation Theory
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
CoP	Community of Practice
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EIL	English as an International Language
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELFA	English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings
ELF-GATE	Growing Awareness Through English as a Lingua Franca
ELF-TED	English as a Lingua Franca-Teacher Education
ELLiE	Early Language Learning in Europe
ELT	English Language Teaching
ENL	English as a Native Language
F	Female
FL	Foreign Language
FLT	Foreign Language Teaching
GCC	Global Communicative Competence
ICA	Intercultural Communicative Awareness
ICC	Intercultural Communicative Competence
IMR	Individual Multilingual Resources
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
M	Male
MRP	Multilingual Resource Pool
NNEST(s)	Non-Native English-Speaking Teacher(s)
NNS(s)	Non-Native Speaker(s)
NS(s)	Native Speaker(s)
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SNSE	Standard Native Speaker English
TBLT	Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching
TIG(s)	Transient International Group(s)
TILA	Telecollaboration for Intercultural Language Acquisition
TRP	Transition Relevance Place
VOICE	Vienna and Oxford International Corpus of English
WE	World Englishes

1. Introduction

This work stems from a simple question: what will the English syllabus in Italian schools be like in the 21st century? The school landscape, with its multilingual and multicultural classrooms, has changed drastically over the past few decades, but very little has changed in the English Language Teaching (ELT) classrooms in Italy. As English has become a crucial asset for intercultural communication in our globalized world, the emerging use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) – i.e. the English used by speakers of different first languages (L1s) and cultures in diverse sociocultural communicative contexts – is bound to reshape the ELT scenario, normally played out by English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The average Italian student will inevitably use the English learnt at school to communicate with native speakers of English (NSs) and with an ever-increasing number of non-native speakers (NNSs) (see Crystal 2008) in countless communicative situations. Hence, the acquisition of ELF communicative competence, defined in cognitive-experiential terms as the ability to accommodate and negotiate culture-bound meanings between different ELF variations in contact, has become urgent in Italian schools.

The structure of our societies has increasingly become ‘liquid’ (Bauman 2000, 2005): yet the teaching of the English language in Italian schools is still ossified and keeps resting on the well-established ‘scripts’ that are validated by EFL institutional bodies, even though life skills, such as communication (in L1 and L2) and learning how to learn, have become pivotal to cope with the challenges of our time. In such a stagnant landscape of language teaching, school-age learners are taught and trained to take examinations that gauge their competence against NS regulative norms of *usage* and *use* (Widdowson 1978)¹: in other words, not only are they required to know the linguistic rules belonging to the English language system (*usage*), but also to know how to use the language structures for communication (*use*), just like native speakers do for their communicative purposes. As a result, the learners’ real (current and future) needs for effective communication in an intercultural environment is largely overlooked. The majority of our multilingual learners, the so-called ‘digital natives’, have been exposed

¹ Widdowson (1978) first introduced and developed the distinction between language usage and language use.

to English outside the classroom since they were children, mostly via the Internet; their perception of English is that of a language with a global function (Sifakis 2018: 16), as opposed to that of a language needed only for visiting or studying in an English-speaking country. Studies carried out in Chile (Kormos *et al.* 2011) and in Finland (Ranta 2010) have revealed learners' awareness of the international role played by English. Kormos and coauthors (2011), who investigated the English language motivations amongst secondary school students, university students, and young adult learners in Chile, found that "a new language-learning goal has emerged: *international posture*" (2011: 496, emphasis added): namely "the students' intention to use English as a lingua franca and communicate with other people in the world" (2011: 510). Similarly, Ranta's (2010: 165) research shows that upper secondary school students in Finland recognize that "[i]t's important to hear both 'real' English and International English because you have to be able to understand both." Thereby it is crucial for learners to be confronted with the plurality of English and to be guided to become effective language users. In the ELT classroom, instead, as Marlina observes,

there is still a hunger for, what I prefer to call, 'PESTS', which stands for 'Practicality' (*not practical to teach different types of English*), 'Efficiency' (*just a waste of time*), 'Standards' (*need to learn standard native English*), and 'Simplicity' (*don't like to be confused, keep things simple*)."
(Marlina 2014: 9, emphasis in original)

The multidimensional competence that EFL teachers try hard to enhance in their classrooms, at least in Italy, does not yet acknowledge the naturally occurring phenomenon of English as a lingua franca – the medium of communication in an intercultural environment *par excellence*. Acknowledging ELF in the ELT classroom means to become aware of how intercultural communication works, and hence to delve into the pragmatic, adaptive strategies that enable speakers to get their message across in an efficient and intelligible way. An ELF-informed pedagogy requires teachers to be more flexible, less norm-oriented, and proactive towards tasks and practices that turn learners into actual users of the language and satisfied protagonists of their learning (Kohn 2018a, 2018b, 2020).

Much research on ELF implications for the English Language Teaching classroom has been devoted to teacher education and language learning materials, but to date only a limited number of studies have focused on ELF-oriented practices

specifically addressed to school-age learners (for an overview of such practices see Sifakis and Tsantila 2018).

To fill what I regard as a major gap, I designed and conducted an empirical investigation aimed to explore the use of ELF in the educational domain. The investigation is based on naturally occurring discussions in which small groups of school-age learners from a diverse range of first language backgrounds talk about a challenging topic and work out a mutual agreement, acting out in a strictly ‘teacher-free’ environment. The main purpose of my research is to investigate the cognitive and communicative processes activated by students in accommodating and negotiating meanings through ELF variations that reflect their own different native linguacultural schemata. The task I designed enabled students to interact under unconstrained conditions, that is to say, without any form of supervision by a teacher and without having to follow a standard classroom protocol of turn-taking and lexicogrammatical correctness, generally enforced in teacher-learner activities; in other words, in the absence of any ‘external’ pressure for performance.

Over the course of the investigation I explored (i) the conversational moves that frame interactions among multicultural and multilingual speakers, and (ii) the meaning-making and accommodation strategies that ELF speakers employ to achieve successful and meaningful communication.

For my research I adopted a Conversation Analysis (CA) approach, adapting CA models to a multicultural context of ELF interactions. I focused on conversational turns, first investigating them according to the sociocultural conventions underpinning the conversation analytic methods, and subsequently revising them in light of ELF new findings. I examined the ‘moves’, the basic functional units of the discourse structure, employing both the structural UK Model of Conversation Analysis and the ethnomethodological US Model of Conversation Analysis. The latter, developed by American ethnomethodologists (Sacks *et al.* 1974), allowed me to identify the ethnographic moves (see Moerman 1988) in the frame of ELF conversations. This approach to CA proves especially helpful for the understanding of intercultural communication, as the ethnomethodological moves represent the pragmalinguistic and socio-pragmatic rules (Thomas 1983) the speakers appropriate cognitively and

affectively in a spoken interaction.

Standing on my own professional experience as a school teacher, to recognise the dynamics of communicative interaction amongst students I used an ethnographic approach. I applied an ELF-oriented approach to the CA method, moving beyond the monocultural traditional models; this was achieved by (i) adapting them to the new context of my research, and (ii) reinterpreting the moves that can account for the linguacultural idiosyncrasies of the speakers' native languages, transferred to the ELF variations they use in interaction.

Most existing research on ELF spoken discourse based on conversation analytic methods has investigated ELF polyadic interactions – both in the academic and in the business domains (Firth 1996; Mauranen 2006, 2009, 2012; Cogo 2009; Kaur 2011; Björkman 2014) – and dyadic interactions in the private sphere (Pietikäinen 2014, 2016; Klötzl 2015; Klötzl and Swoboda 2020). Surprisingly, only a small number of studies have focused on ELF spoken discourse by school-age learners' in teacher-learner activities (Lopriore 2015; Vettorel 2016a); and, as far as I am aware, there are no studies on ELF peer interactions in a pedagogical context and under unconstrained conditions. Conversely, there is much literature on ELF pedagogy acknowledging the need for reflecting activities on the use of the language in naturally occurring spoken interactions. As Lopriore (2018: 163) contends, “[i]n order to move beyond traditional teaching routines and to sustain teachers and learners in language awareness, it would be important to engage them in observing authentic language use.”

In light of these latter points, I became determined to explore how ELF communicative competence develops amongst school-age learners engaged in actual spoken ELF interactions, in a context that is relevant to my profession.

The thesis consists of seven chapters. Following this introductory section, Chapter 2 contextualizes the research study in the relevant literature on ELF in pedagogical contexts, building on the theoretical background that informs the construct of communicative competence. It also provides an overview of the conceptual and empirical research conducted in the field of English teacher education and ELF pedagogical practices.

Chapter 3 delves into the research methodology applied to the analysis of ELF discourse, focusing on the conversation analytic framework, and illustrates the research method I adopted to explore the ELF interactions of my corpus.

Chapter 4 deals with data collection, analysis and interpretation. It introduces the participants and describes the activity design in detail. It also elucidates the transcription and notation protocol utilized for a fine-grained investigation of the data, and presents the analysis of three case studies that correspond to the three upper-secondary schools where the data were collected.

Chapter 5 provides a thorough discussion of the results in the context of the literature presented in the previous chapters. It illustrates the prominent pragmatic strategies employed by the participants to achieve understanding and to build comity. It also reports the rare occurrence of self- and other-repairing practices aimed to comply with the rules of the ELT classroom.

Chapter 6 is entirely devoted to the pedagogic implications and the practical applications of this study.

Finally, Chapter 7 discusses the limitations of the investigation, addresses some open questions, and suggests directions for further research developments.

The thesis ends with an autobiographical reflection that unveils my gradual professional growth towards a more flexible, ELF-aware attitude to my future teaching practice.

Some of the experimental data and interpretation, of their background and of the relevant quotations were drawn from Chiaruttini (2020). Material from this publication has been used here with permission of the journal.

2. Theoretical Background: ELF and ELT implications

2.1. ELF and EFL: a normative divide

In a globalized world, where intercultural communication plays a most significant role, the use of English as a Lingua Franca has become a reality. But what is ELF? According to Seidlhofer (2011: 7), ELF is “any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option.” In other words, ELF is the way we use English to communicate in an intercultural environment. Native speakers of English and non-native speakers alike use the language to make communication more effective and intelligible, and in order to do so they accommodate to each other and mediate culture-bound meanings. ELF is co-constructed and negotiated *ad hoc*, and hence variable and hybrid.

ELF is a natural phenomenon – a sort of democratic phenomenon to which all languages spoken by ELF users contribute – that leaves room for the creative potential of bi- or multi-lingual users. There is ample literature on ELF as a medium of intercultural communication, and significant empirical research has been conducted mostly in the business (Firth 1996; Ehrenreich 2009; Cogo 2012, 2016) and academic (Mauranen 2006, 2009, 2012; Kaur 2009, 2011; Björkman 2013, 2014) domains. An extensive and lively discussion has been held on English as a subject (see Jenkins 2005; Seidlhofer 2011), and a fair amount of experimental research has been carried out in the school environment in recent years (Vettorel 2013, 2016a; Grazzi 2015, 2016; Kohn 2015, 2016; Lopriore 2015; Kordia 2016, 2018; Kouvdou 2016; Kouvdou and Tsagari 2018).

ELF is a global phenomenon that is still overlooked in the English Language Teaching landscape, in Italy as much as elsewhere. I agree with Seidlhofer (2011: 190) when she argues that “[it] seems to be not so much a deliberate act, but rather a general lack of awareness.” Most ELT teachers – especially those in-service –generally pay little or no attention to the emerging reality of ELF as a worldwide medium of intercultural communication; and even when they are aware of the phenomenon, they believe it should stay away from their classrooms – so as not to interfere with their well-established teaching routine and not to disturb their professional comfort zone.

The English taught at school, English as a Foreign language (EFL), is the English that conforms to the regulative norms of usage and use of the native speaker, either British or American. In other words, learners are taught the distinct linguistic components of the English language system and how such language items are used by the native speaker in a communicative context. In the traditional ELT classroom learners are required to make appropriate choices according to the English as a Native Language (ENL) paradigm; any alternative linguistic realizations – no matter how communicatively successful they are – are considered incorrect, “formally ‘defective’” (Seidlhofer 2011: 197). Defective from an EFL perspective, perhaps, but certainly not from an ELF perspective, as long as the “linguistic forms [are] pragmatically motivated by the functional context” (Widdowson 2012a: 22) make communication flow in an intelligible and effective way.

An ELF-oriented pedagogy requires a reconceptualization of English as a subject. The ELT classroom is imbued with ideologies of native speakerism (Holliday 2005; Seidlhofer 2011; Jenkins 2012), NS correctness and appropriateness, that overlook the bilingual or multilingual repertoire of the learners, who speak one or more languages in addition to English. As Guido (2008: 21) maintains, “[t]aken for granted [...] is the idea that the grammar code of Standard English – and, implicitly, also native-English pragmatic behaviours – are shared norms in intercultural transactions across the world.” Whatever piece of language is taught, it is bound to conform to the rules of usage and use and to the idioms of the native speaker. Learners are expected to adhere to such norms: not only do they have to know the linguistic rules (usage), but they also have to know how to apply them in a correct and appropriate way (use), following the native speaker’s practice (Widdowson 2012a, 2015a).

Normativity is a crucial issue in the discussion about a plurilithic pedagogical approach to ELF (Seidlhofer 2011; Widdowson 2012a; Vettorel 2017a). The issue of ELF conformity to the NS rules was addressed years before ELF started to be studied in its own right. In the late 1980s, for example, while discussing the use of English as an international lingua franca between non-native speakers, Knapp identified the features of ELF exchanges in terms of norms and intercultural mediation:

these norms have to be negotiated *ad hoc*, and they may well be an idiosyncratic creation originating from a process of communicating interculturally and not at all related to norms that hold among native (or nativized) speakers of E[nglish]. (Knapp 1987 [2015: 181])

As ELF discourse develops in emergent contexts characterised by “a high degree of linguacultural diversity, routinely resulting in highly variable, and creative use of linguistic resources” (Dewey 2012: 163), norm-driven parameters can no longer gauge the effectiveness of ELF communication. Dewey (2012) suggests the adoption of an ELF perspective that encompasses a post-normative orientation to language teaching and learning. Such orientation implies reconsidering deep-seated ELT beliefs and assumptions concerning ‘correctness’ in grammar and pronunciation, traditionally measured against the standard regulative norms of a native speaker. Walker (2010: 69) holds that “teaching pronunciation for ELF is primarily about re-thinking goals and re-defining error.” Blair (2015: 99), too, believes that “ELT needs to move away from debates on ‘nativeness’, ‘ownership’ and idealised pedagogical norms, towards notions of ‘beyond-native’ language competence, a ‘multilingual principle’ for teaching and learning, and more appropriate teacher education programmes.”

A post-normative approach entails a shift in focus: no longer on the correct linguistic realizations in Standard English (SE), but rather on the communicative effectiveness, to be achieved through a “dynamic and adaptive use of language resources” (Dewey 2012: 142). To this end, Dewey proposes an array of objectives that should be subsumed in the ELT classroom and in teacher education:

[i]nvestigate and highlight the particular environment and sociocultural context in which English(es) will be used; [i]ncrease exposure to the diverse ways in which English is used globally; presenting alternative variants as appropriate whenever highlighting linguistic form; [e]ngage in critical classroom discussion about the globalization and growing diversity of English; [s]pend proportionately less time on ENL forms, especially if these are not widely used in other varieties; and thus choose not to penalize non-native-led innovative forms that are intelligible; [f]ocus (more) on communicative strategies [...]. (Dewey 2012: 163)

In his turn, Kohn (2018a: 4) provides a social constructivist (Vygotsky 1978; Williams and Burden 1997) interpretation of language acquisition “as a complex process of individual and social creation”, arguing that only a social constructivist approach to learning with a more adaptable orientation to the target language can reconcile teachers

and learners, who are traditionally confronted with Standard English parameters. Furthermore, Kohn believes that this approach, based on the students' active participation in learning, can strengthen the process of creating what he (2015: 55) calls "my English" – namely the personal version of the language constructed in the mind, heart and behaviour of the learner. Kohn (2018a: 8) holds that "[s]uch an 'open' social constructivist orientation enables teachers and learners to maintain and actively pursue a pedagogical focus on SNSE [Standard Native Speaker English] means of expression, while at the same time relaxing and changing their normative learning attitudes and practices." And in his view, "[a]cknowledging learners' own contribution to learning can also serve as an antidote against any forms of standard language ideology or ELT business interests promoting or even enforcing SNSE norms" (*ibid.*).

When it comes to developing learning goals in an ELF-aware ELT classroom, Kohn (2018a: 8) points out three steps: "first, a social constructivist relativization of ELT's prevailing normative orientation to SNSE; second, learners' involvement in awareness-raising activities; and, third, their reflective engagement in authentic communicative (ELF) interactions." Dewey's (2012) and Kohn's (2018a) suggestions on how to incorporate respectively a post-normative and a social constructivist perspective into ELT practices aim to engage teachers and learners alike in communicative activities with a critical reflective attitude towards English as a *lingua franca* (Seidlhofer 2011).

Most often learners do not conform to native norms because "what learners are doing is acting on the experience of their own language, and so using their English together with their own language as a pragmatic resource, seeking to communicate in a natural way" (Widdowson 2015b: 370). Learners use the language they have learnt creatively, stretching their linguistic repertoire to effective and intelligible communication. Widdowson also clarifies that "they are trying to use the language in a normal communicative way, with linguistic form determined by pragmatic function" (*ibid.*). And it is exactly this behaviour that is condemned by teachers, who evaluate students against NS norms under the aegis of the publishing industry and English language assessment boards, acting on the organization of English as a subject.

EFL teachers are focused on what they teach; hence they evaluate “*teachees*” (Widdowson 2015b: 371, emphasis in original), not learners. An ELF-oriented pedagogy, instead, focuses on who teachers are teaching English to (Widdowson 2015a) and on the learning process. As Seidlhofer (2011: 202) puts it, “[t]his would be to focus attention not on the language as product, on how much English learners manage to accumulate, but on the process of ‘*linguaging*’, on how learners make use of what they know of the language.” *Linguaging*, according to Swain (2006: 98), is “the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language. It is part of what constitutes learning.” Swain (2006: 96) further clarifies that *linguaging* “refers to *producing* language, in particular to producing language in an attempt to understand – to problem-solve – to make meaning” (emphasis in original). The dynamic process of *linguaging* naturally turns learners into users who exploit what Widdowson (2003: 173) calls ‘virtual language’, namely “the potential inherent in the language for innovation beyond what has become established as well-formed or ‘correct’ encodings.” Learners/ELF users activate their capability for using their linguistic resources – regardless of whether their linguistic realizations do or do not conform to the native speaker encodings. Acknowledging such non-conformities implies focusing the attention on the learner and on the learning process. Hence, to investigate ELF means to delve into the dynamics of language learning and the strategies of communication.

Looking at the English language in these terms should spur teachers to turn learners into the protagonists of the ELT classroom, and therefore into effective communicators in an ELF context. To achieve this goal teachers should provide tools that help learners develop the ability to accommodate and negotiate culture-bound meanings between different ELF variations in contact.

2.2. Communicative competence in the ELT classroom

2.2.1. Communicative competence: theoretical models

As I illustrated earlier, the focus of my research is to investigate how communicative competence in ELF can be enhanced through cognitive-experiential practices in the ELT classroom. And since “all pedagogic practice presupposes theory of one kind or

another” (Widdowson 2012b: 3), I will now start to explore the concept of ‘communicative competence’ introduced by Hymes (1972) over forty years ago. Through the lens of ethnography of communication, Hymes (1972) argued that in addition to Chomsky’s (1965) ‘linguistic competence’ – based on the knowledge of grammatical rules by an ideal speaker-hearer in a homogeneous speech community – also the knowledge about the rules of use was part of competence.

We have then to account for the fact that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences not only as grammatical but also as *appropriate*. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where and in what manner.
(Hymes 1972: 277, emphasis added)

Such competence enables the speaker to produce utterances that are grammatical but also appropriate to his/her social context, which, according to Hymes, corresponds that of native speakers:

[t]here is an important sense in which a *normal member of a community* has knowledge with respect to all these aspects of the communicative systems available to him.
(Hymes 1972: 282, emphasis added)

It is evident that there is no pedagogical theory in Hymes’s paper, yet his construct of communicative competence comprising grammatical and speaking rules has been crucial in second or foreign language (FL) pedagogy. Hymes’s (1972) notion was developed in North America and in Europe respectively by Canale and Swain (1980) and by van Ek (1986), who theorised it into models that have since become a reference paradigm for many teachers. At the beginning of the 1980s Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) devised a communicative competence model that encompasses four areas of knowledge and skills:

1. *Grammatical competence*. It deals with the “mastery of the language code (verbal or non-verbal) itself. Such competence focusses directly on the knowledge and skill required to understand and express accurately the literal meaning of utterances.” (Canale 1983: 7)
2. *Sociolinguistic competence*. It concerns the ability to use the language appropriately in specific social situations. “[It] addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts

depending on contextual factors such as status of participants, purposes of the interaction, and norms or conventions of interaction. [...] Appropriateness of utterances refers to both appropriateness of meaning and appropriateness of form. Appropriateness of meaning concerns the extent to which particular communicative functions (e.g. commanding, complaining and inviting), attitudes (including politeness and formality) and ideas are judged to be proper in a given situation. [...] Appropriateness of form concerns the extent to which a given meaning (including communicative functions, attitudes and propositions, ideas) is represented in a verbal and/or non-verbal form that is proper in a given sociolinguistic context.” (Canale 1983: 7)

3. *Discourse competence*. It relates to the knowledge and ability that are needed to put together forms and meanings for constructing written or spoken texts. “Unity of a text is achieved through cohesion in form and coherence in meaning. Cohesion deals with how utterances are linked structurally and facilitates interpretation of a text. For example, the use of cohesion devices such as pronouns, synonyms. [...] Coherence refers to the relationship among the different meanings in a text, where these meanings may be literal meanings, communicative functions and attitudes.” (Canale 1983: 9)
4. *Strategic competence*. It deals with the ability to make oneself understood under particular circumstances. It pertains to the “mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action for two main reasons: (a) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication (e.g. momentary inability to recall an idea or grammatical form) or due to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas above; and (b) to enhance the effectiveness of communication (e.g. deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect).” (Canale 1983: 11)

Canale and Swain (1980) also insist on the necessity to interact with “highly competent speakers”, so that learners would be able to attend to real communicative situations. Furthermore, they suggest that learners should be given enough second language sociocultural background to help them understand social meanings and the values of conversations.

In the mid-1980s van Ek (1986: 33) presented “a framework for comprehensive foreign language learning objectives”. van Ek argued that a foreign language teaching (FLT) model must include the personal and social development of the learner as an individual. As reported by Byram (1997: 9), van Ek (1986) also proposed that FLT objectives include aspects such as “social competence”, “the promotion of autonomy” and the “development of social responsibility”. According to Byram (1997: 9-10), van Ek’s (1986) model of “communicative ability” can be summarized as based on six ‘competences’, which appear to be partly overlapping and are interdependent:

1. *Linguistic competence*: the ability to produce and interpret meaningful utterances which are formed in accordance with the rules of the language concerned and bear their conventional meaning [...] that meaning which native speakers would normally attach to an utterance when used in isolation ([van Ek 1986] p. 39).
 2. *Sociolinguistic competence*: the awareness of ways in which the choice of language forms [...] is determined by such conditions as setting, relationship between communication partners, communicative intention, etc., etc. [...] sociolinguistic competence covers the relation between linguistic signals and their contextual or situational meaning (p. 41).
 3. *Discourse competence*: the ability to use appropriate strategies in the construction and interpretation of texts (p. 47).
 4. *Strategic competence*: when communication is difficult we have to find ways of ‘getting our meaning across’ or of ‘finding out what somebody means’; these are communication strategies, such as rephrasing, asking for clarification (p. 55).
 5. *Socio-cultural competence*: every language is situated in a sociocultural context and implies the use of a particular reference frame which is partly different from that of the foreign language learner; socio-cultural competence presupposes a certain degree of familiarity with that context (p. 35).
 6. *Social competence*: involves both the will and the skill to interact with others, involving motivation, attitude, self-confidence, empathy and the ability to handle social situations (p. 65).
- (Byram 1997: 9-10)

van Ek’s (1986) builds upon Canale’s (1983) four components of communicative competence, but expands the original scheme with two further components: the knowledge of the sociocultural frame in which the target language is used, and the (more personal) social dimension of communication, which he describes in terms of interactional skills.

More or less explicitly, all three frameworks – Hymes’s (1972), Canale and Swain’s (1980) and van Ek’s (1986) – make reference to the native speaker as a model, above all in their definition of grammatical and sociolinguistic competence. Learners

are required to produce utterances that are both accurate, following “the rules of the language concerned and bear their conventional meaning” (van Ek 1986: 39), and appropriate, according to a specific sociolinguistic context. Furthermore, the sociocultural dimension of competence formulated by van Ek (1986: 63) requires learners to “be aware of the sociocultural implications of the language forms they are using”, and thus to comply with the native speaker sociocultural norms. With regard to this issue, Byram (1997: 11) shares Kramsch’s (1993) view that “van Ek’s approach places power in social interaction in the hands of the native speaker.” All three communicative competence schemes share the assumption of a native speaker norm to which the communicatively competent learner needs to conform. Hence, according to these frameworks, communicative competence can only be measured against linguistic, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural native speaker parameters.

Byram (1997: 11) argues that the use of the native speaker paradigm must be criticised from two independent viewpoints. Firstly, he holds that learners cannot attain an impossible target, and consequently they fail; he also adds that the reason for failure lies in the different circumstances by which learners and native speakers learn and acquire a language. Secondly, the native speaker model suggests learners should separate from their own culture and acquire a new sociocultural identity, which may bring to linguistic schizophrenia. And lingua franca English is a case in point as the language is used in globalized intercultural environments where successful communication is gauged in terms of functional effectiveness and mutual intelligibility, not in terms of native speaker formal correctness.

Byram (1997) develops the concept of communicative competence into intercultural communicative competence (ICC) in foreign language teaching. Unlike van Ek’s sociocultural competence, Byram’s ICC does not assume that learners are necessarily familiar with the sociocultural background of their interlocutors, but rather that they are able to interpret and to establish connections between different cultural aspects. Byram holds that communication revolves around establishing and maintaining relationships. He also stresses that communication amounts to more than exchanging information with a merely transactional function, because the message we convey, either in writing or orally, may be decoded differently, depending on the cultural context. Byram takes the stance of symbolic interactionists such as O’Keefe and Delia

(1985), and points out that “FLT should not attempt to provide representations of other cultures, but should concentrate on equipping learners with the means of accessing and analysing any cultural practices and meanings they encounter, whatever their status in a society” (Byram 1997: 18-19). According to this scholar (1997: 113), the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence in terms of knowledge, attitudes, skills of interpreting and relating, and skills of discovering and interaction, fosters both an open and a critical approach to otherness since it “involve[s] learners in questioning and discovering, not in simply accepting a transmitted account of a specific country and its dominant culture.” Byram (1997: 115) goes on to argue that “[i]t thus seems to me that the acquisition of intercultural communicative competence can take place through the learning of a lingua franca, whether English or another language.” Such a view is consonant with ELF, as ELF speakers make use of any linguacultural resources at their disposal to co-construct and negotiate culture-bound meanings in diverse sociocultural contexts.

The introduction of social, discursual and strategic dimensions to the formulation of communicative competence has been highly influential in ELT pedagogy and has shaped the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach to English as a second or foreign language. In the wake of Canale and Swain’s (1980) and van Ek’s (1986) theoretical frameworks, other communicative competence models have been devised and tested in several fields of language teaching. For example, in the mid-1990s Bachman and Palmer (1996) expanded the Canale and Swain model and proposed a ‘communicative language ability’ framework where language knowledge comprises two main components that are complementary to achieve effective communication: organizational knowledge (grammatical and textual knowledge), and pragmatic knowledge (functional and sociolinguistic knowledge). A few years later, in 2001, the Council of Europe published the first version of the “Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment”, a description of communicative language competence, designed for assessment as well as for language learning and teaching. Since then this framework, along with its periodical updates, has underpinned the design of ELT textbooks and assessment tests in European schools.

Communicative competence, as theoretically modelled in the aforementioned examples, is measured against the linguistic and speaking rules of the native speaker –

an idealized speaker belonging to a “self-elected elite” (Widdowson 2003: 37) of educated people. In other words, these models of communicative competence, which have shaped the CLT approach, assume an idealized NS, whose language usage and use provide the yardsticks of competence. Over the years Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers have concurred that the competent learner/user is expected to acquire not only the knowledge of the language, expressed in terms of correctness and accuracy, but also the skills and ability, expressed in terms of appropriateness to the social context, i.e. that of the NS, to activate the linguistic knowledge in a communicative situated event. But despite the need for learners to use the language in meaningful communicative situations, as it is used by native speakers, teachers are not fully equipped to deal with the promotion of the social practice in the ELT classroom. In his overview on communicative competence, Leung (2005: 136) in fact notes that “the social dimension – the dynamic and co-constructed processes of actual communication – has been narrowly rendered into a form of guided social practice to be learned by students in the CLT teacher training literature.”

It is evident that such stance reflects pedagogy in terms of objectives, not processes. The adjective ‘appropriate’, first used by Hymes (1972), referring to utterances circumscribed to a specific sociolinguistic event, in fact, brings back to the ELT objective of achieving the goal of native-speaker proficiency. From an ELF-oriented and learner-centred perspective, ‘appropriate’ should be interpreted as the homograph verb ‘to appropriate’, which refers to the dynamic role of the learners/users who get hold of the language they need for their own use. In his dialogic perspective of language Bakhtin (1981: 293) stresses that the word “becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with its own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention.” A similar view is expressed in Cazden’s 1996 paper on communicative competence:

AppropriATE [...] connotes the more active and aware decision on the part of the learner to acquire a certain way with words in full knowledge of conventionally defined, even hegemonic, contexts of use, more or less feasible meanings, and probable perlocutionary effects.
(Cazden 1996: 16, emphasis in original)

Cazden certainly did not have lingua franca English interactions in mind when she gave her own interpretation of the term ‘appropriate’; nevertheless, her reasoning can be

applied to the *linguaging* process of ELF users who, as Widdowson (2015c: 228) maintains, “do not borrow somebody else’s property, they appropriate it and make it their own.”

2.2.2. Communicative competence: pedagogical models

The communicative approach to ELT, based on the formulation of communicative competence through multidimensional models, has been implemented through several methods. Among the more significant and relatively recent ones, there is Task-based Language Learning and Teaching (TBLT, see Ellis 2000, 2003). In TBLT learners are required to carry out purposeful communicative tasks, whereby they improve their competence – defined in reference to native-speaker norms – through three essential components: complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) (Skehan 1998). Such components of the triad are described by Housen *et al.* (2012: 2) as follows: “complexity is commonly characterized as the ability to use a wide and varied range of sophisticated structures and vocabulary in the L2, accuracy as the ability to produce target-like and error-free language, and fluency as the ability to produce the L2 with native-like rapidity, pausing, hesitation, or reformulation.”

The TBLT purposes are indeed promising in terms of communicative activity. Willis identifies eight of them:

1. to give learners confidence in trying out whatever language they know;
 2. to give learners experience of spontaneous interaction;
 3. to give learners the chance to benefit from noticing how others express similar meanings;
 4. to give learners chances for negotiating turns to speak;
 5. to engage learners in using language purposefully and co-operatively;
 6. to make learners participate in a complete interaction, not just one-off sentences;
 7. to give learners chances to try out communication strategies; and
 8. to develop learners’ confidence that they can achieve communicative goals.
- (Willis 1996: 35-36)

Learners, for example, are encouraged to use the linguistic resources at their disposal and be interactively spontaneous, but in actual fact the only ‘manoeuvres’ allowed to learners must fall within the norms of use and usage of the standard language. Thus, competence in TBLT, or rather, L2 proficiency, as Housen *et al.* (2012) call it, is to fulfil native norms and not to stretch “whatever language they [learners] know” (Willis

1996: 35), including their first language. As Seidlhofer (2011: 184) remarks, “tasks are designed not to develop communicative proficiency as such but proficiency in conforming to native-speaker norms.” Tasks are conceived to guide learners through interlanguage steps towards the achievement of a native-speaker linguistic competence. Ellis (2000: 213) argues that, depending on the adopted theoretical views – cognitive-oriented (Skehan 1998) or sociocultural-oriented (Yule 1997) – that underpin task-based language pedagogy, tasks can improve L2 acquisition and communicative effectiveness with differing emphases but – I would add – with the same goal: attaining native-speaker competence.

In TBLT meaning-focused tasks promote language acquisition in interaction with ‘focus on form’, a term introduced by Long (1991) to refer to “the occasional shifts in learners’ attention from meaning to a linguistic form that can occur while the overriding focus remains on communicating” (Ellis and Shintani 2014: 144). Dewey (2018: 169) highlights that “when the language focus does occur there is nothing novel in TBLT in terms of its approach to English”, and Widdowson (2012a: 23) comments that in TBLT “linguistic competence is taken to be the objective and communication the means for achieving it.” Thus, the task-based approach is not suitable for ELF-oriented classrooms, where both the objective – communicative capability – and the learning process – exploitation of any linguistic resources – are geared to enhance communicative effectiveness and intelligibility in intercultural settings (Seidlhofer 2011). In TBLT activities learners’ initiative is invariably constrained by the ENL requirements, determined through CAF, and, perhaps, also by the teacher, who, wearing the EFL straitjacket, does not allow learners any leeway in *linguaging*.

2.2.3. ELF and the reconceptualization of communicative competence

The reconceptualization of communicative competence has become crucial in the past two decades with the emerging use of lingua franca English for communication in intercultural environments. ELF users seem to disregard the native speaker regulative norms, and to appropriate the language to make their communicative act more effective, depending on the contexts of use. Nonetheless, in the ELT classrooms the learners who do not conform to the rules of use and usage of the native speaker are labelled as incompetent, which turns out not to be true as they use the linguistic and cultural

resources at their disposal to communicate efficiently and effectively. As Widdowson explains:

they are judged to be incompetent on two counts: not only is their knowledge of the language imperfect in that they do not conform to the abstract encoding rules that are said to constitute native speaker competence, but they do not know how to perform properly because they do not conform to conventions of actual native speaker usage either.
(Widdowson 2012a: 16)

And this entrenched concept is translated into the equation ‘competence=conformity to NS norms’. Furthermore, Widdowson makes it clear that:

competence in ELF cannot correspond with native speaker competence. Non-native ELF users cannot know English as native speakers know it. Native speaker knowledge is abstracted from the experience of primary socialization whereby language, culture and social identity are naturally and inseparably interconnected. Non-native speaker ELF users experience the language very differently, as an extension of a language resource they already have, acquired through secondary socialization and separated from these primary and inherent connections with culture and identity.
(Widdowson 2012a: 16)

Non-native ELF users usually communicate in an intelligible and effective way although their knowledge of English, considered deficient, does not compare with the accepted NS competence level. ELF research has shown that ELF users exploit the potential for making meaning inherent in the language – the so-called virtual language – focusing on what is important and functional to communication in diverse contexts of use. In so doing, they show a capability for calling on the virtual language, and accordingly, for making realizations not (yet) encoded that well express their communicative purposes while developing “a capability for further language learning” (Widdowson 2015a: 12). A similar view is expressed by Seidlhofer, who points out that:

[u]sers of ELF, having learnt ‘how to mean’ (Halliday 1975) make communicative use of the language they have learnt and extend their learning quite naturally as they extend its use.
(Seidlhofer 2011: 189)

Learners of English are confronted with this scenario when they turn into users of the language and experiment with *languaging*, that is with “the strategies for making sense, negotiating meaning, co-constructing understanding” (Seidlhofer 2011: 198).

The emerging use of ELF also requires a reconceptualization of communicative competence which casts light on the intercultural dimension of communication, namely on the relationship between language and ever-changing sociocultural contexts. In fact, as Baker (2015: 43) explains: “ELF is by definition intercultural in nature since ELF communication is typically defined as involving speakers from different linguacultures.”

Baker (2011: 199) rejects the essentialist view according to which the English language carries English culture with it (see Gu 2009, quoted in Baker, *ibid.*). He points out that ELF exchanges cannot be seen as culturally neutral either, since:

[c]ommunication is always embedded in and constitutive of social situations and involves speakers with purposes and positions, none of which are neutral.
(Baker 2011: 199)

The view that both language and culture are fluid and dynamic resources in intercultural communicative events implies that ELF users negotiate and mediate in sociocultural contexts, invariably diverse and emergent, which suggests that “there is no clear ‘target culture’ to which English can be assigned” (Baker 2011: 200). Baker goes on to argue that “[a]longside a knowledge of the more formal features of language, knowledge of culture is needed, but not of only one specific target culture” (*ibid.*).

What is crucial in ELF-mediated communicative exchanges is an understanding of the cultural influences that shape intercultural communication in a fluid and variable way. Baker calls it intercultural awareness (ICA) and defines it as follows.

Intercultural awareness is a conscious understanding of the role culturally based forms, practices and frames of reference can have in intercultural communication, and an ability to put these conceptions into practice in a flexible and context specific manner in real time communication.
(Baker 2011: 202)

The significance of intercultural awareness in ELF communication is twofold: (i) English is no longer associated with the native speaker culture, and (ii) it is recognized as the medium to convey and also appropriate cultural behaviours belonging to communities with different linguacultural backgrounds. Studies on ELF interactions show that ELF speakers call on various cultural reference frames within the same

conversation and move in-between contexts to attain transactional and interactional goals (Baker 2018: 29-30; Pitzl 2018a: 221-222).

Baker (2018: 33) contends that ICA may be a solid attempt to delve into the concepts of skills, knowledge and attitude that come into play in ELF-mediated communication. He also holds that ICA (i) goes beyond the construct of intercultural communicative competence, primarily focused on the concepts of national language and culture, and (ii) provides “an understanding of the fluid, complex and emergent nature of the relationship between language and culture in intercultural communication through ELF” (*ibid.*). Baker (2018) draws on Byram’s (1997) ICC proposal but adopts a multilingual and multicultural perspective, fully dismissing the distinction between ‘host’ and ‘guest’ roles in intercultural communication. The ICA multi-level model proposed by Baker (2011, 2018) encompasses (i) a broad awareness of the cultural dimension of communication, (ii) a better appreciation of the diversity of communicative practices, and finally, (iii) a higher ICA level, which moves beyond the ‘our culture’-‘their culture’ dichotomy (Holliday 2011: 19) in a flexible, dynamic way, so as to produce novel and emergent forms and practices.

In her discussion about linguistic and multicultural competence in Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF), Pullin (2015) refers to Louhiala-Salminen and Kankaaranta’s (2011) Global Communicative Competence (GCC), i.e. the effective communication in the global business context, to introduce a new dimension of GCC: that of socio-pragmatic competence, a crucial aspect in business interactions. Pullin (2015: 39), who draws on Leech’s (1983: 10) definition of socio-pragmatics, including “specific ‘local’ conditions on language use”, views socio-pragmatic competence “as encompassing social norms and genres and their relative natures (Baker 2011), on the one hand, and pragmatic strategies for communication on the other hand.” Pullin’s dimension of competence incorporates the sociocultural and strategic components illustrated in previous communicative competence models, acting out as “[t]he interface between linguistic and cultural competence” (*ibid.*).

As Santner-Wolfartsberger points out:

pragmatics [...] is definitely culture-bound. The context of an utterance is very often shaped by cultural factors, and what we really ‘mean’ when we say

something depends not least on our beliefs, values, norms, and expectations, i.e., on many of the things we encounter in contemporary definitions of culture. (Santner-Wolfartsberger 2015a: 59)

Thomas (1983: 99), who investigates pragmatic failure in cross-cultural encounters, argues that the teacher should distinguish pragmalinguistic failure, “basically a *linguistic* problem, caused by differences in the linguistic encoding of pragmatic force,” from socio-pragmatic failure, which “stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behaviour” (emphasis in original). Thomas (1983: 109) also points out that pragmalinguistic failure is evidence of language-specific decisions, and socio-pragmatic failure is “a reflection of the student's system of values and beliefs, and should not be ‘corrected’, but only pointed out and discussed.” Thomas’s view is grounded in the Interlanguage pragmatics models that assess pragmatic failure against the ENL paradigm. Nevertheless, her suggestion may be adopted when dealing with pragmatic misunderstandings in English as a lingua franca interactions: under these circumstances, discussion develops awareness of ELF speakers’ different way of communicating, which is crucially informed by the interactants’ L1 grammar and discourse-pragmatic features (Guido 2008: 26).

In the context of the widespread use of English as a lingua franca we can conceptualize ELF communicative competence as the ability to accommodate and negotiate culture-bound meanings in an intercultural environment, where speakers convey their own cultural behaviours while nurturing their identity. ELF communicative competence hinges on the “strategic capability for using the linguistic resources of English adapting them as appropriate to the various contexts and for the various purposes of global communication” (Widdowson 2015a: 14). Most importantly, ELF speakers do not conform to a NS model; rather, they use the potential of the virtual language for their own communicative purposes. As a result, a linguistic form can get adapted to serve a communicative function (Widdowson 2015a: 10); in other words, effective communication in ELF does not entail SE formal correctness. I also believe that communicative competence in ELF encompasses intercultural awareness, that is, an understanding of the cultural features that linguistic forms and behaviours convey, dynamically shaping intercultural communication. Thus, developing an intercultural awareness leads to a better appreciation of ELF speakers’ meanings and cultural capital. In summary, the kind of communicative competence that

needs to be enhanced in ELF-oriented classrooms combines the pragmatic exploitation of all linguistic resources available to ELF users (Widdowson 2015b; Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2017) with a broad awareness of the cultural diversity inherent in intercultural communication.

2.3. ELF and teacher education

In recent years, a fair amount of research has been addressed to investigating how to integrate ELF into ELT practices. Researchers concur that ELF theoretical studies and empirical findings can break into the ELT arena through reflective teacher education. Dewey (2012: 143) argues that teacher education in the UK has mostly focused its attention upon training, providing teaching approaches and methods, and disregarding the subject matter ‘English’. The backdrop of this *status quo* is represented by “little desire to question new assumptions” about English (Seidlhofer 2011: 190). Although the role of English as a lingua franca is taken for granted worldwide, the way ELF manifests itself is often either overlooked or dismissed as learner English. ELF unhinges the commonly held assumptions concerning communicative competence and language learning. Traditional ELT pedagogy revolves around the assumptions (i) that communicative effectiveness depends on linguistic competence, normally measured against SE norms or the conventions of native-speaker usage and (ii) that language learning is – as Seidlhofer (2015: 24) words it – “a *quantitative* matter: what counts is how much English is learned, particularly how much grammar can be drawn upon” (emphasis in original).

Misconceptions concerning ELF may also keep ELT pedagogy away from the new reality of English as a medium of intercultural communication. A definitely wrong interpretation is that ELF is a “‘new’ variety” of English (Seidlhofer 2011: 192), or a “monolithic model of English” (Park and Wee 2014: 41). Guido (2008: 25) writes in support of “the argument for the existence of more than one ELF variety depending on the particular groups of speakers from different L1 backgrounds who ‘authenticate’ English according to their own diverse native cognitive-semantic, syntactic, pragmatic and specialized-discourse parameters.” Those who firmly cling to the orthodox ELT tradition view ELF either as a separate and distinct variety of English and thus an alternative to Standard English, which may threaten the aura of ‘pure’ ENL, or as

broken linguistic realizations of EFL “modelled on ENL” (Seidlhofer 2011: 194). A common belief is that ELF exchanges exclude ENL speakers. This is not true since both native and non-native speakers of English participate in intercultural communication, adjusting to their interlocutors so as to make their interactions more fluid and effective (Seidlhofer 2011: 192). Finally, it is important to report the position of key ELT stakeholders, especially policy decision makers and testing bodies; they do not acknowledge ELF as a field of research and, accordingly, do not take into consideration the possibility to incorporate ELF findings in the teaching contexts (Seidlhofer 2015: 20).

As ELF researchers caution, however, the question is not teaching ELF, which they have amply demonstrated is not a variety of English, but teaching how to integrate ELF into the English classroom. Researchers suggest that teachers “should proceed to question some of the more deeply rooted assumptions [they] hold about language” (Park and Wee 2011: 368) and “re-examine current methodology and practice in context-relevant ways” (Dewey 2012: 141). Teachers should question their “normative view of English”, bearing in mind that all norms are “unstable, negotiated online, continually shifting and changing” (Seidlhofer 2008: 33.4). Dewey (2012: 166) posits that “ELF is relevant not so much in terms of identifying alternative sets of norms, but more in terms of enabling us to move beyond normativity.” He adds that:

[a]dopting an ELF perspective might not in fact be so much concerned with developing a multi-norm approach [...], but rather with incorporating a postnormative orientation to language learning and use.
(Dewey 2012: 166)

A post-normative approach – an approach that moves beyond native-speaker rules – would enable teachers to decide for themselves on the relevance of the norms to be presented, according to the ever-changing idiosyncracies of their teaching contexts. Thus, a sociolinguistic understanding of English would help teachers realize that the language continuously adapts to serve local contextual uses (Dewey 2012: 167). Also Blair (2015: 91) argues in favour of a reformulation of an ELT pedagogy that encompasses multicompetence and an ELF-aware orientation for a ‘post-native’ era. He highlights that “the ever-moving pedagogical target can be imagined as ‘beyond-native’ competence, with no ‘final state’ to the acquisition process” (*ibid.*). Blair points out that both teachers and learners would need to understand better the inherent

language variability and diversity, and suggests that teachers should put more energy on dealing with pragmatics and intercultural competence. He goes on to argue that a ‘multilingual principle’ is needed in ELT pedagogy in order to implement ELF-aware practices. Blair (2015: 97) further elaborates on this principle: “[l]earning a new language, or returning to a previously-studied one, should be an important part of training to be a teacher of English; this particularly applies to (near-) monolingual ‘natives’.” The researcher writes that (near-) monolingual ‘natives’, in particular, should resume or start the study of a language (*ibid.*): but referring to my own teaching experience, I would add that all language teachers should learn at least another language at some point in their teaching career. When they learn a new language, all English teachers – ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ alike – gain fresh, first-hand experience of how languages are acquired and may develop a deeper insight into how ELF communication works; as a result, they are better geared up for dealing with ELF pedagogic implications in the ELT classroom. In doing so, as Blair (2015: 97) remarks, the ‘nativeness’ issue loses relevance among teachers and learners in favour of more cogent issues such as confidence, competence and identity. Borrowing Kirkpatrick’s (2010: 10) words, a more open, ‘post-native’ ‘multilingual’ perspective in ELT pedagogy could “provide more appropriate goals and targets for the countless multilingual learners of English who have hitherto been penalised if their use and production of language differs from that of the native speaker.”

Sifakis (2014: 330) proposes a transformative orientation to ELF teacher education to help “teachers define ELF for themselves and for their teaching contexts.” His transformative framework promotes a change that focuses on the mindsets of the teachers, who may then feel empowered to introduce ELF-aware practices into their classrooms. Sifakis’s (2007) transformative approach to ELT, based on Mezirow’s (1989) critical social theory, encourages teachers to explore ELF discourse, read ELF literature, engage in critical reflective discussions about the issues arising along the programme (e.g. attitudes to ELF and preconceived ideas about language teaching and testing), and finally design, implement and evaluate an ELF action plan tailored to their specific contextual teaching situations. Through a transformative framework, teachers question their assumptions and entrenched beliefs about English and language teaching; their transformation ultimately takes shape into ELF-aware self-designed practices. In this respect Sifakis maintains that:

[t]he (need for) change is located in teachers' personal interest in understanding ELF and seeing it as an opportunity for change first for themselves (as teachers, users, and custodians of English – cf. Sifakis 2009) and only in a second step for their learners.
(Sifakis 2014: 325)

In the ELF-Ted (English as a Lingua Franca-Teacher Education) project (Bayyurt and Sifakis 2015a), all teachers who started the 'transformative process' for becoming ELF-aware felt more self-confident in their role of non-native teachers of English, and also better equipped to cater for students' actual uses of English. According to Sifakis and Bayyurt (2018: 459), ELF teacher development involves teachers "learn[ing] about ELF research and go[ing] on to develop, teach and evaluate their own original implementations"; hence "ELF [pedagogy] develops together with the teachers who develop by implementing it" (*ibid.*). Sifakis's framework moves in the direction of an ELF-aware pedagogy, based on "the co-construction of the teaching and learning experience through practical implementation" (Sifakis and Bayyurt 2018: 460) that goes beyond an ELF-informed pedagogy, based on information and on little individual experimentation. Thus, according to these researchers, an ELF-aware pedagogy is "better suited to EFL teacher education" (*ibid.*). Such projects as ELF-Ted (Bayyurt and Sifakis 2015a, 2015b) and ELF-GATE (Growing Awareness Through English as a Lingua Franca: Kordia 2016; Sifakis *et al.* 2018), which were both developed out of a synergy between university researchers and English practitioners, have proved to be highly successful regarding teachers' personal transformation towards a re-evaluation of ELT practices, in the light of ELF theoretical and empirical research.

ELT teacher education programmes may bridge the gap between the current ELF research literature and the language teachers' local reality. This is well illustrated in Vettorel's (2017b) overview of research works dealing with English as an international language (EIL)/ELF implications in teacher education². As Lopriore and Vettorel point out:

[r]e-consideration of language and language learning in terms of the role and function of English varieties and of ELF should be included as the underlying component of teacher education courses since it is in *initial education* and teaching communities that awareness of language, language varieties and multi-language competence may best be developed (Cook 2002; Alptekin 2010).

² Among the global Englishes that have an impact on the English Language Teaching, Vettorel (2017b) also includes World Englishes (WE).

(Lopriore and Vettorel 2015:19, emphasis added)

In fact, pre-service teacher education courses that focus on a reflective exploration of ELF-related questions promote “a critical awareness towards issues like intercultural competence, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, World Englishes, among other topics” (Azuaga and Cavaleiro 2015: 347).

ELF-oriented teacher education implies questioning a variety of assumptions that underpin established didactic practices. For example, there are conceptual issues concerning the language in terms of variation, ownership, monolingualism and standardness, communication strategies and intercultural communication (Jenkins 2006, 2007; Seidlhofer 2011; Vettorel 2016b). As Jenkins suggests, teacher education should

look at ELF within a framework of sociolinguistic variation (which means treating variation as the norm and conformity as the exception) and take into consideration social-psychological factors relating to identity, both by not denying ELF speakers their L1 linguacultural roots and by giving them space to develop their ELF shoots, i.e. their ELF group membership.
(Jenkins 2005)

Additionally, Seidlhofer argues that:

[t]he objective [...] would be to counteract the ‘code-fixation’ of much current language pedagogy that tends to be focused on developing proficiency in language forms rather than awareness of the nature of language itself and its creative potential.
(Seidlhofer 2011: 205)

ELF discourse brings about interesting insights into the language panorama of lexicogrammar, intelligibility, pragmatics and communication in its various aspects (Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Sifakis 2007). Teachers must appreciate the various interacting strategic processes that ELF speakers activate to guarantee mutual intelligibility and successful communication (see Jenkins *et al.* 2011 for an overview). They should focus on communicative awareness like ‘let it pass’ (Firth 1996), and pragmatic strategies such as providing and asking for repetition, rephrasing and reformulation (Kaur 2011; Björkman 2014), “regulating back-channel behaviour [...], avoiding ‘unilateral idiomaticity’” (Seidlhofer 2011: 205), and pre-empting non- or mis-understanding (Mauranen 2006; Kaur 2009; Cogo and Pitzl 2016). As Baker (2018: 33) points out,

“these strategies are not [to be] seen as ‘compensating’ for communicative deficiencies but rather as displays of pragmatic competence by successful multilingual and multicultural intercultural communicators”, who are accommodating to their interlocutors’ repertoires (Dewey 2012: 164). ELF communicative strategies are normally not different from the pragmatic features of all communication, but they become essential for speakers from diverse linguacultural backgrounds willing to build common ground and understanding. Accommodation to the communicative situated event and ‘comity’ (Leech 1983) among the interactants, namely the construction and maintenance of a rapport in terms of negotiating solidarity and of negotiating support (Aston 1988, 1993), are crucially promoted by the aforementioned strategies. The Europe-based ELF corpora, VOICE³ and ELFA⁴, and the Asia-based ELF corpus, ACE⁵, combined with ELF findings in various domains (e.g. Cogo 2009; Dewey 2011; Kaur 2011; Björkman 2014; Cogo and House 2018) provide transcriptions of authentic interactions that teachers may explore and translate into pedagogical practices. For example, teachers willing to design noticing and reflective activities on communication strategies such as comprehension, confirmatory, or clarification checks may resort to the excerpts from ELF transcriptions available on the aforementioned online corpora⁶.

Most of the studies conducted on teacher education (and training) programmes in Italy (e.g. Bozzo 2015; Pedrazzini 2015; Vettorel 2015, 2016b; Lopriore 2016; Vettorel and Lopriore 2017) and elsewhere (e.g. Blair 2015; Dewey 2015a; Gimenez *et al.* 2015; Cavaleiro 2016; Siqueira 2016) demonstrate that the ELF paradigm represents a potential catalyst for questioning traditional ELT beliefs and attitudes and for adopting a more open view towards English as a medium of intercultural communication. The studies mentioned above highlight that encouraging both prospective and in-service teachers to reflect on the nature of English and communication determines a shift in perspective in the trainees: “an understanding that English is not a monolithic entity and its plurilithic aspects can be integrated and localized in and for the language

³ VOICE is the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English compiled at the University of Vienna between 2005 and 2013 under the supervision of Prof. Barbara Seidlhofer (<https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/>).

⁴ ELFA is the English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings corpus completed at Helsinki University in 2008 under the supervision of Prof. Anna Mauranen (<http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/>).

⁵ ACE is the Asian Corpus of English compiled between 2009 and 2014 under the supervision of Prof. Andy Kirkpatrick (<https://corpus.eduhk.hk/ace/index.html>).

⁶ Chapter 6 illustrates some activities built on ELF transcriptions.

classroom” (Cogo 2015: 9). Although critical reflection and noticing (Schmidt 1993, 2001) trigger positive attitudes towards a “change in mindset” (Jenkins 2007: 238) in trainee teachers, the findings of some research studies (e.g. Pedrazzini 2015, Lopriore 2016, Siqueira 2016) show that the trainees are hesitant to include ELF-oriented practices into their day-to-day teaching. Thus, there is the need for further collaboration between researchers, teacher educators and teachers in the field of lesson plans and activities (for example, collaborative action research). As Vettorel explains:

[s]uch cooperation would support teachers in finding “their own ways” of consistently introducing plurality and ELF into the ELT curriculum and their classroom practices, as well as to critically examine ingrained beliefs (language as a complex system, language change, language use within a sociocultural perspective; Kohn 2015) and traditional ELT practices to “make sense of them” in their own teaching and learning contexts (Dewey 2014, Dewey 2015b: 191). (Vettorel 2016b: 128)

Vettorel and Lopriore (2017) illustrate the module on World Englishes (WE) and ELF implications in ELT that they introduced in two language teacher education courses in Italy (University of Verona and University of Roma Tre), interestingly remarking that the “critical evaluation of published material has led to the exploitation of textbooks as a starting point for a WE- and ELF-aware approach” (Vettorel 2016b: 127-128). Although examples of some sociocultural aspects of plurilithic English have been more present in coursebooks lately, both at international level (e.g. Matsuda 2012; Song 2013) and in the Italian landscape (Vettorel 2010; Vettorel and Corrizzato 2012; Vettorel and Lopriore 2013), Vettorel (2016b: 128) underlines that this evidence “would probably be left unexplored by the teachers, and consequently students, unless teachers are trained to notice, expand and build on them”, quoting Cogo (2015: 9). Teachers and learners alike largely picture the language – and the culture it conveys – through the coursebooks in use. For this reason, the teachers’ critical appraisal of the textbooks and of their supplementary materials becomes of paramount importance in ELF-aware classrooms.

2.4. ELF and pedagogical practices

Having discussed the pivotal issues of teacher education in light of the diversity of English in global and local contexts, it is now crucial to examine how ELF can impact on pedagogical practices. As Lopriore and Vettorel (2015: 18) point out, moving

towards an ELF-aware pedagogy means “to identify, implement and share successful activities, tasks and materials that promote and sustain learner awareness of different instantiations of English.” The researchers (2015: 24) suggest that students should develop an awareness-based orientation to the variability of the language, to be achieved through noticing tasks that elicit learners’ reflections on the features of different realizations of English in different contexts. They explain that “learners can be involved in noticing activities, for example of the communication strategies as used by characters in video extracts, as well as of those the learners normally use in their L1” (Lopriore and Vettorel 2015: 26).

Along with the sociolinguistic awareness of the variability of English, learners need to enhance their ability to use interactive and intercultural communicative strategies (Hülmbauer 2009; Seidlhofer 2011; Cogo and Dewey 2012). The learners’ out-of-school reality, where English plays a significant role within Web 2.0 practices and computer gaming, inevitably turns them into users of the language and more inclined to exploit their “literate underlife” (Finders 1997) in their school context (Sifakis 2018: 16). eTwinning⁷, a platform that provides technological and organizational support for European school partnerships, along with dedicated blogs and other digital spaces, all used in classroom and out-of-class settings, can be valid tools for promoting learners’ actual ELF communication using *language* (Swain 2006) and *translanguaging* (García and Wei 2014) and for reflecting on communicative strategies, cultural and pragmatic features. Such tools enable learners (i) to engage in meaningful interactions with non-native (but also native) speakers, and hence (ii) to become aware of cultural and linguistic differences (Lopriore and Vettorel 2016). As Benson and Reinders (2011: 2) point out, “[w]ell-rounded communicative proficiency, it seems, depends to a large extent on the learner’s efforts to use and learn the language beyond the walls of the classroom.” Lopriore and Vettorel (2015), too, underscore the importance of out-of-school activities, which enable learners to make actual use of the language, ultimately turning them into real users/communicators.

Grazzi (2016) provides an example of intercultural telecollaboration – in class

⁷ eTwinning is a free online community for schools in Europe and some neighbouring countries. It promotes school collaboration providing support and tools within a secure network and platform (<https://www.etwinning.net/en/pub/index.htm>).

and out of class – within an Italian-Finnish partnership between two upper-secondary schools in Rome and Helsinki during the academic years 2014-2015. With the goal of promoting intercultural communicative skills, the project was designed to make learners fully in charge of the communicative process. To this end, activities such as peer review, aimed at improving the overall intelligibility of the written texts, were prioritized. The project shows that “pedagogical innovations in the English classroom can be based on a blended approach whereby the variability of English as a global language, the technological innovations of web-mediated communication, and the potential of multicultural collaborative learning practice converge to enhance the L2-user's ‘intercultural communicative competence’ (Byram 1997: 3)” (Grazzi 2016: 21).

In a similar vein, TILA (Telecollaboration for Intercultural Language Acquisition), a project focused on intercultural telecollaboration for FL learning in secondary schools in Germany, France, the Netherlands and Spain, has proved to be a successful tool for improving intercultural learning, using ELF and implementing lingua franca pedagogy beyond the face-to-face classroom (Kohn 2015, 2016, 2018a; Kohn and Hoffstaedter 2017). The learners, engaged in oral and written conversational interactions in synchronous and asynchronous telecollaborative environments, discussed everyday topics assigned from a list without any prior specific preparation and, more often than not, they brought up topics they were interested in by “mak[ing] their conversations authentic for themselves” (Kohn 2016: 30). The choice of familiar topics was in line with the researchers’ assumption that intercultural communicative competence is strongly rooted in ordinary communication (Kohn 2018b: 35) and “[i]t also reflects the pedagogical principle to first enable learners to acquire interculturally relevant communicative attitudes and skills before confronting them with topics that are cognitively or emotionally loaded” (Kohn and Hoffstaedter 2017: 356). The findings of the project reveal that telecollaborative communication, experienced as authentic conversations with ‘real’ speakers, can enhance learner agency in terms of topic, communicative and language choices, promoting the development of an emancipated non-native speaker identity that is substantiated by “speaker satisfaction based on communicative and communal requirements of success” (Kohn and Hoffstaedter 2017: 361). According to the researchers, the didactic keystone lies in a social constructivist language learning approach (Kohn 2011, 2015) and in the ‘real’ communicative experience activated through telecollaborative participation in

intercultural exchanges, which enables learners to feel users of the language and effective communicators outside the classroom (Kohn 2018b). In keeping with Kohn (2018b), Benson and Reinders (2011: 5) comment that many SLA researchers “no longer see acquisition in purely cognitive terms, but in terms of participation in communities and contexts of various kinds” and acknowledge the value of out-of-class learning.

Within a more traditional instructional approach, Kordia (2018) illustrates how she incorporated some original ELF-aware activities into her own ELT classroom. The activities she designed were part of the action research she conducted in the framework of an online ELF-aware teacher development programme that adopts a transformative perspective for teacher education. After having explored whether and to what extent her learners used English outside the classroom and how they viewed the issues of ownership of English, Kordia (2018: 62) devised activities that could couple issues concerning intelligibility, comprehensibility, multilingualism and multiculturalism with the requirements of the teaching curriculum and the use of English in her own country. The main challenge the researcher (and teacher) had to face was to understand what her “learners would *do* at these activities that would be *useful* to them as language users” (Kordia 2018: 63, emphasis in original). The ELF-aware approach to designing original classroom activities has proved to be useful to foster the learners’ awareness of ELF communicative aspects. Kordia (2018: 66) also comments on the importance of adjusting ELF-oriented activities to the learners’ local context, for example, regarding the teaching of pronunciation or error correction. Indeed Kirkpatrick (2018: 259) holds that “the complexity and diversity of ELF contexts means that perhaps the most fundamental principle underlying an ELF-aware approach to language teaching is its sensitivity to context.” A similar view is expressed by Seidlhofer, who underlines that any decision concerning courses content and teaching practices is “above all a *local* question” (2011: 202: emphasis in original).

An interesting study on English oral tasks conducted in primary schools in Italy within the ELLiE (Early Language Learning in Europe) research project (Lopriore 2015) shows that young learners can be fairly effective communicators when they interact in the absence of much performative pressure. The research highlights the students’ spontaneous meaning negotiation and co-construction, sustained by a range

of communicative and pragmatic strategies, in a typical ELF context, where the guiding teacher is a non-native speaker of English and the learners are multilingual and multi-competent. The data cast light on “the hybrid uses in code-switches in teacher talk and students’ pair and group work (Firth 2009a), various aspects of lexicogrammar typical of ELF (Seidlhofer 2004), and [on] how ELF features represent creative ways of using English, learners’ multiple competences and suggest the emergence of new identities (Seidlhofer 2004, Jenkins 2007)” (Lopriore 2015: 166). The most surprising finding is the young learners’ strong desire to communicate and their ample use of pragmatic strategies such as code-switching, repetitions, paraphrasing, lexical creativity and the like. Lopriore (2015: 170) investigates the acquisition of such strategies, as they are not explicitly taught in the ELT primary classrooms, concluding that the learners “partly resort to their L1 competence and partly re-use or echo those strategies they have been mostly exposed to.” Lopriore (*ibid.*) indeed suggests that teachers should be educated to develop suitable activities for communicative effectiveness and to exploit all sorts of linguacultural resources available in the classroom and in the out-of-school contexts rather than to simply focus on the correctness of form. Lopriore (*ibid.*) also maintains that such a change in perspective would enhance effective communication in the ELT primary classroom and “develop confident English users” who “are eager to communicate trying out the language they are learning.” This orientation should be adopted in all school grades in Italy as learners need first to appropriate and authenticate the language and then to feel leading actors of their own learning.

This chapter has introduced the implications of ELF – a global medium of intercultural communication – for the ELT classroom. Through an overview of how English as a subject is dealt with in Italian schools we highlighted the engrained ideologies of native speakerism acting on the learning objectives, which must comply with the norms of use and usage of the native speaker. The theoretical models of communicative competence that over the years have informed the CLT approach and the more recent TBLT, all assume an idealized NS as a benchmark for measuring learners’ competence. In light of the globalized use of ELF and its emergent nature, such paradigm can no longer be adopted to gauge the effectiveness of ELF communication, or to foster the emancipation of the learner/ELF user. Successful ELF speakers use the linguistic resources available in their repertoire to make meaning and to co-construct understanding in an intercultural environment.

Building upon this background, we attempted to conceptualize ELF communicative competence as the ability to accommodate and negotiate meanings in an intercultural environment, drawing on the strategic exploitation of the virtual language for specific communicative purposes. This conceptualization fully dismisses the native speaker model: English in ELF is no longer associated with NS formal correctness, nor NS culture. ELF communicative competence also entails developing a broad awareness of the variable cultural behaviours that permeate intercultural exchanges.

This chapter has then homed in on ELF-oriented pedagogy, which privileges the learning processes and approaches language teaching and learning with a post-normative perspective, raising language and cultural awareness and encouraging speaker satisfaction. It has discussed teachers' assumptions and deep-rooted beliefs about English (as a language as well as a school subject) along with their misconceptions about ELF, and has examined a variety of approaches that may help teachers integrate ELF into their English teaching. Finally, the discussion has centred on a selection of successful ELF practices enacted in Italian and German ELT classrooms involved in European projects or school partnerships. The researchers involved in the projects concur that activities such as those engaging learners in meaningful ELF interactions enhance learner agency and turn learners into effective, confident communicators. But they also made very clear that ELF-aware activities are all sensitive to context, no matter whether they are developed in a real or virtual space, in class or out of class, and that any decision about their content and implementation needs to be made locally.

Having established a theoretical framework of ELF implications for the ELT classroom, the next chapter will examine significant approaches to ELF empirical investigation, focusing on the research methodology adopted for this study.

3. ELF Discourse Analysis: Research Methodology

3.1. Beyond ELF Communities of Practice

The established methodological tools utilized to analyse talk-in-action within speech communities explore the dimensions of the speech event (Hymes 1972) and examine the relationship among the interactants and the purpose of their communication, focusing on the “Trinity” represented by culture-community-language (Widdowson 2019). Since ELF is concerned with local networks of interactions where speakers connect to one another employing their multilingual schematic resources, ELF breaks up, or rather, “denies this trinity”, quoting Widdowson (*ibid.*). Hence, new *ad hoc* analytic frameworks should be taken into consideration.

For over a decade the social dimension of ELF has been investigated within a framework of Communities of Practice (CoPs), rejecting the concept of speech communities, which is associated with homogenous linguacultural backgrounds and shared cultural schemata. Such reconceptualization of ELF dates back to the second half of the 2000s, when Seidlhofer (2007), arguing that ELF could not fit into the framework of ‘speech community’, suggested adopting the concept of ‘community of practice’ instead. Mauranen (2018: 12) describes a CoP as “a real community (in contrast to imagined communities) in that it is based on members’ direct interaction with one another”, adding that “these communities consist of people who know each other.” The three criterial dimensions that Wenger (1998: 73) ascribes to a CoP, namely mutual engagement, its joint enterprise and a shared repertoire, may very well characterize an ELF-CoP whose speakers interact on a regular basis along a reasonably long stretch of time. In fact, the CoP framework has been utilized as a methodological tool in the exploration of ELF-based communities of practice in the business domain (Ehrenreich 2009; Cogo 2016), in higher education contexts (Kalocsai 2009, 2014; Smit 2010), and in the blogosphere (Vettorel 2014). Investigating Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF), Ehrenreich (2018: 40) contends that “the community of practice framework, which requires an ethnographic and multi-dimensional research methodology, facilitates detailed sociolinguistic and sociopragmatic analyses of *when* and *how* ELF speakers in a given interactional sequence decide to co-operate or not

with each other” (emphasis in original). The same researcher also stresses the innovative facet of (B)ELF-CoP studies that:

make ‘the social’ visible in (B)ELF, thus restoring its full communicative complexity as ‘language in its social context’; an aspect that had previously, hence Seidlhofer’s [*et al.* 2006: 21] call, been neglected in ELF research. (Ehrenreich 2018: 45)

In her overview of studies on CoPs, Pitzl (2018b: 29) notes that a CoP is likely to consist of smaller (social) groups. She also points out that “[w]e hardly ever see ‘a/the CoP’ in a recorded interaction; we tend to see groups of ELF speakers that may – or may not – be part of one (or more) ELF-CoPs” (*ibid.*). As time is one of the factors upon which ELF speakers build up a community of shared practices, I agree with Pitzl (2018b) on the inappropriateness of the notion community in what we can refer to as ‘chance meetings’. Pitzl (2018b: 27) maintains that in the ELF universe, mostly constellated by transient encounters, the CoP framework can be applied only in very specific circumstances because “ELF speakers are often organized in *groups* not necessarily in communities of any kind” (emphasis in original). Jenkins (2015: 76) suggests that Pratt’s (1991) notion of ‘contact zones’ – whose focus lies on ‘contact’ rather than on ‘practice’ – might better describe ‘online’ co-constructed communication between speakers of diverse linguacultural background in “one-off or infrequent encounters”. Jenkins (2015: 77) believes that such notion, “with further theorizing, would enable us to move the ELF research focus away, where relevant, from the more homogeneous notions of community, shared practices, and mutual engagement towards greater heterogeneity and ‘ad hoc-ness’ in metaphorical zones or ‘spaces’.” Pitzl (2018b: 27) proposes, instead, the term Transient International Groups (TIGs), which better suits the emergent nature of ELF in short-lived encounters. Pitzl (2018b: 28) also points out that as an analytic tool, the CoP does not seem appropriate to describe the lexicogrammatical features and the pragmatic strategies in spoken ELF interactions. This happens because within the CoP framework the focus mostly rests on the community dynamics rather than on the language, and on interviews/focus group data rather than on third person-recorded ELF interactions (*ibid.*).

Pitzl’s (2018b: 32) analysis of TIGs is based on the assumption that “most TIGs will not be *intercultural* (as in: happening between *cultures), but are likely to be *transcultural*” (emphasis in original). Following Baker (2018: 26), who proposes the

expression ‘transcultural communication’ to describe communication across and through borders rather than between borders, Pitzl (2018b: 35) maintains that ELF speakers make use of their whole multilingual repertoire, sharing not only part of their ‘similects’⁸ (Mauranen 2012: 248), but also the linguistic resources at their disposal, expanding the ‘Multilingual Resource Pool’ (MRP) that characterizes each TIG as long as the interaction takes place.

Describing ELF communication – short-lived in temporary meetings or more enduring in stable communities – requires an ethnographic perspective and a focus upon the use of the language that is crucially (trans)schematic-pragmatic. Denying the culture-community-language “Trinity” (Widdowson 2019), ELF unveils the communicative processes that speakers activate to converge to their interlocutors by negotiating different cultural schemata and by employing whatever linguistic resources are available in their repertoire.

3.2. CA and ELF: A viable approach

ELF is not a language variety but the way people use English to relate to each other in an intercultural environment; hence analysts should not investigate the language itself (in terms of conformity or non-conformity to the target language: ENL), but rather the language-in-use, that is how the speakers use their linguistic resources to achieve intersubjectivity in local contexts. A Conversation Analysis (CA) approach to ELF investigation allows for “gain[ing] insight into people’s methods for making sense of their social world” (Brandt and Mortensen 2016: 299). CA, that is the study of talk-in-interaction, can be defined as “both a theory of the systematics of social action, and a methodology for its analysis” (Brandt and Mortensen 2016: 307). According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 1), the aim of CA as a theory is “to reveal the organized reasoning procedures which inform the production of natural occurring talk”, and the objective of CA as a methodological tool is “to explicate these procedures, on which speakers rely to produce utterances and by which they make sense of other speakers’

⁸ “[S]imilects’, i.e. the lects that arise from speakers with a shared first-language background” (Mauranen 2012: 248).

talk.” The CA approach is therefore endonormative to the extent that utterances are shaped by the local circumstances that motivate their production.

The roots of CA can be found in sociology, and specifically in ethnomethodology, namely the investigation of social order as a product of the “contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life”, as defined by Garfinkel (1967: 11), who calls them “ethno methods”. Drawing on the so-called “three-step method of ethnomethodology”: ‘self-reflection’, ‘analysis of recorded talk and action’, and [...] ‘acquired immersion’” (ten Have 2007: 44, quoting Hester and Francis 2004), Sacks *et al.* (1974) developed Conversation Analysis to study how social acts are organised in talk-in-interaction. They identified the ways in which people jointly make meaning and accomplish social order, such as turn-taking, sequence organization and repair. Through the CA’s lens “the production of utterances [...] is seen not in terms of the structure of language, but first and foremost as a practical social accomplishment” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 14). Words, in fact, are not analysed *per se* but as “products” or “objects” (*ibid.*) that serve to convey referential and relational information that the speakers negotiate in the talk. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 14) add that “the accomplishment of order, and of sense, or coherence, in talk-in-interaction is seen inextricably tied to the local circumstances in which utterances are produced.” Thus, the CA’s marginal concern about language and the crucial focus on how social acts are accomplished in contingent local contexts are compatible with the investigation of ELF talk, which is defined by its functions rather than the forms it takes (Seidlhofer 2011, Cogo 2012). Seidlhofer well explains that:

investigating how ELF works is not primarily about which *forms* it takes [...] but about the *functions* it fulfils and the more general processes of language dynamics and communication that the forms we observe alert us to.
(Seidlhofer 2011: 143, emphasis in original)

Applying a CA approach to ELF interactions allows the researcher to study the dynamics of the discourse without preconceived categories, focusing upon how the speakers make meaning converging with (or diverging from) their interlocutors. As Seedhouse (2005: 259) remarks, “[t]he constructs which are revealed by CA are those to which the participants themselves orient during interaction, rather than those that may be pre-specified in a priori fashion by analysts.” Brandt and Mortensen (2016: 303) call this position “analytical ‘neutrality’”. They clarify that “it is for the participants to

demonstrate – through their interactional practices – if, and how, categories are relevant to them as they go about their social business” (*ibid.*). Seedhouse (2005: 264-265) also points out that the knowledge that analysts gain of speakers’ communicative abilities depends essentially on the methodology employed to investigate them. He exemplifies this as follows.

If individuals are asked to produce speech in isolation, which is then segmented, quantified and compared to a norm, the result will inevitably be presented in terms of deficit. By contrast, a holistic view of the same individuals in interaction may reveal the inventive ways they are able to co-construct meaning with their interactional partners.
(Seedhouse 2005: 265)

CA’s attention to the accomplishment of interactional social acts through locally negotiated meanings and identities sets the researcher free from imposing “a deficit model” (Gardner and Wagner 2004: xi) on the investigation of lingua franca talk-in-interaction. Conversely, the traditional research on NNS/second language learner talk conducted along the lines of SLA employs a pre-packaged “deficit-oriented” analytical framework, highlighting the recurrence and the seriousness of linguistic and pragmatic errors, measured against the so-called ‘target language’ (Firth 2012: 1044, see also Firth and Wagner 1997). CA’s ethnomethodological underpinnings allow the ELF researcher to enquire into the communicative practices that ELF speakers enact to accomplish social goals and intersubjectivity, adopting “an emic (i.e. participant’s) perspective on analytical relevancies” and “giving analytical primacy to uncovering interactional achievement [...] rather than failure and deficit” (Firth 2012: 1044). As Kaur (2016: 162) maintains, ELF talk is unlikely to be organized much differently from NS talk, but it may differ in the resourceful application of interactional strategies (e.g. turn-taking structure, repair mechanisms); hence, CA-based analysis unveils “how ELF speakers use the language in and on their own terms” (Seidlhofer 2011: 23).

The CA theoretical and methodological approach to spoken ELF interactions dates back to the 1990s, when researchers (e.g. Firth 1990, 1996) started to investigate context-dependent interactions through detailed annotated transcripts. These early works revealed the effectiveness of communication by means of contingent interactional strategies and pragmatic uses of the language, which would be considered as evidence of failure within traditional analytical frameworks (e.g. SLA). Over the past

three decades the CA research paradigm has been applied to the analysis of various aspects of spoken ELF interactions, from ‘let it pass’ (Firth 1996), (mis)understandings (Kaur 2009, 2010, 2011; Pietikäinen 2016), (un)cooperativeness (Jenks 2012, Kimura 2019), overlapping speech (Konakahara 2013, 2015), collaborative humour (Matsumoto 2014, 2018), to simultaneous speech in multi-participant interaction (Santner-Wolfartsberger 2015b). According to Pietikäinen (2018), the reasons why the conversation analytical approach well suits ELF talk analysis may rest on its detailed methodology, which closely captures behaviours of *ad hoc* practical reasoning, and on its endonormative approach to the explanation of social phenomena through the analysis of speakers’ orientation to the phenomena in question. In fact, Kaur (2016: 163) maintains that CA “provides ELF researchers with reliable means to identify the communication strategies and practices that speakers in ELF settings employ to arrive at shared understanding.” Kaur (2016: 161) also contends that “CA-based research has contributed significantly [...] in re-conceptualizing non-native speakers of English as interactionally competent users in their own right.” When analysing ELF talk-in-interaction, the researcher is likely to be confronted by important challenges arising from the participants’ diverse linguacultural backgrounds and level of proficiency in English, but also from such strategies as ‘let it pass’ and ‘make it normal’ (Firth 1996) that speakers might employ to hide their non-understanding (Kaur 2016: 163). CA tools and the CA core principle for emically investigating intersubjectivity – respectively the finely detailed talk transcriptions and the ‘next-turn proof procedure’ – help the researcher to analyse on a turn-by-turn basis how speakers orient to their interlocutors and utilize their resources to make communication effective.

3.3. Accommodation in ELF

Investigating communication also requires a focus on the strategies that speakers employ to adjust (or not) to their interlocutors’ speech patterns. Such communicative behaviours are at the heart of the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT). Nearly fifty years ago Giles (1973) started to develop CAT to explain the various factors that shape interpersonal communication. CAT describes the degree of adjustment in terms of (i) convergence, i.e. “adjusting one’s communicative behaviors to be more similar to another’s” (Dragojevic *et al.* 2016: 36-37), (ii) divergence, i.e.

“adjusting one’s communicative behaviors to be more dissimilar to another’s” (*ibid.*), and (iii) maintenance, i.e. “sustaining one’s ‘default’ level of communicating, without adjusting for others” (*ibid.*). In addition to that, CAT examines the reasons why speakers converge or diverge, and the social consequences of such interactional choices (Giles *et al.* 1991). Convergence generally signals (i) the desire to affiliate and to develop solidary bonds, (ii) the search for approval or support, and (iii) the negotiation of joint goals. On the contrary, divergence displays the speaker’s will to maintain or even to enhance social distance. CAT also demonstrates that speakers are skilful at converging or diverging according to their identity, relational and attitudinal factors (Gasoriek *et al.* 2015). Most importantly, Gasoriek *et al.* specify that:

individuals have expectations and cognitive schemas about what constitutes appropriate and desirable accommodation depending on the general context, the socio-cultural backdrop to an interaction, and idiosyncratic preferences. (Gasoriek *et al.* 2015: 3)

The investigation of spoken ELF interactions with conversation analytic tools enables the researcher to focus on the collaborative practices of making meaning and on accommodation, or, in other words, on the cooperative behaviour that speakers display in contingent local contexts. Meaning-making negotiations entail all the processes that aim to pre-empt, jointly handle, and possibly resolve non-understanding (Mauranen 2006, Cogo and Pitzl 2016). Accommodation calls for the speakers’ ability to adjust or modify their use of the language according to the linguacultural background, the language proficiency, and the identity of their interlocutors. As Seidlhofer (2005: 160) contends, ELF speakers “usually unconsciously, adjust their speech and non-verbal behavior, fine-tune these to become more accessible and more acceptable to each other.” Cogo’s (2009: 257) empirical research demonstrates that the skilful employment of accommodative strategies not only improves cooperation and mutual engagement, but also makes ELF speakers’ communication effective to the extent that it “allow[s] their exchanges to be more intelligible than if they had referred to ‘standard native-speakers’ norms’.”

CA-based studies, such as Kaur’s (2011, 2012), demonstrate that ELF speakers “are aware of and sensitive to the diversity and variability associated with the ELF context of use and thus take measures to make themselves more easily understood” (Kaur 2016: 165). ELF speakers show robust cooperativeness and listener orientation

and draw on self- or other-initiated strategies to make communication as intelligible as possible. Table 3.1 summarizes the most common cooperative strategies and pragmatic behaviours reported in many ELF studies.

Table 3.1
Common cooperative strategies and pragmatic behaviours in ELF discourse.

(Self-/Other-) Repetition	Lichtkoppler 2006, 2007; Cogo 2009; Kaur 2012; Bjorkman 2014
Self-rephrasing	Mauranen 2006, 2012; Kaur 2010
Code-switching	Klimpfinger 2007, 2009; Cogo 2009; Mauranen 2013; Klötzl 2015
Accommodation	Cogo 2009; Dewey 2011; Cogo and Dewey 2012
Co-construction	Mauranen 2007; Bjorkman 2014
Interactive repair	Mauranen 2007
Self-repair	Mauranen 2007; Kaur 2011
Being explicit	Kirkpatrick 2007; Kaur 2011, 2015; Mauranen 2012
Backchannelling	Meierkord 2000
Supportive laughter	Meierkord 2000
Humour	Pitzl 2009; Pullin Stark 2009; Kalocsai 2014; Matsumoto 2014, 2018
Silence	Böhringer 2007
‘Let it pass’	Firth 1996
‘Make it normal’	Firth 1996
Lexical anticipation	Kirkpatrick 2010; Mauranen 2012; Bjorkman 2014
Word replacement	Kaur 2011; Bjorkman 2014
Online idiomatizing	Seidlhofer 2009, Pitzl 2018a

In the variable, fluid universe of ELF interactions, where different linguacultures connect, ELF speakers adopt accommodation strategies that are listener-oriented, such as repetition or self-rephrasing, to prevent possible moments of non- or misunderstanding. Thus, convergence in ELF speech appears to be triggered by the fundamental need for intelligibility and understanding but also, following Giles *et al.* (1991), by solidarity and approval motives. Cogo (2009) remarks that the strategic use of repetition, along with rendering talk more effective, shows alignment and solidarity with the interlocutor and may suggest affiliation to the community of multilingual ELF speakers. Furthermore, Dewey’s (2011) study demonstrates that also convergence through new lexical items and grammatical structures signals alignment with the interlocutor. Dewey (2011: 212-213) illustrates that the repetition of the word “plant”, used by one of the speakers to indicate a patient in a persistent vegetative state, and then repeated by the other participants along the conversation, not only maintains the flow

of communication, but is also a sign of a communal communicative project. In fact, the practice of echoing each other's phrases seems to reinforce the sense of affiliation and support. Additionally, Dewey notes that:

speakers in ELF settings are more concerned with orienting towards the language patterns of their speech partners than to established norms and conventions.
(Dewey 2011: 212)

In their corpus-driven investigation of spoken ELF interactions Cogo and Dewey (2012: 106) describe the speaker's reproduction of a non-standard lexicogrammatical form previously uttered by an interlocutor as "productive convergence". Likewise, the researchers (2012: 103-104) define the listener's acceptance of unconventional forms as "receptive convergence"; they also stress that ELF speakers do not spotlight non-conformities or totally innovative forms, but rather prioritize the effectiveness and efficiency of communication. As ELF speakers do not share the same linguistic or schematic background, it seems they need to draw on all the resources available to them and cooperate actively to achieve successful communication.

Accommodative behaviour has been analysed extensively in spoken ELF interactions. In her investigation of ELF academic talk, Mauranen (2007: 257; 2012: 49) underscores that, among the various adaptive strategies ELF speakers engage in, cooperation and explicitness play the most crucial role in the smooth unfolding of ELF communication. Mauranen (2012) identifies three main strategies that enhance clarity in ELF academic discourse and help ELF speakers achieve intelligibility, pre-empting non- and mis-understanding. These strategies are topic negotiation, self-rephrasing, and discourse reflexivity. Topic negotiation, a syntactic structure whereby lexical topic referents are introduced by both a noun phrase and a coreferential subject pronoun, enhances discourse explicitness. For example:

it was quite acceptable for the scholars too peace policy
(Mauranen 2012: 196, emphasis in original)

The full noun phrase, added at the end of the utterance, as if an afterthought, serves the strategic function of clarification (*ibid.*). In a similar vein, self-rephrasing, the reformulation of the original segment of speech, giving to it a supposedly more intelligible form, is another self-initiated strategy aimed at improving comprehension. Mauranen provides the following example:

the poor nutrition level, this poor diet
(Mauranen 2012: 207)

The speaker repeats the original utterance adjusting the form but preserving its actual meaning. The third strategy boosting explicitness investigated by Mauranen (2012) relates to metadiscourse; she calls it discourse reflexivity: it is discourse about the ongoing discourse (see also Mauranen 2010). For instance:

[o]ne thing I wanted to ask you...
(Mauranen 2010: 16)

shows the speaker's awareness of his/her own talk, but also a high degree of interaction with the interlocutor(s). The use of the verb "to ask" makes clear that a question is following and lubricates the ongoing discourse.

Aware of their linguistic and cultural differences, ELF users employ practices that ensure both the smooth unfolding of the talk, by either preventing possible interruptions or increasing the chances of being understood, and a successful communicative accomplishment. Building on Mauranen's studies (2006, 2007), Kaur's (2011) investigation of spoken ELF interactions among graduate students at a higher education institution in Malaysia focuses on other accommodative practices that enhance explicitness and intelligibility. Kaur (2011) explores the use of self-repair in communicative situations that may turn out ambiguous or unclear to the interlocutor(s). She illustrates self-repair procedures entailing the replacement of a pronoun used in the prior segment of talk with its referent, either immediately or in a partial repeat of the preceding part of speech. In the following example:

because *they*: *china* try to im- export very much but *they*- *US companies* and
the:: *EU companies* they are not allowed to import as much to er export
(Kaur 2011: 2710, emphasis added)

the speaker is very likely aware of the ambiguous use of the pronoun "they", and immediately makes up for it, pre-empting any comprehension problems.

Moreover, Kaur highlights the self-repair practice involving the substitution of a general term with a more specific, unambiguous one, for example "speak" with "pronounce" (2011: 2709). She also notes that the vagueness of the referent may be avoided by the insertion of qualifying lexical items just after having uttered the

ambiguous word, which clarify the meaning and contribute to the correct interpretation of the message. For instance:

so it is a kind of *interaction* . . . (1.4) a kind of *trading interaction*
(Kaur 2011: 2710, emphasis added)

Such procedures create redundancy that helps the speaker communicate without being interrupted or misunderstood. Within the same category of self-repair practices, Kaur also investigates the functions of the discourse marker “I mean”, which introduces the upcoming reformulation of the speaker’s preceding segment of speech. Through this discourse marker the speaker orients toward the interlocutor, but also ‘invites’ the interlocutor to pay attention to the next part of talk. Kaur (2011: 2712) concludes that “[b]y making the repair of the ongoing utterance explicit [using “I mean”], the speaker is seen to not only manage the organization of his contribution effectively but also facilitate recipient understanding.” The aforementioned strategies reveal how skilfully speakers of diverse linguacultural backgrounds use English to make themselves understood, forestalling communicative problems through practices that prioritize clarity and explicitness.

In her ELF corpus of informal conversations among teachers of foreign languages Cogo (2009) identifies two main accommodative strategies – repetition and code-switching – that enable speakers to achieve communicative effectiveness and to show cooperation along the speech event, signalling membership in the multilingual ELF community they belong to. Cogo (2009: 260) makes it clear that the accommodation repetition she investigates does not occur in potential trouble-source utterances “as a face saving or helping strategy to make up for non-understanding, but as a cooperative strategy meant to show alignment and solidarity, as well as affiliation with the previous turn.” According to Cogo (2009: 261), repetition serves the threefold function of (i) acknowledging comprehension, (ii) ensuring the smooth flow of talk through synchronic delivery, and (iii) displaying support to the interlocutor, invoking their approval and suggesting membership in the same community of multilingual ELF speakers. In line with Cogo, Dewey (2011: 210) points out that “[o]ften it seems that speakers in ELF will echo each others’ [*sic*] phrases, not simply in the interest of effectiveness of communication, but also as a means of showing alignment with each other.”

The second pragmatic strategy Cogo deals with is code-switching, which is not only an extra resource that may be called on in word search moments or in dodgy moments of conversation, but also an additional tool that may provide for making meaning and for rendering conversation more nuanced. Interestingly, in Cogo's (2009: 269) study participants do not appear to codeswitch to make up for some linguistic deficiencies; they rather use code-switching mostly for signalling solidarity and membership in the same multicultural community. Cogo highlights both the playful aspect of the code-switching practice enacted by some participants in her corpus, and the feeling of solidarity and membership in a (special) multilingual ELF community that this practice arouses. Her study emphasizes that "not only have ELF speakers been found to deal with potentially problematic situations carefully and appropriately, but they also use pragmatic strategies to enhance their communication" (Cogo 2009: 257).

The accommodative strategies illustrated above reveal ELF speakers' awareness to render ongoing speech explicit and clear so as to make interaction more fluid and intelligible on the one hand, and highly cooperative on the other hand. Despite the significant evidence of adaptive strategies of explicitness and cooperation in ELF discourse, the "*situationality factor* which determines every lingua franca interaction anew and on its own" (Hülmbauer 2009: 324, emphasis in original) plays an important role in the dynamics of ELF interactions. In his 2012 work on online voice-based chat rooms Jenks points out that ELF users may also do being reprehensive⁹ and play the uncooperativeness card. The participants in Jenks' (2012: 394) study deploy interactional practices that draw attention to and reprove communication troubles, such as dysfluencies, unconventional and ungrammatical forms, and inappropriate speech, through humour and ridicule. Jenks notes that the interactants under scrutiny handle their exchanges exhibiting very little mutual support and performing the practice of doing being reprehensive as soon as communication difficulties arise. The researcher remarks that in some ELF encounters where problems or non-/mis-understandings occur, speakers do not display a letting it pass or supportive behaviour. Although most ELF findings show that ELF interactions are built on consensus-seeking and mutual

⁹ Jenks (2012: 9) provides the following definition for doing being reprehensive: "The interactional practice of reproofing troubles in communication [...]. That is, doing being reprehensive encompasses those practices that are used to find fault with, and draw attention to, linguistic and/or interactional trouble."

support, Jenks (2012: 402) underscores the context-dependent variable that influences the speakers' communicative behaviour, pointing out that "the appropriateness of being supportive or unsupportive is determined by the norms, expectations, and interactional and institutional goals of the communicative context." The role played by the setting where ELF communication reveals its idiosyncrasies is also crucial to my research, which attempts to shed light on the communicative behaviour of school-age ELF users in the educational context.

3.4. Adopted research approach

Having presented the analytic frameworks that have been widely applied to the investigation of ELF interactions, I will now delve into the methodological approach I adopted to analyse my data. As anticipated in the Introduction, this approach involved recording prompted discussions among students of different L1s in a 'teacher-free zone', and investigating ELF communication strategies through a CA-based analysis.

The CA-based analysis applied to the present study aimed to investigate the turn-taking dynamics (Sacks *et al.* 1974), the unfolding of moves (see Moerman 1988; Tsui 1989), and the communicative strategies that school-age ELF users implement to make their interactions meaningful within an intercultural setting. To this purpose, I followed both the structural models of conversation, collectively referred to as 'UK Conversation Model' (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Coulthard and Montgomery 1981; Stubbs 1983; Coulthard and Brazil 1992), and the ethnomethodological models, known as the 'US Model' (Firth 1957; Gumperz and Hymes 1964; Sacks *et al.* 1974).

Although the structural models of CA conventionally work on specialized talk through a set of established moves (see Table 3.2), they provide the researcher with a Conversation Frame for identifying the functional units of the discourse structure. The communication setting analysed here does not match that of the instances presented by the UK Model, as it is neither formal nor ritualistic (e.g. teacher-pupil, doctor-patient); it is, instead, rather protean, dynamic and hybrid by nature. Moreover, since the setting is intercultural, the moves may be unpredictable; hence, I reinterpreted them according to the sociocultural behaviours of the speakers. Nevertheless, as Guido (2004) contends, such a model may be useful to understand to what extent the speakers' different

linguistic and schematic background impacts on the structure of the talk. All structural moves observed in the present analysis – sometimes adapted, as stated above – are listed in Table 3.2, along with the description provided by Guido (2004: 344-345)¹⁰.

Table 3.2
Structural moves adopted in the study (from Guido 2004).

Move	Description
Acknowledge	<i>Move to recognize and accept a previous statement.</i>
Answer	<i>Move to provide a response to a question.</i>
Challenge	<i>Move to ask for or defy a previous statement.</i>
Close	<i>Move by which a participant ends an exchange.</i>
Direct	<i>Move to request an action.</i>
Elicit	<i>Move meant to provoke, stimulate, and induce a response.</i>
Focus	<i>Move by which concentration on something/somebody is solicited.</i>
Inform	<i>Move by which information is provided.</i>
Open	<i>Move by which a participant initiates an exchange.</i>
Reopen	<i>Move to avoid concluding the exchange.</i>
Repair	<i>Move to hold up the exchange.</i>
Summon	<i>Move to attract the listener's attention.</i>
Support	<i>Move to uphold a previous statement.</i>

Such moves, however, are not all of the same kind. Some (e.g. Answer, Open, Close) are textually signalled – and so easily recognized – while others (e.g. Challenge, Elicit, Support) are covert as they relate to the speaker's intention – and so depend on interpretation. For instance, some moves in my corpus could have been tagged as Explain and Direct at face value; but following a closer examination focused on the specific sociocultural setting where communication took place, they turned out to be Challenge moves¹¹.

Aware of the limitations of the UK Model, which analyses the language within a discourse frame of fixed interactional positions in a monocultural environment, without connecting it to the speakers' sociocultural communicative context, I also followed the CA ethnomethodological model, which enables the researcher to

¹⁰ The taxonomy of structural moves is taken from Guido's (2004: 344-345) adaptation of the Conversation Frame of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

¹¹ See Appendix 3, line 192 and line 314.

investigate the constructs the speakers themselves orient to along the interactions (Seedhouse 2005). The US Model proves especially helpful for the comprehension of intercultural communication, as the ethnomethodological moves represent the pragmalinguistic and socio-pragmatic rules (Thomas 1983) the speakers appropriate cognitively and affectively in an interaction. Table 3.3 lists the most frequent ethnomethodological moves applied to my analysis¹². They are drawn from the work of researchers following the ethnomethodological US Model of CA, such as Schegloff (1982), Moerman (1988), and Tsui (1989).

Table 3.3

Most frequent ethnomethodological moves used in the study (from Guido 2004).

Move	Description
Continuer	<i>Move indicating that the speaker allows the other participant to go on holding the floor with his/her talk, by expressions like: “uh hum”; “mmhm”; “yeah”.</i>
Downgrade	<i>Move to weaken or mitigate a previous utterance (e.g., a request) in order to make it more acceptable.</i>
Newsmark	<i>Move that encourages further talk about a previous utterance, considering its content as new information.</i>
Oh-Receipt	<i>Move introduced by the expression “oh”, that signals the speaker's achievement of new information which modifies his/her previous expectation or knowledge.</i>
Passing Turn	<i>Move to indicate that the speaker has nothing further to say and so s/he passes the floor to another participant by uttering an expression such as “Okay”, or “Alright”.</i>
Rejection Finalizer	<i>Move to mark the speaker's acceptance of a rejection (e.g., of an offer) by another participant. In this case, the conclusive “Okay” in the last turn is to be interpreted as a rejection finalizer.</i>
Try-Marker	<i>Move with raising intonation for the speaker to test his/her addressee whether s/he has recognized a referent.</i>
Upgrade	<i>Move to emphasize what has been previously said (e.g., “Get in; the water's warm.”).</i>

To sum up, I tagged the moves pragmatically performed by the participants in the spoken activity adopting and adapting the moves of both Models. The move-tagged exchanges allowed me to observe more closely the detailed composition of the participants' interactions, formulating hypotheses on their communicative behaviour in an ELF setting. I analysed the move-tagged exchanges in light of the turn-taking machinery to explore how the different sociocultural background of school-age ELF users impacts on their interactional behaviour in an educational setting. Additionally, I delved into the cooperative pragmatic strategies employed by the students to make

¹² The ethnomethodological moves are taken from Guido (2004: 349-350). See also Guido (2008, 2012).

meaning while converging towards their interlocutors, and – crucially – into the practices for accomplishing social goals while performing a task.

4. Research Design and Analysis

4.1. Data collection and setting

To explore the actual use of ELF in the educational domain, I audio recorded natural spoken ELF interactions among learners of diverse linguacultural backgrounds, captured in their authentic learning context. In January 2018 I contacted three English teachers who are in charge of intercultural exchange programmes in three upper-secondary schools (*Liceo Scientifico*): one in the centre of Rome and two in the Castelli Romani area, a residential area south-east of the city. I presented my research on ELF in the educational setting and explained the activity I intended to conduct: prompting small groups of students of different L1s to talk about an assigned topic, and audio recording the students' ELF interactions. I also requested to perform my experimental activity in a 'teacher-free zone', i.e. in the absence of the students' own English teacher, so that all participants could carry out the discussion without feeling constrained by the standard conditions of the ELT classroom. All three teachers agreed to let me perform the activity and audio record their students' multi-party interactions. Finally, before starting the data collection I wrote to the head teachers of the three upper-secondary schools involved in my data collection, explaining the aim of the activity and assuring them that I would anonymize the data. Once I obtained ethical clearance, in late January 2018 I started planning the meetings.

Each speech event was coded with the name of the school, followed by a number identifying the single event, according to the chronological sequence of my contacts with the three schools. The first school I contacted was the school where I had previously taught, Liceo Scientifico Statale "G. Vailati" in Genzano di Roma (Rome). This *liceo* routinely hosts students from all over the world, coming to Italy through two international organizations: AFS (American Field Service)/Intercultura and YFU (Youth for Understanding)/Navigando, for either a full school year, or a semester. I audio recorded the discussions of two different small groups of students, which I named *Vailati_1* and *Vailati_2*. The second school I approached was Liceo Scientifico Statale "B. Touschek" in Grottaferrata (Rome), which regularly runs Erasmus+ programmes of the European Union. I audio recorded the discussions of five different small groups of students, which I named *Touschek_1*, *Touschek_2*, *Touschek_3*, *Touschek_4*, and

Touschek_5. The third school I contacted was Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” in Rome, which every year organizes a one-week intercultural exchange with a Polish school. I audio recorded the discussions of three different small groups of students, which I named *Gullace_1*, *Gullace_2*, and *Gullace_3*. By the beginning of June 2018, I had collected a corpus of ten audio recordings for a total duration of just over two hours, one formal (audio recorded) retrospective reflective interview, several informal feedback interviews, and many field notes (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1
Summary of data collection.

School name	Audio file name	Date
<i>Liceo Scientifico Statale “G. Vailati” Genzano di Roma (Rome)</i>	Vailati_1_Non mi avete fatto niente	5 March 2018
	Vailati_2_Non mi avete fatto niente	7 June 2018
	Vailati_2_Retrospective reflective interview	7 June 2018
<i>Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Touschek” Grottaferrata (Rome)</i>	Touschek_1_Los Borbones son unos ladrones	17 April 2018
	Touschek_2_Imagine	17 April 2018
	Touschek_3_Obriu les portes	17 April 2018
	Touschek_4_Collapse (Post-Amerika)	17 April 2018
	Touschek_5_Human	17 April 2018
<i>Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” Rome</i>	Gullace_1_Africa	23 March 2018
	Gullace_2_Imagine	23 March 2018
	Gullace_3_We Are the Champions	23 March 2018

4.1.1. Participants

In the first school I contacted in the Greater Rome area I organized two separate discussions to allow all foreign students spending an extended period of time at Liceo Scientifico Statale “G. Vailati” to take part in the interactions. At the time when I started my experimental activity, that is in January 2018, the school was hosting three foreign students: one coming from Argentina through the AFS/Intercultura organization and two coming respectively from Chile and Thailand through the YFU/Navigando organization. The first speech event was audio recorded on 5 March 2018. The participants were five, all aged 16-17: three Italian students (L1: Italian), one Argentinian student (L1: Spanish), and one Chilean student (L1: Spanish). Their CEFR levels of English were B1 or B2. The Argentinian student had enrolled in the Italian school for a semester in January 2018, joining the class of the three Italian students

involved in the discussion, while the Chilean student had started her full school year in September 2017. The Chilean student had met the Argentinian and the Italian students only once before the ELF activity. The discussion lasted a complete period (sixty minutes), exactly the time I was given for my experimental activity; hence I had no time left for conducting any formal retrospective interviews with the participants. I could only informally ask feedback questions to some of the students.

The second speech event was postponed until the last school day for several reasons, mostly due to the Thai student's frequent absences from school. It was audio recorded on 7 June 2018. The participants were five, all aged 16-17: two Italian students (L1: Italian), one Thai student (L1: Thai), one Romanian student (L1: Romanian), and a Chinese student (L1: Chinese). Their CEFR levels of English were B1 or B2. The Thai student had enrolled at this *liceo* in September 2017 for a full school year, joining the class of the two Italian students participating in the discussion. At the time of the activity the Romanian student had lived in Italy for about ten years and entered the Italian school system at the age of six, while the Chinese student had moved to Italy from China only a couple of years earlier, and had attended this *liceo* for two years. The Romanian and the Chinese students, coming from two different classes, first met the co-participants in the discussion on the scheduled day of the activity. The activity lasted less than an hour, hence I had enough time to carry out a formal audio recorded retrospective reflective interview, in which the participants, one by one, disclosed their thoughts and feelings about the experience they shared in their learning context.

The second school I contacted was Liceo Scientifico Statale "B. Touschek" in Grottaferrata (Rome). At the time of my experimental activity the school was leading an Erasmus+ project with schools from Croatia, Finland, Germany, Poland, and Spain. My activity was scheduled during the transnational project meeting that was held on 16-22 April 2018. I was assigned a one-and-a-half-hour slot, labelled "Team Work and the Art of Negotiation in ELF", on 17 April 2018. Just after having audio recorded the discussions, the students were asked to report on a song previously selected by each group. I audio recorded the discussions of five small groups. The participants were twenty-four, all aged 16-17: two from Croatia (L1: Croatian), three from Finland (L1: Finnish), three from Germany (L1: German), two from Poland (L1: Polish), five from Spain (L1: Spanish, except for two students, bilingual in Spanish and Catalan), and nine

from Italy (L1: Italian). To further preserve and safeguard the participants' anonymity, the students chose a pseudonym, most of the times funny or unexpected, which made them feel "the protagonists of an important event" (*verbatim*). Their CEFR levels of English were B1 or B2. All the participants in the discussion had met before the activity at least once in person, and virtually many times using the eTwinning platform.

The third school I contacted, Liceo Scientifico Statale "T. Gullace", is in Rome, and at the time of my experimental activity it was holding a one-week intercultural exchange with a Polish upper-secondary school. The activity took place on 23 March 2018, during the afternoon, when Italian students usually attend extra-curricular classes. I selected six seventeen-year-old students from the large Polish group (L1: Polish), and six Italian students (L1: Italian), all aged 15, joined the discussion. I audio recorded three discussions in which the twelve students were evenly distributed: four students per group (two Italians and two Poles). Their CEFR levels of English were A2 for the Italian participants and B2 for the Polish ones. The Italian and the Polish students had never met before the activity. The activity lasted just over an hour. At the end of the audio recording the three small groups reported on their selected songs to the rest of the Polish students, and played the songs using their smartphones.

Table 4.2

Participants in terms of nationality, L1, number, gender, age, and CEFR levels.

School name	Nationality	L1	Number of students	Gender (M/F)	Age	CEFR levels
<i>Liceo Scientifico Statale "G. Vailati" Genzano di Roma (Rome)</i>	Argentinian Chilean Chinese Italian Romanian Thai	Chinese Italian Romanian Spanish Thai	10	4 M 6 F	16-17	B1-B2
<i>Liceo Scientifico Statale "B. Touschek" Grottaferrata (Rome)</i>	Croatian German Spanish Finnish Italian Polish	Croatian German Spanish Finnish Italian Polish	23	9 M 14 F	16-17	B1-B2
<i>Liceo Scientifico Statale "T. Gullace" Rome</i>	Italian Polish	Italian Polish	12	8 M 4 F	15-17	A2-B2
Total	11 (Nats)	9 (L1s)	45	21 M 24 F	---	---

Background information on the participants taking part in the ten speech events is summarized in Table 4.2.

4.1.2. Activity design

I divided my experimental activity into two parts. In the first part I introduced myself and my research on ELF, asking the students what the expression ‘English as a Lingua Franca’ might mean. Then I presented the task – Select a song that gives an insight into contemporary society – through a series of statements (e.g. “Some songs give us an insight into what life is like in a certain period of time, thus turning into social documents”), followed by a brainstorming session about crucial issues that affect our society. Then the students were asked to think of any contemporary song that might fit in the category of social documents. They were encouraged to answer the following question: “In the year 2500, when people listen to songs that were composed in the 20th and 21st centuries, what will they learn about us?” After they had completed the individual task, the students were divided into small groups and invited to discuss their choices within the group and to reach an agreement on a single, most representative song. Only the three groups of Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” were given a handout with some reminder questions to stay focused on the topic. I audio recorded their interactions using my own voice recorder (Sony PX240 Digital Voice Recorder) or a smartphone, either mine or the students’. At the end of the activity the students who had recorded the speech event using their own smartphones sent me their sound files by email or WhatsApp.

Data were recorded under totally unconstrained conditions: the English teacher was not present during the discussions, and the students were free to use all the resources at their disposal to arrive at a shared decision. Most of the groups used their smartphones either to read (out) the lyrics or to play the songs. In this phase of the experimental activity my role was merely that of an observer. When it was feasible, for instance when I audio recorded the *Vailati_1* and *Vailati_2* speech events, I never left the room where the students carried out their task. At Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Tuschek” and Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” the groups (respectively five and three) audio recorded their discussions in two separate rooms for acoustic reasons; hence I went back and forth from one room to the other. Despite having clarified my

role as a researcher/observer at the very beginning of the activity, I stepped in during three speech events. In *Vailati_1* I prompted one of the students to take part in the discussion by asking him whether he had selected a song, in *Vailati_2* I encouraged the quieter students to discuss their choices after they had presented their songs, and in *Gullace_2*, after having seen the students rummaging in their rucksacks, I checked whether they had accomplished the task. Only once an Italian student addressed me in her mother tongue asking for lexical help. This happened in the school where I had taught before I started my doctoral research, and even though I had not been the student's former English teacher, she turned to me using the Italian expression "prof" (teacher), whereby she clearly identified me as a teacher, not a researcher.

4.2. Data transcription

After having collected my data, which comprise sound files, retrospective feedback interviews, and field notes, I had to make my primary data – i.e. ten speech events – functional to my enquiry into the dynamics of ELF discourse within a conversation analysis framework. ELF discourse is always co-constructed and negotiated *ad hoc*; thus, as Pitzl (2018a: 80) notes, its variability can only be observed qualitatively. Having opted for audio recordings instead of video recordings, I adopted a transcription notation system that would provide a detailed representation of interaction, and would allow for a fine-grained investigation. I followed the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) transcription conventions¹³ (www.univie.ac.at/voice). As Pitzl (2018a: 87) points out, "VOICE [...] follows the tradition of conversation analysis (CA) in the sense that transcripts include a relatively high level of mark-up." The VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1] include two sets of conventions: the VOICE Mark-up Conventions [2.1], that is all the features (e.g. tags, pauses, background information) that accompany the words uttered by ELF speakers, and the VOICE Spelling Conventions [2.1], that is the way the words are spelt (see Breiteneder *et al.* 2006).

¹³ I closely applied the VOICE mark-up and spelling conventions, except for the use of italics in transcribing the title of the songs. I used the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 9th edition (<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com>) and the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (<https://www.merriam-webster.com>) as my sources of reference.

In line with VOICE transcripts, the ELF interactions in my corpus are represented in full orthographic form, including repetitions, false starts, word fragments, hesitations and fillers. Following the VOICE protocol, I generally did not provide phonological or phonetic transcriptions, except for (i) onomatopoeic noises (e.g. ta ta ta tu: tu: tu:), which are tagged <ono> </ono>, on the one hand, and (ii) unexpected pronunciations (e.g. kæmɪən) and one-off idiosyncratic fillers (e.g. əf), which are tagged </ipa> </ipa> on the other hand. VOICE mark-up tags also show how actual speech unfolds. For instance, overlaps are assigned numbered tags (e.g. <1> </1>), other-continuation is represented by the equal symbol (=), and short pauses by (.) for up to half a second and by a number in parentheses for the number of seconds: (1), (2), and so forth. In VOICE each speaker output is assigned a line, called utterance, which does not correspond to the CA category of a turn (Pitzl 2018a: 87). Thus, when analysing a turn, more than an utterance may be considered.

Other features of speech are rendered in VOICE through mark-up: rising and falling intonation, which are respectively tagged “?” and “.”; emphasis (the phrase, word, or syllable to which is given prominence is written in capital letters); lengthening (the lengthened sound is followed by a colon); tokens of laughter (@) and laughingly uttered words (<@> </@>); speaker noises (e.g. <smacks lips>) and various modes of talk (e.g. <fast> </fast>). The VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1] also provide specific mark-up for three rather frequent phenomena in ELF: code-switching, tagged with the language that the speaker is switching to, informing whether or not the language is the speaker’s mother tongue (e.g. <L1it> </L1it> or <LNit> </LNit>); pronunciation variations and coinages (<pvc>); and onomatopoeic sounds. Importantly, VOICE gives voice to these ELF features, and, as Pitzl (2018a: 88) remarks, “[a]lthough these categories are not unique to ELF but can be found in other data, they are not systematically indicated in most corpora.” My transcriptions provide additional information on significant actions that occur during the interactions and on important non-linguistic behaviour.

Through the VOICE transcription and notation protocol I could not only transcribe my data in detail, but also make my data interactive, providing “evidence of how participants react to a particular expression” (Pitzl 2018a: 102-103). The

transcripts contain, in fact, markers of dysfluencies, hesitations, repetitions, silent and filled pauses.

4.3. Issues of data interpretation

Having gathered such informative data, my first concerns about data interpretation arose. The design of the spoken activity, carried out in the students' actual learning setting, played a crucial role in the natural unfolding of ELF interactions. The students were first given time to think about a song that they deemed representative of contemporary society; then, they were invited to discuss their choices in a so-called 'teacher-free zone', where they could talk freely, in the absence of their English teacher and without the standard constraints of an ELT classroom. Although the students expressed their ideas naturally, my presence as a non-participant observer during the actual interactions and the device used to record them might have had an impact on the speakers' output. This is an issue that Labov (1972: 209) terms "Observer's Paradox": researchers need to find out how people talk naturally, that is as if they were not being observed, but such data can only be collected by observation. Yet, this only implies that researchers must come to terms with this paradox, and adopt one of the various methods that mitigate its impact (Labov 1972, Milroy 1987). For example, they may try to establish a researcher-informants relationship that favours the natural unfolding of the talk. I tried to do so by building rapport with the participants, positioning myself as an ELF speaker studying the ELF phenomenon, and asking for their collaboration. In the pre-activity phase I introduced myself to the participants as an ELF researcher, and explained the purpose of my study, assuring them that my presence during their interactions would be as unobtrusive as possible, and that I would not act as a teacher, that is to say, I would neither make any corrections, nor judge their performance. During the discussions I stayed at quite a distance from the students and sat in what Duranti (1997: 101) calls a "blind spot", namely the least intrusive place in the scene. Following Duranti (1997), I generally played the role of the "by-stander" (p. 101), performing "passive participation" (p. 99). Only in three speech events I addressed the students, encouraging them to carry on talking, and on a single occasion one student turned to me in Italian requesting an English word. Overall, the students did not seem to be affected by my observation, and to my ears their communication sounded totally natural.

The presence of a recording device, a smartphone in most instances, did not seem to intrude too much either. After having started the recording, the students put the device on the desk, and apparently paid no heed to it until the end of the discussion. Being all the participants in my study digital natives and – I presume – being accustomed to sending voice messages via WhatsApp or other messaging applications, they did not express any concern about audio recording their interactions, and seemed at ease with the recorder set on their desk.

The “Observer’s Paradox” is strictly connected with the concept of naturally occurring talk. The data I collected are spontaneous, that is to say, non-elicited, authentic interactions. To what extent can I describe my informants’ interactions as natural speakers’ output, since I participated in their unfolding – albeit passively – and I used a device to audio record their voices? This issue is still a matter of dispute in sociolinguistics. I gathered my data from speakers who interacted ‘naturally’ in the presence of the researcher and of the recorder. Elaborating on the act of observing and recording talk, Cameron maintains that this conduct:

has the potential to affect participants’ behaviour and make the talk something different from what it would have been otherwise. All talk is shaped by the context in which it is produced, and where talk is being observed and recorded becomes part of the context.

(Cameron 2001: 20, quoted in Klötzl 2015: 150)

This does not imply that the interactants are not influenced by the researcher’s observation or by the recording device. Conversely, it reminds the researcher to consider the extent of the impact that observation and recording may have in the analysis and interpretation of the data. Widdowson (2004: 9) crucially argues that the spoken text recorded and analysed by the researcher is “not the reflex of interaction but the result of intervention. It is a partial version too because it records only the linguistic text”, being the transcription unable to capture all the features of interactive behaviour. Widdowson (2004: 10) also contends that “the very observation of an interaction necessarily misrepresents it, and the more precise the observed record, the greater the misrepresentation”, calling this “the paradox of irreducible subjectivity”. Hence, it is evident that what follows the actual realization of the spoken text is a matter of interpretation. Unless the researcher has taken part in the interactions, all the efforts he or she makes to describe/analyse the data from an emic perspective will be insufficient

to represent the original experience of the participants. Thus, the researcher should deal with “the *emic-etic dilemma* of analyzing third person data”, to borrow Pitzl’s (2018a: 102, emphasis in original) words, by attempting to get as close as possible to the emic reality of the speaker while maintaining the etic stance of the analyst (Pitzl 2018a: 103). Yet, one basic CA tool that helps the by-stander researcher move quite safely in the quicksand of interpretation – using a metaphor – is the ‘next-turn proof procedure’, which “ensure[s] that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented-to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 15).

4.4. Data analysis

In the following section the analysis of the third person data is presented with reference to three case studies, each one corresponding to one of the three schools where the spoken activity was recorded. Each school runs different intercultural exchange programmes; hence, I analysed the speech events of Liceo “G. Vailati”, Liceo “B. Touschek”, and Liceo “T. Gullace” separately. This allowed me to look more closely into the dynamics of the groups within a specific intercultural context. Supplementary material concerning each individual speech event is provided in Appendix 1.

In each case study I analysed the most relevant stretches of talk produced by each group, also referred to as *extracts*. Each of them is assigned a progressive code *x.y.z*, where *x* indicates the case study, *y* identifies the group of students within the case study, and *z* refers to a specific short section of the talk. Additionally, each extract is named with a significant utterance contained in it. The first language spoken by each participant in the discussion along with his/her country of origin (e.g. spa/AR to indicate the Spanish language and Argentina as the country of origin¹⁴) and gender are specified in the header of each extract. Each speaker is identified with S followed by a number.

4.4.1. Case study 1

In this section I analyse the transcripts of the audio recordings collected at Liceo Scientifico Statale “G. Vailati” in Genzano di Roma (Rome). The school runs

¹⁴ See Appendix 2 for a complete list of abbreviations for the first language and the country of origin of each individual speaker.

intercultural exchange programmes jointly with two international organizations: AFS/Intercultura and YFU/Navigando. In the school year 2017-2018 three students – a Thai, a Chilean, and an Argentinian – joined the intercultural programmes. In the *liceo* there are also regularly enrolled students originally from various parts of the world, whose first language is not Italian.

Two different small groups of students participated in the spoken activity: I will call them *Vailati_1* and *Vailati_2* (see *Vailati_1* and *Vailati_2* in Appendix 1). Their discussions were recorded respectively on 5 March 2018 and on 7 June 2018. In the *Vailati_1* group there are five students: three Italians, a Chilean, and an Argentinian. The Argentinian and the Italian students had attended the same class and had known each other since January 2018. Also in the *Vailati_2* group there are five students: two Italians, a Thai, a Chinese, and a Romanian. The Thai participant joined the class of the two Italian students in September 2017 for a full-year exchange programme. The Chinese and the Romanian students, who live permanently in Italy, attended different classes; they met the co-participants for the first time on the day of the activity.

Extracts 1.1.1-1.1.2: “so it’s an italian song”

From the outset, the students of the first group – *Vailati_1* – approach the discussion in a collaborative way. In case of problematic turns, as in the following extract, they help each other with such moves as Elicit and Direct, which they generally mitigate with a token of laughter.

Extract 1.1.1 (*Vailati_1*: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male)

- | | | |
|---|-----|--|
| 3 | S1: | and (.) it’s (2) it’s e:rm (4) / <i>[possible Focus-M]</i> |
| 4 | S2: | it’s what? @ (1) / <i>[Elicit-M]</i> |
| 5 | S3: | tell us @ / <i>[Direct-M]</i> |
| 6 | S2: | eh (.) who are the singers? / <i>[Elicit-M]</i> |

In line 3 of Extract 1.1.1, for example, S1 – the speaker who volunteers to break the ice and starts the discussion – makes pauses of considerable length, and S2 and S3, respectively in lines 4, 5 and 6, provide a scaffold to keep up the conversation. Both S2 and S3 conclude their turn with a laughter token, which lightens their requests to go on speaking.

The dialogue continues in Extract 1.1.2.

Extract 1.1.2 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 7 S1: erm (.) francesco moro and ermal meta / *[Answer-M]*
 8 S2: *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* so it's an italian song (.) / *[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]*
 9 S1: yes: / *[Acknowledge-M]*
 10 S2: and it talks about terrorism (.) / *[Focus-M]*
 11 S1: yeah and = / *[Acknowledge-M]*
 12 S2: = only terrorism? / *[Elicit-M]*

S1 shows hesitation before she eventually answers. In lines 8 and 10 S2 appears to play the role of a teacher, as she processes the information gathered so far, respectively with an Upgrade *[b]* (Moerman 1988: 76-77) and a Focus move (lines 8 and 10); then in line 12 she performs another Elicit move, whereby she prompts S1 to carry on talking, focusing more on the selected song. The marker *so*¹⁵ in line 8, uttered after a minimal pause, functions as a “double-bind element, a (mental) hinge between what has come before and what will occur next” (House 2012: 196); it acts as “a self-prompting strategy” (*ibid.*) that helps S2 to introduce the upcoming Upgrade move.

Extracts 1.1.3-1.1.4: “i:n... SPAIN”

These two extracts describe interactive repair in a word search moment.

Extract 1.1.3 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 19 S1: and in (1) / *[possible Upgrade-M]*
 20 S3: <soft> england </soft> / *[Repair-M]*
 21 S2: in (.) england / *[Repair-M]*
 22 S1: i:n (1) / *[possible Upgrade-M]*

S1's pause in line 19 triggers S2's and S3's Repair moves. Such moves, though, do not provide S1 with the expected contribution. As we can see in line 22, S1 repeats the word used in line 19, but this time she lengthens the vowel, as if to dismiss previous suggestions and take time for her word search.

Extract 1.1.4 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 23 S2: no {SX whispers something (1)} / *[Acknowledge-M]*
 24 S3: <3> spain </3> / *[Repair-M]*
 25 S2: <3> spain </3> / *[Repair-M]*
 26 S1: SPAIN / *[Acknowledge-M]*

Moving on with the analysis, in line 23 of Extract 1.1.4 S2 acknowledges with a negative token that the suggestion she and S3 have provided is not correct. In

¹⁵ From now on, all quotations from the transcripts will be shown in italics.

overlapping speech S3 and S2 make a further Repair move. At this stage, having the correct suggestion been given, S1 signals the accomplishment of the utterance started in line 19, repeating the missing word and giving prominence to it by pronouncing it in an emphatic fashion. In so doing, she acknowledges the repair and is ready to resume the presentation of her song.

Extract 1.1.5: “do you like it?”

This brief extract exemplifies S1’s search for support.

Extract 1.1.5 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 29 S1: do you like it? / [Elicit-M]
 30 S2: yes: (.) i = / [Answer-M]
 31 S3: = can you tell us some (.) some pieces of this song? / [Direct-M]

Once S1 has presented her song to the group, she performs an Elicit move (line 29) whereby she seeks common ground. Both S2’s preferred response in line 30 and S3’s suggestion of eliciting some of the lyrics in line 31 show solidarity with S1, who has volunteered to start the discussion. S3’s Direct move, mitigated by the use of a modal verb, concludes the first sequence of this discussion.

Extract 1.1.6: “you have to be louding”

Similarly to the co-construction of S1’s utterance in lines 19-26 (Extracts 1.1.3 and 1.1.4), in the following extract S2, S3 and S6 co-construct their request to S5 to speak up.

Extract 1.1.6 (Vailati_1: S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S5=L1: spa/AR, male; S6=L1: spa/CL, female)

- 43 S2: [a] okay (.) [b] you have to = / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Direct-M]
 44 S3: = to speak more (.) / [Direct-M]
 45 S2: to speak (.) / [Direct-M]
 46 S3: loud (.) / [Direct-M]
 47 S6: <soft><@> **louder** </@></soft> / [Repair-M]
 48 S3: **you have to be** <pvc> **louding** {louder} </pvc> / [Direct-M]
 49 S5: [a] @@ [b] i was thinking about (.) a november rain (.) / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Reopen-M]

In this stretch of talk, the students perform a Direct move, which in line 47 turns into a Repair move. S6, in fact, does not endorse S3’s choice of *more loud* (lines 44 and 46) and discreetly suggests *louder* in a soft smiling voice. Interestingly, in line 48 S3

reformulates his request replacing *to speak more loud* with *to be louding*, hence completely disregarding S6's suggestion.

Two observations can be made at this point. The first concerns S6's Repair move. In line 47 S6 takes the floor for the first time in the discussion, providing a contribution that is grammar-oriented and does not improve the 'quality' of the Direct move triggered by S2: she substitutes the English periphrastic form – *more loud* – with the inflected form – *louder*. Her soft smiling voice may be interpreted as a face-saving strategy as she overtly makes a repair¹⁶ adopting the (unexpected) role of the 'language expert'. The same behaviour is also detected later on in the speech event, in line 197 (see Appendix 3), when S6 performs another Repair move; she overlaps in a soft voice while providing S2 with the correct word (*twenty-first*). In both cases she tiptoes into the talk supplying the words she believes need repairing. The second observation concerns the vocabulary coinage – *louding* – that S3 makes when he rephrases his request to S5 to speak louder. After a sequence of repeats (*to speak, to speak; loud, louder*), S3 opts for a quite different construction: instead of repeating the complete Direct move employing the previously uttered words and including S6's suggestion, he replaces the original verb *to speak* with the verb *to be* and coins the adjective *louding*. The result is that his move sounds even more powerful than the expected "you have to speak louder". The use of the verb *to be* along with the adjective *louding* seem to impact more on the listeners, certainly on S5, who acknowledges S3's request with laughter [a] and resumes talking in the normal speaking mode through a Reopen move [b] (line 49).

Extract 1.1.7: "do you know what is the rambla?"

S1's proposal to translate the lyrics of the Italian song she has chosen triggers a series of interesting moves that I illustrate in the following extract.

Extract 1.1.7 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S6=L1: spa/CL, female)

- 85 S1: are (2) erm <reading aloud><L1it> il sole sulla <LNsp> rambla </LNsp>
oggi non è lo stesso {the sun on the rambla is not the same today} </L1it></reading
aloud> erm (1) / [Inform-M]
86 S2: <LNsp> rambla </LNsp> is a: (1) beach (.) <soft> i think.</soft> / [Upgrade-M]
87 S1: erm is a: (1) **do you know what is (the) <LNsp> rambla?</LNsp>** / [Check-M]
88 S6: <soft> no no </soft> / [Answer-M]
89 S2: [a] **it's something in spain** (.) [b] **eh?** / [a. Answer-M + b. Check-M]

¹⁶ Jefferson (1987) calls this sort of correction 'exposed repair'.

- 90 S1: <soft> **is a road** </soft> / [Answer-M]
 91 S6: <8> **the ROA:D**.</8> / [Oh-Receipt-M]
 92 S2: [a] <8> **the ROA:D**.</8> [b] yeah yeah okay / [a. Oh-Receipt-M +
 b. Acknowledge-M]
 93 S6: it's an avenue (.) / [Upgrade-M]

In line 86 of Extract 1.1.7 S2 focuses her attention on the foreign word contained in the lyrics: *rambla*, and makes a hypothesis about its meaning – *rambla is a beach*. She does so in a tentative style, by means of a pause and the epistemic hedge *i think*, softly uttered. S1 hesitates to translate the word. In fact, she starts her turn with an elongated article (*a:*), following it with a long filled pause (*erm*). After a one-second pause she checks whether the other students know what the *rambla* is. The first answer provided (line 88) is dispreferred and reiterated in a soft voice: *no no*, and the following one (line 89, [a]), which is the best answer that S2 could provide, is followed by a Check move [b]: *eh?* In line 90 S1 softly discloses the meaning of *rambla*, and in lines 91-92 the two students that have just taken part in the interaction perform an Oh-Receipt move (Tsui 1989: 562-563; Schegloff 2007: 123), emphatically repeating the word provided by S1 in an overlap. By giving prominence to the word (*ROAD*), S6 and S2 signal with enthusiasm the achievement of new information. Furthermore, in line 92 S2's Oh-Receipt move [a] is accompanied by an Acknowledge move [b], introduced by the repetition of *yeah* and followed by an *okay*-uptake, whereby the speaker recognizes the focus of the utterance in line 85. The organization of turns in lines 89-92 registers what Heritage (1984) calls “third turn”: the oh-receipts follow the adjacency pairs “question-answer”, an extremely frequent occurrence in talk-in-action. This stretch of talk ends with an Upgrade move on the part of S6, who specifies that the *rambla* is indeed an avenue.

Extract 1.1.8: “he only said that it’s good and it’s beautiful”

Extract 1.1.9: “the weekend”

I will now analyse the use of humour in a macro-sequence that I subdivided into two separate extracts, both dealing with teasing, namely “a practice in which the students playfully make fun of each other” (Kalocsai 2014: 147). Despite the similar dynamics of the humorous practice, the two moments have slightly different outcomes. The student being teased in both extracts is S5 – a quiet Argentinian student who barely takes part in the discussion. S5 joined the class of the three Italian students involved in the spoken activity two months earlier.

Extract 1.1.8 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S5=L1: spa/AR, male; S6=L1: spa/CL, female)

- 153 S3: <to S1> so the yours would be the best.</to S1> / [Evaluate-M]
 154 S6: yeah / [Acknowledge-M]
 155 S3: good job / [Evaluate-M]
 156 S1: okay. / [Finalizer-M]
 157 S5: <L1sp> (**grande**) {(great)} </L1sp> / [Evaluate-M]
 158 SS: @@@ / [Challenge-M]
 159 S2: [a] <@> we can't know if er the [S5] song (.) [S5] song is the best [b]
 because he said that he doesn't know er <6> what </6> the song is <7> about </7>
 [c] so @ **he only said that** (.) **it's good and** (.) **it's beautiful** </@> / [a. Challenge-M + b. c. Explain-M]
 160 S3: <6> @@@ </6> / [Acknowledge-M]
 161 S3: <7><@> talking about </@></7> / [Support-M]
 162 S3: @@ / [Acknowledge-M]
 163 S5: <soft><@> **november rain** </@></soft> / [Acknowledge-M]
 164 SS: @@ / [Acknowledge-M]

In Extract 1.1.8 humour is triggered by S5's code switch into his first language, Spanish, (*grande*, line 157), which echoes with S3's Evaluate move (*good job*, line 155). The meaning of *grande* is known to all participants as their first languages, Italian and Spanish, share the same word. S5's choice to implement an Evaluate move in Spanish, in the wake of those previously uttered by S3 (lines 153 and 155), acts as a Challenge move that leads to a loud outburst of challenging laughter in all students. At this point, S2 seizes the floor, and laughingly provokes S5 by saying that they are not meant to know whether his song is the best [a], because he did not even say what it is about [b], but he did say that it is good [c]. While she is teasing S5, S3 overlaps twice: the first time with loud laughter (line 160), the second time cooperatively constructing S2's utterance in a laughing voice (line 161). Even though S2 sounds quite abrupt in her making fun of S5, she shows alignment with S5 at the end of the turn. She starts her utterance stigmatizing S5's choice of a song which he does not know much about, but she ends it repeating the expression used by S5 in a previous turn: *it's beautiful* (see Appendix 3, line 53). In the next turn, S3 performs an Acknowledge move laughing again – actually, he does not seem to have ever stopped laughing since S5's code switch. Crucially, in line 163 S5 responds uttering the title of his original song in a soft laughing voice, as if to acknowledge the tease and to show affiliation with the group. The sequence ends with another outburst of laughter on the part of all the participants in the discussion.

The next sequence, which follows the students' outburst of laughter in line 164, unfolds in a slightly different fashion from the previous one.

Extract 1.1.9 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S5=L1: spa/AR, male)

- 165 S3: [a] if (.) do you want to choose another song [S5]? [b] cos = / [a. Elicit-M +
b. Explain-M]
166 S5: = *smoke weed every day* / [Answer-M]
167 SS: @@@@ / [Challenge-M]
168 S5: this talk about (.) / [Focus-M]
169 SS: @@@ (3) / [Challenge-M]
170 S3: <@> **the weekend** </@> / [Challenge-M]
171 SS: @@@ / [Challenge-M]
172 S5: <soft> ah (.) okay </soft> / [Finalizer-M]
173 SS: @@@@ / [Challenge-M]
174 S1: [a] okay (.) [b] so: = / [a. Finalizer-M + b. possible Open-M]
175 S5: = <soft><@><L1sp> **basta** {enough} </L1sp></@></soft> / [Finalizer-M]
(gap 00:00:19) {the students laugh and whisper}

In line 165 S2 takes the floor and performs an Elicit move [a], whereby he gives S5 the chance of selecting another song, followed by a potential Explain move [b]. S5 accepts the offer instantly, and latching to S3 provides the title of a new song (line 166). Surprisingly, in the next turn, the students laugh even louder than before. Disregarding the co-participants' challenging reaction, S5 attempts to focus on the content of his song. But again, they explode into laughter, as if they were to challenge S5's second opportunity to present a song. Only after a three-second pause S2 takes the floor, and laughingly supplies a teasing-like completion of S5's Focus move (line 170). His completion sounds humorous also to the other participants, who burst out laughing. The word *weekend* (line 170) is assonant to the title of S5's song. To some extent, it also sounds reductive in relation to the task being accomplished: the selection of a song that gives an insight into contemporary society. In line 172 S5 resumes the soft speaking tone he had at the beginning of the discussion (see Extract 1.1.6), and performs a Finalizer move (Tsui 1989: 556). In the wake of the collective laughing of the previous lines (167-169-171), S5's turn is followed by another outburst of laughter: the fourth along the extract. Then, in line 174 S1 echoes with S5's Finalizer move [a], and while she is about to say something [b], S5 seizes the floor and utters another Finalizer move, this time in his first language and in a soft laughing voice. His *basta* ('enough' in English) sounds quite abrupt to both Italian and Spanish speakers, who share the same word, but having been pronounced in a humorous tone, it does not refrain the participants from carrying on laughing.

In Extract 1.1.8 S5 enters the discussion using an unexpected code switch that prompts S2's teasing exchange. S5's code switch into his first language may be

interpreted as a means to either flag his presence in the group in a creative fashion, or challenge S3's Evaluate mode (*good job*) in a mocking way, using the 'up-graded' adjective *grande* – "great" in English. After a series of laughter tokens and the teasing implications of S2's utterance (line 159), S5 sounds to play along when he repeats the title of his original song in a soft laughing mode, acknowledging S2's humorous remark. At the beginning of Extract 1.1.9, the discussion resumes in a normal tone of voice. But, when S5 utters the title of another song and starts focusing on it, the students laugh loudly, in the wake of the humorous atmosphere triggered by his code switch in line 157. The following outbursts of laughter and S3's teasing utterance completion in line 170 lead to S5's second code switch, whereby he displays some annoyance concealed by a smiling voice that serves as a face-saving device.

S2 and S3 use ELF in their natural habitat – their school – keeping the lively personality they show when speaking their own L1. According to Pözl and Seidlhofer (2006), the place where ELF interactions unfold is crucial, and has an effect on the speakers' pragmatic behaviour. The "habitat factor" (*ibid.*) enables the two participants to feel more at home in English; indeed they play with ELF quite skilfully, challenging S5 in a humorous fashion.

Extract 1.1.10: "it's referred it's linked"

The following stretch of talk exemplifies cooperation in a word search moment introduced by code-switching. One of the participants appeals for linguistic assistance resorting to her L1. All co-participants take part in the meaning negotiation; two of them take up the turn more than once, showing their willingness to give a useful contribution to the unfolding speech, preventing any interruption.

Extract 1.1.10 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S5=L1: spa/AR, male; S6=L1: spa/CL, female)

(gap 00:00:05) {S1, S2 and S3 whisper in italian: now they negotiate the translation of a word}

- 262 S1: <soft><L1it> **riferito?** {referred to?} </L1it></soft> / [*Question-M*]
 263 S3: <soft> **it's** <pvc> **bounding** {bound} </pvc> to </soft> (.) **it's linked** / [*Answer-M*]
 264 S2: **it's referred** / [*Answer-M*]
 265 S1: okay / [*Acknowledge-M*]
 266 S2: **it refer** <6> **it refers to** </6> / [*Repair-M*]
 267 S3: <6> it's referred it's linked </6> / [*Repair-M*]
 268 S6: [*a*] yeah (.) [*b*] **it refers to or it talks about.** / [*a. Acknowledge-M + b. Repair-M*]
 269 S1: okay / [*Acknowledge-M*]

- 270 S2: **it refers to (.) the (.)** / [Focus-M]
 271 S1: okay / [Continuer-M]
 272 S5: <soft> it refers to (go) </soft> = / [possible Focus-M]
 273 S3: = <to S5><joking><L1it> **stai zitto** {shut up} </L1it></joking></to S5> /
 [Direct-M]
 274 S1: okay / [possible Reopen-M]
 275 S2: it refers to the (.) / [Focus-M]

After a very brief gap during which three students negotiate the translation of a word, whispering in their own L1, S1 takes the floor and asks for lexical help, code switching to Italian, her L1. Despite her soft tone of voice, she sounds quite confident in using her L1, possibly because all participants share (at various level) both English and Italian. In line 263 S3 starts the meaning negotiation providing a couple of tentative translations in a soft speaking mode. The two expressions – totally unfitting to the context – are vaguely connected to each other. The former is the outcome of a creative act – *it's bounding to* – that reminds of “it's bound to”, and the latter – *it's linked* – turns out equally incorrect. S2 takes up the turn and suggests a literal translation – *it's referred*, which the student appealing for assistance acknowledges with an *okay*-uptake. The meaning negotiation continues with the same two participants who have provided their contributions in lines 263-264. S2 seems to have changed her mind and suggests another English expression – *it refer it refers to* – implementing a Repair move. Not only does she supply an alternative translation, but also performs a self-correction, complying with the Standard English rules. Her move appears as a ‘Repair within Repair’, where *it's referred* turns into *it refer* that, in turn, becomes *it refers to*. In overlapping speech, S3 makes a further suggestion, repeating S2's first attempt at translating the requested lexical item and following it with his original suggestion, an established English expression (see line 263). At this point S6 takes the floor and, recognizing S2's suggestion [a], repeats the repair, adding a near synonym [b] – *it refers to or it talks about* (line 268). After S1 has acknowledged her co-participants' lexical choice, S2 takes the floor again and resumes the thread of the discussion with a Focus move. In a juncture pause (Godwin 1981: 68) S1 encourages S2's delivery with a Continuer move (line 271). Unexpectedly, in line 272 S5 takes up the turn, and in a soft voice repeats S2's English expression validated by S6 (*it refers to*); he follows it with an unclear word, possibly implementing a Focus move. In the wake of previous teasing-like moments, S3 latches to him and, jokingly addressing him, performs an impolite Direct move in Italian, his own L1. Although S3's joking tone makes it rather playful

and comradely, his code switch sounds quite inappropriate at this stage of the discussion. In line 274 S1 takes the floor, and paying no heed to S3's challenging turn she possibly implements a Reopen move with an *okay* token. This stretch of talk ends with S2 performing her Focus move for the second time.

The extract contains two instances of code-switching. The former embodies a request for a missing English word. S1 flags that she is short of the right word in English using her own L1, aware of the fact that all participants would understand her; in truth, the two exchange students taking part in the discussion had been living in Italy for a few months at the time of the recording, and very likely had learnt *some* Italian. The latter – a rather flippant request mitigated by the participant's joking tone – sounds as a defying invitation, aiming to create a playful atmosphere and to establish rapport with the co-participant, who is also a new comer into S3's class.

The two code switches have very different outcomes. S1's request in line 262 triggers a series of Answer and Repair moves that eventually lead to a shared agreement on the most suitable English expression. Interestingly, the meaning negotiation comes to an end only after S6 – the student who has supplied correct English forms and terms on various occasions along the speech event – has validated S2's translation (*it refers to*), and has reinforced it with a near synonym (*it talks about*). Conversely, S3's latching to S5's soft repetition of the 'validated' English expression falls on deaf ears. S3's impolite Direct move jokingly addressed in Italian to S5 does not produce any jocular effect: S1 takes the floor, and without heeding it likely performs a Reopen move while S5 does not even reply.

Extract 1.1.11: “the truck tu:f tu:f tu:f”

The following extract is rich in linguistic resources and pragmatic strategies. It contains instances of onomatopoeic additions, of interactive repair, and of a specific code switch which I refer to as ‘oblivious’.

Extract 1.1.11 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S6=L1: spa/CL, female)

- 283 S3: that's the <L1it> **camion** {truck} <ipa> kə'miən </ipa></L1it> who: (.) /
[Inform-M]
284 S6: truck / [Repair-M]
285 S3: who <pvc> **trucked** {knocked down} </pvc> some people (.) / [Inform-M]
286 S6: no the truck / [Repair-M]
287 S3: [a] <@> no the truck </@> who kills some people (.) [b] cos he was on the (.) /

- [a. Inform-M + b. Explain-M]
 288 S6: on a tourist erm / [Explain-M]
 289 S3: yeah / [Acknowledge-M]
 290 S6: on a tourist = / [Explain-M]
 291 S3: = that was a party e:r (1) that was a **city party** and (.) the truck (.)
 <soft><ono> **tu:f tu:f tu:f** </ono></soft> the truck @@@
 <7> hit some people.</7> / [Explain-M]
 292 S6: <7> **it drove over people.**</7> / [Repair-M]
 293 S1: yeah / [Acknowledge-M]
 294 S3: <ono> **ta ta ta tu: tu: tu:** </ono> @@ / [Explain-M]

At this stage of the discussion, S3 describes the terrorist attack that took place in Nice, France, on 14 July 2016. Instead of using the word “lorry” or “truck”, he utters the corresponding Italian word, *camion*, a loanword from French in both Italian and Spanish (the participants’ first languages), seemingly unaware of performing a code switch. S6, who has shown sensitivity to grammar and vocabulary issues and an attitude to repair in previous exchanges, takes the floor, providing the English word *truck*, which S3 immediately appropriates and authenticates, as if it were a verb, to complete his Inform move. S3 is so involved in the delivery of the information he holds about the terrorist attack that he instantly recognizes the word “truck” as a verb, and uses it in the past tense: *trucked* (line 285). In the next turn, S6 performs another Repair move, repeating the word *truck* preceded by the definite article, and introduced by a negative token, to indicate that *truck* is a noun, not a verb. Only at this point (line 287) does S3 realize his quite original use of the word “truck” made in line 285; hence he resumes his Inform move with an exact repetition comprising the negative token *no*, whereby he recognizes his misinterpretation. He utters it in a laughing voice, which serves as a face-saving strategy. The next three utterances (lines 288-290) of the extract show cooperative behaviour in a word search moment. The hesitation pause at the end of line 287 allows S6 to provide a hint (*on a tourist erm*), immediately acknowledged by S3. She then repeats it, supposedly to supply more information, but S3 seizes the floor and explains what in fact happened in Nice. In line 291 S3 latches to S6’s second attempt of giving her contribution to the word search, and incorporates the idea of *tourist* (lines 289-290) in the expression *city party*. In the same turn, he recapitulates what he has just said, softly adding onomatopoeic sounds that copy the noise of a running truck. S3 is aware of his unusual fashion of expressing information, and, in fact, the second time he utters the word *truck* he produces an outburst of laughter; only after that does he conclude his turn reformulating the information given in a previous turn (see line 287). The addition of onomatopoeic sounds to make the conversation livelier, despite the

most serious topic being dealt with, is interpreted by S6 as a further request for lexical help. That is why she overlaps in line 292, providing a complete sentence that contains the supposedly missing verb. In this case S6 misinterprets S3's use of onomatopoeic sounds as S3 does not flag a problem, conversely, he peppers his contribution and successfully completes his turn verbalizing his *tu:f tu:f tu:f*. The Acknowledge move uttered by S1, the participant who has chosen the song about terrorism, confirms that the information provided by S3 and S6 through a collaborative overlap (see Meierkord 2000) has been effectively delivered (line 293). The sequence ends with another instance of onomatopoeic sounds that reproduce the shots fired during the terrorist attack. This time, S3's turn is totally non-verbal: his onomatopoeic contribution to the discussion, accompanied by laughter, is not followed by a verbal explanation.

The lexical choice – *camion* – made by S3 at the start of Extract 1.1.1, and pronounced as if it were an English word, is not perceived by the speaker as a code switch since he appropriates and authenticates the word *truck*, suggested by S6 in line 284, creatively using it as a verb to complete his move. I have interpreted this as an instance of 'oblivious' code switch, prompted by the foreign origin of the word in the speaker's first language – Italian – and induced by strong emotional charge, whereby he informs the participants in the discussion about the Nice terrorist attack. The series of repairs (as defined by Schegloff *et al.* 1977 and Levinson 1983: 340) in lines 284-287 unfold instances of other-correction (*truck* and *the truck*), other-initiated correction (*the truck*), and an instance of a quite creative use of the language (*trucked*). Besides, S6 does not overlook S3's code switch, despite the proximity of the word in the two L1s spoken by the participants in the discussion; complying with the constrained rules of the ELT classroom, she serves up the correct English word.

In the second part of the extract S3 implements his Explain moves employing a highly effective communication strategy. He uses onomatopoeic sounds to reinforce the message he intends to deliver (lines 291 and 294). His laughter tokens in both turns may reveal S3's awareness of his unusual (at least in the traditional ELT classroom) yet playful fashion to handle the discussion. S3 uses sound effects as a pragmatic strategy that he deploys with great ability. Such skill, according to Coates (1997: 83), "is widely recognized as a feature of boys' talk." In my data, though, instances of sound effects are also found in girls' talk (see Appendix 3, line 178 and Extract 2.3.3, line 851).

Additionally, the extract exemplifies the process of meaning negotiation and the variety of strategies employed by the students to ensure effective communication and mutual intelligibility. Constructing meaning is synonymous with collaboration; in fact, as Mauranen (2015: 45) notes, there is a “pronounced propensity of ELF speakers to engage in cooperative behaviour.” Among speakers who do not share the same common ground and mediate knowledge with their own cultural schemata, constructing meaning may also imply to try out different – sometimes original – paths for accomplishing satisfactory communication. S3 and S6 are eager to give their contribution to the discussion, and to do so they adopt multiple strategies. S6 is a quiet girl who has met the co-participants only once before the spoken activity. She first deploys a repair practice (*camion/truck*), then she engages in a word search (*on a tourist...*) triggered by a minimal hesitation pause on the part of S3; and finally, misinterpreting S3’s self-laughter as a request for help, she completes S3’s utterance in overlapping speech (*it drove over people*). Conversely, S3 is a playful boy who resorts to unusual pragmatic strategies for effective communicative purposes. He first handles his unintentional code switch (*camion*) – which I previously defined as ‘oblivious’ – with remarkable skill by uttering the term as if it were English. Then he falls back on his playfulness to make a death scenario more vivid with vocal additions in the form of onomatopoeic sounds. Both students succeed in making meaning and in getting across their message – the content of the Italian song. In fact, in line 293 S1, the student who originally suggested the song, acknowledges their jointly constructed utterances.

Extract 1.1.12: “this song talks about the pain of erm”

In the following stretch of talk the participants cooperatively construct a turn and venture on a joint other-correction practice.

Extract 1.1.12 (Vailati_1: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 295 S1: and erm (6) <soft><L1it> come si dice dolore? {how do you say
pain?} </L1it></soft> / [Question-M]
- 296 S2: pain / [Answer-M]
- 297 S1: [a] okay (.) [b] this song talks about the pain erm (1) / [a. Acknowledge-M +
b. Focus-M]
- 298 S2: of (.) th- the pain (1) of the mums. / [Focus-M]
- 299 S1: that lose erm (.) / [Focus-M]
- 300 S3: **their sons** / [Focus-M]
- 301 S1: **their sons** / [Acknowledge-M]
- 302 S2: okay / [Acknowledge-M]
- 303 S1: **son** = / [Focus-M]
- 304 S3: = <8> **sons** </8> / [Repair-M]

- 305 S2: = <8> **sons** </8> / [Repair-M]
 306 S1: <fast> **children** </fast> / [Repair-M]
 307 S2: aha / [Acknowledge-M]
 308 S1: so <fast> this song speaks about </fast> (.) the pain of the mother that (.)
 lose their children. / [Focus-M]

The extract opens with some hesitations on the part of S1, who eventually code switches to her mother tongue, Italian, asking for lexical help. Her switch is prefaced by a filled – *erm* – and a long silent pause indicating a moment of serious difficulty, which she bypasses resorting to her first language. Once S2 has provided her with the missing word (line 296), S1 first acknowledges it [a], then performs a focus move [b], whereby she starts illustrating what the song she has selected is about. Another filled pause, followed by a one-second pause, discloses her hesitation; again, S2 goes to her aid and completes S1’s utterance with a recycling, namely a “‘simple’ same-turn self-repair” (Kasper and Wagner 2014: 15) – *th- the* – and a couple of minimal pauses (line 298). S1 then takes the floor adding further information, but once more her hesitations prompt a co-participant, S3, to take up the turn and to complete S1’s original utterance. In line 301 S1 repeats S3’s words – *their sons* – recognizing his suggestion. S2 too acknowledges the addition made to her prior utterance completion with an agreement token – *okay*. Unexpectedly, in line 303 S1 repeats the word previously uttered by S3 for the second time, but now in the singular form – *son*. No sooner does she pronounce the word *son*, both S3 and S2 perform a Repair move in latched and overlapping speech, correcting the form of *son* into *sons*. Interestingly, S1 responds with another Repair move, uttering the word *children* in a fast mode, as if to signal that *children* is the correct word, not *sons*. In line 307 S2 immediately recognizes her wrong guess with an acceptance token – *aha*. At this point, S1 feels confident and resumes her original utterance – jointly constructed with her co-participants – half of it uttered in a fast speaking mode.

A few observations can be made at this point. The purpose of the code-switching practice enacted by S1 at the beginning of this stretch of talk is once again that of asking for linguistic assistance; in fact, she had resorted to the same practice in Extract 1.1.10, triggering a series of turns. This time, though, there is no negotiation as the missing word is instantly provided and authenticated.

The extract contains an instance of other-initiated grammar correction made by two participants in overlapping speech; it appears prompted by other-initiated lexicogrammatical repairs performed by another co-participant, S6, who has displayed her sensitiveness to Standard English forms all along the discussion (see Extracts 1.1.6 and 1.1.11). Their correction sounds more an act of ‘doing being English learners’, rather than a measure for enhancing understanding. Interestingly, S1 does not authenticate her co-participants’ repair. I interpret S1’s repetition of the word *son* in the singular form as evidence of second thoughts on the lexical choice suggested by both S3 and S2. My interpretation is supported by S1’s next turn in line 306, whereby she comes up with the word she was presumably looking for, uttering it in a fast mode as if to flag her accomplishment – she indeed meant *children*, not *son(s)* – and her urge to resume the talk.

The extract also shows the participants’ robust cooperativeness in creating meaning: three students jointly construct a turn as soon as the first speaker shows some hesitations (lines 297-300). They immediately and strategically provide their contribution so as “to keep the communicative channel open” (Canale and Swain 1980: 25), making talk flow smoothly.

Extract 1.2.1: “makes sense makes sense”

The following extract opens the *Vailati_2* group discussion. The participants employ communication strategies that enhance explicitness and show a high degree of listenership and willingness to understand.

Extract 1.2.1 (Vailati_2: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: tha/TH, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female)

- 334 S1: [a] okay (.) [b] i (.) i’m thinking about a song (.) that is e:r is a song about the: society (.) [c] and the: group is dark polo gang (.) [d] and it could be (.) a stupid song (.) [e] but (.) it’s e:r reflect the (.) erm the society (.) [f] because (.) it’s talk about it talks about the: money and the (.) sometimes er talk about drug [g] and i think that is it (.) they are some problem that (.) **the society of the (.) today so- society** erm reflect (.) a lot so (1) er (.) [h] what do you think about **this?** (1) **this** (1) **this problems?** / [a. Open-M + b. c. Inform-M + d. Downgrade-M + e. Focus-M + f. Explain-M + g. Upgrade-M + h. Elicit-M]
- 335 S2: [a] <soft> i think </soft> i think that (1) i agree wi- with you [b] because erm (.) they’re these are the problems that (.) really exist in our society nowadays [c] especially with the teenagers (.) [d] so (1) this song **is really (.) makes sense** in my opinion. / [a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Evaluate-M]
- 336 S3: <soft> is really?</soft> / [Loop-M]
- 337 S2: <1> **makes sense** </1> / [Answer-M]

338 S1: <1><soft> **makes sense** </soft></1> / [Answer-M]
 339 S3: <soft> **makes sense makes sense** </soft> / [Acknowledge-M]

S1 introduces his Open move with an ice-breaking *okay*, and starts presenting his song. His presentation is interspersed with minimal hesitation pauses and fillers (*e:r, erm, er*), which allow him to gain time and organise his ideas. S1's orientation to the participants in the discussion is made clear near the end of his utterance, when – through a couple of self-repairs – he implements two accommodative strategies to pre-empt non-understanding. By inserting the qualifying lexical item *today* before the word *society*, he clarifies that his song deals with contemporary society issues, and by replacing the pronoun *this* with the lexical referent *this problems* after performing his Elicit move (*what do you think about this?*), he enhances explicitness. The two one-second pauses that punctuate his clarification – *this problems* – may serve two different functions. The former pause might correspond to the time given to the interlocutors for implementing an Answer move; the latter – after the repetition of the word *this* – possibly serves the function of gaining time in order to make a satisfactory lexical selection (Boomer 1965: 156, quoted in Godwin 1981: 68). In line 335 S2 takes the floor, and hedges his reply move with a repetition (*i think i think that*) and a recycling – *i agree wi- with you*. S2 concludes his turn implementing an Evaluate move through a replacement – *this song is really (.) makes sense* – followed by the epistemic hedge *in my opinion*. His replacement, possibly unexpected by S3, triggers a Loop move that she utters in a soft voice, which may serve as a face-saving device. S2 and S1 provide the missing words in overlapping speech. In line 339 S3 softly performs an Acknowledge move by repeating *makes sense* twice, as if she wanted to appropriate S2's lexical choice.

The extract shows the participants' genuine involvement in the spoken activity and a natural use of the language that encompasses delay markers (e.g. repetitions, lengthening sounds), self-repairs (e.g. recyclings, replacements), and both silent and filled pauses. Interestingly, from the very beginning of the discussion the participants display their listenership and cooperativeness in the turn-by-turn unfolding of the interaction, asking for clarification (line 336) and rapidly providing an answer in overlapping speech (lines 337-338). S3's use of a soft speaking mode as a face-saving device in line 336 may conceal either her shyness or her embarrassment for implementing a Loop move. In the think-aloud interview, which allowed the students

– one by one – to disclose their thoughts about the spoken activity in ELF, she openly acknowledged her lack of confidence in the English language and her desire to improve.

Extract 1.2.2: “è cinese”

The unexpected choice of a Chinese song triggers a code switch, followed by collective approval. The extract also contains another instance of code-switching and simultaneous laughter, which helps create a communal atmosphere.

Extract 1.2.2 (Vailati_2: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: tha/TH, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S6=L1: chi/CN, female)

- 355 S6: = [a] and (.) i (.) choose a song called *model* [b] and it means a
model er in a shop (.) [c] the singer (.) says that er he (.) just like a model in a
shop or (.) something which can be (.) judged commented [d] and (1) says reflect (.)
superficial psychological of the society. / [a. b. Inform-M + c. d. Focus-M]
- 356 S2: <soft> uhu (.) okay. </soft> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 357 S1: **i didn't understand the (.) singer** / [Loop-M]
- 358 S6: [a] the singer is <L1ch> li ronghao </L1ch> [b] maybe (.)
<3> you </3> don't = / [a. Answer-M + b. possible Check-M]
- 359 S3: <3> a:h </3> / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 360 S3: = eh <L1it> **è cinese**. {he is chinese.} </L1it> **he (.) he's chinese**. / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 361 S6: yeah / [Acknowledge-M]
- 362 S1: [a] **a:h** (.) [b] **okay** (2) / [a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]
- 363 S6: <fast> it's a chinese song. </fast> / [Inform-M]
- 364 SS: <soft> **@@** </soft> / [Support-M]
- 365 S1: [a] <L1it> **vai** {go} </L1it> [S2] (.) [b] <fast> **is your moment** </fast> /
[a. Direct-M + b. Explain-M]
- 366 SS: <soft> **@@@** </soft> / [Support-M]
- 367 S1: yes. / [Passing Turn-M]

S6 presents her song to the group without saying the name of the singer, nor that the song is Chinese. In line 356 S2 recognizes her choice with two acknowledgement markers, softly uttered (*uhu* and *okay*). In the following line S1 takes the floor, implementing a Loop move in an indirect fashion – *i didn't understand (.) the singer*. S6 immediately provides the name of the singer in Chinese, as the song is indeed Chinese; then, aware of the multi-linguacultural context, she adds a tentative Check move to test whether the interactants know him. As soon as S6 utters the name of the singer, S3 performs an Oh-Receipt move in overlapping speech: a prelude to an emotional code-switch that she enacts in the next latched turn. In fact, in line 360 S3 gives voice to her surprise, code-switching (*è cinese*) to her own first language (Italian), and immediately repeating the switch in English (*he (.) he's chinese*). The turn-initial hesitation marker– *eh* – gives prominence to her code-switch; in addition, the minimal hesitation pause after the choice of the personal pronoun *he* for the Chinese singer may

conceal an afterthought concerning the sex of the singer, motivated by the fact that S3 does not speak Chinese. In line 361 S6 acknowledges S3's guess, and in the following turn another participant, S1, performs a further Oh-Receipt move (*a:h*) [a], along with an Acknowledge move (*okay*) [b]. The two-second pause that follows S1's turn prompts S6 to confirm that hers is a Chinese song (line 363). At this point, all participants laugh softly, recognizing and fully supporting her choice.

In the wake of S3's code-switching practice, S1 takes the floor, and tersely invites S2 to present his song, performing a Direct move [a] in Italian, his mother tongue – *vai (go)*, followed by S2's name. The use of Italian – the language S2 has been learning for the past nine months – makes S1's request sound comradelier and more playful. In the same turn (line 365), S1 follows it with an Explain move [b], which mitigates the apparent abruptness of his Direct move. The fast uttered *is your moment* sounds very much like an L1-transfer to English; indeed, it reminds the Italian idiomatic expression “è il tuo momento” (it's your turn). Once again, the students laugh softly, supporting S1's request. The sequence ends with S1 implementing a Passing Turn move (Levinson 1983: 317), whereby he further encourages S2 to get the floor.

The two instances of code-switching in this extract serve quite different functions. S3's code-switching to her L1 displays the participant's reaction to an unexpected piece of information and possibly, as in an epiphany, her sudden awareness of being a member of a truly multi-linguacultural group. Her emotional response provided in Italian is immediately followed by the English translation, whereby she extends her surprise, almost seeking confirmation of her guess: the singer is Chinese. Conversely, S1's code-switching to his mother tongue, the language all participants speak (at various levels) in addition to English, has an affective nuance, and signals in-group belonging. S1 invites S2 to seize the floor in Italian; in fact, S2 is a Thai exchange student who has spent the whole school year in the same class as S1, and possibly has made very good friends with him. S1's code-switching instantiates rapport-building, which is supported by soft simultaneous laughter. Interestingly, soft joint laughter, displaying support to S6 and S2, follows both S6's choice of a Chinese song and S1's code switch inviting S2 to seize the floor. All participants appear to converge to S6 and S2, whose tone of voice has been soft and polite all along the discussion. This adaptive

behaviour may unveil a token of respect for both students' East Asian origins and cultural values, such as being quiet in public speaking.

Extract 1.2.3: “physical erm judge”

Cooperativeness and alignment are manifest in the extract below. The participants perform Repair moves that speed up the talk and make it flow smoothly.

Extract 1.2.3 (Vailati_2: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: tha/TH, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S5=L1: rum/RO, female; S6=L1: chi/CN, female)

379 S1: bullying (1) and (1) <4> homosexual </4> marry = / [Focus-M]
 380 SX-5: <4> homosexual </4> / [Focus-M]
 381 S5: = <5> marriage </5> / [Repair-M]
 382 S3: = <5> marriage </5> / [Repair-M]
 383 S6: physical erm (.) / [Focus-M]
 384 S1: <pvc> judge {judgement} </pvc> / [Repair-M]
 385 S2: <soft><pvc> judge {judgement} </pvc> (.) and the violence </soft> / [Focus-M]

After the first round of song presentations S1 focuses on the theme of each song. His hesitation in line 379 prompts a participant – probably S5 – to provide him with a scaffold, which comes in overlapping speech (*homosexual*). S1's misspeaking at the end of line 379 (*marry*) is not overlooked by two participants, who simultaneously seize the floor and implement a Repair move, whereby they supply the correct word (*marriage*). S5 has suggested a song about homosexual marriages; her very likely overlap in line 380, along with the Repair move she performs in line 381, indicate her true interest in the topic, which makes her not gloss over S1's wrong lexical choice. Interestingly, also S3 provides the correct word in latched and overlapping speech (line 382). Her move, though, seems to be driven by her desire to “speak English well” – quoting S3's concern, which she voiced in the retrospective interview I audio recorded just after the activity. In line 383 S6 takes up the turn, and suggests the theme of her song. Yet, she does not complete her utterance: her filled (*erm*) and silent hesitation pauses trigger a Repair move on the part of S1, the student who originally started to recapitulate the topics of the songs. S1 likely meant to say “judgement”; instead, he utters the word *judge*, which S2 immediately validates in the following turn (line 385). In fact, not only does S2 authenticate the word by repeating it, but he also signals alignment with the previous turn, and, most importantly, affiliation with the co-participant. Additionally, the repetition of the word *judge* – a word similar to

“judgement” – serves a further function: that of ensuring the smooth unfolding of the talk and the synchrony of its delivery (Cogo 2009: 260-261).

In the extract the participants show a high degree of mutual supportiveness. They all step on the ‘communication floor’ with their identity, cultural background, and experiences. S5 takes the floor to give dignity to the topic of her song, S3 to provide a correct English lexical item, S6 to highlight the theme of the song she has selected, S1 to make the talk flow without any interruption, S2 to both align with S1 and resume the talk. Although their reasons for seizing the floor are most diverse, the talk develops smoothly and harmoniously. Once again, the accommodative practice of “other-repetition” (Johnstone *et al.* 1994: 15) in lines 384-385 – also referred to as “echoing” (Mauranen 2012: 220) – displays convergence between participants.

Extract 1.2.4: “terrorism and all the tragedy that nowadays happens”

The following extract revolves around a quite lengthy song presentation during which the participants exhibit a rather high degree of listenership. It also contains an instance of code-switching that reveals the speaker’s flicker of annoyance over his own grammar issue.

Extract 1.2.4 (Vailati_2: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: tha/TH, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S5=L1: rum/RO, female)

- 438 S1: [a] and now i’m thinking about another song [b] and (.) erm it’s an italian song. [c] a:nd (.) ta- talk about the islamic terrorism. (.) [d] and is erm (2) <smacks lips> the name (1) the singer erm is (.) fabrizio moro and er an- also ermal meta [e] and the song (.) is (.) **was** (1) **sang** [f] <L1it> **come si dice?** {how do you say?} </L1it> (.) / [a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + d. e. Inform-M + f. Question-M]
- 439 S3: <8> **sang** </8> / [Answer-M]
- 440 S2: <8> **sung** </8> / [Answer-M]
- 441 S1: [a] was sung <9> in </9> sanremo (.) this year (.) [b] a:nd (.) is the topic of this song is very very important (.) [c] because (.) er it talk about er terrorism (.) and all the tragedy that (.) er nowadays (.) happens (.) / [a. Inform-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Explain-M]
- 442 S3: <9> sung </9> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 443 S2: **a:h** / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 444 S5: **uhu** / [Continuer-M]
- 445 S1: because religious problems are another (.) for me is another problem of the society (.) / [Explain-M]
- 446 S2: <soft> **mh** </soft> / [Continuer-M]
- 447 S1: the difference of (1) the (.) all the religion of the world. / [Explain-M]
- 448 S2: <soft> **a:h** </soft> / [Oh-Receipt-M]

In the second round of songs that may give an insight into contemporary society, S1 suggests a song about terrorism. He neatly presents his song up to the point where the verb “to sing” gives him trouble. At the end of line 438 he utters the phrase *was sang*; doubtful about the correct form of the verb “to sing”, he immediately asks for assistance, code-switching to his L1 – Italian – which is also the language all his interlocutors are familiar with in addition to English. Immediately two students – S3 and S2 – respond to his request in overlapping speech (lines 439-440). Only S2, though, provides the correct form of the verb, which S1 recognizes as the one he needed, and appropriates it in the following turn. Quite interestingly, after having provided the wrong verb form (line 439) and heard both S2 and S1 pronounce the correct one (*sung*), S3 performs an Acknowledge move, repeating *sung* in an overlap, as if to enact a self-correcting practice that may conceal a significant language awareness. In line 441 S1 resumes presenting the song *sung in sanremo*¹⁷, and both S2 and S5 use a juncture pause to signal their attention to his presentation. In line 443 S2 performs an Oh-Receipt move, whereby he displays his achievement of new information – S1’s song is about *terrorism and all the tragedy that nowadays happens* (line 441) – and, presumably, a change in his state of knowledge (Heritage 1984: 309), while in line 444 S5 encourages the speaker to hold the floor through a Continuer move (Schegloff 1982). Additionally, S2 shows his interest in the song after another juncture pause; to this end, in line 446 he softly implements a Continuer move. At the end of S1’s song presentation, once again S2 performs an Oh-Receipt move, this time in a soft voice, possibly to adjust to the quite serious theme dealt with in the song.

4.4.2. Case study 2

In this section I analyse the transcripts of the audio-recordings collected at Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Tuschek” in Grottaferrata (Rome) on 17 April 2018. The school regularly runs Erasmus+ programmes of the European Union. In the school year 2017-2018 it was leading an Erasmus+ project with partner schools from Croatia, Finland, Germany, Poland and Spain. My activity took place during the transnational project meeting that was held in Grottaferrata on 16-22 April 2018. All the students taking part in the activity had participated in a similar meeting held in Finland a few months earlier.

¹⁷ Sanremo is an Italian town that every year hosts the most popular Italian song contest, the Sanremo Music Festival.

Five different small groups of students participated in the spoken activity. I named the groups *Touschek_1*, *Touschek_2*, *Touschek_3*, *Touschek_4*, and *Touschek_5* (see *Touschek_1-5* in Appendix 1).

Extract 2.1.1: “the family of the monarchy are wasting our money”

The following stretch of talk occurs early in the discussion, when the participants in *Touschek_1* group motivate the choice of their songs. It exemplifies the participants’ eagerness to give a contribution to the discussion and their concern for being as clear as possible.

Extract 2.1.1 (*Touschek_1*: S1=L1: ger/DE, female; S3=L1: spa/ES, male)

- 464 S1: why would you want to (read) some to each other (then)? / [Elicit-M]
(gap 00:00:04) {unintelligible words spoken in a very soft mode}
- 465 S3: [a] hh (.) i think that this song represents the thoughts of a lot of spanish people (.) [b] because (.) the situation of poverty in a lot of spanish cities it’s (.) very big [c] and (.) **this monarchy** (.) **th- the family of the monarchy** are (.) wasting our money (.) so = / [a. Answer-M + b. c. Explain-M]
- 466 S1: = **so like corruption** = / [Focus-M]
- 467 S3: = [a] **yeah corruption** and (.) [b] **you know?** [c] so much (.) ceremonies that (.) aren’t useful (.) [d] they only (.) / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Try-Marker-M + c. d. Focus-M]
- 468 S1: <soft> **waste money?** </soft> / [Repair-M]
- 469 S3: [a] **yeah** (.) [b] **they only waste money.** / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]
- 470 S1: [a] i think mine could be chosen [b] because (.) social media plays a very big role in today society (.) [c] it (.) creates these standards that are (.) very high and very hard (too huge) [d] and that (.) creates a lot of **probl- mental problems** for (.) er **people** (.) [e] **boys and girls both** and everything (.) [f] and erm <@> yeah </@> (.) / [a. Answer-M + b. c. d. Explain-M + e. Clarify-M + f. Finalizer-M]

Just after the round of song presentations, S1, who acts as the leader of the group, asks the co-participants the reasons for their choices through an Elicit move. S3 takes the floor and provides an answer [a], explaining why his song *represents the thoughts of a lot of spanish people* – [b, c] (line 465). He blames the monarchy – *this monarchy* – specifying *the family of the monarchy*; in so doing he possibly voices his indignation towards all members of the Spanish royal family. Although the use of the discourse marker *so* at the end of the turn seems to signal S3’s attempt to hold the floor, S1 latches to him, and through a Focus move suggests the theme of S3’s song – *corruption* (line 466). By means of a repetition she incorporates *so* in her utterance, following it with the pragmatic marker *like* in clause-medial position. Both markers appear to serve a face-saving function since she has interrupted S3, disclosing what his song is about. In latched speech S3 acknowledges S1’s suggestion, giving prominence to it by repeating

the word *corruption* [a]. In addition to that, he performs a Try-Marker move [b], *you know?*, drawing the co-participants' attention to what he is about to say through a Focus move [c]. S3's minimal hesitation pause just after starting another Focus move [d] prompts S1 to provide him with the supposedly missing verb – *waste (money)*. In line 468 S1 utters her Repair move in a soft voice, which may serve as a face-saving device; after all, she has jumped into S3's talk twice. In the following turn, S3 acknowledges S1's suggestion [a] and resumes his Focus move [b], not only by repeating *waste money*, but also by reinforcing it with the addition of the adverb *only* (line 469). Eager to motivate the choice of her song, S1 takes up the next turn (line 470). While implementing her Explain moves [b, c, d], her attitude to being as clear as possible is manifest on two occasions: via a restart (*probl- mental problems*), and by specifying who she means by people: *boys and girls both* [e]. In both cases S1 enhances intelligibility: in the former self-repair she adds a qualifying adjective (*mental*) to the general term (*problems*), making it more specific, while in the latter she clarifies that mental problems affect young people, regardless of their sex. The need for being so explicit appears to be driven by the premise she makes in [c], where she states that social media set *very high and very hard* standards that harm the mental health of young people. After a long filled pause (*erm*) S1 closes her turn laughingly, with a positive *yeah* token, whereby she performs a Finalizer move [f].

All along the extract, S1 and S3 use various practices to enhance explicitness; S1 uses hyponyms of the word “people”, *boys* and *girls*, to make it more specific, and both of them add qualifying lexical items in self-repairs (S3: *the family of the monarchy*, line 465; S1: *mental problems*, line 470). Interestingly, the intensifier *both* that follows *boys and girls* seems to suggest that the impact of social media on teenagers' health is not a gender issue. Additionally, the turn-medial discourse marker *you know?*, uttered by S3 in line 467, highlights the upcoming information and serves as a magnet for having all co-participants focus on his song.

Extract 2.1.2: “d’you know the piramide of needings?”

This extract contains very little negotiation. It mostly revolves around one participant's ability to hold the floor, interspersing his long turn with discourse markers that not only serve organizational uses, but also trigger ‘suspense’.

Extract 2.1.2 (Touschek_1: S1=L1: ger/DE, female; S3=L1: spa/ES, male; S4=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 481 S1: [a] and social media also plays the role all that <un> x </un> (.)
[b] because (1) a lot (.) most people use facebook instagram everything (2) a lot
of (1) different (.) / [a. Focus-M + b. Explain-M]
- 482 S3: [a] but the (.) i think it's like (.) [b] **d'you know the** <L1sp> **piramide**
{pyramid} </L1sp> **of** (.) of <pvc> **needings?** {needs?} </pvc> [c] **you know?**
(.) [d] first it's (.) <smacks lips> th- the basic <pvc> needings {needs} </pvc>
for our lives (.) [e] **you know?** [f] breathing (1) (know) breathing (.) eating (.) / [a.
Challenge-M + b. Check-M + c. Try-Marker-M + d. Inform-M + e. Try-Marker-
M + f. Upgrade-M]
- 483 S4: yeah / [Continuer-M]
- 484 S3: [a] habit and then (.) next level we have our (.) <fast> our happiness
</fast> [b] and the next level we have (.) [c] **you know?** [d] our image (.) and it's
like (2) [e] because (happy) a thought of a (.) a important people (.) [f] and i saw a
video the other day and it was interesting [g] because (.) when you don't have (.)
[h] **you know?** [i] you don't have to to eat (.) how to eat (.) and what to (1) [j] **you**
know? [k] a a good house (.) you don't think in social standards (.) [l] **you know?**
[m] when you don't have to what to eat you only think that (.) you don't have time
to (.) to think (.) maybe i could be like that? or (.) maybe if i was like he (.) no (.)
(that you know) (.) / [a. b. Inform-M + c. Try-Marker-M + d. Inform-M +
e. Explain-M + f. Upgrade-M + g. Explain-M + h. Try-Marker-M + i. Explain-M
+ j. Try-Marker-M + k. Explain-M + l. Try-Marker-M + m. Explain-M]
- 485 S1: [a] that's (.) a very good point (1) [b] and poverty also exists everywhere
(.) [c] **right?** [d] there's not a country where more people are (.)
<soft> middle class </soft> = / [a. Evaluate-M + b. Focus-M + c. Check-M +
d. Upgrade-M]

Extract 2.1.2 follows S4's proposal to select S3's Spanish song, *Los Borbones son unos ladrones* (see Appendix 3, line 477), as the favourite song of the group, and comes immediately after a short speaking break in which the students have googled the lyrics of their songs. S1 resumes the role of group leader, and through a Focus move [a] she starts the discussion. She attempts to explain why social media play an important role in today's society [b], but her hesitations at the end of line 481 favour S3's seizing the floor. In line 482 S3 hedges a Challenge move [a], which triggers a series of interesting moves; he tries to persuade his group that poverty is the issue and that the social and economic standards promoted by social media should come after people's basic needs. To do so S3 implements a Check move [b] that conceals a rhetorical question – *do you know the piramide of needings?* (line 482). Mindless of his code-switching (*piramide*) combined with his original coinage (*needings*), and without expecting an answer from the floor, he skilfully performs a Try-Marker move [c] – *you know?* – that (i) highlights the upcoming information and (ii) “invites the addressee[s] to recognize both the relevance and the implications of the utterance[s]” (Jucker and Smith 1998: 194, quoted in Fox Tree and Schrock 2002: 737). After having introduced the first category of needs (*basic needings*) [d], S3 implements another Try-Marker move [e], highlighting the

truly basic physical needs (*breathing eating*) [f]. The rising intonation of the repeated discourse marker *you know?* prompts a Continuer move (line 483) on the part of S4, who utters a supportive backchannel – *yeah* – just after one of S3’s minimal pauses. In line 484 S3 continues his description of the *piramide of needings* levels, and explains why poor people are not worried about social *standards*. He skilfully uses the Try-Marker move [c]: his timely *you know?* creates a cliffhanging effect, preceding the climax of his long turn – *our image* [d]. Importantly, S3 upgrades his explanations with the insertion of a personal experience [f] that keeps up the co-participants’ attention, and peppers them with Try-Marker moves that inform the interlocutors that an inference is expected. Apparently (the pronunciation is not clear) S3 ends his turn with a final *you know*, “closing off prior discourse” (Fox Tree and Schrock 2002: 740). In line 485 S1 seizes the floor, performing an Evaluate move [a], followed by a Focus move [b] that comes after a one-second pause. Interestingly, in the same turn S1 implements a Check move [c] using *right?*, whereby she appeals to shared understanding, and finally introduces her Upgrade move [d]. The softly uttered *middle class*, which concludes her turn, possibly conceals the uncertainty of her statement.

The extract, which is quite different from all those analysed so far, does not contain much intersubjectivity: one participant holds the floor at length, providing as many reasons as possible to persuade the co-participants that his song is the one that must be selected. At the beginning of his turn S3, possibly excited about keeping his point, performs a code switch into Spanish, his L1 – *piramide* – seemingly unaware of it, and coins a new word that stems from “need” – *needings*. Both S3’s ‘oblivious’ code switch and the new coinage go unnoticed by the participants in the discussion. Very likely, the proximity of both words to the English words “pyramid” and “needs” does not make communication problematic. Interestingly, S3 incorporates his code-switching-coinage combination into a Check move, making it sound rather like a rhetorical question. From this point onwards, S3 peppers his talk with Try-Markers moves, using the multifunctional discourse marker – *you know?* – with great ability. The discourse marker “you know”, which has a forward-looking purpose (Fox Tree and Schrock 2002: 736) in turn-medial position, serves here the following functions: (i) highlighting information ([c], [e] in line 482); (ii) getting the addressee(s) to draw the correct inference ([h], [j], [l] in line 484); and (iii) creating a cliffhanging effect ([c] in line 484). S1 performs a Check move in her final turn of the extract. The effective use

of the comprehension check *right?* in line 485 is twofold: it serves (i) to verify shared understanding – poverty is a worldwide issue – and (ii) to support her next move, which ends with the words *middle class*, softly uttered and preceded by a minimal hesitation pause. The soft tone of her voice may have a face-saving function since, after all, she is making a guess.

Extract 2.2.1: “you know? i was in an international congress”

The extract reports the robust participation and listenership of this Erasmus+ group – *Touschek_2* – in the talk, and focuses on a participant’s highly emotional response to the choice of the song *Imagine*.

Extract 2.2.1 (Touschek_2: S1=L1: pol/PL, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: fin/FI, female)

- 597 S4: = [a] yeah [b] and it’s very like positive the other songs were like almost
<9> depressing </9> yeah [c] and it’s like (.) the song is about we have
<1> hope </1> and everything’s <2> gonna be better [d] **so yeah so** </2>
<un> x </un> (someone will say) in the future (.) **they will be like o:h** = /
[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Focus-M + d. Upgrade-M]
- 598 S3: <9> yeah like </9> / [Continuer-M]
- 599 S2: <9> yeah </9> / [Continuer-M]
- 600 S3: <1> yeah </1> / [Continuer-M]
- 601 S2: <2> yeah i think so (.) absolutely </2> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 602 S1: <2> **you know?** </2> / [Summon-M]
- 603 S1: = [a] **you know?** [b] i was in an **international** congress (.) / [a. Summon-M +
b. Inform-M]
- 604 S3: yeah / [Continuer-M]
- 605 S1: and i shou- there were lots of people from another countries like israel taiwan (.) /
[Inform-M]
- 606 S2: aha / [Continuer-M]
- 607 S1: [a] korea or also german [b] and actually it was er (.) like (.) THE main
song we were (.) we had to like learn it and sing <3> it </3> from all
<4> all these </4> / [a. b. Inform-M]
- 608 S3: <3> yeah </3> / [Continuer-M]
- 609 S3: [a] <4> yeah </4> [b] because it’s **inter**<5>**national** </5> = / [a. Acknowledge-M
+ b. Explain-M]
- 610 S1: <5> yeah </5> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 611 S2: <5> yeah </5> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 612 S4: = [a] yeah [b] **worldwide** = / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M]
- 613 S1: = it talks about (.) every<6>thing </6> / [Focus-M]

After having presented their songs, the students have finally arrived at a shared agreement on John Lennon’s song, *Imagine*. In latched speech S4 acknowledges S3’s song suggestion [a], and performs an Evaluate move [b], which she reinforces echoing a supportive backchannel – *yeah* – provided by S3 and S2 in overlapping speech, respectively in lines 598-599. S4 continues her turn with some self-repairs (*it’s like (.) the song is about we have*), focusing on the topic of the song [c] (hope and a better

future), and completes it by implementing an Upgrade move [d], which she constructs in quite an original way. She starts her Upgrade move with two discourse markers, *so* and *yeah*, which allow her to gain time and resume her track of thoughts (Cogo and House 2018: 217); she ends it with an exclamation – *o:h* – giving voice to people’s surprise at listening to the song in the future. While S4 is holding the floor, her co-participants give their contribution to the talk in overlapping speech, signalling their attention and approval through Continuer moves (lines 598-600). S2’s and S1’s overlaps in lines 601-602, though, indicate rather different moves. S2 recognizes that the song is definitely about hope, performing an Acknowledge move in a non-competitive overlap. Conversely, S1 competes for the floor through a Summon move (*you know?*), whereby she intends to draw the co-participants’ attention to her personal experience. Despite S1’s competitive overlap, S4 continues to speak, taking no heed of S1’s request for the floor. Only after S4’s exclamation does S1 seize the floor (line 603), and in latched speech she repeats the Summon move [a] performed in line 602. She follows it with a series of Inform moves, emotionally implemented ([b] in line 603; line 605; [a, b] in line 607), whereby she reports her own experience at an international congress. The co-participants backchannel her delivery, showing their interest in the event she is reporting. In line 609 S3’s competitive overlap, indicating acknowledgement [a], is followed by an Explain move [b], whereby she motivates the choice of the song *Imagine* in S1’s international congress. All participants acknowledge S3’s explanation. In line 612 S4 latches to her and additionally performs a Support move [b], whereby she aligns with S3, corroborating S3’s statement. S1 concludes the sequence in latched speech with a Focus move that confirms the choice of their song and conveys her further flicker of emotion.

The first turn of this sequence ends with an exclamation – *o:h* – that creatively expresses S4’s attempt to convey the expected surprise on the part of ‘future people’ when listening to *Imagine*. The vowel elongation gives prominence to S4’s marker of surprise and the overall effect is rather powerful. The whole sequence is characterized by overlapping and latched speech that shows all participants’ attentive listenership and eagerness to take part in the spoken activity. The students perform both competitive and uncompetitive overlaps that appear not to affect the speaker’s delivery. An interesting instance of competitive overlap is the one in line 602: S1 feels the urge to share her recent experience at an international congress. She competes for the floor

using a Summon move (*you know?*) that S4 totally ignores. S1 politely waits for a transition relevance place (TRP)¹⁸, here represented by S4's elongated *o:h*, and eventually latches to her, reporting her experience at an international congress. A few restarts (*i shou- there were; we were (.) we had*), the use of the pragmatic marker *like*, minimal hesitation pauses, and the hesitation marker *er* reveal her emotion along the turn (lines 603, 605, 607). In addition, some dysfluencies precede the core message that she is emotionally conveying: coincidentally, *Imagine* is *THE main song* (line 607) that the participants in the international meeting were invited to learn and sing. Interestingly, the prominence she gives to the definite article preceding *main song* discloses her emotion connected to the very song that is now being discussed and selected within another international assembly, the Erasmus+ group. The extract also contains an instance of corroboration: in line 612 S4 supports S3's explanation using *worldwide*, a synonym of the word *international* previously uttered by S3. By saying *worldwide* not only does she align with the previous turn (*it's international*, line 609), but also with S1's turn (*international congress*, line 603), emphasizing her attunement with her co-participants.

Extract 2.2.2: “to stay together for doing something (.) changing this bad world”

The following stretch of talk – delivered at a fast tempo – exemplifies both the students' mutual support and their authentic engagement in the spoken activity through latched and overlapping speech.

Extract 2.2.2 (Touschek_2: S1=L1: pol/PL, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: fin/FI, female)

- 669 S2: = [a] yeah [b] he wanted another dreamers **to** (.) **gather** <9> and </9> = /
[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]
- 670 S4: <9> yeah </9> / [Continuer-M]
- 671 S3: = **to stay** <1> **together** for doing something (.) changing </1> this bad
world = / [Focus-M]
- 672 S2: <1> for (doing better) yeah the world will be as one </1> / [Focus-M]
- 673 S4: = and it's = / [possible Evaluate-M]
- 674 S1: = [a] also i think that is why we have <un> x </un> [b] (you know?) this
project <2> erasmus plus </2> [c] cos (.) **we're joining each other** <3> we met
new cultures </3> <4> people </4> / [a. Upgrade-M + b. Try-Marker-M +
c. Explain-M]
- 675 S3: <2> yeah </2> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 676 S3: <3> [a] yeah [b] **to stay together** </3> / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M]
- 677 S2: <4> yes yeah yeah yeah </4> / [Acknowledge-M]

¹⁸ According to Wagner and Gardner (2004: 9), a transition relevance place is “the place where S has ended a syntactic unit and B might start up his own talk.”

After acknowledging the previous turn on John Lennon's message of peace [a], S2 implements a Focus move [b], which is supported by S4 through a Continuer move performed in overlapping speech. His utterance though is completed by S3, who latches to him and starts her turn by upholding S2's words (*to gather*) with a near synonym (*to stay together*). John Lennon's message is so powerful and engaging that S2 chips in almost anticipating the conclusion of S3's utterance (line 672). S4 too competes for the floor latching to S3 (line 673), but no sooner does she start her utterance another co-participant, S1, seizes the floor and takes up quite a long turn punctuated by a series of overlaps. First, she hedges her Upgrade move [a], then she (possibly) captures the co-participants' attention with a Try-Marker move [b] through the discourse marker *you know?*¹⁹ in turn-medial position, and finally concludes her turn with an Explain move [c]. While she is speaking, S3 overlaps twice: the first time (line 675) she recognizes the Erasmus+ project they all take part in, while the second time (line 676) she acknowledges the project [a] and, more importantly, supports S1's opinion [b] through the verb *to stay together*, reverberating the one just uttered by S1 – *we're joining each other*. S1's turn ends with another overlap, this time performed by S2, who acknowledges S1's stance with an agreement token – *yes* – combined with the marker *yeah* repeated three times, expressing “positive final emphasis” (Cogo and House 2018: 218).

S3 shows her affiliation to the co-participants and her emotional involvement in the discussion all along the stretch of talk. She first completes S3's utterance displaying her “in-tuneness” (Pullin Stark 2009) with the speaker. Then, in latched and overlapping speech, she repeats the verb *to stay together* twice. Through this verb, which is almost synonymous with the ones uttered by S1 and S2 respectively in lines 669 and 674, not only does she support her co-participants, but she also underscores the aim of their Erasmus+ project: getting together *for doing something* (.) *changing this bad world* (line 671).

Extract 2.2.3: “like make drea:ms come true::”

¹⁹ The discourse marker *you know?* is put in parentheses to indicate uncertain transcription; thus my interpretation of this move is tentative. See VOICE Project (2007), ‘Mark-up conventions’. VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1], 4, https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf (6 March 2020).

The cooperativeness of ELF speakers in terms of utterance completion, backchannelling and supportive laughter, and their efforts to make the discussion both engaging and lively are well illustrated in the following stretch of talk.

Extract 2.2.3 (Touschek_2: S1=L1: pol/PL, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: fin/FI, female)

- 748 S3: = [a] yeah (.) [b] we can change something now? (1) some ways?
[c] <4> but </4> i don't know how / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M +
c. Answer-M]
749 SX-f: <4> yeah </4> / [Continuer-M]
750 S4: <soft> **all the dreamers** </soft> (.) / [Answer-M]
751 S3: yeah / [Continuer-M]
752 S4: <soft> **can change it @** </soft> / [Answer-M]
753 S1: <soft> @@ </soft> / [Acknowledge-M]
754 S2: [a] yeah [b] and the- <5> they sure they'll </5> / [a. Acknowledge-M +
b. possible Upgrade-M]
755 S1: [a] <5> and it won't be </5> a dream actually at that time (.) if we (.)
<fast> will change something [b] so it won't finally be a dream [c] we can
(just) </fast> (.) / [a. b. Challenge-M + c. possible Direct-M]
756 S3: yeah / [Acknowledge-M]
757 S4: [a] yeah [b] like **make drea::ms** / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Direct-M]
758 SS: **come true:: yeah @@@@** (1) / [Direct-M]

In this extract the students still comment on the lyrics of the song *Imagine*. In line 748 S3 latches to the prior turn acknowledging it [a]; she then performs an Elicit move [b], whereby she asks herself and the co-participants whether and how things can be changed. In the same turn she also provides an answer [c], admitting that she does not know. While S3 is performing her turn, an unidentified female participant signals her attentive listenership through a Continuer move (line 749). Tiptoeing, S4 takes the floor, attempting an answer: she softly suggests that *all the dreamers* (line 750) *can change it* (line 751), adding a token of laughter at the end of her turn while S3 – the participant who has prompted the question – performs a supportive backchannel. S4's proposal receives support from S1, who recognizes it with soft laughter. In line 754 S2 takes the floor; he starts his turn with an agreement token [a], and follows it with a possible Upgrade move [b] introduced by a cut-off and a replacement. In overlapping speech S1 competes for the floor, feeling the urge to express her afterthought about dreams and dreamers (line 755). She performs a Challenge move [a, b], whereby she defies the stance she has previously acknowledged with supportive soft laughter, followed by a possible Direct move that she mitigates with a modal verb in a fast speaking fashion. In line 756 S3 recognizes S1's challenging observation. In the following turn, S4 acknowledges S1's proposal [a] and, predicting the conclusion of

her utterance, she performs a Direct move [b] – *make drea:ms* – uttered in an original fashion and prefaced with the pragmatic marker *yeah*. The elongation of the vowel in the word *drea:ms* triggers an enthusiastic reaction in all co-participants, who complete S4's Direct move, jointly uttering *come true::*. They collectively give further prominence to her suggestion; they lengthen the vowel in the word *true::* making their suggestion sound more effective, and stress their hope for a better world uttering a clear-cut agreement token – *yeah* – before exploding with laughter. Interestingly, this cathartic moment is followed by a one-second pause, the minimal time the students need to resume the discussion after a very emotional release.

In this stretch of talk all participants exhibit a high level of involvement in the discussion: they not only signal their attentive listenership and support through backchannelling and tokens of laughter, but also 'appropriate' the utterances of their co-participants, completing them in an emotionally engaging fashion. In lines 755, 757, and 758 there is a cascade of utterance completions: S4 completes S1's suggestion, and in turn, all the participants jointly complete S4's move. In the wake of S4's enthusiasm, expressed through the lengthened pronunciation of the word "dreams", all the participants follow suit and complete the turn satisfactorily. The final outburst of laughter creates a communal atmosphere. Not surprisingly, the unison utterance completion combined with laughter promotes solidarity and a sense of in-group belonging.

Extract 2.2.4: "yeah to free his soul"

The following extract reveals the students' high degree of involvement in the discussion in terms of listenership and meaning negotiation.

Extract 2.2.4 (Touschek_2: S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female)

- 763 S3: it's really emotional and (.) deep (.) yeah / [Evaluate-M]
 764 S2: [a] hm hm (.) yeah (.) [b] because then (.) er he left this ba:nd (.) few
 years <7> be</7>fore making this song [c] and he had problem wi- with **his wife** (.)
 [d] so that like (.) / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. c. Explain-M + d. Focus-M]
 765 S3: <7> yeah </7> / [Continuer-M]
 766 S3: <soft> **yoko ono** </soft> / [Inform-M]
 767 S2: something he said to:: (1) i don't know (.) **get things off his chest** (.) / [Focus-M]
 768 S3: yeah (.) **to free** (.) **his soul**. / [Support-M]

In line 763 S3 performs an Evaluate move, whereby she appraises *Imagine*, the song that the group has selected. In the following turn, S2 feels the urge to explain why John

Lennon wrote such *an emotional and deep* song. The turn starts with S2 vocalizing his thinking – *hm hm* – and acknowledging S3's statement [a] through the repetition of the *yeah* token, which rounds off S2's previous move. After a couple of minimal pauses S2 provides his explanations [b, c]. In overlapping speech S3 signals her attention and support (line 765), and in a moment of S2's hesitation she takes the floor, adding extra information (line 766); she utters the name of John Lennon's wife – *yoko ono* – in a soft voice, implementing an Inform move. S2 concludes his turn focusing on the lyrics (line 767). He uses a couple of practices for buying time – vowel elongation (*to::*) and a one-second pause – before coming up with a rather effective idiom²⁰, which he prefaces with the pragmatic marker *i don't know*, signalling some uncertainty with regard to his interpretation of John Lennon's mood when he wrote *Imagine*. Interestingly, in line 768 S3 seizes the floor again, performing a Support move; in so doing not only does she share S2's interpretation, but she also corroborates S2's words by rephrasing his idiom – *get things off his chest* – into *free his soul*, making it more spiritual.

Extract 2.3.1: “is the melody good?”

The following extract occurs at the onset of the spoken activity of the group named *Touschek_3*, when the students introduce themselves and present the song they have chosen. It reports two instances of effective communication strategies enacted by the participants through a Check and a Question move, respectively aiming to verify comprehension and to clarify meaning.

Extract 2.3.1 (Touschek_3: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: spa/ES, male; S5=L1: hrv/HR, male)

- 785 S4: [a] i'm [S4] (.) er i'm spanish [b] and e:r my song is erm a catalan song
[c] that talk that talks about refugees on the program that <smacks lips> erm
closing borders [d] <ipa> **ha ha?** </ipa> [e] a:nd (.) well cri- criticize all the
countries that don't want to (.) to open their borders to let the <soft> refugees
pass </soft> / [a. b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + d. Check-M + e. Focus-M]
786 S5: [a] okay [b] <1><soft> i'm [S5] </soft></1> / [a. Open-M + b. Inform-M]
787 S1: <1><to S4> **is the melody good?**</to S4></1> / [Question-M]
788 S4: **what?** / [Loop-M]
789 S1: <to S4> **is the melody (.) the tune (.) good?**</to S4> / [Question-M]
790 S4: not for me (.) not for me / [Answer-M]
791 S1: no / [Acknowledge-M]

²⁰ OALD Online: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/chest?q=chest> (6 March 2020).

In line 785 S4 takes up the turn, introducing himself and presenting his Catalan song, *Obriu les portes*, [a, b]. While focusing on the topic of the song [c], his delivery is slowed down by some delays (*erm*, smacking lips), which may conceal a problematic word search. Thereby, possibly aware of his unclear wording, S4 performs an original Check move (*ha ha?*) [d] to test whether the co-participants are familiar with the topic of refugees. He follows it with other delay markers (*a:nd*, *well*), a minimal hesitation pause, and a recycling (*cri- criticize*) that, unlike the previous instance, allow him to successfully articulate his next Focus move [e], partially reformulating the prior segment of talk. As soon as S4 relinquishes the floor, S5 seizes it, implementing an Open move [a] and softly introducing himself [b] (line 786). Possibly still tuned to the song, S1 asks S4 whether the melody of his song is good; he does so in overlapping speech with S5, as if he were competing for turns. Unexpectedly, S4 does not provide an answer; on the contrary, he performs a Loop move, likely implementing a hearing check since in the same room there are three groups discussing simultaneously. S1, though, interprets S4's move as evidence of lack of understanding, and in line 789 he repeats his request, providing a synonym for melody – *tune* – after the original word *melody*. S4's negative reply in line 790 – *not for me*, repeated twice – seems to disappoint S1, who acknowledges it uttering a rather flat *no*.

S4 and S1 sound rather skilful at pre-empting and at handling non-understanding moments. Aware of his incomplete, hence, unclear presentation of his song, S4 creatively implements a Check move – a comprehension check (Björkman 2014) – to test whether his co-participants have recognized the current issue of refugees that are pushed back at the European borders. He translates his move into an original *ha ha?* – the output of a creative momentum – fully displaying his listener-oriented involvement in the discussion. In a similar vein, S1, another effective speaker, negotiates meaning using synonyms. He clarifies the meaning of *melody* by providing the synonym *tune*; in so doing he contributes to accomplishing understanding.

Extract 2.3.2: “how longer do you travel?”

This brief extract exemplifies the ‘small talk’ that punctuates the discussion of this group. The Erasmus+ participants in this spoken activity are generally very curious students who are willing to broaden their cultural horizons.

Extract 2.3.2 (Touschek_3: S4=L1: spa/ES, male; S5=L1: hrv/HR, male)

(gap 00:00:09) {some students fiddle with their smartphones}
 828 S5: <to S4> how longer do you travel?</to S4> / [Question-M]
 829 S4: what? / [Loop-M]
 830 S5: <to S4> how longer do you travel (.) **from sp- spain to italy?**</to S4> / [Repair-M]
 831 S4: er one hour and a half (.) more or less / [Answer-M]
 832 S5: okay okay @ / [Acknowledge-M]

While some of the participants are fiddling with their smartphones, possibly googling the lyrics of their songs, S5 addresses S4, asking him about his journey (*how longer do you travel?*). S4 does not provide an answer; instead he performs a Loop move, indicating mishearing or lack of specificity, and prompting repair. S5 repeats his question, specifying that he meant S4's journey from Spain to Italy; in doing so he partially repairs the problematic construction of his question, and finally makes himself understood. Adding the names of the two countries to the original syntactic structure in ELF indeed makes S5's request explicit, thus intelligible. In the next turn, S4 provides a satisfactory reply, which S5 acknowledges, uttering *okay* twice, and following this by self-laughter. His token of laughter may serve either as a face-saving device after an other-initiated repair (Schegloff *et al.* 1977), or as a pragmatic strategy to build rapport.

This extract well illustrates authentic (i.e. non-elicited) ELF interactions: S5 appropriates English as an emancipated speaker would do, and, setting aside the assigned topic, moves to a self-initiated one. As Kohn and Hoffstaedter (2017: 362) note, “[a]uthenticity [in pedagogical lingua franca conversations] is closely linked to thematic autonomy.” In my data set some participants ‘deviate’ from the discussion on several occasions, eliciting information about the co-participants, or their countries; in so doing they naturally use the language for their own needs – in and on their own terms – and make it even more ‘real’ and authentic for themselves.

Extract 2.3.3: “it’s a rock song but a calmer one”

The participants of this group sound particularly sensitive to the melody of the song they have selected. The extract revolves around S3's song, *Acid Rain*. One of the students resorts to verbal and non-verbal strategies – self-repetition and onomatopoeic sounds – to clarify the type of song she has chosen, while another translates the onomatopoeic sounds into a confirmation check.

Extract 2.3.3 (Touschek_3: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: fin/FI, female)

- 848 S2: and what about the melody? / [Elicit-M]
 849 S3: [a] e:rm it's a: it's a rock song [b] but it's a (.) calmer one (.) kinda (.) /
 [a. b. Answer-M]
 850 S1: hm / [Continuer-M]
 851 S3: [a] yeah <8> it's i mean </8> i like it (.) but not everyone <fast><@>
 likes it </@></fast> [b] but (.) yeah even (.) it's a (.) **it's a rock song but a**
calmer one [c] **it's not a** <ono> **krrr** </ono> @ / [a. Evaluate-M + b. Answer-M +
 c. Clarify-M]
 852 S1: <8><un> xx </un> to understand </8> / [possible Focus-M]
 853 S2: aha okay / [Acknowledge-M]
 854 S1: **not an heavy metal one?** / [Check-M]
 855 S3: y- no <@> no no </@> @@ / [Answer-M]

In line 849 S3 replies to S2's question concerning the melody of her song (line 848) with some delays – a long filled pause (*e:rm*), and a recycling (*it's a: it's a*) – that allow her to buy time before giving her best answer. She also uses a pragmatic marker (*kinda*), whereby she hedges her tentative reply. In the middle of her turn one participant signals his attention through a Continuer move (line 850). In line 851 S3 feels the urge to specify that she likes her song but not everybody does, introducing her clarification with a false start (*it's*) and the discourse marker *i mean*, and concluding it in a fast laughing voice. In the same turn, S3 repeats with some delays that hers is *a rock song but a calmer one*, further clarifying this concept with onomatopoeic sounds – *krrr* – followed by a token of self-laughter. Very likely, S1's overlap in line 852 has prompted S3 to make a self-repetition. At the end of S3's turn (line 853), S2 fully acknowledges S3's answer with an *okay*-uptake. Conversely, another participant, S1, performs a Check move, whereby he wants to make sure that he has well interpreted the implicature of S3's onomatopoeic sounds. Interestingly, S1 implements his move translating S3's *not a krrr* into *not an heavy metal one*. In line 855 S3 immediately reassures him, laughingly denying that hers is a heavy metal song, and ending her turn with an outburst of laughter.

S3's hesitation shown at the beginning of her turn (line 849) is possibly due to the difficulty of providing a clear-cut response to S2's Elicit move, since hers is *a rock song but a calmer one* at the same time. S3 also adds that she likes it but not everybody does, using this addition as a face-saving strategy in case her co-participants dislike it too. She introduces her liking of the song through the discourse marker *i mean*, whose function here, according to Fox Tree and Schrock (2002: 744), is “[to] encourage[s] listeners to focus more on the speakers' thoughts.” S1's overlap may have led S3 to

make a repetition and ‘to upgrade’ it with onomatopoeic noises that reproduce the sound of a hard rock song. Aware of her original way of implementing a clarification, S3 follows it with a token of self-laughter, which – again – may act as a face-saving device for her unusual clarifying addition. The whole turn, punctuated by *yeah*, likely a speech habit of S3, is constructed to pre-empt non- or mis-understanding: she employs self-repetition (*a rock song but a calmer one*), and onomatopoeic sounds (*krrrr*) to clarify respectively what her song sounds like and what it does not sound like. Nevertheless, one of the participants requires further assurance on S3’s type of song. The tone of S1’s voice increases the seriousness of his utterance: S1 truly checks whether S3’s rock song belongs to the heavy metal genre. S3’s response dispels any doubts: her negative response token, laughingly repeated several times, and her self-laughter make it clear that hers is definitely not a heavy metal song.

Extract 2.3.4: “yeah i mean in all over the songs the problems”

This stretch of talk comes just after the teacher on duty has entered the ‘discussion room’ and interrupted the spoken activity for about a minute. The students resume the recording, and attempt to pick up the thread of the discussion in a collaborative fashion.

Extract 2.3.4 (Touschek_3: S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: fin/FI, female; S4=L1: spa/ES, male)

- 920 S3: [a] okay yeah (.) [b] where were we? / [a. Open-M + b. Question-M]
 921 S2: erm we were talking about erm (.) / [Answer-M]
 922 S4: which song <8> were we </8> / [possible Question-M]
 923 S3: [a] <8> yeah </8> [b] okay erm (.) [b] **so the problems were** (.) / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Reopen-M + c. Focus-M]
 924 S2: **what?** / [Loop-M]
 925 S3: **those** <fast> **yeah i mean** </fast> **in all over songs the problems** if we just (.) / [Focus-M]
 926 S2: <soft> rephrase (it)?</soft> / [Repair-M]
 927 S3: take <9> ‘em </9> again @@ / [Direct-M]
 928 SX-m: <9> okay </9> / [Accept-M]

The recording starts with two gambits – *okay yeah* – that S3 skilfully uses to reopen the discussion floor [a] after a short break. She follows this with a Question move [b], asking the co-participants to what stage of the discussion they had got before interrupting the recording. In line 921 S2 attempts to collaborate, but she hedges her answer with both silent and filled hesitation pauses, which ‘invite’ the other participants to take the floor. In fact, S4 takes up the turn, and aligning with S3 he starts performing another Question move (line 922). In an overlap S3 acknowledges S4’s move [a]; she then seizes the floor (line 923), performing a Reopen move [b], followed by a Focus

move [c] – *so the problems were*. At this point, S2's Loop move signals mishearing or lack of understanding (line 924). S3 repairs the problematic turn clarifying what she means by *problems*. S3 starts her turn with *those*, a pronoun that stands for *problems*, but she immediately realizes that she must be more explicit – *yeah i mean*; hence, she adds the lexical referent *problems* at the end of the phrase – *in all over the songs the problems*. In the middle of her turn, just after a minimal hesitation pause, S2 jumps in, and softly suggests the verb *rephrase* to S3, implementing a Repair move (line 926). Her soft tone of voice may act as a face-saving device for two reasons: (i) S3 has not flagged any vocabulary gap, and (ii) S2 has interrupted S4's communication flow. Yet S3 concludes her turn in line 927 through a Direct move, which she mitigates with some tokens of laughter. In overlapping speech an unidentified male co-participant acknowledges and accepts S3's proposal (line 928).

Extract 2.3.5: “you’ll vote for me”

In the following extract the use of humour serves as a strategy to accomplish the task assigned to the students (to choose a contemporary song that gives an insight into our society), and to develop rapport among the participants in the discussion.

Extract 2.3.5 (Touschek_3: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: fin/FI, female; S4=L1: spa/ES, male)

- 947 S3: what does (.) everyone want? (.) / [Elicit-M]
 948 SX-m: @
 949 S3: <@> what d’you think is the best one?</@> / [Elicit-M]
 950 S1: <4> let’s vote </4> / [Direct-M]
 951 S2: [a] <4> i think </4> we we have to (.) [b] yeah / [a. Direct-M +
 b. Acknowledge-M]
 952 S5: i’ll vote for him. / [Inform-M]
 953 S3: hm you think *refugees*? a:nd (.) / [Check-M]
 954 S4: <soft><@> **and you’ll vote for me.**</@></soft> (.) / [Direct-M]
 955 S1: @@@ / [Acknowledge-M]
 956 SS: @@@ / [Acknowledge-M]
 957 S3: <@> [a] okay (.) i think it’s pretty clear (.) we’re taking *refugees* (.)
 [b] yeah okay it sounds good </@> / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M]
 958 SX-m: @@ / [Acknowledge-M]

Having presented their songs, the students now negotiate how to reach an agreement on one single song. A token of laughter follows S3's Elicit move in line 947. In the wake of the prior laughing turn, S3 reformulates her question laughingly, a strategy that signals alignment with the previous turn. S3's self-rephrase makes her move more explicit and effective. Instantly, both S1 and S2 reply in overlapping speech. In line 950

S1 implements a Direct move, whereby he suggests voting for the best song. S2 overlaps with him with an epistemic hedge (*i think*) [a], and as soon as she has processed S1's suggestion, she acknowledges it with an affirmative response token [b]. In the next turn (line 952), not only does S5 accept S1's proposal, but he also declares his vote for a male participant, very likely for S4. After a turn-initial hesitation marker (Kasper and Wagner 2014: 26) – *hm* – that affords S3 a moment to spot the song, she performs a Check move to make sure the song she has identified is the one chosen by S5. Then she resumes speaking (*a:nd*), but after a hesitation pause, S4 seizes the floor (line 954). Using a soft laughing voice, he implements an unexpected Direct move – *you'll vote for me* – creating humour. S4 has presented the song *refugees*²¹, hence his move may sound cheeky. The humour of his move is first acknowledged by S1 with loud laughter (line 955), and then by the other participants, who join in laughing hard (line 956). The outburst of laughter by all the participants in the discussion is also meant to endorse the choice of the song as a group choice, which is spelt out by S3 in the next turn. In fact, S3 laughingly recognizes it [a], adding an Evaluate move [b] – *yeah okay it sounds good*. She makes it clear that the task has been accomplished, showing some satisfaction. The discussion closes with final laughter by an unidentified male participant who once again performs a confirmatory move.

Extract 2.4.1: “you know d’you know what i mean?”

The following extract, the first of *Touschek_4* group, instantiates a couple of self-initiated strategies aimed to ensure and to enhance the interlocutor's understanding. The participant's strategic use of the language discloses his listener-oriented attitude, and also his willingness to make his message more transparent.

Extract 2.4.1 (Touschek_4: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 994 S4: [a] cos e:r i love trap music (.) [b] and also (.) i like music with <smacks lips> with some (.) erm <pvc> **communicate** {message} </pvc> (.) [c] **you know d’you know what i mean?** [d] <soft> so </soft> = / [a. b. Explain-M + c. Check-M + d. Finalizer-M]
- 995 S3: = yes i think = / [Acknowledge-M]
- 996 S4: = **i need th- the music (.) need to teach you something.** / [Clarify-M]
- 997 S1: <3><soft> hm <un> x </un> it's true </soft></3> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 998 S3: [a] <3> yes (.) yes </3> (.) [b] i think it too (.) [c] and <to S5> what about you?</to S5> [d] i don't know. (1) / [a. b. Acknowledge-M + c. Elicit-M + d. Passing Turn-M]

²¹ The students call the song presented by S4 *refugees*: the real title is *Obriu les portes*.

In a prior turn S3 has asked the co-participants why they have selected the song they have presented to the group. In line 994 S4 explains his two reasons [a, b], showing some hesitation in expressing the second. Very likely he is short of a word; some dysfluencies – the noise produced by his smacking lips, a cut off (*with-*), a silent and a filled pause – preface the word he chooses (*communicate*) to convey the meaning he has in mind, i.e. “message”. Aware of his original use of the word *communicate* and of the possibility that the meaning of the word is unclear, he follows it with a Check move [c] – *you know d’you know what i mean?* – whereby he checks on the co-participants’ understanding of his explanation. S4 ends his turn performing a Finalizer move [d], softly uttering the discourse marker *so*, which may be interpreted as a “participation transition” (Schiffrin 1987: 221) marking S4’s “willingness to transfer the floor” (*ibid.*) to his co-participants. Without a gap, S3 recognizes S4’s reasons, implementing an Acknowledge move through the agreement token *yes* in combination with the epistemic hedge *i think*. In line 996, though, S4 latches to him through a Clarify move, self-rephrasing the fuzzy explanation he has provided in his prior turn. Despite minor dysfluency, i.e. a restart – *i need th- the music (.) need to* – at the beginning of his turn, the falling intonation of his explicatory utterance suggests his sense of accomplishment: this time he has indeed expressed what he really meant by the word *communicate*, and understanding can now be shared. In overlapping speech S1 and S3 acknowledge their co-participant’s clarification, but they do so in a very different fashion. S1 softly recognizes it with a minimal signal – *hm* – possibly indicating a reflective moment, followed by an unintelligible word and an overt agreement – *it’s true* – (line 997). Conversely, S3 uses a normal tone of voice to agree with S4, repeating a response token twice [a] – *yes (.) yes* – and adding an enthusiastic *i think it too* [b] (line 998). Through an Elicit move [c] S3 then invites another co-participant, S5, to take the floor: he ends his turn with the pragmatic marker *i don’t know* [d], uttered with falling intonation, and serving the purpose of passing the turn to S5.

In this extract S4 draws on his linguistic resources to avoid any interruption of the talk, enacting interactional practices to pre-empt non-understanding on the part of the co-participants. Without appealing for assistance, he chooses quite an original term – *communicate* – to express what he has in mind, and in the same turn he performs a comprehension check (*you know d’you know what i mean?*) to make sure the co-participants have understood what he meant. In addition, despite a co-participant’s

reassuring acknowledgement response, S4 feels the urge to amplify the explanation provided in his prior turn through the term *communicate*; he clarifies its meaning by means of self-rephrasing, which two co-participants immediately recognize in overlapping speech. Not only does S4 strive for averting any communication breakdown charging an existing word (“communicate”) with a new meaning (“message”); he also orients to his interlocutors. Aware of his original use of the language, he first employs a comprehension check explicitly requesting whether the co-participants can follow his explanation ([c] in line 994), then he makes a self-rephrase allowing the co-participants to enhance their understanding of his explanatory move (line 996). As Kaur (2009: 119) notes, “[w]hile such practices to some extent disrupt the smooth flow of talk, it appears that what is of greater importance to the participant[s] is the achievement of shared understanding.” Furthermore, S4 proves a skilful communicator displaying a high degree of “perceptiveness to [...] the more subtle suggestions of trouble” (*ibid.*). Being aware of having filled a lexical gap in a creative fashion, he implements interactional procedures that enable him to secure mutual understanding. Following Kaur (2009: 119), ELF speakers compensate their lack of lexical accuracy and grammar correctness with a robust use of interactional practices that eventually lead to mutual understanding.

Extract 2.4.2: “who cares? we have to think about the fu:t-”

In this extract a mispronunciation initiates a brief humorous sequence of turn-taking that comprises teasing-like utterances and a witty quip. The sequence is at a fast tempo, resulting from the participants’ competing for the floor.

Extract 2.4.2 (Touschek_4: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ger/DE, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 1015 S1: = [a] who cares? [b] we won’t even be here (.) and = / [a. Challenge-M +
b. Upgrade-M]
1016 S3: = [a] yeah who cares? [b] **we have to think about the** <ipa> fu:t-</ipa>
the future so = / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]
1017 S2: = <@> **the food** </@> @@@ = / [Challenge-M]
1018 S4: = **food also** @ / [Acknowledge-M]
1019 S3: <6><@> the future so: </@></6> / [Explain-M]
1020 SS: <6> @@@ </6> / [Acknowledge-M]
1021 S2: <@> a:h we get the (micky) out of the poor guy </@> @@@ = / [Oh-Receipt-M]
1022 S4: = [a] okay [b] my song (.) there are part of the words like (.) man don’t worry and
going to when this game called life (.) so (.) / [a. Finalizer-M + b. Inform-M]

The students are discussing a song about pollution. In line 1016 S3 latches to S1 to acknowledge S1's Challenge move [a], using a response token (*yeah*) and an exact repetition (*who cares?*), and to express his own idea through a Focus move [b], containing a self-repair (*the fu:t- the future*). S3's mispronunciation of the word *future* is perceived as a slip of the tongue – *food* – by S2, who immediately takes the floor: she laughingly utters the word *food* and roars with laughter (line 1017). In the next latched turn, S4 makes a humorous remark (*food also*) in a serious tone, and he follows it with a self-laughter token. S4 manipulates his voice skilfully, which contributes to the humorous effect of his comment. In the following lines (1019-1020) an overlap occurs. While S3 gains the floor, repeating the repair (*the future*) in a laughing voice and recognizing the fun triggered by his own mispronunciation, the other participants acknowledge S4's witty quip with several tokens of laughter. The sequence continues in line 1021: with an Oh-Receipt move S2 laughingly admits that they are teasing S3, yet she carries on laughing. Latching to S2's comment, S4, the student who had contributed to the humorous moment with a witty remark, seriously closes the sequence with a Finalizer move [a]. To this end, he uses an *okay* token as a face-saving device in favour of the entire group, and starts to report the lyrics of his song, implementing an Inform move [b] (line 1022).

The sequential analysis highlights the twofold purpose of S4's humorous remark (*food also*) in line 1018. First it serves S4 to align with the prior turn, and secondly it allows S4 to play down S3's mispronunciation by acknowledging that we must think about food too. The serious tone of his voice orients to S3's previous utterance while giving prominence to the quip. Along the sequence S4 manages to balance the humorous interactions (lines 1020-1021) with the need to resume the regular unfolding of the discussion (line 1022). His latching to S2 in line 1022 and his Finalizer move denote solidarity with the participant who is being teased and his intention to maintain good relations with him.

Extract 2.4.3: “stop produce carbon footprint”

The degree of involvement in the discussion is shown in the dynamics of the turn-taking machinery (Wagner and Gardner 2004: 15), to which the participants contribute with overlapping and latched speech, thus revealing both their eagerness to take part in the

talk and their skills at handling a shared floor. In Extract 2.4.3 four of the five participants in the discussion are talking about pollution.

Extract 2.4.3 (Touschek_4: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ger/DE, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 1057 S2: [a] i think part of the chorus er says erm (.) <reading aloud> of a world too proud to admit our mistakes we're crashing into the ground as we all fall from grace </reading aloud> [b] <fast> **which yes (.) i know it's very depressing** </fast> (.) [c] but <1> @@@ </1> (.) i mean it talks about the pollution [d] and how it will eventually (.) [e] you know? [f] <fast> end humanity in the world </fast> [g] because <soft> the world is gonna die </soft> = / [a. Answer-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. d. Focus-M + e. Try-Marker-M + f. Focus-M + g. Explain-M]
- 1058 S1: <1> **NO no well** </1> / [Denial-M]
- 1059 S3: <1> **no no** </1> / [Denial-M]
- 1060 S3: = [a] i hope i hope the world will not be destroyed about pollution [b] but (.) / [a. Focus-M + b. possible Challenge-M]
- 1061 S2: yea:h i <soft><un> xxx </un> (ideal) </soft> = / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1062 S1: = **i think people will wake up (more)** = / [Upgrade-M]
- 1063 S3: = yes = / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1064 S4: = **and stop produce carbon footprint.** / [Upgrade-M]
- 1065 S3: <2> **now or later** </2> / [Upgrade-M]
- 1066 S1: <2> [a] a:nd yes [b] so </2> / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible Reopen-M]
- 1067 S2: **end carbon footprint** / [Support-M]
- 1068 S4: [a] yeah [b] <3> eco</3>terror = / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Challenge-M]
- 1069 S3: <3> yes </3> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1070 S2: = <fast> my carbon <un> xxx </un> fifty per cent carbon footprint </fast> = / [Inform-M]
- 1071 S4: = @@@ wow @ = / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 1072 S1: = [a] ah [b] i erm i like i'm talking about all those things [c] but i don't actually like (.) i take care every day (.) <soft> that's all.</soft> / [a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. c. Inform-M]
- 1073 S4: uhu = / [Continuer-M]
- 1074 S1: = my carbon footprint is HUGE @ = / [Inform-M]

The sequence starts in line 1057: complying with the request for elaborating on the song that she has chosen, S2 reads out some of the lyrics, implementing an Answer move [a]. She follows this with an Evaluate move [b] and a Focus move [c], introduced by self-laughter. S2's Evaluate move (*which yes (.) i know it's very depressing*), uttered in a fast voice, triggers a Denial move that S1 (*NO no well*, line 1058) and S3 (*no no*, line 1059) perform in overlapping speech. S1's and S3's overlaps denote listenership and supportive response: both speakers deny that S2's song may be *depressing*; on the contrary, they make use of self-repeats to support the co-participant's choice. Their simultaneous and homogeneous overlaps serve to enhance solidarity and to keep up with the delivery. In fact, after a hesitation pause, S2 resumes speaking, and, by means of the discourse marker *i mean*, she sums up the content of the lyrics. In the next turn

(line 1060), S3 latches to her, and performs a Focus move, which S2 acknowledges with an affirmative token (*yea:h*) and some softly uttered words (line 1061).

From line 1062 the discussion moves on at a fast tempo. In line 1062 S1 seizes the floor, and hedges her Upgrade move, whereby she imagines a more positive future scenario. The following turns (lines 1063-1066 and 1068-1072) follow one another, either in latched or overlapping speech, indicating a truly collaborative floor, to which the participants, as in a dance of words, step in to give their contribution, co-constructing meaning. As Coates (1997: 70) holds, “the collaborative floor is a shared space, and therefore what is said is construed as being the voice of the group rather than of the individual.” In line 1063 S3 latches to S1 with an acknowledgement token, expressing clear-cut agreement. Without a gap, S4 provides a further Upgrade move, whereby he introduces a much-felt issue: *carbon footprint*. The first round of this dance ends with two overlaps, signalling the speakers’ involvement in the issue, and a Support move. In line 1065 S3 ‘upgrades’ the micro-sequence adding a time reference – *now or later* – that he moulds on the English idiom “sooner or later”. Simultaneously, in overlapping speech (line 1066), S1 recognizes S4’s contribution to her statement [a], and with a minimal token (*so*) she possibly performs a Reopen move [b]. The meaning-making negotiation, which started in line 1062, ends in line 1067, when S2 corroborates S4’s contribution to the discussion by making a partial repetition: *end carbon footprint*. In the next two lines (1068 and 1069) both S4 and S3 acknowledge the prior turn. Besides, S4 performs a Challenge move [b] by means of a single word (*ecoterror*), expressing his opinion in a straightforward fashion.

The rest of the talk maintains a fast pace, with three speakers competing for the floor while elaborating on the *carbon footprint* issue, brought into play by S4 in line 1064. S1 and S2 are eager to talk about their own carbon footprint, and they do so through an Inform move. In line 1070 S2 latches to S4, stating in a very fast voice that her impact on the environment is *fifty per cent*. Instantly, S4 reacts with self-laughter, performing an Oh-Receipt move (*wow*), whereby he signals his surprise. S1 then seizes the floor, implements an Oh-Receipt move [a] too, and with a false start (*i erm i like i’m talking*) she reveals her poor environmental behaviour through Inform moves [b, c] (line 1072). Signalling his attention and interest in the issue, S4 backchannels S1’s delivery with a Continuer move (*uhu*). In line 1074 S1 discloses her own carbon

footprint, giving prominence to the level of her personal impact on the environment (*HUGE*), and concludes her turn with a token of laughter.

Extract 2.4.3 denotes a high degree of listenership and cooperativeness. The alternation of the turns is very fast-paced: the participants handle the floor as if one single voice were speaking, each of them providing a contribution to the discussion. The *carbon footprint* issue introduced by S4's in line 1064 is the catalyst of the extract: first it is acknowledged with a partial repetition (line 1067), and then it triggers turns on personal information, by which two speakers lay their impact on the environment bare to the other participants (lines 1070, 1072 and 1074).

In the co-constructed micro-sequence (lines 1062-1067) the temporal expression used by S3 in line 1065 comes timely. S3 produces a creative time expression – *now or later* – having in mind the English idiom “sooner or later”²². S3's *now and later* is an example of creative idiom – “an adapted realization of an existing conventional expression” (Pitzl 2018a: 120) – that exploits the virtual meaning potential of the language. S3's new verbal realization removes the alliteration present in the original expression, but the substitution of “sooner” with a shorter word – *now* – makes the time reference sound even more effective. If we consider “now” as a hyponym of “sooner”, hence a more specific word than the lexical item in the original idiom, we may interpret S3's word substitution as a pragmatic choice influenced by context (Pitzl 2018a). I would venture that S3's lexical choice, which cannot be construed as an L1 transfer (in Italian there is no equivalent idiom containing the lexical item “now”), gives voice to his strong urge to start reducing the human impact on the environment as soon as possible, that is to say, starting immediately. Thus, the choice of *now* does not express any ‘intentional’ creativity, but rather conveys a communicative purpose.

S2's Support move in line 1067 rounds off this jointly built sequence. S2 employs a partial repetition (also referred to as “repetition with variation” by Tannen 1989: 54, or “non-exact repetition” by Johnstone *et al.* 1994: 14) – *end carbon footprint* – to corroborate S4's Upgrade move in line 1064 – *stop produce carbon footprint*. S2 repeats only the last two words of the original utterance, and changes the two verbs

²² OALD Online: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/soon#soon_inflg_2 (10 January 2020).

used by S4 into one direct monosyllabic verb, *end*, reinforcing the utterance. Despite mostly having an interaction-oriented function, S2's repetition here serves an array of functions: (i) it recognizes the urgency of the issue, (ii) it upholds S4's statement by signalling alignment and affiliation with the speaker of the original utterance (Cogo and Dewey 2006: 70; Mauranen 2012: 220), and (iii) it makes S2 ready to reflect on her personal impact on the environment (see line 1070). S2's repetition, defined as a "partial repetition" in the "*scale of fixity*" of form and content and "other-repetition" in relation to the interlocutors (Lichtkoppler 2007: 43-46, emphasis in original), seems to fit into all three categories of repetitions that Lichtkoppler (2006: 54) identifies according to their functions: production, comprehension and interaction. It is production-oriented because it facilitates the management of conversation; as I wrote above, S2's utterance rounds off the jointly constructed sequence in lines 1062-1067. It is comprehension-oriented because it promotes cohesion; in other words, it acts as a cohesive device after overlapping speech (lines 1065-1066). But, most importantly, it is interaction-oriented because it is used to develop rapport among the participants and to show involvement in the talk (Lichtkoppler 2006: 54). S2 orients to the co-participant through repetition and she establishes affiliation by expressing common ground.

Extract 2.4.4: "rap or trap"

This extract illustrates the use of self- and other-repetition, serving the function of facilitating comprehension (Lichtkoppler 2006, 2007).

Extract 2.4.4 (Touschek_4: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 1084 S3: [a] that's it for me. [b] a:nd (.) i don't know (.) for example which (.)
which type of mu- music inspired you most? / [a. Finalizer-M + b. Elicit-M]
- 1085 SX-f: hm / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1086 S4: probably er rap music or <5> trap </5> yeah / [Answer-M]
- 1087 S1: <5> **rap?**</5> / [Loop-M]
- 1088 S3: **rap or tr**<6>**ap** </6> / [Answer-M]
- 1089 S1: <6> **a:h rap** <soft> **or trap** </soft></6> / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 1090 S4: i think trap = / [Answer-M]
- 1091 S3: = [a] <to S4> for the reasons that you said before?</to S4> (1) [b] <to S4>
for the reasons that you said before?</to S4> / [a. b. Question-M]
- 1092 S4: er of course / [Answer-M]

In line 1084 S3 concludes a macro-sequence in which all participants have presented their song implementing a Finalizer move [a], and resumes the discussion with an Elicit move [b]. The latter move is introduced by a conjunction pronounced with a lengthened vowel (*a:nd*), a hesitation marker (*i don't know*) (Metsä-Ketelä 2006), a short pause,

and, within the same request, both self-repetition (*which*) and a recycling (*mu- music*) (Fox *et al.* 2009: 66). A non-identified female participant acknowledges S3's suggestion with a *hm* response token (Gardner 2001), and S4 replies using a quite sophisticated hedge (*probably*). At this point, a Loop move triggers a series of other-repetitions (lines 1088-1089) that uphold S4's initial response and give him time to make a more restricted choice in line 1090. S1's Loop move (*rap?*) is followed by an exact repetition (*rap or trap*), both in the Answer move implemented by S3 in line 1088 and in her Oh-Receipt move – the so-called “third move” – in line 1089. Not only does the other-repetition confirm S4's original answer and build understanding, but also produces a harmonious dance, which reveals the participants' active involvement in the communicative task. S3's latched speech in line 1091 testifies to his attentive listenership, and his self-repetition (*for the reasons that you said before?*), which is one second delayed, reveals his high expectation for an immediate reply. After his first enquiry, which fails to receive a response from S4, supposedly for either non-hearing or non-understanding, S3 repeats his question so as to restore shared understanding and to avoid a communication breakdown. S4's somehow affirmative answer in line 1092 (*er of course*) indicates why he has not been as quick as expected. In fact, he had already expressed his reasons in a previous turn, and now he deems there is nothing more to add. Here the strong agreement token “of course” appears to carry a negative connotation; borrowing Schneider's (1988: 164, quoted in Kordon 2006: 72) words, S4 uses it as if he wanted to say: “That's obvious, I didn't think it was worth mentioning” [in fact, repeating].

In line 1087 the repetition of the lexical item *rap* with rising intonation appears as a successful strategy for requesting confirmation of the kind of music that truly inspires S4. This strategy has been investigated in non-understanding situations by Watterson (2008: 400), who notes that ELF speakers show “a seeming preference for repetition as both an indicator of, and response to, non-understanding at the level of individual lexical items.” Interestingly, the repetition of the cluster *rap (music) or rap* in lines 1086, 1088 and 1089 serves the interactional function of establishing a special solidary bond among the three participants in the discussion.

Extract 2.4.5: “i have to listen spanish trap”

Lines 1093-1106 follow the sequence described in Extract 2.4.4. This stretch of talk sounds as a ‘mating dance’ through which the students negotiate comity and affiliation.

Extract 2.4.5 (Touschek_4: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: pol/PL, male; S5=L1: spa/ES, female)

- 1093 S3: <to S5> what about you? which is your favourite?</to S5> (.) / [Elicit-M]
 1094 S5: **trap** / [Answer-M]
 1095 S3: no (.) <to S5> your favourite type of music?</to S5> (.) yes / [Elicit-M]
 1096 S5: **trap** / [Answer-M]
 1097 S1: **a:h** <7> **trap** </7> / [Oh-Receipt-M]
 1098 S3: <7> **a:h trap too** </7> (1) / [Oh-Receipt-M]
 1099 S3: **spanish** (.) <8> **spanish trap** </8> / [Upgrade-M]
 1100 S4: <8> **aFRICA trap** </8> @ / [Challenge-M]
 1101 SS: @@@@ / [Acknowledge-M]
 1102 S3: <@> i have to listen spanish trap </@> / [Inform-M]
 1103 S1: <@> **not polish?**</@> / [Challenge-M]
 1104 S4: @@@@ / [Acknowledge-M]
 1105 S3: <@> i have to listen polish trap too </@> / [Inform-M]
 1106 S5: <@> **or french trap?**</@> / [Challenge-M]

In the first line of the extract S3 resumes the role of ‘master of ceremonies’ that he has played all along the discussion, and turns to S5 to keep up the conversation. Apparently, S3 believes that S5’s answer to his question in line 1094 refers to S4’s favourite kind of music (see line 1090 in Extract 2.4.4), and this answer does not reflect her own preference, that is why he initiates his turn in line 1095 with an abrupt *no*. In the same utterance S3 repeats his Elicit move, expanding it to make his request more explicit (*your favourite type of music?*), and adding *yes*, as if to reinforce it. At this stage, the word *trap* triggers a sort of “choric” performance (Firth 1964: 112) in all but one participants in the discussion, emphasizing the ‘harmonious dance’ nature of what they are saying rather than the actual content of their exchanges. After a couple of overlapped Oh-Receipt moves (lines 1097-1098), which also serve to acknowledge S5’s response, S3 upgrades the word *trap* with a nationality adjective (line 1099). The use of the nationality adjective – *spanish* – preceding the word *trap* may appear predictable in this turn since S5 is Spanish. On the contrary, S4’s move, uttered in an overlap and followed by a laughter token in line 1100, may indicate a Challenge move that aims at building rapport and lightening the discussion. Also the stress that falls on the second syllable of the word “Africa”, which here serves as an adjective – *aFRICA* – may disclose a pragmatic choice. All students laugh and start a series of humorous exchanges – a sort of a little show – with the word *trap* preceded by a nationality adjective. Jokingly, S1 challenges S3, asking him in a ‘smile voice’ why he does not

also listen to Polish trap, in consideration that S4 is Polish (line 1103). S4 immediately acknowledges S1's Challenge move with a loud outburst of laughter. Laughingly, S3 takes up the suggestion made by S1 (line 1105); in doing so he may express his intention to broaden his cultural horizons. In the following turn, S5 concludes the humorous sequence with a further Challenge move, whereby she suggests listening to French trap, possibly hinting at the song she had previously presented.

The sequence reveals that the participants in the discussion can manage intersubjectivity²³ in a playful fashion, using Challenge moves, rhythmic repetitions, and humour. They seem to negotiate comity (Leech 1983), namely the building and maintaining rapport, and to create a friendly and communal atmosphere. Interestingly, their favourite style of music serves as a catalyst for "a convergence of participants' worlds in affective terms" (Aston 1993: 226). The sequence shows the interactional aspect of their communication and the strategies they employ to "end up feeling comfortable with each other and friendly" (Brown and Yule 1983: 12); even their Challenge moves, uttered jokingly or accompanied by a laughter token, act as a trigger to start (line 1100) or to nourish (lines 1103 and 1106) humorous exchanges. Here the role of repetition is threefold: it indicates both alignment with the previous turn and affiliation with the interlocutor, and ensures rhythm and group synchrony (Cogo 2009: 260). Furthermore, their exchanges sound like a dance of words performed by perfectly timed dancers (speakers) who act out cooperatively and consonantly.

The little show revolving around the word "trap", accompanied by nationality adjectives, also discloses the intercultural dimension of the participants' interactions. The speakers 'play' with each other's nationalities, and in so doing they appear to strengthen the intercultural bond within their international Erasmus+ group, along with establishing comity.

Extract 2.5.1: "para que el mundo lo vea"

In the following extract, the first of *Touschek_5* group, there are instances of repetitions that are uttered laughingly in Spanish, a foreign language to the speaker who uses it,

²³ According to Wagner and Gardner (2004: 10), intersubjectivity is "the joint construction of meaning by the participants in and through sequential order of action and talk."

and serve the interactional function of creating rapport and establishing a sense of in-group belonging.

Extract 2.5.1 (Touschek_5: S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: fin/FI, female; S4=L1: spa/ES, female; S5=L1: ger/DE, female)

- 1183 S1: i don't know. <5> that's </5> the problem (.) i've no idea about my song = /
[Answer-M]
1184 SX-f: <5> @@ </5> / [Acknowledge-M]
1185 S4: = i can <fast> give you one. </fast> / [Offer-M]
1186 S5: so we <6> have </6> (.) so we: have = / [Reopen-M]
1187 S1: <6><@> okay </@></6> / [Accept-M]
1188 S4: = and talk about social media (.) that in your (house) always with the
mobile phone <7> internet </7> and other things = / [Focus-M]
1189 S1: <7> uhu </7> / [Continuer-M]
1190 S1: = the title? / [Question-M]
1191 S4: ah <L1sp> para que el mundo lo vea {so that the world can see it} </L1sp> /
[Answer-M]
1192 S1: <LNsp> para que el mundo? {so that the world?} </LNsp> / [Loop-M]
1193 S4: <L1sp> lo vea. {can see it.} </L1sp> / [Answer-M]
1194 S1: <LNsp> lo vea {can see it} </LNsp> / [Acknowledge-M]
1195 S4: eh say (.) er (2) that the world can see it. / [Inform-M]
1196 SS: @@@@ / [Acknowledge-M]
1197 S2: [a] so (.) [b] we have homophobia (.) internet and you had racism = / [a. Reopen-M
+ b. Focus-M]
1198 S1: = <@><LNsp> para que el mundo lo vea {so that the world can see it}
</LNsp></@> / [Focus-M]
1199 SS: @@@@ / [Acknowledge-M]
1200 S1: <@> it's right? </@> = / [Check-M]
1201 S5: = <soft><@> [a] no [b] (loneliness) and feminism </@></soft> / [a. Challenge-M
+ b. Focus-M]
1202 S1: <LNsp> para que el mundo lo vea {so that the world can see it} </LNsp> /
[Focus-M]

Before analysing the sequence of repetitions, I will delve into the first lines of the extract. At the beginning of the extract, S1 admits that he does not know what his song is about because he has not chosen one (line 1183). While uttering a dispreferred answer with a falling intonation suggesting a sense of unease, a non-identified female speaker overlaps with laughter, as if sympathizing with him (line 1183). The collaborative endeavour manifested in the co-construction of speech, and elaborated on in earlier analysis, turns into effective collaboration in line 1185, where S4 latches to S1 with an Offer move, proposing him a song. The following lines (1186-1188) are particularly significant in terms of turn-taking management. Mindless of S4's offer, S5 seizes the floor, and with a Reopen move she tries to resume what has already been said (line 1186). Two significant things happen in the unfolding of her utterance. First, accepting the offer made by S4 in the prior turn, S1 overlaps in a laughing voice with S5, who then performs a self-repeat in the same turn. Secondly, S5's utterance is interrupted by

S4, who takes the floor to focus on the content of the song she has in mind for S1 (line 1188). In the next two lines S1 shows great interest in S4's proposal. In fact, in line 1189 he overlaps with S4 with a Continuer move, signalling interest and attention, and in line 1190 he interrupts S4 with a Question move (*the title?*), requesting more information about the song. Introduced by a response token (*ah*) in line 1191, S4 provides the title of the song, which is a Spanish song, as promptly revealed by its title (*para que el mundo lo vea*).

At this stage of the sequence, a series of repetitions serving diverse functions come into play. In line 1192 S1, whose first language is Italian, repeats the first part of the title in Spanish (henceforth LNsp)²⁴, performing a Loop move to signal his mishearing of the complete title (*para que el mundo?*). The Italian speaker sounds at ease to code switch into a foreign language; in fact, he acknowledges S4's Spanish response with an exact repetition (*lo vea*), using LNsp for the second time. The next turn (line 1195) seems to be prompted by S1's Loop move in line 1192: S4 sees the need for translating the Spanish title into English to make it intelligible to all co-participants. After displaying some dysfluencies (*eh, er*) and a couple of hesitation pauses, she provides its translation (*that the world can see it*). Her turn is immediately followed by a chorus of laughter, acting as an Acknowledge move, whereby the students endorse S4's translation. The subsequent turn is taken up by S2, who speaks for the first time in this sequence (line 1197). Performing a Reopen move [a], she continues S5's utterance started in line 1186 (*so we have...*), and with a Focus move [b] she reviews the topics of the songs. Quite unexpectedly, S1 latches to her, and jokingly repeats the original title of the song 'offered' to him by S4 in line 1185. The participants in the discussion dissolve into laughter, acknowledging S1's playfulness and his comity strategy (line 1199). In the next turn, maintaining a joking tone of voice, S1 performs a Check move to make sure that he has pronounced the Spanish title correctly while keeping up his humorous participation in the discussion. In line 1201 S5 latches to him in a soft laughing voice, first providing a straight dispreferred negative response (*no*), which may be interpreted as a playful Challenge move [a], then completing her turn

²⁴ "Utterances in languages which are neither English nor the speaker's first language are marked LN with the language indicated." VOICE Project (2007), 'Mark-up conventions'. VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1], 4, https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf (6 March 2020). The suffix "sp" indicates Spanish.

with a Focus move [b]. The sequence ends with S1, once again repeating the title of ‘his’ Spanish song, this time to flag his effective affiliation with the group, because now he too has a song that can be selected by the others (line 1202).

The repetitions in lines 1192, 1194, 1198 and 1202 are all “exact repetitions” (Tannen 1989: 54), uttered by S1 in a language that is foreign to him. They are exact repetitions, also called “full repetitions” by Brody (1994: 5), because the repeated lexical items have exactly the same form and meaning as the original ones (see Lichtkoppler 2007: 43-44). The first two repetitions convey respectively a Loop move (line 1192) and an Acknowledge move (line 1194). S1 has accepted S4’s song offer (line 1187), and his moves indicate that he intends to fully appropriate it. The fact that the song is Spanish seems to add extra value to the intercultural discussion, that is why S1 performs the above-mentioned moves using the words of the Spanish title (*para que el mundo? / lo vea*), not the English language (for example, “sorry?” / “okay”). S1 makes the same choice in line 1198, where he performs a Focus move, pronouncing the full title of the song in Spanish. The laughing tone that S1 uses while uttering his move helps him establish rapport with the other participants. The use of laughter as a voice quality (Rühlemann 2010: 65) enables the co-participants to interpret S1’s utterance as a genuine interactional strategy enacted to build a sense of in-group belonging and playfulness. The effectiveness of S1’s move, built on an exact repetition uttered jokingly in a foreign language, is in fact confirmed in the next turn taken up by the students, who all burst into laughter (line 1199). The last repetition (*para que el mundo lo vea*), delivered by S1 in a normal speaking mode, concludes the sequence, confirming the sense of affiliation and comity that S1 had failed to develop in his initial turn (line 1183). Along with serving the functions of alignment and affiliation, the repetitions made by S1 in a language that is neither English nor his own appear to build up rhythm in the unfolding of the discussion and to create a friendly atmosphere.

4.4.3. Case study 3

In this section I analyse the transcripts of the audio-recordings collected at Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” in Rome on 23 March 2018. The school routinely runs an intercultural exchange programme with a Polish upper-secondary school. The six Italian students taking part in the discussions first met the Polish group on the day of

the activity. Three different small groups of students participated in the spoken activity: *Gullace_1*, *Gullace_2*, and *Gullace_3* (see *Gullace_1-3* in Appendix 1).

Extract 3.1.1: “like a tough one”

This extract, the first of *Gullace_1* group, illustrates collaborative speech in a situation of non-understanding. The turn-taking sequence focuses on a vocabulary issue. One of the participants in the discussion, S2, does not understand the word “tough”. Although the term is listed among the most important words to learn in English according to the Oxford 3000 list²⁵, it is unknown to him.

Extract 3.1.1 (*Gullace_1*: S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 1286 S4: [a] yes a bit [b] but the: e:r how do like humans behave (.) [c] how do they create songs right now (.) [d] how do they like how do (those) societies does all society look like (1) <smacks lips> er er [e] **it's more like a tough one** (.) yeah hm = / [a. Answer-M + b. c. d. e. Focus-M]
- 1287 S2: = **like a?** / [Loop-M]
- 1288 S4: what? / [Loop-M]
- 1289 S2: [a] like a? [b] i don't = / [a. Answer + b. possible Explain-M]
- 1290 S1: = **tough one.** / [Answer-M]
- 1291 S4: it's like tough one because (.) / [Explain-M]
- 1292 S1: **hard** = / [Repair-M]
- 1293 S4: = he says it's hard <3> lifestyle </3> / [Explain-M]
- 1294 S1: <3> **hard** </3> (.) **do you know what does it mean tough?** / [Check-M]
- 1295 S3: **hard** / [Answer-M]
- 1296 S1: <4> yes </4> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1297 S4: <4> yes </4> like (.) / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1298 S3: a:h okay / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 1299 S4: [a] because he says about his childhood [b] and (1) how he (.) yeah (.) about all all (.) he's been through. / [a. b. Explain-M]

In line 1286 S4 focuses on the content of the song he has chosen, answering S3's question (*why is it an important social document?*: see Appendix 3, lines 1281 and 1283). At the end of his turn, S4 performs a Focus move [e] – *it's more like a tough one* – followed by a minimal hesitation pause, a filler (*yeah*) and a hesitation marker (*hm*). S2 latches to the prior turn, performing a Loop move, whereby he asks S4 to repeat the last words he has uttered by means of an exact repetition (*like a?*, line 1287). S4, in turn, implements a hearing check through a Loop move (*what?*, line 1288). S2 seizes the floor, and after repeating the same words uttered in line 1287, providing an answer to S4 [a], he possibly half-explains his request [b] – *i don't*. At this point, another

²⁵ OALD Online: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/tough_1?q=tough (11 November 2019).

participant, S1, interrupts S2, and takes the floor, repeating the words uttered by S4 at the end of line 1286 – *tough one*. In so doing, he perfectly complies with the rules of the adjacency pair sequence (also called “pair type” by Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 296): question-answer, which indeed has been unhinged in the previous lines (1287-1288) with two similar pairs: question-question. In the following turn, S4 uses the word *tough* again, which is immediately replaced by S1 with the synonym *hard* in line 1292. In the next latched turn, S4 recycles the suggested word, completing his explanation (line 1293). S1, though, repeats *hard* in overlapping speech, and asks whether the meaning of the word *tough* is now clear (line 1294). Unexpectedly, S3 takes up the turn instead of S2, the participant who had originally performed a Loop move. She provides the answer, *hard*, which is acknowledged in unison by S1 and S4 with a confirmatory move (lines 1296-1297). In turn, S3 signals the achievement of new knowledge with an Oh-Receipt move in line 1298. S4 ends the sequence completing his explanation about the reasons why, in his opinion, the singer says *it’s hard lifestyle*.

The extract unfolds how speakers use collaborative speech to tackle non-understanding. In this multi-party discussion, two speakers – S1 and S3 – interchange turns to make the speech flow smoothly, showing effective listenership and participation. S1 takes up S4’s turn, quickly providing a response to S2 (line 1290); similarly, S3 takes over S2, acknowledging her understanding of the word *tough* (line 1295), and thus signalling her involvement. S1’s awareness that S2’s Loop move does not display mishearing, but rather non-understanding, is shown in lines 1292 and 1294, where he provides a synonym for the unknown word. S1 further orients to S2 when, implementing a Check move, he makes sure that the meaning of “tough” has been understood (line 1294). S4, too, orients to S2 in line 1293, using *hard* instead of *tough* when he resumes explaining. However, he rather seems to do so to align with the previous turn than to make his speech more intelligible. Both the Acknowledge move (*yes*) performed in overlapping speech by S1 and S4 (lines 1296-1297) and S3’s Oh-Receipt move (*a:h okay*, line 1298) satisfactorily conclude the meaning-negotiation activity triggered by the word “tough”.

Extract 3.1.2: “we can GET to KNOW each other”

At the end of the discussion the occurrence of another moment of non-understanding reveals the collaborative work of the participants, who pool their resources and eventually make themselves understood.

Extract 3.1.2 (Gullace_1: S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 1359 S2: <6> what do we have to do?</6> / [Elicit-M]
 1360 S4: we chose it. / [Answer-M]
 1361 S1: [a] so we're now just <fast> CHILLing </fast> (.) [b] **we can GET to KNOW each other** / [a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]
 1362 S3: <soft><L1it> non ho capito {i didn't understand} </L1it></soft> / [Inform-M]
 1363 S2: **can you repeat?** / [Loop-M]
 1364 S1: we can get (1) mhm we can mhm / [Answer-M]
 (gap 00:00:03) {S1 and S4 speak to each other in polish}
 1365 S4: he says that **we can meet each other and talk about like** (.) / [Repair-M]
 1366 S1: [a] us like (.) [b] **you could could introduce yourselves to us** by (.)
tell us something about you / [a. Repair-M + b. Upgrade-M]
 1367 S2: <7> a:h </7> / [Oh-Receipt-M]
 1368 S3: [a] <7> a:h </7> [b] okay. / [a. Oh-Receipt + b. Acknowledge-M]
 1369 SS: @@@@ / [Acknowledge-M]

The students have selected a song, accomplishing the task given at the beginning of the spoken activity. They now wonder what else they have to do (line 1359). The answer provided by S4 in line 1360 seems to imply that there is nothing else to do since the song has been chosen. Conversely, in the next turn, S1 replies that it's time to relax and suggests they get to know one another, giving prominence to both actions. In actual fact, the Italian and the Polish students have met on the very afternoon of the spoken activity, and have shown mutual curiosity since the beginning of the discussion. S3, though, does not understand S1's suggestion, softly flagging it in Italian, her own L1 (line 1362). The other Italian student immediately takes the floor, and gives voice to S3's implicature, performing a Loop move. S1 attempts to rephrase his proposal, but after some filled and silent hesitation pauses followed by a restart, he stops completely. At this point, he addresses his Polish friend in their mother tongue. After a three-second gap S4 resumes the talk; he clarifies what S1 meant by *we can GET to KNOW each other*, performing a Repair move. Taking advantage of S4's minimal hesitation pause, S1 seizes the floor (line 1366). He completes S4's Repair move, and 'upgrades' the meaning of the problematic expression, making it more explicit (*introduce yourselves to us; tell us something about you*). He does so with some delays: using the pragmatic marker *like* and a repetition (*could could*), along with a couple of minimal pauses. In overlapping speech, the Italian students perform an Oh-Receipt move, showing that the

meaning of the verb “to get to know” is now clear. In line 1368 S3, who originally expressed non-understanding through a code switch, adds an Acknowledge move, whereby she “registers and accepts a responsive action” (Schegloff 2007: 123). The sequence ends with joint laughter, sealing the participants’ desire to get to know one another.

The extract shows collaboration within the two L1 groups; the interchangeable turns between S2 and S3 (lines 1362-1363) and between S4 and S1 (lines 1365-1366) may display (i) great attunement between the two students sharing the same linguacultural background, and (ii) eagerness to give a contribution to the talk. For instance, no sooner does S3 perform a code switch into her own L1, signalling her non-understanding, S2 takes the floor, and without any gap he translates the implicature of S3’s code switch into a Loop move. In doing so S2 requests that S1 repeat the answer to his question (see line 1359), preventing any further interruption of the communication flow. Very likely, S2’s move also indicates his own non-understanding as his English proficiency level is similar to S3’s.

The micro-sequence following the brief exchange in Polish between S1 and S4 (lines 1365-1366) is quite different from the previous one. Unexpectedly, S4 resumes the talk instead of S1, and uses the indirect speech to explain what S1 meant in line 1361. His turn-taking may be motivated by his interest in S1’s proposal – to learn something about new cultures – and by his impatience to give a clarification. Also S1 shows his impatience for taking the floor when he completes S4’s turn collaboratively (line 1366); in addition to that, he orients to the Italian co-participants by resorting to the practice of self-rephrasing (*introduce yourselves... tell us...*), so as to ensure full understanding.

Interestingly, the Loop move at the beginning of the extract (line 1363) comes after an unexpected change in the topic: S1 moves from the ‘song topic’ to a more personal one, involving mutual acquaintance. Following Drew (1997: 76), the rather abruptness of the topic shift may have occasioned the initiation of the repair since both S3 and S2 were found unprepared for it. S1’s topic shift is unmarked, that is to say, it is neither signalled nor supported by a lexical marker of topical discontinuity, which may explain S3’s lack of understanding and S2’s request for repeating. Most strikingly,

both S1 and S4 identify the expression “to get to know” as the only troublesome one in S1’s utterance. I would venture that the verb to which S1 gives prominence in the first part of his utterance – *CHILLing* (out) – may have been even more problematic to understand than the expression “to get to know” uttered in the second part. The reasons may be two: (i) it is pronounced in a fast mode, and (ii) it is a phrasal idiomatic expression that may not be known to everyone, meaning “to relax”²⁶. Nevertheless, no participant explicitly flags it. The Polish students may have focused immediately on the intercultural dimension of the activity they were performing – getting to know one another – while the Italian students may have played the ‘let-it-pass’ card, using it as a face-saving device in case of non-understanding. As Firth (1996: 244) puts it, “we cannot know whether the ‘problem’ was missed by the hearer (but not by the analyst), or whether it was heard or seen by the hearer and allowed to pass.” As the above exchanges are the very last ones recorded by the group, it will be impossible to demonstrate either hypothesis.

Extract 3.2.1: “we gonna have bigger problems”

This stretch of talk is taken from the beginning of a discussion triggered by one of the questions handed down to the students to keep them focused on the song. The extract, the first of *Gullace_2* group, contains an interesting use of the moves conveying a challenging stance. In the fast-paced short sequence two students skilfully challenge each other using Newsmark, Summon and Acknowledge moves along with straightforward Challenge moves.

Extract 3.2.1 (Gullace_2: S2=L1: pol/PL, male; S3=L1: pol/PL, male)

- 1494 S3: i wonder if the people in two thousand and five hundred would have (the same) problems as we have now (.) wi:th <4> the wars and things like that </4> / [Focus-M]
- 1495 S2: <4> probably (.) we gonna have </4> bigger problems than (.) / [Upgrade-M]
- 1496 S3: **BIGGER problems** = / [Newsmark-M]
- 1497 S2: = seriously (.) look at how gradually problems from (.) for example (.) fourteen hundreds (.) to now (.) became bigger (.) / [Summon-M]
- 1498 S3: ye<5>a:h </5> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 1499 S2: <fast><5> but it’s so </5> everything smaller now?</fast> (for examples) = / [Challenge-M]
- 1500 S3: = [a] but i wonder if it’s not [b] <6> be</6>cause we just started to care about (.) for example human rights (.) / [a. Challenge-M + b. Explain-M]

²⁶ OALD Online: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/chill-out_2#chillout5_e (6 March 2020).

The extract starts with S3 focusing on people's problems in the year 2500. In overlapping speech S2 takes up the turn, and hedges (*probably*) his Upgrade move, whereby he surmises that there will be *bigger problems* in the future. In line 1496 S3 seizes the floor, challenges S2's future scenario, implementing a Newsmark move that signals his disbelief. He does so by using an exact repetition and by giving prominence to the lexical item that has triggered his scepticism (*BIGGER problems*). S2 latches to him, and through a Summon move tries to persuade S3 that the problems have indeed become bigger since the 15th century (line 1497). In line 1498 S3 appears to acknowledge the prior turn; on the contrary, his response token (*yea::h*), uttered with a vowel elongation, indicates that he is truly challenging S2's stance. In his turn, S2 defies S3, partially in overlapping speech, asking him a thought-provoking question. He does so in a fast voice, which may conceal his emotional involvement. In line 1500 S3 latches to S2, implementing another Challenge move [a], followed by an Explain move [b], whereby he exemplifies the reasons why problems are not any bigger today.

The use of the voice plays an important role in this stretch of talk. The students are seriously discussing to what extent problems have become bigger over the centuries; at a very fast pace they perform Challenge moves and a series of other moves that they adapt to the defying tone of the discussion. The first of these moves is the Newsmark move in line 1496: S3 not only uses it as an "announcement response that encourages elaboration" (Wong and Waring 2010: 101), but also as a Challenge move that defies S2's prior turn. Skilfully, S3 modulates his voice, giving prominence to the lexical item that has sparked the 'defy' – *BIGGER*. The second move that fuels the challenge is the Summon move in line 1497. Not only does S2 implement the move to draw S3's attention to an example, but also to convince him of his own good reasons. The third move that turns into a Challenge move is the Acknowledge move in line 1498. Ironically, S3's elongated response token – *yea::h* – registers no recognition of S2's point of view; it rather displays his scepticism. S2 reacts to it in a fast voice, challenging him with a question that revolves around the lexical item *smaller*, the opposite of *bigger*, the adjective that has triggered the 'challenge' (see line 1495). In addition to that, the fashion in which the two students modulate their voice may reflect their truly emotional participation in the discussion.

Extract 3.2.2: "but i think we can't understand this song even now"

In this long stretch of talk all four participants give their contribution to the discussion. The extract instantiates a failed attempt at getting the floor and active listenership in latched and overlapping speech.

Extract 3.2.2 (Gullace_2: S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: pol/PL, male; S3=L1: pol/PL, male; S4=L1: ita/IT, female)

- 1514 S3: so i wonder if they could really understand our problems (.) / *[Focus-M]*
 1515 S4: **uhu** / *[Continuer-M]*
 1516 S3: here (.) for example <8> to underst- </8> = / *[Focus-M]*
 1517 S1: <8> **eh** </8> / *[possible Challenge-M]*
 1518 S2: = fro:m (.) fro:m to from nineteen hundreds (.) our history used to be pretty (.) neatly documented so (.) / *[Challenge-M]*
 1519 S3: **yeah** / *[Continuer-M]*
 1520 S2: they have all the needs all they need to: (.) / *[Challenge-M]*
 1521 S1: *[a]* but i think that we can't understand that song even now *[b]* because (.) / *[a. Challenge-M + b. Explain-M]*
 1522 S3: **a:h (those) yeah** / *[Oh-Receipt-M]*
 1523 S1: *[a]* when it was wrote erm there the war and now we are in peace (.) we can say {S1's smartphone rings} (1) *[b]* sorry (.) *[c]* er if we can see that and (2) if er in the future er will be some war (.) it can be more er simple to understand that song (.) / *[a. Explain-M + b. Repair-M + c. Explain-M]*
 1524 S3: **uhu** / *[Continuer-M]*
 1525 S1: <soft> i think.</soft> / *[Explain-M]*
 1526 S2: i think that = / *[possible Focus-M]*
 1527 S3: = *[a]* we are not in a complete peace (.) *[b]* for example (.) / *[a. Challenge-M + b. Upgrade M]*
 1528 S4: **yeah** / *[Continuer-M]*
 1529 S3: war in the middle east and (.) / *[Upgrade-M]*
 1530 S2: <9> **syria yemen** </9> / *[Upgrade-M]*
 1531 S4: <9> **korea korea** </9> / *[Upgrade-M]*
 1532 S3: for example now we see erm walls and barriers (.) / *[Focus-M]*

The students focus their attention on how people in the future will interpret John Lennon's song, *Imagine*. In line 1514 S3 wonders whether the issues dealt with in the song will be understood or not. While he is speaking, S1 performs a Continuer move through a supportive backchannel. S3's statement causes a reaction from two students. S1 tries to get the floor, uttering a verbal cue – *eh* –in overlapping speech, mildly flagging her request for the floor (line 1517); S2 interrupts S3, performing a Challenge move in latched speech (lines 1518 and 1520). S3's interest in the co-participant's view is signalled through a Continuer move in line 1519. The lengthening of “to” – *to:* – and a minimal hesitation pause at the end of line 1520 ‘encourage’ S1 to seize the floor. She intends to challenge S3, too. In line 1521, in fact, she first hedges her Challenge move with *i think* *[a]*, then she starts an Explain move *[b]*. After a minimal hesitation pause S3 jumps in, implementing an Oh-Receipt move, possibly referring to the *needs* mentioned by S2 in his latest turn. In line 1523 S1 resumes her turn, explaining the

reasons why *we can't understand the song even now*. In the middle of the turn, her smartphone rings and she immediately apologizes. Along S1's turn S3 genuinely performs a Continuer move. Eventually S1 concludes her turn, hedging her moves – again – with a softly uttered *i think* (line 1525). S2 then takes up the turn, hedging a possible Focus move. His turn is interrupted by S3, who performs a move that challenges S1's view of today's world free from wars. While expressing his thoughts, S4 supportively encourages S3 to go on talking (line 1528). S3's example of ongoing wars triggers S2's and S4's overlaps (lines 1530-1531). The two students are eager to contribute to the discussion, mentioning two countries currently at war and a country threatening a world war. In particular, S4's repetition of the name of a country in the Far East (inaccurately identified) possibly displays her fear of an upcoming war in that area of the world. In the last line of the extract S3 focuses on another aspect of contemporary society: *walls and barriers*.

In this extract the participants' competition for the floor is stimulated by their urge to challenge each other's opinions. The students show engaged listenership when they support each other through Continuer moves, and authentic involvement in the discussion when they not only perform Challenge moves, but also provide Explain and Upgrade moves. Despite S1's shyness and low proficiency in English, she competes for the floor twice. When she succeeds in holding the floor, she hedges her challenging view at the beginning and at the end of the turn: the second time her voice is soft, as if she felt intimidated by the reaction of her co-participants.

Extract 3.3.1: “sì sì”

Extract 3.3.2: “sì?”

The following extracts, the first ones of *Gullace_3* group, contain two examples of code switch in Italian, the language spoken in the school setting where the activity takes place, but also a foreign language to the speaker who uses it (henceforth LNit)²⁷. The use of the Italian language at the very beginning of the audio recording by one of the two Polish students participating in the discussion discloses his desire to build common ground and to negotiate comity. The two Polish students, who are spending a week in

²⁷ LN stands for a language that is neither English nor the speaker's first language. The suffix “it” indicates Italian. See also footnote 24.

Rome on an intercultural exchange programme, meet the two Italian schoolfriends for the first time at the outset of the spoken activity.

Extract 3.3.1 (Gullace_3: S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: ita/IT, male)

- 1578 S1: *we are the champions* by queens / [Answer-M]
 1579 S4: <soft> the champions </soft> / [Acknowledge-M]
 1580 S2: [a] a:h [b] the queens? / [a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Elicit-M]
 1581 S1: <LNit> sì sì {yes yes} </LNit> / [Answer-M]
 1582 S2: eh **it's a good** <pvc><ipa> i 'dɛa {idea} </ipa></pvc>
 <1> **the champ**</1>**ions** / [Evaluate-M]

In the first extract (lines 1578-1582) S1 presents the song he has chosen, replying to an Elicit move previously implemented by S2. Both Italian speakers involved in the discussion acknowledge S1's choice with a repetition: S4 focusing on the title of the song, *the champions* (line 1579), and S2 focusing on the name of the band, *queen(s)* (line 1580). S2's turn is prefaced by an Oh-Receipt move [a], followed by an Acknowledge move, which the rising tone of his voice transforms into an Elicit move [b]. In the next turn, S1 replies affirmatively to S2 in LNit, showing affiliation with the two Italian students and signalling his participation in an intercultural environment. The repetition of the Italian response token – *sì sì* – may flag his feeling at ease in that context. At this point, S2 takes the floor, recognizing S1's song as a good choice through an Evaluate move (line 1582). He does so by employing a hearer-friendly strategy that Mauranen (2012) calls 'topic negotiation'; he uses a 'tail' or 'right dislocation', putting the lexical topic referent (<1> *the champ*</1>*ions*) at the end of the clause for prominence, and replacing it by a pronoun in the clause structure (Mauranen 2015: 44). In the same turn, S2 uses the word *idea*, belonging to both the English and the Italian languages, and pronounces it quite naturally in the Italian fashion without causing any communication breakdowns. The combination of the Italian response provided by the Polish participant and the Italian pronunciation of a word belonging to both the Italian and the English vocabulary on the part of the Italian participant seem to create a sense of solidarity and rapport.

The second extract (lines 1588-1593) investigates another use of LNit just a few turns after S1's first LNit code switch. As has been mentioned above, the two pairs of students – Polish and Italian – have never met before, therefore they do not know their names. The extract focuses on a short stretch of turns, in which S1 and S2 reciprocally ask their names.

Extract 3.3.2 (Gullace_3: S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male)

1588 S2: <2><to S1> what's your name?</to S1></2> / [*Question-M*]
 1589 S1: [S1] (<to S2>and you?</to S2> / [*a. Answer-M + b. Question-M*]
 1590 S2: <fast> [S2] </fast> / [*Answer-M*]
 1591 S1: e:r <LNit> *sì?* {yes?} </LNit> / [*Loop-M*]
 1592 S2: [S2] / [*Answer-M*]
 1593 S1: [S2] <LNit> *sì.* {yes.} </LNit> / [*Acknowledge-M*]

The micro-sequence opens with S2 asking S1's name in overlapping speech. S1 replies [a], and reciprocates the question [b]. In line 1590 S2 utters his rather long Italian name – a five-syllable one – in a fast voice. In the next turn, S1 first shows some hesitation with a long filled pause (*e:r*), probably signalling his difficulty in processing S2's name; then he performs a Loop move by means of the Italian response token *sì*, which he uses effectively, modulating his voice to make it sound a request for repeat. His move is immediately followed by S2's Answer move, whereby S2 repeats his name at a normal pace. S1 ends the micro-sequence with a 'double-bill' Acknowledge move in line 1593. After pronouncing S2's name correctly, despite its length, he reinforces his uptake by uttering the Italian affirmative marker *sì* again, to signal not only his understanding, but also his belonging to a multi-linguacultural group. S1 skilfully exploits the Italian response token *sì* according to his pragmatic needs: in line 1591 he uses it as a substitute for the word “sorry”, uttering it with a rising intonation, while in line 1593 he pronounces it with a falling intonation as a substitute for the word “sure”.

As is made clear in both extracts, not only does S1 practise LNit with the purpose of expressing his own communicative needs, but he also exploits his multilingual repertoire for the creation of rapport (Kalocsai 2014: 169). S1's use of LNit at the very beginning of the discussion signals both an accommodative attitude to the context where the activity takes place, and an icebreaking strategy aimed to achieve the social goal of a satisfactory rapport (Aston 1993: 224-226). Additionally, his code switch supports Pullin Stark's (2009: 169) claim that multilingual speakers have a “natural interest in language[s].”

Extract 3.3.3: “we have the queen and the er tox-”

The following extract contains other-oriented practices that help (i) the speaker re-organize his/her discourse, making it clearer and more explicit, and (ii) the listener understand the message and stay tuned. One student orients to the co-participants using

the discourse marker “I mean” and the other-oriented metadiscourse expression “put it simply”.

Extract 3.3.3 (Gullace_3: S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: pol/PL, female)

- 1664 S3: = we have the queen and the er (.) tox- = / [Inform-M]
 1665 S1: = **the question is** who do (.) which one do you (.) think is better as a SOcial document (.) that will illustrate how = / [Elicit-M]
 1666 S2: = as (.) song er this is better but as a social document this is better. (1) / [Answer-M]
 1667 S1: yeah i guess so. (1) / [Acknowledge-M]
 1668 S2: [a] maybe (.) [b] what do you think? / [a. Answer-M + b. Elicit-M]
 1669 S1: [a] erm yeah <un> x </un> (mine) <un> x </un> [b] (**i mean**) i i chose (.) th- the the champions [c] mostly because i thought that (1) er it shows that <smacks lips> (.) <ipa> əf </ipa> the idea of the song that <un> x </un> (.) [d] **put it simply** is (.) even though the world has problems (.) we'll (.) very optimistic to the future. (2) [e] so yeah yeah. = / [a. b. Answer-M + c. Explain-M + d. Focus-M + e. Finalizer-M]

In latched speech S3 informs the co-participants about the two songs they have shortlisted: one is by *the queen* and the other is *tox-* (line 1664). Quite abruptly S1 interrupts her, seizing the floor and performing an Elicit move, whereby he asks which song may be better as a social document, that is to say, which song complies with the assigned task. Interestingly, the participant announces his move through discourse reflexivity (Mauranen 2010, 2012): *the question is*, following this with a false start and a question (line 1665). S1 gives prominence to the first syllable of the adjective “social” – *SOcial* – highlighting his scepticism about the idea of a “social document”. In fact, later he says: *i don't understand the whole point of social document* (see Appendix 3, line 1741). S1's question is interrupted by S2, who appears impatient to answer and communicate his clear-cut opinion on the songs being discussed (line 1666). In the following turn, S1 acknowledges S2's choice with a hedge – *i guess so*. After a one-second pause S2 takes the floor again, giving voice to his second thoughts – *maybe* – [a], and eliciting S1's opinion [b]. S1's answer [a] in line 1669 is initially rather messy; it starts with a hesitation marker (*erm*), followed by an acceptance token and some quite unintelligible words. Possibly aware of this, S1 attempts to put his thoughts in order; he uses the discourse marker *i mean* “to explicitly forewarn [his co-participants of] upcoming adjustments to what has just been said” (Fox Tree and Schrock 2002: 731). Yet, the next segment of the talk [b, c] is still marked by delays: repetitions (*i i; th- the the*), filled (*er*) and silent pauses, and speaker's noises, which make his speech difficult to grasp. Unexpectedly, in the middle of his turn, S1 resorts to metadiscourse to impose order to his fuzzy answer, and by means of the expression *put it simply* he finally

announces how the upcoming Focus move [d] is to be understood (see Mauranen 2012: 175-179). After a two-second pause S1 closes his turn implementing a Finalizer move [e]; he uses the discourse marker *so*, followed by *yeah*, acting as a self-supportive token, repeated twice.

The extract demonstrates how ELF speakers orient to their interlocutors through recipient-designed strategies. The construct of recipient design, originally elaborated by Sacks and Schegloff (1979) in their investigations of monolingual, monocultural interactions, is crucial for investigating multilingual, multicultural ELF talk. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 138-139) provide the following definition for recipient design: “the way in which all turns at talk are in some way designed to be understood in terms of what the speaker knows or assumes about the existing mutual knowledge between him or her and the recipient.” S1 employs two recipient-designed strategies in the same turn (line 1669): he uses the discourse marker *i mean* and the metadiscourse expression *put it simply* to make the interpretation of his song clearer. Since effective, intelligible communication is the main objective in ELF interaction, the participant sounds a skilful ELF user; he tries to make his message as intelligible as possible, guiding his interlocutors along the communicative process with (meta)discourse markers. Additionally, S1’s markers choice reveals his urge to reorganize his ideas and to make the message of his song straightforward. Emotion too plays a role in his long turn. S1’s noises – smacking lips and the idiosyncratic sound *əf* – in his Explain move, along with the missing verb “be” in his Focus move, reveal his emotional state.

Furthermore, line 1668 of the extract contains both alignment and affiliation, two important features in ELF interactions. When S2 takes the floor and says *maybe*, he not only aligns with the previous turn (*i guess so*), but also affiliates with S1. Affiliation plays a crucial role in the dynamics of S2’s talk; he corroborates S1’s position to the detriment of his own. In fact, S2’s clear-cut position on the two songs adopted in line 1666 loses its force after his affiliation with the co-participant.

5. Discussion

The exploration of the ELF discourse naturally unfolded by school-age ELF users under unconstrained ELT classroom conditions reveals that the speakers enthusiastically use the language to establish common understanding and to negotiate rapport. The students take hold of ELF, temporarily setting aside their status of English learners and turning into language users, who pursue functional effectiveness rather than striving to conform to native-speaker norms (Hülmbauer *et al.* 2008: 28). My dataset inevitably contains morpho-syntactic and lexical infelicities; yet these do not affect communication. The students in fact make and negotiate meaning successfully despite ungrammaticalities, and do not generally attend to their co-participants' non-standard language. Only in very few exchanges some students seem to feel constrained by the ELT classroom rules – grammar correctness and lexical accuracy; hence they either provide or elicit correct forms. As I illustrated in Chapter 3, the students' interactions have been investigated within a Conversation Analysis framework, which legitimates every single linguistic realization and move, and not from a Second Language Acquisition perspective, according to which learners' communication – described as 'interlanguage' – is rather deficient and problematic.

The above data analysis largely demonstrates that ELF talk is characterized by cooperation and by the speakers' pronounced attitude to pre-empt non- and misunderstanding. As Mänttinen (2013: 243) notes, "[o]ne reason for engaging in collaborative behaviour [...] is speakers' reliance on the commonsense assumption that speaking a language that is not participants' mother tongue must be particularly prone to misunderstanding and therefore calls for cooperation from everyone to succeed." The students who were recorded in my corpus achieve effective communication, and create a friendly – often playful – atmosphere, adopting a wide range of cooperative accommodation meaning-making strategies. They use the language in a natural way, pragmatically shaping it for their communicative and social goals. In all speech events the students manifest their willingness to accomplish the assigned task – to select a song that gives an insight into contemporary society – deploying any resources that are available in their verbal and non-verbal repertoire to co-create meaning and to arrive at shared understanding.

The construct of ‘understanding as a continuum’ (Bremer *et al.* 1996), with full understanding and complete non-understanding being the opposite end members, is connected to that of understanding as an interactional achievement, a basic concept that underpins CA. The turn-taking machinery, and more specifically, the adjacency pairs, allow both the speaker and his/her interlocutor to test whether (i) their understanding is shared, and (ii) they are willing to go along with that (Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 297-298). In other words, understanding in all its degrees – from full to none – is interactionally accomplished through the alternation of turns, constantly providing the interactants (and the researcher too) with cues about the ongoing understanding. As Cogo and Pitzl (2016: 339) put it, understanding is a not just a receptive skill: “achieving shared understanding is a joint, dynamic, and interactive process that participants continuously engage in and work towards.” Negotiating understanding in ELF may be more problematic, given that all ELF realizations are informed by the speakers’ diverse linguacultural backgrounds. On the contrary, early and more recent studies on ELF (see Seidlhofer 2011, Mauranen 2012) have reported that there is no evidence of more communicative breakdowns in ELF interactions than in NS/NS talk. The reason rests on the variety of interactive pragmatic strategies that speaker and listener – or rather co-participants, as speaker and hearer jointly construct talk-in-interaction (Schegloff 1996) – employ in the ever-changeable ELF settings by negotiating meaning and making themselves understood. The following table summarizes the main communication strategies the school-age ELF users of my study enact to make meaning and to achieve mutual understanding while building rapport and establishing common ground.

Table 5.1

Most salient communication strategies employed by the school-age ELF users of my study.

Self-initiated strategies for enhancing understanding
<i>Being explicit</i>
Self-repetition
Self-rephrase
Topic negotiation
Lexical replacement
Substitution of a pronoun with its lexical referent
Onomatopoeic sounds
<i>Comprehension checks</i>

Other-initiated strategies for enhancing understanding
<i>Other-paraphrase</i>
<i>Confirmation checks</i>
Questions
<i>Clarification checks</i>
Requests for repeat
Question repeats
Code-switching to LN
<i>Co-construction of the message</i>
Strategies for signalling attentive listenership, understanding, and engagement
<i>Backchannelling</i>
<i>Supportive laughter</i>
<i>Latchings</i>
<i>Overlaps</i>
<i>Other-repetition</i>
Strategies for building rapport and creating a playful and communal atmosphere
<i>Other-repetition</i>
<i>Other-paraphrase, synonyms</i>
<i>Laughter</i>
<i>Joint utterance completion</i>
<i>Code-switching to L1 and LN</i>
<i>Onomatopoeic sounds</i>

5.1. Prominent pragmatic strategies

5.1.1. Handling (non) understanding

The co-participants in my study do their best to make meaning and to achieve mutual understanding, adopting self- and other-initiated communicative strategies that allow for a smooth unfolding of their talk. Indeed, I detected no instances of communication breakdown or occurrences of misunderstanding²⁸; conversely, the students successfully handle moments of partial non-understanding with *ad hoc* interactional practices.

²⁸ I adopted Cogo and Pitzl's (2016: 340) definitions of non-understanding and misunderstanding: "[a] non-understanding refers to those instances in communication where one or more participants in a conversation realize(s) that there is a gap in understanding, i.e. someone notices that understanding is not shared by all participants. Since at least one participant in an interaction is aware of this, speakers have the choice to indicate a non-understanding at the time it occurs [...]. A misunderstanding, in contrast, usually refers to an understanding problem that only surfaces retrospectively, by accident (if at all). It

5.1.1.1. *Self-repetition and self-rephrase*

All speech events show that students generally orient to their interlocutors: they use accommodative strategies and pragmatic behaviours to pre-empt and to signal non-understanding, drawing on an array of practices from their verbal and non-verbal repertoire to make their communication intelligible, meaningful and often light-hearted. For example, in Extract 2.3.3 self-repetition, which is *per se* a valuable practice to keep the listener tuned and to give him/her an extra chance to re-hear a (problematic) segment of talk, is combined with onomatopoeic sounds that reinforce the original repeated lexical items, adding a playful nuance to the exchange. One of the participants, S3, possibly prompted by a co-participant's overlap, repeats what her song sounds like, and immediately after clarifies what it does not sound like through an onomatopoeic addition – *krrr*. In his following turn, though, the same student who has performed the overlap implements a confirmation check – apparently, he is not fully convinced he has well interpreted S3's words and sounds – asking for further assurance on the kind of song selected by S3. This stretch of talk encompasses two distinct strategic uses of the language. The first is an instance of self-initiated pre-emptive strategy: a 'combined repetition' – a self-repetition in combination with onomatopoeic sounds. The second is an instance of other-initiated strategy: a confirmation check (Björkman 2014), signalling that understanding needs to be confirmed. Both students strive to secure communication using all the resources at their disposal: S3 makes her talk redundant and enhances explicitness through an exact repetition along with a theatrical onomatopoeic addition, while S1 checks on the accuracy of his interpretation, verbalizing S3's onomatopoeic sounds and implementing what Heritage and Watson (1979) call 'candidate reading'.

Additionally, in Extract 2.3.1 a student, aware of his fuzzy song presentation, checks on his co-participants' understanding through a listener-oriented move – a comprehension check (Björkman 2014) – uttering a rather uncommon question tag (*ha ha?*) and following it with a partial reformulation of the prior segment of talk. In the same extract another student, who has been requested to repeat his question, employs a synonym, uttered right after the original word (*the melody (.) the tune*), thus enhancing

cannot be indicated or negotiated immediately because no participant is aware of its existence when it happens.”

clarity and assuring his co-participant's understanding. The use of self-rephrase or synonyms makes talk more transparent and helps the interactants construct meaning and achieve understanding in problematic turns.

5.1.1.2. *Requests for clarification and repeat*

The participants in my study monitor the understanding of the unfolding talk through Check moves instantiated by (i) comprehension checks that are performed in the ongoing turn, and by (ii) requests for confirmation of understanding or requests for clarification (Kaur 2010), implemented when comprehension is either problematic or incomplete. In various exchanges the students also implement Loop moves – requests for repeat (Schegloff 2004) – which allow them to signal mishearing or difficulty in understanding. They mostly communicate their lack of uptake with ‘open’ forms of repair initiation (Drew 1997: 69), such as *what?* and *haeh?*. Only in one case a student formulates a much longer ‘ELT classroom-like’ request – *can you repeat?* (Extract 3.1.2, line 1363); in two cases the students perform a question repeat (Dörnyei and Scott 1997) restating a segment of the prior turn with question intonation – *is really?* (Extract 1.2.1, line 336) and *like a?* (Extract 3.1.1, line 1287). Remarkably, a particularly skilful student modulates his voice in Italian, a foreign language to him, requesting a repeat using the response token *sì* (Extract 3.3.2, line 1591). The substantial use of Check moves, investigated in terms of self- and other-initiated communication strategies, suggests the students’ active involvement in the discussion: they continually check on the accessibility of their message, but also verify the understanding of their co-participants’ message, complying with the ‘cooperative imperative’ proposed by Widdowson (1983). Also, the rather frequent use of Loop moves points both to the students’ willingness to actively participate in the talk and to a high degree of listenership. Interestingly, in a couple of exchanges the request for repeat is followed by an Answer move uttered by two students simultaneously, which discloses their full engagement in the discussion.

5.1.1.3. *Topic negotiation and lexical replacement*

My data also show that students adopt self-repair practices not only to make their contribution to the discussion more effective, but also to enhance clarity, pre-empting communicative turbulence and facilitating the co-participants’ understanding. Some of

the recurring measures that the students adopt to raise explicitness and prevent the interruption of the communication flow are the following: (i) the negotiation of topic, e.g. *it's a good idea the champions* (Extract 3.3.1, line 1582), whereby the speaker clarifies with a 'tail' that he refers to the song previously selected; (ii) the lexical replacement, e.g. *people (.) boys and girls both* (Extract 2.1.1, line 470); and (iii) the substitution of a pronoun with its lexical referent, e.g. *what do you think about this? (I) this (I) this problems?* (Extract 1.2.1, line 334). Such measures reveal the cooperative nature of ELF interactions: ELF speakers orient to their interlocutors with recipient designed practices, making their discourse explicit and securing mutual understanding. Self-repetition and self-rephrase also contribute to enhancing clarity and removing any ambiguities or vagueness, which otherwise would probably lead to a communicative breakdown in ELF.

5.1.2. Boosting the *languageing* process

5.1.2.1. *Creative language*

My data clearly demonstrate that school-age ELF users are also skilful *languageers*. They make a creative use of the language to give voice to their urges, adding pragmatic strength to the interactional speech. The *languageing* process, that is "the strategic exploitation of the linguistic resources of the virtual language that characterizes the use of ELF" (Seidlhofer 2011: 198), is well instantiated in Extract 2.4.3 (line 1065); while discussing a much-felt issue – pollution – in a collaborative fashion, one of the students contributes to the discussion adding the temporal expression *now or later*. This time phrase, shaped on the English idiom "sooner or later", is undeniably a creative expression that conveys the participant's desire to take action against environmental pollution as soon as possible, that is to say, starting immediately. The student's creativity is neither 'intentional' nor influenced by his L1; it is rather communicative and pragmatic in nature. Interestingly, also the word coinage *louding* in Extract 1.1.6 (line 48) serves a pragmatic purpose: that of getting a co-participant to speak up. The use of *louding* instead of *more loud*, uttered in a previous turn, in combination with the verb *to be* – *you have to be louding* – makes the student's request more cogent and impactful.

In my corpus there are several instances of creative language. For example, *jemmy* (*towers*) (line 818)²⁹, an L1 (Italian) transfer referring to the Twin Towers, *catalanian* (line 963)³⁰, a nationality adjective that echoes the ones ending in -ian, and *solucionate* (line 999)³¹, another L1 (Spanish) transfer meaning “to solve”, do not affect communication; on the contrary, they seem to enhance faster understanding. Such creative uses of the language, except for the last one, which is uttered in a tentative style (soft voice and slow pace), are incorporated in the unfolding speech in a very natural fashion, making the discourse flow without interruptions; sometimes they are also endorsed by supportive laughter, signalling the co-participants’ full acceptance. Indeed, the participants in the spoken activity play the role of actual ELF users – not that of English learners – and appear “to prioritize content and effective communication over correctness within a normative model” (Cogo and Pitzl 2016: 342; see also Jenkins 2012). In other words, the students’ communicative urge outweighs their lexical accuracy in Standard English.

5.1.2.2. Onomatopoeic sounds

The students in my study call on any resources at their disposal that render their talk not only more effective, but also livelier. A good example is given by the onomatopoeic additions, such as that in Extract 2.3.3 – *krrr* (line 851) – and those in Extract 1.1.11 – *tu:f tu:f tu:f* (line 291), *ta ta ta tu: tu: tu:* (line 294) – all of which contribute to making the speech more vivid, ultimately impacting more on the listener. The students employ sound effects as a pragmatic strategy for reinforcing the message they intend to deliver. In the former extract, the student intends to make it clear that hers is a rock song, but definitely not a hard rock one; thus, the use of sounds that copy those of a guitar string plucked by a hard rocker well conveys her communicative need. In the latter, the student evokes the tragic scene of the July 2016 Nice terrorist attack, resorting to sound effects that add further dramatic power to it. In my dataset onomatopoeic sounds are used by male and female students alike: they both employ them with great ability, even though such skill is generally acknowledged as a boys’ feature.

²⁹ See Appendix 3.

³⁰ See Appendix 3.

³¹ See Appendix 3.

5.1.3. Building comity and lightening the atmosphere

5.1.3.1. *Code-switching*

The participants in my study engage in the code-switching practice, serving manifold functions, which at times interrelate and partly overlap. Although code-switching is traditionally seen as a compensatory strategy which learners utilize in problematic turns, in my corpus code-switching into L1 or LN is mostly used for interactional purposes (Mauranen 2013), that is to say, for creating rapport and establishing common ground.

Drawing on and expanding Gumperz's (1982: 75-81) and Klimpfinger's (2007: 38, 2009: 352) code-switching communicative functions, I identified five functions that are especially suitable for the investigation of my data: *specifying an addressee*, *signalling culture*, *personalization*, *appealing for assistance*, and *interactional*. For instance, S1, an Italian student, addresses a Thai student in his own L1 – Italian – inviting him to take the floor and to give his contribution to the discussion (Extract 1.2.2, line 365). S1's code switch to his own mother tongue may sound incongruous as the addressee is Thai, but it is not since the Thai student has spent the entire school year in the same class as S1, learning and socializing in Italian with his classmates. The code-switching action discloses their friendship and signals in-group belonging: in fact, all participants in the discussion are either bilingual or multilingual and share at least two languages, English and Italian. In such instance, code-switching serves primarily the *interactional* and *signalling culture* purposes. These two functions overlap: the switch fosters rapport building and social cohesion along with signalling S1's cultural bond. The move in Italian is accompanied by the Thai student's first name, which intensifies the affective nuance of the switch, and is immediately followed by joint supportive soft laughter on the part of all participants, conveying general approval. According to ELF researchers (e.g. Cogo 2007, 2009; Klimpfinger 2007, 2009; Vettorel 2014), code-switching is a rather frequent ELF feature: in the case above its use sounds quite natural, and allows the Italian student to turn his Direct move to the Thai co-participant into an original – indeed playful – invitation to take part in the discussion. The switch adds pragmatic force to the move while lightening the atmosphere.

As I already noted, speaking ELF involves pooling all multilingual resources and exploiting them for transactional and interactional purposes in a collaborative effort. In Extract 3.3.1 (line 1581) a Polish student code switches into Italian at the outset of the discussion, converging to the Italian co-participants. The Polish student uses Italian, a foreign language to him (L_{Nit}), as an ice-breaking strategy, establishing rapport with his ‘hosts’; in fact, the group comprises Italian and Polish students on an intercultural exchange week in Rome who meet for the first time on the day of the spoken activity. In another exchange (Extract 3.3.2, lines 1591 and 1593) the same Polish student handles code-switching skilfully: his rising and falling intonation in uttering the Italian response token *sì* allows him to perform respectively a Loop and an Acknowledge move, pragmatically exploiting the switch. Code-switching in this instance fulfils both the *specifying an addressee* and *interactional* functions; by addressing his moves in L_{Nit} to the Italian student who has just uttered his first name, the Polish student converges to him, and, at the same time, establishes common ground, showing “affiliation and membership to the same community” (Cogo 2009: 259). Additionally, the Polish student’s switch into L_{Nit} signals the speaker’s multilingual identity, indicating also “a special bond to another language or culture” (Klimpfinger 2007: 54).

Along the same line, the code switch into Spanish performed by an Italian student in Extract 2.5.1 (lines 1192, 1194, 1198, 1202), fully discloses the *interactional* function of this practice; the student repeats the title of the Spanish song ‘offered’ to him by a Spanish participant, striving to position himself while “creating mutual liking” (Klimpfinger 2007: 48). The combination of code-switching and self-repetition in Loop, Acknowledge and Focus moves gradually helps the speaker establish rapport with the other participants; the addition of laughter contributes to making the atmosphere friendlier and more playful. By the end of the sequence, the student sounds more in tune with the co-participants, and possibly satisfied with his accomplishment. Indeed, he has used Spanish, a language foreign to him, and has handled the switch adeptly, modulating his voice pragmatically, according to his needs.

The degree of personal involvement in the discussion also affects the code choice. In Extract 1.2.2 (line 360) an Italian student performs an Oh-Receipt move code-switching to her L1. Out of an emotional burst she responds in Italian to the Chinese singer’s name provided by the Chinese co-participant. In Gumperz’s (1982: 80-81)

terminology her move is a *personalized* one. Her Italian words not only confirm her uptake of new information, but also act out her emotional response to an unexpected ‘revelation’; in addition, they possibly display her sudden awareness – as in an epiphany – of being a member of a truly multi-linguacultural group, interacting in a “multiple culture territor[y]” (Pitzl 2017, quoted in Vettorel 2019: 190). Furthermore, her switch to Italian, coming right after the Chinese co-participant has pronounced the name of a Chinese singer, may be interpreted as *signalling culture*.

Culture plays an important role in ELF interactions: ELF speakers communicate their identities and cultural schemata all along their exchanges and continually engage in meaning negotiation, employing the verbal and non-verbal resources that are immediately available to them. Code-switching is one of these resources, which the students in my study employ for a variety of purposes, or for no apparent purpose, except the one of making communication flow smoothly. In fact, the data contain another category of code switches, which I refer to as ‘oblivious’, i.e. those switches that the speakers perform without cognizance. In Extract 1.1.11 (line 283) an Italian student seizes the floor to describe the July 2016 Nice terrorist attack. His involvement in the delivery of the message is quite high; instead of using the English word “lorry” or “truck”, he utters the corresponding Italian word *camion*, a loanword from French, pronouncing it as if it were an English word. The student seems unaware of performing a code switch. The evidence comes in the subsequent turns; when a co-participant, who shares the same word – *camion* – in her L1, does not let it pass, providing the English word *truck*, he immediately appropriates and authenticates it as if it were a verb, and resumes his description. Extract 2.1.2 (line 481) contains another instance of ‘oblivious’ code switch. A Spanish student takes the floor, and right after implementing a Challenge move he introduces the phrase *piramide of needings*, referring to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Emotionally involved in keeping his point (he believes that in our society the poverty issue is more serious than the high social and economic standards promoted by social media), the student seems unaware of his code switch. In addition, it goes unnoticed by the co-participants. It is very likely that the proximity of the Spanish word *piramide* to the English word “pyramid” hampers any communication problem. As discussed earlier, ELF talk prioritizes effective communication over lexicogrammatical correctness. This happens also in my data; the very few other-

corrections, such as the ones in Extract 1.1.11 and Extract 1.1.12, are all produced in Case Study 1. I will get back to this point in section 5.2.

The corpus also contains a few instances of code-switching related to the *appealing for assistance* function. In all cases but one the switches concern lexical items. When the students are short of a word, generally resort to their own L1, asking for linguistic help as they do not intend to drop the topic or to interrupt communication. Not surprisingly, assistance is provided instantly, “which may well account for the often-reported enhanced collaboration in ELF speech situations” (Mauranen 2013: 243). In one instance the word search involves all participants, who take up the turn more than once, giving their contribution to the meaning negotiation (Extract 1.1.10, lines 262-268). In an attempt at finding the most suitable English translation for the Italian word *riferito* (“referred to”), a student even performs a creative act, choosing a word – *bounding* – that he immediately replaces with an equally unfitting one – *linked*. Interestingly, their meaning negotiation comes to an end right after the student who has filled lexical gaps in previous turns validates the correct English expression – *it refers to*. Among the relatively few *appealing for assistance* requests performed through code-switching there is only a request for assistance on a grammar issue – the past participle of a verb (Extract 1.2.4, line 438). It comes from a student who has asked for linguistic help in a previous switch, which may imply that the student is particularly sensitive to formal correctness and language accuracy.

The data indicate that cooperation in word searching instances is always ensured by the proactive attitude the students display in all speech events. In this respect, school-age ELF users are not different from other speakers in diverse ELF contexts, whose code-switching peppered discourse has been widely investigated (Cogo 2007, 2009, 2018; Klimpfinger 2007, 2009; Mauranen 2013; Pietikäinen 2014; Vettorel 2014; Klötzl 2015; Brunner and Diemer 2018).

5.1.3.2. *Humour and laughter*

The students display a highly collaborative behaviour not only in word search moments or in interactive repairs, but also in constructing humorous sequences. My data show that humour contributes to establishing rapport and to building up a playful atmosphere. In Extract 2.4.4 the students cooperatively support their affiliation to the Erasmus+

group they belong to, creating a jocular atmosphere. They negotiate comity playing with the word “trap” accompanied by a nationality adjective in jokingly performed Challenge moves, which trigger or nurture humorous exchanges. The little show set up around their favourite style of music displays the “in-tuneness” (Pullin Stark 2009) of the participants who, either laughingly or by means of joint laughter, perform highly coordinated exchanges aiming to lighten up the atmosphere and to accomplish social goals. The witty quip in Extract 2.4.2 (line 1018), following a slip of the tongue of one of the participants, comes timely: it prompts a laughing response while playing down the co-participant’s mispronunciation. The way the student handles his humorous remark allows him to reinforce his solidary bonds both with the student who is being teased for his misspeaking and with the rest of the group.

The unexpected (and cheeky) Direct move laughingly performed near the end of another discussion (Extract 2.3.5, line 954) also discloses the participant’s playfulness and quest for comity. Indeed, the participants in my study appear to use any linguistic resources available in their repertoire to create and/or maintain interpersonal relationships, establish affiliation with their interlocutors, and build up a pleasant atmosphere. Laughter, in fact, is a much-employed device that serves the twofold functions of capturing the interlocutor’s support, and invoking solidarity within the group in a humorous fashion.

As an interactional feature, generally enabling positive collaborative work, laughter plays quite a prominent role in my data. One or more tokens of self-laughter often accompany such moves as Acknowledge, Answer, Direct and Finalizer, serving the functions of (i) capturing the benevolence of the co-participants, (ii) saving face, or (iii) building rapport. In Extract 2.3.2 (line 832), for example, S5 recognizes the co-participant’s answer and follows it with a token of laughter that may function either as a face-saving device after an other-initiated repair – indeed he has been asked to repeat his fuzzy question twice – or as a pragmatic strategy to establish rapport. Acknowledge moves performed through joint laughter are also very frequent in my corpus: the students generally laugh when they collectively recognize a co-participant’s selected song, or agree on a co-participant’s proposal; in so doing they not only express agreement showing understanding, but also exhibit their in-group solidarity while making the atmosphere livelier.

The students laugh simultaneously also (i) to signal support, as seen in Extract 1.2.2 (line 366), where the invitation to talk to S2 performed through a code switch is supported by the co-participants' soft laughter, and (ii) to display a challenging behaviour, as Extract 1.1.9 exemplifies through a series of Challenge moves triggered by a teasing-like utterance completion that take the form of joint laughter.

5.1.4. Signalling participation and engagement

The level of active listenership, engagement, and participation in the discussion is shown in the use of such cooperative practices as utterance completion, collaborative overlap, collaborative floor, other-repetition, and other-paraphrasing. In my corpus some of these practices also contribute to creating rapport and in-group solidarity. The data demonstrate that most of the students sound fully involved in the unfolding of the talk, "shar[ing] the responsibility of collaborating to achieve their communicative goals, i.e. communicate successfully" (Pitzl 2011: 21). In the joint construction of a turn they frequently provide their contributions in latched or overlapping speech, which indicates both their eagerness to take part in the discussion, and their "capacity to anticipate the conclusion of utterances" (Coates 1997: 61) in spite of the different ELF variations. In Extract 1.1.6, for instance, two students construct a turn performing a Direct move in latched speech. What surprises in the dynamics of co-creating meaning is the appropriation of the move by the speaker who completes the utterance (lines 44 and 46), along with his creative reformulation of the move in a subsequent turn (line 48). This behaviour, i.e. the appropriation of the co-participant's move and the interchangeability of turns, can be found in various discussions. In Extracts 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, for example, the two L1 groups – Italian and Polish – appropriate the move of their L1 fellow speaker, interchanging turns; in so doing the students sharing the same linguacultural background show remarkable attunement with each other, along with great impatience to contribute to the talk. Furthermore, the students' cooperativeness is displayed within a 'collaborative floor' frame. Extract 2.4.3 (lines 1062-1065) exemplifies this practice, with the participants handling the floor as if one single voice were speaking. As in a dance of words, they step in to give their contribution and to jointly construct meaning while imagining a future environmental scenario with no carbon dioxide emissions.

5.1.4.1. *Other-repetition and other-paraphrasing*

The students actively engage in the co-construction of meaning, exploiting the turn-taking mechanism to the full, through latched and overlapping speech; but they also orient to their interlocutors, employing pragmatic strategies that signal alignment and add to building group affiliation. The most frequent strategies they enact to express an affective posture towards the co-participants, aiming to establish common ground, are other-repetition and other-paraphrasing³², including synonyms and near synonyms³³. The use of other-repetition (both exact and partial repetition) is rather common in my data: the students resort to it to acknowledge and support the co-participant's utterance while aligning with the previous turn. In Extract 2.4.3 (line 1067), for example, a student employs the partial repetition *end carbon footprint* to align with a prior turn and to uphold the issue introduced by a co-participant, rounding off a series of turns about a future carbon-free world. Through the exact repetition – *who cares?* (Extract 2.4.2, line 1016) – another student aligns with his co-participant, endorsing her opinion and showing an affective stance towards her challenging view. The use of the exact repetition – *rap or trap* – in Extract 2.4.4 (lines 1088-1089) also displays affiliative uptake; one of the two students repeating this phrase even prefaces it with an Oh-change-of-state token (Heritage 1984), showing her interest in the topic and supporting the student who has originally expressed his taste in music. Conversely, in Extract 3.2.1 (line 1496) a student makes an exact repetition – *BIGGER problems* – demonstrating alignment with the previous turn but also disaffiliation with his interlocutor. By giving prominence to the lexical item that has prompted his scepticism he encourages further elaboration on the issue in a rather challenging fashion. This repetition, in fact, reveals cooperativeness only in the structural level of reciprocal actions, i.e. alignment, as the affective level, i.e. affiliation, (Kimura 2019) appears threatened by the student's different opinion about a future scenario.

³² Paraphrasing “entails displaying [this] given information in a new and different way, either by simplifying the form of the message or by expressing it in different words” (Neil 1996: 142, quoted in Kaur 2009: 110).

³³ Franceschi (2019: 65) maintains that paraphrasing may involve a single item rather than an entire segment of speech or part of it. She classifies the new lexical item as a synonym, near synonym, or specific term.

Another frequent practice enacted to acknowledge understanding and to show participatory listenership³⁴ and solidarity is other-paraphrasing, including synonyms and near synonyms. In Extract 2.2.1 (line 612) a student latches to a co-participant using the word *worldwide* to comment on the song *Imagine*; she echoes the term *international* uttered in the previous turn, aligning with it, and, more importantly, signalling her agreement with and support to her co-participant. Her move is prefaced with a positive token that reinforces her agreement based on the students' shared common ground. In the same speech event another student, emotionally involved in the discussion, latches to a co-participant with a verb – *to stay together* (Extract 2.2.2, line 671) – that reverberates the one uttered in the prior turn, *to gather*, demonstrating her active participation in the discussion. Her lexical choice seems to reflect the very moment of the discussion – she and the Erasmus+ students being hosted by her school are together *for doing something (.) changing this bad world*. Conversely, Extract 2.2.4 (line 768) contains an instance of other-paraphrasing: a student rephrases the idiom *get things off his chest*, used by a co-participant to describe John Lennon's mood when he wrote *Imagine*, into *free his soul*. In so doing, not only does she align with the previous turn, showing listenership and participation, but also displays her support and emotional involvement, making the original idiom more spiritual.

5.1.4.2. Backchannelling, latchings and overlaps

Alongside the accommodative strategies I illustrated above, the students utilize supportive backchannelling to signal attentive listenership and participation; they exploit this practice both to encourage the speaker to keep up the delivery of the talk without claiming the floor, and to establish or maintain rapport along with signalling comprehension. Backchannels in my data are mostly verbal, *uhu, aha, hm, mhm, okay, yes, yeah*, i.e. weak or neutral agreement tokens, according to Schneider (1988: 160, quoted in Kordon 2006: 69-70). In a few cases they are either combined with a token of laughter to show extra supportiveness, or totally replaced by laughter to express a benevolent attitude (see Meierkord 2000).

The students' willingness to communicate cooperatively is also evident in the use of such interactional features as latchings and overlaps, which, according to Cogo

³⁴ See Sawir's (2004) elaboration on participatory listenership.

(2010: 302-303), “contribute to create a sense of ‘one conversation’.” By performing Acknowledge and Answer moves in latched or overlapping speech the students show their strong urge to either recognize the co-participant’s contribution, or provide their own contribution to the discussion. The data also contains many occurrences of Challenge moves performed in latched or overlapping speech. The students employ all the interactional resources at their disposal to challenge their co-participants’ stances or ‘speaking incidents’: as in Extract 2.4.2 (line 1017), where no sooner does a student misspeak, a co-participant takes the floor making fun of him laughingly. Interestingly, some overlaps made by two students through an Answer or Oh-Receipt move seem to reproduce the voice of one single speaker as the content and the prosody of the utterance are the same. In Extract 1.1.7 (lines 91-92) the change-of-knowledge Oh-Receipt move performed by two speakers in overlapping speech, using the same word with the same prominence – *the ROA:D* – is paradigmatic of the students’ enthusiastic participation in the ongoing talk. My data show that school-age ELF users (i) handle the floor in a collaborative fashion, using latched and overlapping speech as native speakers normally do, and (ii) resort to backchannelling, repetitions, and laughing, ensuring that communication flows smoothly.

5.1.5. Challenging through prosody

The students in my study are actual ELF users who ‘play’ with the language in quite a natural fashion, accomplishing both transactional and interactional goals. They manipulate the language by giving extra nuances to it according to their needs, and make communication even more effective. They do so employing the variety of pragmatic strategies illustrated above, but also using prosodic features enabling them to perform Loop moves (e.g. *wha::t?*: see Appendix 3, line 918), Newsmark moves (e.g. *BIGGER problems*: Extract 3.2.1, line 1496), or Acknowledge moves (e.g. *yea::h*: Extract 3.2.1, line 1498) as if they were all Challenge moves. The students adeptly modulate their voice to express an implicature that the move they perform would not normally convey. They communicate their challenging stance very subtly: either by converging to their co-participant(s), as S3 does in Extract 3.2.1 (line 1496) through an exact repetition uttered with emphasis, or by performing a request for repeat with a vowel elongation as if it were a hearing check (see Appendix 3, line 918).

Interestingly, their use of the voice becomes crucial when they feel the urge to challenge their co-participant(s). The data demonstrate that prosodic features, such as those illustrated above, are pragmatically motivated and communicate the speakers' intentions well. As described by many ELF investigators, ELF speakers employ whatever linguistic resources are available to them, resorting to the potential of the virtual language and to their Individual Multilingual Resources (IMR) (Pitzl 2018a: 13) to co-create meaning and to implement their moves according to their local needs (see Vettorel 2019).

5.2. 'Doing being English learners': a rare occurrence

In line with the findings in ELF academic and business settings, also the school-age ELF users of my study disregard pauses within and between turns: such pauses are very common in ELF spoken interactions, and apparently do not bother ELF speakers who are aware of the cultural differences they all bring to the conversational floor (see Meierkord 2000). In addition, the students generally do not signal any 'deviations' from Standard English lexicogrammatical forms as making understanding more problematic, prioritizing content and interactional goals over formal correctness and lexical accuracy. Some students showing a high level of language awareness appear to resort to self-repairing ungrammaticalities only when they deem that correction is imperative. A case in point is *these problem problems* (see Appendix 3, line 642) along with *it's talk about it talks about* (Extract 1.2.1, line 334) and *that talk that talks about* (Extract 2.3.1, line 1650): the self-initiated correction in the form of a self-repetition seems to be motivated by the need to comply with the rules of the ELT classroom, rather than by the will to enhance intelligibility. In fact, the students normally activate a variety of communication strategies orienting to content-delivery exchanges, usually glossing over the formal correctness of their message. In one speech event, however, a female participant, possibly sensitive to NS encoded forms or latently constrained by the English classroom rules, expresses the urge to take the floor, providing the co-participants with corrections for non-standard linguistic realizations (e.g. *louder* instead of *more loud* in Extract 1.1.6, line 47, and *truck* instead of *camion* in Extract 1.1.11, line 284). Interestingly in the same speech event (*Vailati_1*), while three students are negotiating meaning, two of them correct the third in overlapping speech uttering *sons* instead of *son* (Extract 1.1.12, lines 304-305), possibly in the wake of the repeated

lexicogrammatical corrections they have just heard from her. I interpret this stance in terms of the persona the two students embody: along with being ELF users for most of the time, they also ‘do being English learners’, hence their urge to make repairs.

5.3. Lesson learnt: a summary

My findings reveal the participants’ full engagement in the topic: the songs they have selected act as a trigger for heightening their communicative capability in ELF and for claiming their sense of agency as successful and competent ELF users. Their equal and symmetric position as ELF speakers – no teacher interferes in their interactions – enhances the natural unfolding of their talk and promotes feelings of self-satisfaction for having accomplished a task while negotiating comity in their authentic learning setting. The students interviewed after the spoken activity felt content with their performance and more in tune with the other participants. Building rapport and establishing common ground through collaboration play a crucial role in the school-age participants in my study. As House (2012: 193) notes: “[their] attempts to negotiate what it is that each one of them wants to convey leads to a feeling of community, solidarity, and group identity.”

My data provide evidence of ELF effective communication, of collaborative construction of rapport, and of building up a communal playful atmosphere. The third person data, complemented by feedback interviews, disclose the two ‘ingredients’ that make school-age ELF users’ communication in a ‘teacher-free zone’ successful: (i) a stimulating prompt that elicits an enthusiastic response (the choice of a song dealing with the issues of contemporary society has proved particularly inspired and inspiring); and (ii) a space that allows for negotiating comity – that is to say, using ELF for social goals – and for creating a positive atmosphere. In other words, the students appropriate and authenticate the English language to responsibly undertake a shared ‘enterprise’ – that of selecting an insightful song into our society – negotiating cultural differences and commonalities, helping each other to accomplish communicative effectiveness, and achieving relational goals without having their interactions been judged, nor compared to a NS model, by their teacher.

Furthermore, my data show that, alongside constructing supportive and cooperative communication, the students strive to enhance and to ensure understanding through a variety of communicative strategies, which have been widely reported in ELF studies carried out in contexts different from mine. The students orient to their interlocutors skilfully, deploying self- and other-initiated strategies to make sure that their message has got across and that they have well interpreted their co-participants' message. The use of Check moves, implemented through comprehension checks and confirmation/clarification-seeking procedures, is rather frequent in my data. The participants seem aware of the hybrid nature of ELF; hence they naturally employ any strategic measures that enable them to pre-empt, or to signal, any potential case of non- or mis-understanding. Cogo's (2010: 303) remark, "[m]eaning and understanding in ELF are [...] not taken for granted, but seen by participants as something to be jointly constructed, negotiated and monitored on a turn-by-turn basis", fits beautifully the results of my study.

Most importantly, my findings demonstrate that when school-age English learners turn into ELF users, they put into play their language skills but also themselves as individuals with their own identity, cultural background and experiences. Their mutual supportiveness and cooperation disclose the participants' attentive listenership and effective engagement in the communicative event. The participants convey their highly interactional orientation either through coordinated dances of words, often accompanied by laughter, or through a skilful use of their multilingual repertoire, namely through practices that bring about "affective convergence" (Aston 1993: 228). These findings are also supported by several individual retrospective interviews I conducted at the end of each speech event. During these feedback interviews most students expressed feelings of self-satisfaction and a sense of agency, having been the protagonists of a "new" (*verbatim*) language experience in their learning context.

In short, my work provides compelling evidence for the crucial 'ELF-user' role played by English learners in a pedagogical context. In fact, the school-age ELF users of my study act as skilful *linguagers*, who draw on their verbal and non-verbal repertoire creating meaning and establishing understanding, and as 'rapport builders', who negotiate relational goals leading to satisfactory communication.

To conclude, my study contributes to demonstrate that, regardless of their age and of their learner status, school-age ELF users exploit the language effectively and efficiently to accomplish their communicative and interpersonal goals, and in so doing they attribute legitimacy to their own English. It also highlights the students' communicative capability as successful users of English who appropriate and authenticate this language for their own purposes; they make their talk not only meaningful, but also “‘*normal*’ and, indeed, ‘*ordinary*’” through “their local discursive practices” (Firth 1996: 242, emphasis in original) in their authentic learning context.

6. Pedagogic implications and practical applications

My experimental activity has attempted to set up a scenario where EFL learners naturally assume the role of ELF users in a school setting. The creative and social dimensions of ELF discourse that emerge from the data analysis carry important pedagogic implications for the ELT classroom.

Before delving into the pedagogic implications of my ELF research for the teaching and learning of English, I will attempt to briefly analyse my primary data from the perspective of an ELT teacher who measures the communicative competence of his/her students in relation to the NS regulative norms of use and usage. As an example, an imaginary, traditional ELT teacher might contend that:

The spoken activity is *per se* a valuable means of enhancing speaking and listening skills: learners practise the language they have been taught, making sense of what is being said in a variety of ‘accents’. The activity also allows for on-the-spot lyrics translations from learners’ L1 into English and for interactive word searches: two tasks that do not normally belong to the practice of the EFL classroom. Yet, in this kind of activity – implemented in the absence of a teacher – learners do not show much accuracy, and use the language with much ‘free rein’.

This opinion indeed ignores the cooperative nature of ELF communication and the intercultural dimension of ELF interactions. It also overlooks the participants’ successful communicative achievements and the “speaker/hearer satisfaction” (Kohn 2015: 62) shown by most of them along the speech event³⁵. In short, a teacher following the established Communicative Language Teaching or the TBLT methodological approach would evaluate the success of these spontaneous interactions only in terms of linguistic correctness gauged against standard norms, without taking into account (i) whether the message has effectively got across, or (ii) “the establishing and maintenance of human relationships” (Byram 1997: 32-33). The participants in my study do pursue their communicative ‘enterprise’ successfully, and indeed engage in the practice of enhancing solidarity and rapport. These two accomplishments contribute to the speaker satisfaction – “the ‘perceived success’ [...] resulting from compliance with one’s own requirements of performance” (Kohn 2015: 56) – which, as Kohn (*ibid.*)

³⁵ Indeed, all the students I formally and informally interviewed after the discussion expressed satisfaction for their speaking experience.

explains, “provides guidance and motivation for learning and competence development.”

ELF introduces a new paradigm in the ELT classroom: the global use of English entails a new reconceptualization of the subject and a learner-centred approach. Following Seidlhofer’s claim made over a decade ago and strongly supported by ELF findings available to date,

[i]t may be that what is distinctive about ELF lies in the *communicative strategies* that its speakers use rather than in their conformity to any changed set of language norms” (Seidlhofer 2009: 211, emphasis added),

an ELF-informed pedagogy focuses on the aspects of the language and on the interactional pragmatic strategies that make communication real and effective to all learners, who are already (or will soon be) using ELF in their everyday life. As Sifakis (2019) puts it, “[t]he benefits of linking ELF with the ELT classroom spring from a perception of the English language learner as an efficient user of English in its own right.”

A way to integrate ELF into the ELT classroom is setting up a “pedagogical space” (Kohn 2015: 51) aimed at (i) implementing learning activities informed by ELF research, and (ii) promoting real or virtual encounters where learners use ELF with peers, appropriating and authenticating their own English. Such pedagogical space would enable teachers to turn their focus from the language objective of conforming to NS norms to the process of making meaning – that is to say, to the effective communicative use of the language – thus enhancing the social and interactive aspects of language learning (Pullin 2015: 45). It would also enable learners to learn how *to language* and to creatively appropriate the language for their local contextual uses, feeling comfortable and giving legitimacy to their use of ELF. Additionally, an ELF pedagogical space would offer learners the opportunity to become ELF users, performing authentic interactions – real or virtual ones – with peers from diverse linguacultural backgrounds, in the absence of any explicit ELT orientations and of a teacher, if possible. In this dedicated space learners turn into ELF users, “mak[ing] communicative use of the language they have learnt, and extend[ing] their learning quite naturally as they extend its use” (Seidlhofer 2011: 189). Under these circumstances “‘learning’ is occurring as the interactions are underway”, as Firth

(2009b: 149) maintains. In other words, learners talk their way into learning, improving their communicative capability through ELF: not only by putting to effective use the language they have learnt, but also by enacting communicative strategies and pragmatic behaviours that make their communication intelligible, meaningful and successful.

Thus, the crucial role of teachers in an ELF pedagogical space is to promote the learners' development of such capability. The pathways teachers can follow to help learners become autonomous ELF users in all contexts should entail an authentic learner-centred approach, fostering what learners can actually make of the language (Seidlhofer 2011: 198) without necessarily stigmatizing any linguistic realizations that diverge from NS norms, as long as they do not hinder intelligibility. Hence, teachers' interest should not lie in the forms that learners/ELF users take up in their interactions, but rather in the strategies and the processes that lead to successful communication (Cogo 2010, Seidlhofer 2011).

In an ELF pedagogical space, teachers are facilitators of the learning process; they promote learners' ELF awareness and foster learners' communicative capability through a series of different steps:

- (i) eliciting and discussing the use of English in our global society, engaging learners in critical reflections on language variation and on language ownership;
- (ii) encouraging discussions about the differences between NS-NNS and ELF interactions by prompting personal experiences or drawing on videos selected from the Internet;
- (iii) playing audio-track fragments of ELF interactions where speakers communicate for various purposes in a diversity of contexts (several recordings are available in online ELF corpora such as VOICE and ACE), thus allowing learners to become familiar with various ELF 'accents' and different interactional styles;
- (iv) supplying the transcriptions of ELF interactions (e.g. those available in the VOICE or ACE corpora) to promote noticing and reflective activities on the variety of the communication strategies and the pragmatic behaviours characterizing ELF talk;
- (v) providing learners with the opportunity to interact in ELF with peers speaking different L1s in real or virtual encounters: many Italian pedagogical contexts are

increasingly multilingual and most schools run semester- or year-long international exchange programmes and/or intercultural projects using online platforms, such as eTwinning (see § 2.4.);

- (vi) inviting learners to audio record their interactions for stimulating reflective practices on their own “‘language in its social context’” (Ehrenreich 2018: 45);
- (vii) getting learners to notice the inter- and trans-cultural dimensions of their ELF talk, encouraging them “to become their own ethnographers” (Murray 2012: 323), and to observe how their ELF communication unfolds, fulfilling (or not) their requirements of communicative and communal success (Kohn 2018b, 2020);
- (viii) designing tasks promoting *linguaging* and creativity;
- (ix) developing noticing and reflective activities on interactional pragmatic strategies.

In this teaching/learning scenario teachers should not completely ban the use of L1, to be regarded as beneficial for the development of new knowledge in L2 according to the standard constructivist theory, and also as a natural exploitation of a speaker’s multilingual repertoire according to the ELF paradigm.

In the context of encouraging learners to exploit all the linguistic resources at their disposal in ELF interactions, my findings indicate which pathways teachers should follow to help learners’ communication become more effective and socially engaging. When designing ELF-informed activities aimed at improving meaning negotiation and mutual understanding, teachers should focus (i) on vocabulary and creativity, and (ii) on interactional pragmatic strategies. Most often these two foci are intertwined, as verbal (and non-verbal) choices may turn into pragmatic practices contributing to successful communication; nevertheless, I keep them separated for the purpose of activity design.

Teachers should design vocabulary activities (i) to help learners/ELF users avoid communication breakdowns and/or miscommunication, and (ii) to encourage them to enhance understanding. The participants in my study employ a variety of strategies to cope with lexical gaps: they appeal for assistance resorting to their L1 (e.g. Extract 1.1.12, line 295); they reformulate their utterance replacing the missing word with a similar one (e.g. Extract 1.1.11, lines 287 and 291); and they use synonyms or

circumlocutions, making discourse more transparent (e.g. Extract 2.4.1, lines 994 and 996). The vocabulary issue of one speaker may even turn into a collective matter: something that is handled cooperatively by all co-participants, who jointly construct meaning exploiting the resources available in their linguistic repertoire while building in-group solidarity (e.g. Extract 1.1.10). In view of these findings, teachers could assign a vocabulary activity in the form of a problem to be solved by small groups of learners, who are expected to first work on vocabulary issues such as those found in the extracts above, providing their own solutions, and then listen to the corresponding audio recordings, taking notes of whatever captures their attention. This activity can be followed by a discussion focusing on the efficacy of the measures taken by the speakers for tackling lexical difficulties in naturally occurring ELF interactions. Teachers should encourage learners to reflect on the use of L1, employed for requesting assistance as seen in Extract 1.1.12, and on the variability and hybridity of ELF as “English as a Multilingua Franca”, borrowing Jenkins’s (2015) terminology.

Learners must be trained to prevent miscommunication and to ensure common understanding. A variety of strategies may be enacted to improve clarity and raise explicitness; working on vocabulary can be a crucial start for making learners aware of the salience of lexical choices in an ELF setting. Activities could include, for example, inviting teams of learners to explain the meaning of a word – a noun or a verb – and to supply its synonym(s) and, when possible, its antonym(s). This ability can be improved by a regular use of monolingual and bilingual (online) dictionaries, both in the classroom and at home, and by manually or digitally drawing tables that collect word searches, e.g. a four-column table listing the original word, its meaning, its synonym(s), and its antonym(s). Other measures that facilitate understanding and enhance explicitness are: (i) the insertion of a qualifying lexical item when the speaker’s reference may turn out opaque (e.g. Extract 2.1.1, line 470 [d]); and (ii) the lexical replacement with a more specific term when the original term is too general (e.g. Extract 2.1.1, line 470 [e]). Learners should be aware of the need to be as precise as possible since ELF incorporates what Firth (2009a) calls the “‘lingua franca factor’” – “an inherent diversity of language proficiency, linguistic form, and of sociocultural and pragmatic knowledge” (Firth 2009a: 162); hence the necessity for ELF speakers to spare no effort to enhance clarity.

Playing with collocations and ‘near’ collocations will help learners enrich their discourse and be prepared for coping with the variability of ELF. For instance, small groups of learners may be given a spider diagram template with either a noun or an adjective in the middle, and then be required to complete the diagram with as many suitable lexical items (adjectives or nouns) as possible in a limited span of time. Once the allotted time is over, the groups discuss the contexts where the combinations ‘noun + adjective’ are most appropriate, answering such questions as: In which situation might collocation X, Y, or Z be used? By whom? To whom? etc. In so doing, learners are sensitized to context-dependent lexical choices, and authenticate these collocations (Widdowson 1978: 80-81).

Another vocabulary task that can help learners enhance explicitness and make speech more accessible focuses on hyponyms, i.e. more specific words than the general terms that include them. Learners may be invited to work on word categories: after drawing the trunk of a tree containing a superordinate (e.g. the word “flower”), they add as many branches as the number of hyponyms they can think of (e.g. “rose”, “daffodil”). Such an activity has a twofold objective: (i) boosting learners’ word-stock, and (ii) making learners reflect on the necessity to be as precise as possible to prevent miscommunication.

An additional activity that teachers may design to encourage learners *to language* and to facilitate mutual comprehension revolves around paraphrase. Small groups of learners may be presented with a short segment of speech, and be invited to paraphrase it using different (and, if possible, more impactful) words. The activity may be designed as a contest supervised by a jury of peers who evaluate the communicative strength of the paraphrase. This vocabulary task allows learners to ‘play’ with English, trying out manifold intelligible word combinations, thereby developing their capability for *language*. Such vocabulary activities not only improve learners’ lexical knowledge, but also heighten learners’ awareness of the importance of clarity and redundancy in ELF-mediated communication.

My data also contain evidence of linguistic creativity, a feature that does not hamper communication but rather makes it more fluent. The participants in my study

confidently use words and idioms in a creative fashion (e.g. *catalanian* in line 963³⁶; *now or later* in Extract 2.4.3, line 1065), contributing to the smooth unfolding of the talk. From a SLA perspective, learners' creative constructions are to be seen as errors; yet, as Seidlhofer (2011: 186) contends, quite often "learners' non-conformities are to be categorized not as errors but as evidence of successful learning." The above examples reveal the speakers' ability to use suffixes for constructing nationality adjectives (*catalanian*), and to modify a conventional idiom for stressing an urgency (*now or later*). Teachers should acknowledge what learners make of the language they have learnt (Widdowson 2012a), and should focus on the pragmatic strategies that motivate the use of such non-conformities in ELF discourse. As Pitzl (2018a: 240) remarks, "[language teachers] should take care not to overlook the creativity that is inherent in many so-called 'errors'." Indeed, teachers should positively evaluate creativity, encouraging learners' self-confidence in ELF.

The exploitation of overt metaphors, i.e. similes, can boost learners' creativity and playfulness in the ELF pedagogical space. Learners may be assigned the task to search for similes in their own L1 (knowing that there will be more than one L1 in the increasingly multilingual classes in Italy), or in any other language they know, and to compare them with the corresponding English ones. Such activity should arouse the learners' interest in the different realizations of similes in different linguacultures. After comparing and discussing similes belonging to diverse linguacultural backgrounds, learners create their own similes using, for instance, realistic and stimulating cues like "as unlucky as", "as funny as", or "as envious as". In a follow-up activity, learners could be invited to imagine by and to whom, where and when their creative similes might be addressed and used. In so doing, learners exploit the potential of the language, and gradually become aware of the contextual uses and of the sociopragmatic dimension of their linguistic choices.

ELF creativity in idioms and metaphors has been extensively investigated in the VOICE corpus by Pitzl (2009, 2011, 2012, 2018a, 2018c); the instances the researcher describes in great detail are creative in forms and meanings, thus they could very well be used for designing in-class activities. Small groups of learners may be assigned the

³⁶ See Appendix 3.

task to compare some VOICE idioms having plurilingual connections with the conventional ones, and to reflect on the impact that a creative use of the language might have in both ELF and NS-NNS interactions. The purpose of using idioms with plurilingual connections is to sensitize learners to the cultural aspect that a language – any language – conveys and to make them reflect on the intercultural dimension of ELF. Following Pitzl (2018a: 246), learners could be asked to imagine a situation in which such creative expressions might have been produced, responding to contextualizing wh-questions (Who? To whom? Where? When? Why?). Additionally, at the end of the activity teachers provide the contextual information about the actual use of the VOICE idioms, and prompt further discussion. In a follow-up activity, pairs of learners could first be given a card with an L1 idiom on it, then assigned the task of creating their own English version of the idiom, and finally asked to incorporate their creative version in a short dialogue. In the subsequent in-class rehearsal learners appropriate and authenticate their original idioms, attempting to “trust their ordinary creativity as *emancipated* agents” (Kohn 2020, emphasis in original). As Pitzl (2018a: 241) points out, an ELF pedagogical space where “learners are invited to be intentionally creative in language use gives learners agency, authority and ownership of language and allows for playfulness.”

Activities promoting and developing the negotiation of meaning and understanding through lexical and creative practices are to be complemented with noticing and reflective activities on the interactional pragmatic strategies that help learners accomplish successful communication in ELF. Along with language awareness, ELF-informed teachers should enhance communication awareness through activities that “activate the strategic processes making communicative use of linguistic resources” (Seidlhofer 2015: 27). The findings of my study support ELF scholars’ claim that ELF users share responsibility for arriving at shared understanding, employing effective strategies to make themselves understood and to achieve understanding.

Teachers could present learners with ELF naturally occurring interactions, e.g. excerpts from the transcriptions presented in this work, and guide them to notice the communication strategies implemented by the participants when they are not sure of having made themselves understood, or of their full understanding of the unfolding talk. Learners may subsequently be invited to reflect on the use of comprehension (e.g.

Extract 2.3.1, line 785; Extract 2.4.1, line 994), confirmatory (e.g. Extract 2.3.3, line 854), and clarification checks (e.g. Extract 1.2.1, line 336; Extract 3.1.1, line 1287) and on their functions. Reflective activities on comprehension checks followed by self-rephrase, as those reported in the extracts above, make learners aware of the interactional pragmatic use of the language and of the listener-oriented attitude displayed by ELF speakers; not only do they monitor the intelligibility of their speech, but also reformulate it to make sure their message gets across. Bearing in mind House's (2012: 202) advice: "Never assume that others understand you", learners should also be prepared to carefully monitor their own talk for implicit signs of non-/mis-understanding – interrogative expressions, lack of uptake, or incongruous responses – on the part of their interlocutors, and be ready to employ self-repetition, or self-rephrase in an ongoing turn in order to pre-empt non-/mis-understanding, or to maintain the communication channel open (e.g. Extract 2.4.4, line 1091). Teachers may also address the way in which ELF speakers implement clarification requests to secure understanding. Instead of much longer 'classroom-like' questions (e.g. "can you repeat that?"), the participants in my study signal difficulty in understanding using either short repair initiators (e.g. *what?*, *haeh?*), or question repeats (e.g. *is really?*, *like a?*). Both of these choices appear highly effective. The latter, in particular, conveys an explicit engagement in the discussion: by partially repeating the speaker's utterance, the co-participant shows his/her attentiveness and his/her willingness to take part in the talk. Additionally, my data show that code-switching is another useful practice for requesting clarification, especially when the language chosen to switch to is shared by two or more participants in the discussion.

In an ELF pedagogical space, code-switching must be seen as a powerful interactional pragmatic resource that ELF users exploit to accommodate and negotiate meaning, along with building comity. ELF-oriented teachers should encourage the practice of switching to L1, or to any other language two or more learners are familiar with. In so doing learners/ELF speakers may resort to the 'Multilingual Resource Pool' of the class, thus developing their own multi-linguacultural identity. In an ELF setting, individual linguacultural attitudes are preserved, and teachers let learners express them, fostering reflection on cultural diversity and promoting accommodation.

Another pragmatic aspect of ELF talk that teachers should introduce through noticing activities in an ELF space is the interactional management of discourse, which entails reflecting on discourse skills (Cogo and House 2018: 215). Learners may be invited to listen to authentic ELF interactions (e.g. recordings available from any ELF corpora or YouTube videos of ELF speakers), and to identify those discourse markers that facilitate talk and easily engage co-participants in the conversation or discussion. My data exemplify two discourse markers that school-age ELF users employ extensively: *yeah* and *so* (see Extract 2.2.1, lines 597-601). These are self-supportive elements: *yeah* not only signals uptake, but also helps the speaker to structure his/her moves, while *so* propels the speaker to resume his/her thoughts and move on (House 2012). House (2012: 195-196) maintains that both self-supporting strategies are useful gambits in ELF talk, and suggests they should be taught to and practised by learners/users of ELF.

Activities like the ones described above are meant to empower learners/ELF users, encouraging them to make meaning, creatively exploiting the virtual language and their IMR, and to explore and practise communication strategies and pragmatic discourse markers. Additionally, my findings suggest that such vocabulary activities as those focusing on paraphrase help learners not only to enhance comprehension and communicative effectiveness, but also to create a strong sense of comity, particularly among school-age ELF users. Teachers should prompt learners to convey their intended message at all costs, and to strive for shared understanding, avoiding – whenever possible – the ‘let-it-pass’ tactics. Having learnt how *to language* and how to accomplish understanding in ELF-mediated communication, learners truly turn into autonomous and confident users of ELF, who use English for their communicative and relational goals in and on their own terms.

ELF-aware teachers who incorporate an ELF pedagogical space in their ELT classroom translate their understanding of ELF into learner-centred activities, focusing on the learners’ strategic capability for cooperatively constructing meaning and negotiating understanding, and, as importantly, on the learners’ speaker satisfaction. In so doing, they encourage learners – current or future ELF speakers – to thoroughly explore the language, using it effectively in a variety of sociolinguistic contexts, and to feel legitimate and competent ELF communicators. Integrating ELF into the ELT

classroom means that teachers recognize that “it is the use of ELF that corresponds more closely to what is real for learners” (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2018: 30); hence, their role is to guide learners to accommodate and negotiate culture-bound meanings between diverse ELF variations in contact: in short, to promote ELF communicative competence.

7. Conclusions

7.1. Concluding remarks

This study set out to explore the dynamics of spoken ELF interactions among English learners of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in their authentic learning context, in the absence of a teacher and therefore without the usual constraints of the ELT classroom. The purpose of my research was to examine the cognitive and communicative processes that school-age learners activate in accommodating and negotiating meanings through ELF variations that reflect their own different native linguacultural schemata. The ultimate goal of this study was to devise guidelines for developing cognitive-experiential practices that enhance ELF communicative competence in the ELT classroom. As such, these guidelines may be of use for a variety of stakeholders, ranging from language policy makers, course book designers, upper-secondary school teachers, and teacher educators.

My findings reveal that – contrary to a common belief – most school-age ELF users are competent communicators, who orient to their interlocutors accommodating the possibilities for achieving shared understanding while accomplishing social interactional goals. The participants in my study are legitimate and independent users of English: they appropriate and authenticate the language for their own communicative and relational purposes, showing that the teacher is not crucial to successfully carry out the assigned oral task. All participants, feeling equally responsible for the management and the success of their interactional endeavour, exhibit robust cooperativeness at any time of the talk; not only when they are constructing meaning through utterance completions or performing word searches, but also – even more importantly to them – when creating humorous moments or building empathetic solidarity. In all my case studies the participants display their mutual supportiveness through a variety of practices – backchannelling, repetition, paraphrasing, joint utterance completions, and (collective) laughter – unveiling their disposition to alignment and affiliation.

These findings are broadly in agreement with the results obtained by researchers such as Mauranten (2006), Cogo (2009), Kaur (2010, 2011), and Björkman (2014), who investigated adults' spoken ELF interactions in either academic or higher education institutions. The target of these scholars was indeed quite different from that of my

work, where I focused on teenagers and on the upper-secondary school setting. Nevertheless, my data reveal some of the pragmatic strategies for pre-empting non-understanding and of the self-repair practices for enhancing explicitness that are described in those studies.

More specifically, and similarly to Cogo's (2009), my findings highlight the implementation of accommodation strategies such as other-repetition, used to signal active engagement in the unfolding talk along with mutual supportiveness, and code-switching, used to build rapport and establish a sense of in-group belonging. Unlike the studies mentioned above, however, the participants in my research also resort to onomatopoeic sounds, which allows them to increase the strength of their message and add a playful nuance to their talk. Additionally, they appear to 'play' with the language so as to create a friendly and communal atmosphere: they either elongate the sound of a word, collectively performing utterance completions, or adeptly modulate their voice in a joking fashion when addressing their co-participants.

7.1.1. Limitations of the study and open questions

The evidence from this study suggests that English school-age learners can turn into fluent, legitimate users of ELF when they are neither constrained by ENL requirements, nor by the presence of a teacher. Under these circumstances their use of ELF is generally not different from that of adult ELF speakers (e.g. academic people, language teachers, and university students, whose ELF interactions are investigated in the studies above). The process of *linguaging* – i.e. how to exploit the potential in the language for negotiating meaning and jointly constructing understanding (Seidlhofer 2011) – that learners activate in an ELF context enables them to simultaneously use and learn the language while successfully meeting their communicative goals. The spoken activity designed and implemented in my study has engaged the participants in a discussion on a topic that is most stimulating for teenagers, but also challenging; a cognitive-experiential activity that teachers may replicate in the ELT classroom to enhance communicative competence in ELF.

However, the results of my study do not necessarily imply that all English learners/ELF users under similar conditions may be able to employ the interactional pragmatic strategies described in this work, hence achieving satisfactory

communication. Low-proficiency learners/ELF users who have difficulties in making themselves understood might often resort to message abandonment and to the ‘let-it pass’ tactics; thus, their teachers should guide them to start reflecting on and using requests for confirmation, repetition or clarification, as well as strategic resources for modifying unclear responses (see Sato *et al.* 2019).

My analysis explored the unfolding of moves and the interactional pragmatic strategies that school-age English learners/ELF users implement to successfully accomplish their communicative and social goals in the absence of a teacher. Yet, it is unfortunate that the study did not include a thorough investigation of interpersonal positioning (Widdowson 2012c) as some participants in the spoken activity took up more than one role apart that of ELF speaker among peers. According to the assigned task, each group was meant to select a single meaningful song, and at times one or two participants in the same group acted out the part of the person in charge of the activity, sparing no effort to keep the communication channel open and to get to a shared agreement. Only occasionally my investigation contains reflections concerning speakers who take up a leading role with respect to their peers.

Although the spoken activity was designed to set learners/ELF users free from any ELT constraints, both the setting – a classroom or a multimedia room – and my presence might have had an impact on the output of their communication. Some learners might have felt inhibited by the educational environment and, accordingly, provided fewer contributions to the unfolding talk. Conversely, some learners overtly displayed their sensitivity to the formal correctness and to the lexical accuracy expected in an ELT classroom, for example in Case study 1. As I suggested earlier, my double role as an analyst and a former English teacher in their school might have caused them to be concerned with their correct morphosyntactic and vocabulary choices. Measuring the impact of latent (or even patent) ENL requirements on the learners’ communicative effectiveness in ELF was not meant to be a goal of my study; yet this is a question that would require further investigation.

The forced choice of audio recording rather than video recording the speech events – mostly due to the difficulty in the implementation of video sessions and in obtaining the necessary ethical clearance – may have reduced the depth of my data

analysis. The interpretation of some moves could have been corroborated by non-verbal signals that are well captured by the video camera, such as eye gaze, facial expressions, and gesture. Furthermore, the inherent nature of Transient International Groups did not allow me to adopt triangulation for validating my data transcriptions and interpretations. As I could not play their own audio recording to all participants in my study, who met for the spoken activity on a random basis, I did not have the chance to ask them to clarify ambiguous words, or to explain their moves through a retrospective protocol. Triangulating my data would have helped me reduce the potential for interpretive errors and would have afforded further insights into the speech events. In fact, a problem arose during the transcription and interpretation of the stand-alone phoneme /wi/³⁷, uttered by an Italian participant³⁸ in response to a Question move, and followed by the chuckle of a co-participant. I transcribed it into the French response token *oui* instead of the more obvious English personal pronoun “we”, relying on the multilingual and intercultural setting and on the playful atmosphere created by the group, whose speakers had previously shown a great interest in modern foreign languages (e.g. differences between Catalan and Spanish, Arabic words in Spanish). The triangulation would have clarified what the participant had meant by uttering /wi/, and possibly the reasons for his choice, validating or rejecting my transcription and interpretation of his move.

In spite of its limitations, the study certainly adds to our understanding of the communicative strategies enacted by learners/ELF users in their authentic learning environment, trusting their capability for *linguaging* – “getting somewhere against all the odds” (Phipps 2006: 1) – and making communication a real interactional endeavour.

7.1.2. Suggestions for future research

My empirical investigation of naturally occurring ELF interactions in the under-researched educational setting affords significant insights into school-age ELF users’ discourse, illuminating how they use English for their transactional and interactional purposes. I maintain that ELF-aware teachers and teacher educators should draw on real data collected in the learners’ authentic learning setting, and that further work is

³⁷ See Appendix 3, line 895.

³⁸ Italian speakers of English do not generally discriminate between long and short vowels.

needed to explore the crucial strategic use of ELF talk. This new effort should ideally be carried out along the same lines as those presented here, replicating the format of the empirical research of this thesis.

As I have already suggested, investigation into spoken activities conducted with low-proficiency learners might well complement the results of my study, and support strong recommendations for incorporating reflective practices on the strategies deployed in successful intercultural communication within an ELF integrated approach to ELT.

Another promising avenue for further exploring the repertoire of such strategies would be enquiring into school-age ELF users' discourse beyond the school walls. Further enquiry into casual 'debates' occurring outside the classroom would be of great help in identifying the meaning-making and meaning-negotiation processes that need noticing and reflective practices in the ELT classroom. The more empirical data we collect and analyse, the more pathways teachers can follow to help learners turn into successful and confident ELF users.

Adopting a multimodal approach to collecting data, and directing a greater focus on the non-verbal interactional resources (e.g. gesture, eye gaze, body posture) school-age ELF users exploit to interact (and make communication more meaningful to them) could produce interesting evidence of their individual involvement and mutual supportiveness along their shared communicative 'enterprise'. As Kimura and Canagarajah (2018: 302) contend, human communication entails an array of semiotic resources – not just words – that collectively afford “a more holistic understanding of the dynamics of ELF interactions.” Thus, multimodality in interaction would help researchers take into account verbal as well as embodied actions in the exploration of meaning-making processes and of social behaviour.

7.2. Autobiographical reflection

Undertaking this research study after having spent a long time away from the academia has been quite a challenging, yet invaluable experience. My journey into research has been fascinating, but also full of bumps and hurdles; clearing the road has sometimes been frustrating, even exhausting, although it has been highly stimulating and

rewarding at other times. The desire for breathing new life into my teaching routine has accompanied me all along my teaching career and has fuelled this uneven journey.

It all started in Spring 2017, when as an upper-secondary school English teacher I attended two rather engaging events: an ‘outside-the-box’ presentation on ELF pronunciation given by Robin Walker³⁹ at the Oxford National Conference 2017 in Rome, and an inspiring ELF International Symposium⁴⁰ held at Sapienza University of Rome. Unexpectedly, these two events were the trigger for my doctoral study on ELF in the teaching and learning context. In the following month of July, I applied for an international PhD programme in English Linguistics run in co-tutelle by the University of Salento, definitely a hub for ELF studies in Italy, and the University of Vienna, where the very first ELF corpus (VOICE) was compiled. I submitted a project that was eventually approved in September, ultimately leading to the elaboration of this thesis. Starting in the following month of November, I was granted a three-year study leave by the Italian Ministry of Education: my extraordinary journey as a ‘mature’ PhD student had officially begun, and my daily routine was bound to change quite drastically.

Being myself an English teacher, my research has primarily shed light on the motives of my discomfort at teaching Standard English and measuring competence against NS-based norms to my students: intermediate-proficiency learners who were invariably struggling for morphosyntactic correctness and lexical accuracy, and who inevitably felt frustrated for not fulfilling native norms. Over the past ten-odd years my mindset towards learners’ needs and expectations has gradually changed. The study I proposed for my doctoral thesis has accompanied this evolving view, demonstrating that learners must be given opportunities to use the language and freely express their personality; in their turn, teachers must strive to develop learners’ capability for putting the language into effective use (Seidlhofer 2011).

Addressing key constructs, such as lingua franca English, sociolinguistic variation, virtual language, communicative capability, and intersubjectivity, along with

³⁹ R. Walker, “Make No Mistake: Correcting Errors in the ELT Classroom”, Oxford National Conference 2017, Rome, 8 March 2017.

⁴⁰ “English Lingua Franca: expanding scenarios and growing dilemmas” International Symposium, Sapienza University, Rome, 6-7 April 2017.

adopting an unbiased data analysis framework (CA), has been extremely fruitful for my research and for my professional growth. The growing awareness of ELF as the *status quo* of today's English communication in the global arena – i.e. “*variety* rather than *a variety* [of English]” (Baker 2011: 201, emphasis in original) – and of its crucial pedagogic implications for the ELT classroom has deeply modified my teaching attitude, and has ultimately prompted me to introduce important changes to my future teaching practice.

Getting to grips with authentic (non-elicited) ELF spoken interactions in a pedagogical context has been illuminating. Motivated school-age learners/users of ELF use English on and in their own terms: not only for the transactional accomplishment of a shared goal, but also – and more importantly – for interactional socialization, often showing their speaker satisfaction. The empathetic speaker learner, who ‘plays’ with the language for establishing rapport and creating a supportive and solidary atmosphere, and who is generally overlooked in the ELT classroom, has made me reflect on learning and teaching priorities. While working on my thesis, I have come to take a positive stance on what learners can make of the language (rather than on what they cannot), and I have revisited the role of teachers, whom I regard as mediators or facilitators⁴¹ encouraging learners to express their identity, cultural background, and experiences through the language.

Furthermore, I have questioned my approach to oral skills. In particular, I have begun to reflect on how much attention I pay to the interactional pragmatic strategies learners deploy to accommodate and negotiate meaning in (intercultural) group discussions, and on how much I value the learners’ use of verbal and non-verbal resources for achieving social goals, or, in other words, how much I appraise the affective dimension of (intercultural) interactions.

This research study has definitely empowered me as an English teacher in the Italian state-run school establishment. It has stirred up new enthusiasm for a fresh teaching start: adopting a more flexible attitude to the English subject will allow me to have more leeway to cater for my students’ actual needs. Through an ELF pedagogical

⁴¹ See Llurda (2018) on the role of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) as mediators and facilitators, rather than custodians of the language.

space, I will be able to implement the teaching resolutions made along this three-year work: (i) addressing the sociocultural dimension of the language and, more specifically, homing in on the different linguacultural schemata reflected in ELF speakers' communication; (ii) designing creative tasks – both oral and written ones – that develop learners' self-confidence and foster their own speaker satisfaction; (iii) engaging learners in noticing and reflective activities on the strategic use of English in intercultural communication; and (iv) resorting to intercultural exchange programmes (e.g. Erasmus+) or telecollaboration projects (e.g. via eTwinning), and to the presence of the multilingual students who increasingly attend our schools for activities aimed to turn learners into competent ELF users. I am confident that this twist in my future teaching practice will make me feel more comfortable as a teacher, and will indeed help my future students feel legitimate and effective users of English.

References

- ACE, (2020), *The Asian Corpus of English*. Director: Andy Kirkpatrick, <https://corpus.eduhk.hk/ace/index.html> (21 May 2020).
- Alptekin, C. (2010), "Redefining multicompetence for bilingualism and ELF", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 95-110.
- Aston, G. (1988), *Learning comity: An approach to the description and pedagogy of interactional speech*, Bologna, Cooperativa Libreria Universitaria Editrice.
- Aston, G. (1993), "Notes on the Interlanguage of Comity". In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, New York, Oxford University Press, 224-250.
- Azuaga, L., Cavaleiro, L. (2015), "Bringing new ELT policies and ELF to teacher training courses". In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (eds.), *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 103-120.
- Bachman, L.F., Palmer, A.S. (1996), *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Baker, W. (2011), "Intercultural awareness: modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca", *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 197-214.
- Baker, W. (2015), *Culture and Identity through English as a Lingua Franca: Rethinking Concepts and Goals in Intercultural Communication*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.
- Baker, W. (2018), "English as a lingua franca and intercultural communication". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 25-36.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. In M. Holquist (ed.), Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000), *Liquid modernity*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2005), *Liquid life*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bayyurt, Y., Sifakis, N.C. (2015a), "ELF-aware In-Service Teacher Education: A Transformative Perspective". In H. Bowles and A. Cogo (eds.), *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 117-135.

- Bayyurt, Y., Sifakis N.C. (2015b), "Developing an ELF-Aware Pedagogy: Insights from a Self-Education Programme". In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 55-76.
- Benson, P., Reinders, H. (2011), *Beyond the Language Classroom: The Theory and Practice of Informal Language Learning and Teaching*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Björkman, B. (2013), *English as an Academic Lingua Franca: An Investigation of Form and Communicative Effectiveness*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.
- Björkman, B. (2014), "An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 66, 122-138.
- Blair, A. (2015), "Evolving a post-native, multilingual model for ELF-aware teacher education". In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (eds.), *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 89-101.
- Böhringer, H. (2007), "The Sound of Silence: Silent and Filled pauses in English as a Lingua Franca Business Interaction", Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vienna.
- Boomer, D.S. (1965), "Hesitation and Grammatical Encoding", *Language and Speech*, 8, 148-158.
- Bozzo, L. (2015), "Which English(es) to Teach? Empowering EFL Trainee Teachers to Make their Choices". In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 103-128.
- Brandt, A., Mortensen, K. (2016), "Conversation Analysis". In Z. Hua (ed.), *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide*, Hoboken, N.J., Wiley-Blackwell, 297-310.
- Breiteneder, A., Pitzl, M.-L., Majewski, S., Klimpfinger, T. (2006), "VOICE Recording – Methodological Challenges in the Compilation of a Corpus of Spoken ELF", *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 161-188.
- Bremer, K., Roberts, C., Vasseur, M.-T., Simonot, M., Broeder, P. (1996), *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters*, London, Longman.
- Brody, J. (1994), "Multiple Repetitions in Tojolab'al Conversation". In B. Johnstone (ed.), *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Vol. 2*, Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 3-14.

- Brown, G., Yule, G. (1983), *Teaching the Spoken Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Brunner, M.-L., Diemer, S. (2018), “‘You are struggling forwards, and you don’t know, and then you... you do code-switching...’ – Code-switching in ELF Skype conversations”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 59-88.
- Byram, M. (1997), *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Cameron, D. (2001), *Working with Spoken Discourse*, London, Sage.
- Canale, M. (1983), “From communicative competence to language pedagogy”. In J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt (eds.), *Language and Communication*, London, Longman, 2-27.
- Canale, M., Swain, M. (1980), “Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing”, *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Cavalheiro, L. (2016), “Developing Intercultural Awareness and Communication in Teacher Education Programs”. In L. Lopriore and E. Grazzi (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*, Rome, Roma TrE-Press, 149-165.
- Cazden, C.B. (1996), “Communicative Competence, 1966-1996”. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics*, (18th), Chicago, IL, 23-26 March 1996, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED399764.pdf> (12 March 2019).
- Chiaruttini, D. (2020), “A study of cognitive-experiential practices for promoting ELF communicative competence in Italian ELT classrooms”, *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 38 (Special Issue), 387-406.
- Chomsky, N. (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Coates, J. (1997), “The Construction of a Collaborative Floor in Women’s Friendly Talk”. In T. Givon (ed.), *Conversation: Cognitive Communicative and Social Perspectives*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 55-89.
- Cogo, A. (2007), “Intercultural Communication in English as a Lingua Franca: A Case Study”, PhD thesis, King’s College London.
- Cogo, A. (2009), “Accommodating Difference in ELF Conversations: A Study of Pragmatic Strategies”. In A. Mauraanen and E. Ranta (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 254-273.

- Cogo, A. (2010), "Strategic Use and Perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca", *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 46(3), 295-312.
- Cogo, A. (2012), "ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2), 287-313.
- Cogo, A. (2015), "English as a Lingua Franca: Description, Domains and Applications". In H. Bowles and A. Cogo (eds.), *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 1-12.
- Cogo, A. (2016), "'They All Take the Risk and Make the Effort': Intercultural Accommodation and Multilingualism in a BELF Community of Practice". In L. Lopriore and E. Grazzi (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*, Rome, Roma TrE-Press, 365-383.
- Cogo, A. (2018), "ELF and multilingualism". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 357-368.
- Cogo A., Dewey M. (2006), "Efficiency in ELF Communication: From Pragmatic Motives to Lexico-grammatical Innovation", *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, (5)2, 58-93.
- Cogo, A., Dewey, M. (2012), *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-driven Investigation*, London, Continuum.
- Cogo, A., Pitzl, M.-L. (2016), "Pre-empting and signalling non-understanding in ELF", *ELT Journal*, 70(3), 339-345.
- Cogo, A., House, J. (2018), "The pragmatics of ELF". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 210-223.
- Cook, V. (ed.) (2002), *Portraits of the L2 User*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Coulthard, M., Brazil, D.C. (1992), "Exchange Structure". In M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*, London, Routledge, 50-78.
- Coulthard, M., Montgomery, M. (1981), "The Structure of Monologue". In M. Coulthard and M. Montgomery (eds.), *Studies in Discourse Analysis*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 30-39.
- Council of Europe (2001), *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Crystal, D. (2008), "Two thousand million?", *English Today*, 24(1), 3-6.
- Dewey, M. (2011), "Accommodative ELF Talk and Teacher Knowledge". In A. Archibald, A. Cogo and J. Jenkins (eds.), *Latest Trends in ELF Research*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 205-227.
- Dewey, M. (2012), "Towards a post-normative approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), 141-170.
- Dewey, M. (2014), "Pedagogic criticality and English as a Lingua Franca", *Atlantis. Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies (AEDEAN)*, 36(2), 11-30.
- Dewey, M. (2015a), "Time to wake up some dogs! Shifting the culture of language in ELT". In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (eds.), *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 121-134.
- Dewey, M. (2015b), "ELF, Teacher Knowledge and Professional Development". In H. Bowles and A. Cogo (eds.), *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*, Basingtoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 176-193.
- Dewey, M. (2018), "Changing the task: Developing an ELF approach to 'focus on form'". In N.C. Sifakis, L. Lopriore, M. Dewey, Y. Bayyurt, P. Vettorel, L. Cavaleiro, D.S.P. Siqueira and S. Kordia, "ELF-awareness in ELT: Bringing together theory and practice", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 167-173.
- Dörnyei, Z., Scott, M.L. (1997), "Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies", *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173-210.
- Dragojevic, M., Gasiorrek, J., Giles, H. (2016), "Accommodative Strategies as Core of the Theory". In H. Giles (eds.), *Communication Accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities across Contexts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 36-59.
- Drew, P. (1997), "'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 69-101.
- Duranti, A. (1997), *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrenreich, S. (2009), "English as a Lingua Franca in Multinational Corporations – Exploring Business Communities of Practice". In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 126-151.

- Ehrenreich, S. (2018), "Communities of practice and English as a lingua franca". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 37-50.
- ELFA (2008), *The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings*.
Director: Anna Mauranen, <http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/> (21 May 2020).
- Ellis, R. (2000), "Task-based research and language pedagogy", *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 193-220.
- Ellis, R. (2003), *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Shintani, N. (2014), *Exploring Language Pedagogy Through Second Language Acquisition Research*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Finders, M. (1997), *Just Girls: Hidden Literacies and Life in Junior High*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- 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, 237-59.
- Firth, A. (2009a), "The *lingua franca* factor", *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 147-170.
- Firth, A. (2009b), "Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA", *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1), 127-156.
- Firth, A. (2012), "Conversation Analysis and Lingua Franca". In C.A. Chapelle (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1043-1047.
- Firth, A., Wagner, J. (1997), "On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research", *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285-300.
- Firth, J.R. (1957), *Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951*, London, Oxford University Press.
- Firth, J.R. (1964), *The Tongues of Men and Speech*, London, Oxford University Press.
- Fox, B. et al. (2009), "A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair". In J. Sidnell (ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 60-103.
- Fox Tree, J.E., Schrock, J.C. (2002), "Basic meanings of *you know* and *I mean*", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(6), 727-747.

- Franceschi, V. (2019), "Enhancing explicitness in BELF interactions: self-initiated communication strategies in the workplace", *Iperstoria*, 13, 59-71.
- García, O., Wei, L. (2014), *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gardner, R. (2001), *When Listeners Talk: Response tokens and listener stance*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Gardner, R., Wagner, J. (eds.) (2004), *Second Language Conversations*, London and New York, Continuum.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967), *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Gasiorek, J., Giles, H., Soliz, J. (2015), "Accommodating new vistas", *Language and Communication*, 41(1), 1-5.
- Giles, H., (1973), "Accent Mobility: A Model and Some Data", *Anthropological Linguistics*, 15, 87-105.
- Giles, H., Coupland, N., Coupland, J. (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, 1-68.
- Gimenez, T., Calvo, L.C.S., El Kadri, M.S. (2015), "Beyond Madonna: teaching materials as windows into pre-service teachers' understanding of ELF". In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (eds.), *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 225-238.
- Godwin, C. (1981), *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*, New York, Academic Press.
- Grazzi, E. (2015), "Linking ELF and ELT in Secondary School through Web-Mediation: The Case of Fanfiction". In H. Bowles and A. Cogo (eds.), *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 55-71.
- Grazzi, E. (2016), "Network-based language teaching and ELF". In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios and M. Ilkos (eds.), *ELF: Pedagogical and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Athens, Deree – The American College of Greece, 16-24.
- Gu, Q. (2009), "Editorial", *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(3), 139-143.
- Guido, M.G. (2004), *Mediating Cultures: A Cognitive Approach to English Discourse*

- for the Social Sciences*, Milano, LED, Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia e Diritto.
- Guido, M.G. (2008), *English as a Lingua Franca in Cross-cultural Immigration Domains*, Bern, Peter Lang.
- Guido, M.G. (2012), “ELF authentication and accommodation strategies in crosscultural immigration encounters”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(2), 219-240.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982), *Discourse Strategies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J., Hymes, D. (eds.) (1964), “The Ethnography of Communication”, *American Anthropologist*, 66(6) II (Special Issue).
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1975), *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language*, London, Edward Arnold.
- Heritage, J. (1984), “A Change-of-State Token and Aspects of its Sequential Placement”. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 299-345.
- Heritage, J., Watson, R. (1979), “Formulations as Conversational Objects”. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, New York, Irvington, 123-62.
- Hester, S., Francis, D. (2004), *An Invitation to Ethnomethodology: Language, Society and Interaction*, London, Sage.
- Holliday, A. (2005), *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2011), *Intercultural Communication and Ideology*, London, Sage.
- House, J. (2012), “Teaching Oral Skills in English as a Lingua Franca”. In L. Alsagoff, S.L. McKay, G. Hu and W.A. Renadya (eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language*, New York and London, Routledge, 186-205.
- Housen, A., Kuiken, F., Vedder, I. (2012), “Complexity, accuracy and fluency: Definitions, measurement and research”. In A. Housen, F. Kuiken and I. Vedder (eds.), *Dimensions of L2 Performance and Proficiency: Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency in SLA*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1-20.
- Hülmbauer, C. (2009), “‘We don’t take the right way. We just take the way that we think you will understand’ – The Shifting Relationship between Correctness and

- Effectiveness in ELF". In A. Mauranen, and E. Ranta (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 323-347.
- Hülbauer, C., Böringer, H., Seidlhofer, B. (2008), "Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication", *Synergies Europe*, 3, 25-36.
- Hutchby, I., Wooffitt, R. (1998), *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972), "On Communicative Competence". In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, Baltimore, USA, Penguin Education, Penguin Books Ltd., 269-293.
- Jefferson, G. (1987), "On exposed and embedded correction in conversation". In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and Social Organization*, Philadelphia, Multilingual Matters, 86-100.
- Jenkins, J. (2005), "ELF at the gate: the position of English as a Lingua Franca", *Humanising Language Teaching*, 7(2), <http://old.hltmag.co.uk/mar05/idea.htm> (21 May 2020).
- Jenkins, J. (2006), "Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca", *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157-181.
- Jenkins, J. (2007), *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2012), "English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom", *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486-494.
- Jenkins, J. (2015), "Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca", *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., Dewey, M. (2011), "Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca", *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281-315.
- Jenks, C.J. (2012), "Doing Being Reprehensive: Some Interactional Features of English as a Lingua Franca in a Chat Room", *Applied Linguistics*, 33(4), 386-405.
- Johnstone, B. et al. (1994), "Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue". In B. Johnstone (ed.), *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Vol. 1*, Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1-20.

- Jucker, A.H., Smith, S.W. (1998), “And people just you know like ‘wow’: Discourse Markers as Negotiating Strategies”. In A.H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and theory*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 171-201.
- Kalocsai, K. (2009), “Erasmus exchange students: A behind-the-scene view into an ELF community of practice”, *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 3(1), 25-49.
- Kalocsai, K. (2014), *Communities of Practice and English as a Lingua Franca: A Study of Erasmus Students in a Central European Context*, Berlin and Boston, De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kasper G., Wagner, J. (2014), “Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics”, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 1-42.
- Kaur, J. (2009), “Pre-Empting Problems of Understanding in English as a Lingua Franca”. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta, E. (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 107-123.
- Kaur, J. (2010), “Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes”, *World Englishes*, 29(2), 192-208.
- Kaur, J. (2011), “Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2704-2715.
- Kaur, J. (2012), “Saying it again: Enhancing clarity in English as a lingua franca (ELF) talk through self-repetition”, *Text and Talk*, 32(5), 593-613.
- Kaur, J. (2015), “Using pragmatic strategies for effective ELF communication: Relevance to classroom practice”. In K. Murata (ed.), *Exploring ELF in Japanese Academic and Business Contexts: Conceptualisation, Research and Pedagogic Implications*, London and New York, Routledge, 240-254.
- Kaur, J. (2016), “Conversation analysis and ELF”. In M.-L. Pitzl and R. Osimk-Teasdale (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Perspectives and Prospects, Contributions in Honour of Barbara Seidlhofer*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 161-168.
- Kimura, D. (2019), “Re-specifying the meaning of cooperativeness in ELF research: Alignment and affiliation”. Abstract of *AAAL Atlanta Conference*, 9-12 March 2019, <https://aaal.confex.com/aaal/2019/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/1411> (6 March 2020).

- Kimura, D., Canagarajah, S. (2018), “Translingual practice and ELF”. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 295-308.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007), “The communicative strategies of ASEAN speakers of English as a lingua franca”. In D. Prescott (ed.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, Literacies and Literatures*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 118-137.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010), “English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT”, *Language Teaching*, 43(1), 1-13.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2018), “Concluding Chapter”. In N.C. Sifakis and N. Tsantila (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 247-260.
- Klimpfinger, T. (2007), “‘Mind you sometimes you have to mix’ – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca”, *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16(2), 36-61.
- Klimpfinger, T. (2009), “‘She’s mixing the two languages together’ – Forms and Functions of Code-Switching in English as a Lingua Franca”. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 348-371.
- Klötzl, S. (2015), “A Love Affair with ELF: linguistic hybridity in ELF couple discourse”, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Vienna.
- Klötzl, S., Swoboda, B. (2020), *Interpersonal Positioning in English as a Lingua Franca Interactions*, New York and London, Routledge.
- Knapp, K. (1987), “English as an International *lingua franca* and the Teaching of Intercultural Communication”. In W. Lörcher and R. Schulze (eds.), *Perspectives on Language in Performance. Studies in Linguistics, Literary Criticism, and Language Teaching and Learning. To Honour Werner Hüllen on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1022-1039. Reprint in *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2015, 4(1), 173-189.
- Kohn, K. (2011), “English as a lingua franca and the Standard English misunderstanding”. In A. De Hower and A. Wilton (eds.), *English in Europe Today: Sociocultural and educational perspectives*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 71-94.

- Kohn, K. (2015), "A pedagogical space for ELF in the English classroom". In Y. Bayyurt and S. Akcan (eds.), *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 51-67.
- Kohn, K. (2016), "Teaching towards ELF competence in the English classroom". In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios and M. Ilkos (eds.), *ELF: Pedagogical and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Athens, Deree – The American College of Greece, 25-32.
- Kohn, K. (2018a), "MY English: a social constructivist perspective on ELF", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 1-24.
- Kohn, K. (2018b), "Towards the Reconciliation of ELF and EFL: Theoretical Issues and Pedagogical Challenges". In N.C. Sifakis and N. Tsantila (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 32-49.
- Kohn, K. (2020), "The art of ELF communication and how to get there". Plenary lecture delivered at *PRIN Seminar: Connecting ELF research to the language classroom*, University of Roma Tre, 20 Jan. 2020.
- Kohn, K., Hoffstaedter, P. (2017), "Learner Agency and Non-Native Speaker Identity in Pedagogical Lingua Franca Conversations: Insights from Intercultural Telecollaboration in Foreign Language Education", *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(5), 351-367.
- Konakahara, M. (2013), "Overlapping as an Active Involvement in ELF Interactions: Explicitness and Efficiency", *Waseda Working Papers in ELF*, 2, 40-58.
- Konakahara, M. (2015), "An analysis overlapping questions in casual ELF conversation: Cooperative or competitive contribution", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 84, 37-53.
- Kordia, S. (2016), "Reflective practice in transformative ELF-aware teacher education: Insights from the 'ELF-GATE Project'". Paper presented at *English as a Lingua Franca Conference (ELF9)*, University of Lleida, 27-29 June 2016.
- Kordia, S. (2018), "ELF-aware Teaching in Practice: A Teacher's Perspective". In N. Sifakis and N. Tsantila (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 53-71.
- Kordon, K. (2006), "'You are very good' — Establishing rapport in English as a lingua franca: The case of agreement tokens", *Vienna English Working PaperS*, 15(2), 58-82.

- Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., Csizér, K. (2011), “Systems of Goals, Attitudes, and Self-related Beliefs in Second-Language-Learning Motivation”, *Applied Linguistics*, 32(5), 495-516.
- Kouvoudou, A. (2016), “Towards an Alternative Approach to Oral Performance Assessment in English as a Lingua Franca”. In T. Tsagari (ed.), *Classroom-based Assessment in L2 Contexts*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 207-228.
- Kouvoudou, A., Tsagari, D. (2018), “Towards an ELF-aware Alternative Assessment Paradigm in EFL Contexts”. In N. C. Sifakis and N. Tsantila (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 227-246.
- Kramsch, C. (1993), *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Labov, W. (1972), *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Leech, G.N. (1983), *Principles of Pragmatics*, London, Longman.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983), *Pragmatics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Leung, C. (2005), “Convivial communication: recontextualizing communicative competence”, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 119-44.
- Lichtkoppler, J. (2006), “Repetition in English as a lingua franca talk: forms and function”, Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vienna.
- Lichtkoppler, J. (2007), “‘Male. Male.’ — ‘Male?’ — ‘The sex is male.’ — The Role of Repetition in English as a Lingua Franca Conversations”, *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16(1), 39-65.
- Llurda, E. (2018), “English language teachers and ELF”. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 518-528.
- Long, M. (1991), “Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology”. In K.D. Bot, R. Ginsberg and C. Kramsch (eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross- Cultural Perspective*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 39-52.
- Lopriore, L. (2015), “Young Learners in ELF Classrooms: a Shift in Perspective”. In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 159-177.

- Lopriore, L. (2016), “ELF in Teacher Education. A Way and Ways”. In L. Lopriore and E. Grazzi (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*, Rome, Roma TrE-Press, 167-188.
- Lopriore, L. (2018), “ELF in ELT education: New perspectives in language awareness”. In N.C. Sifakis, L. Lopriore, M. Dewey, Y. Bayyurt, P. Vettorel, L. Cavaleiro, D.S.P. Siqueira and S. Kordia, “ELF-awareness in ELT: Bringing together theory and practice”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 160-166.
- Lopriore, L., Vettorel, P. (2015), “Promoting Awareness of Englishes and ELF in the English Language Classroom”. In H. Bowles and A. Cogo (eds.), *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*, Basingtoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 13-34.
- Lopriore, L., Vettorel, P. (2016), “A shift in ELT perspective: World Englishes and ELF in the EFL classroom”. In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios and M. Ilkos (eds.), *ELF: Pedagogical and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Athens, Deree – The American College of Greece, 8-15.
- Louhiala-Salminen, L., Kankaaranta, A. (2011), “Professional Communication in a Global Business Context: The Notion of Global Communicative Competence”, *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 54(3), 244-262.
- Marlina, R. (2014), “The Pedagogy of English as an International Language (EIL): More Reflections and Dialogues”. In R. Marlina, and R.A. Giri (eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language: Perspectives from Scholars, Teachers and Students*, New York, Springer, 1-22.
- Matsuda, A. (2012), “Teaching materials in EIL”. In L. Alsagoff, S.L. McKay, G. Hu and W.A. Renadya (eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language*, New York and London, Routledge, 168-185.
- Matsumoto, Y. (2014), “Collaborative co-construction of humorous interaction among ELF speakers”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(1), 81-107.
- Matsumoto, Y. (2018), “Functions of laughter in English-as-a-lingua-franca classroom interactions: a multimodal ensemble of verbal and nonverbal interactional resources at miscommunication moments”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(2), 229-260.

- Mauranen, A. (2006), "Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 177, 123-150.
- Mauranen, A. (2007), "Hybrid Voices: English as the Lingua Franca of Academics". In K. Fløttum (ed.), *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 243-259.
- Mauranen, A. (2009), "Chunking in ELF: Expressions for managing interaction", *Journal of Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 217-233.
- Mauranen, A. (2010), "Discourse Reflexivity – A Discourse Universal? The Case of ELF", *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 13-40.
- Mauranen, A. (2012), *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mauranen, A. (2013), "Lingua Franca Discourse in Academic Contexts: Shaped by Complexity". In J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Discourse in Context: Contemporary Applied Linguistics. Vol. 3*, London, Continuum, 225-245.
- Mauranen, A. (2015), "What is Going on in Academic ELF? Findings and Implications". In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 31-52.
- Mauranen, A. (2018), "Conceptualizing ELF". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 7-24.
- Meierkord, C. (2000), "Interpreting successful lingua franca interactions. The analysis of non-native/non-native small talk conversations in English", *Linguistik Online*, 5(1), <https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.5.1013> (6 March 2020).
- Metsä-Ketelä, M. (2006), "'Words are more or less superfluous': The Case of *more or less* in Academic Lingua Franca English", *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 117-43.
- Mezirow, J. (1989), "Transformation theory and social action: A response to Collard and Law", *Adult Education Quarterly*, 39(3), 169-75.
- Milroy, L. (1987), *Observing and Analysing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Moerman M. (1988), *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Murray, N. (2012), "English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence", *ELT Journal*, 66(3), 318-326
- Neil, D.M. (1996), *Collaboration in Intercultural Discourse: Examples from a Multicultural Australian Workplace*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang.
- O'Keefe, B.J., Delia, G.J. (1985), "Psychological and interactional dimensions of communicative development". In H. Giles and R.N. St. Clair (eds.), *Recent Advances in Language Communication and Social Psychology*, London, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Park, J.S.-Y., Wee, L. (2011), "A practice-based critique of English as a Lingua Franca", *World Englishes*, 30(3), 360-374.
- Park, J.S.-Y., Wee, L. (2014), "English as a Lingua Franca: Lessons for language and mobility", *Multilingual Margins*, 1(1), 53-73.
- Pedrazzini, L. (2015), "Raising Trainee Teachers' Awareness of Language Variation through Data-based Tasks". In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 76-102.
- Phipps, A. (2006), *Learning the Arts of Linguistic Survival: Languaging, Tourism, Life*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Pietikäinen, K.S. (2014), "ELF couples and automatic code-switching", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Pietikäinen, K.S. (2016), "Misunderstandings and Ensuring Understanding in Private ELF Talk", *Applied Linguistics*, 39(2), 188-212.
- Pietikäinen, K.S. (2018), "The intercultural, translingual and multicontextual ELF: Implications for CA and potential empirical directions". Paper presented at *English as a Lingua Franca Conference (ELF11)*, King's College London, 4-7 July 2018.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2009), "'We should not wake up any dogs': Idiom and Metaphor in ELF". In A. Mauranen, and E. Ranta, (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 299-322.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2011), "Creativity in English as a lingua franca: Idiom and metaphor", Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Vienna.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2012), "Creativity meets convention: idiom variation and re-metaphorization in ELF", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), 27-55.

- Pitzl, M.-L. (2017), "Creativity and re-metaphorised idioms in spoken ELF interactions". Paper presented at *English as a Lingua Franca International Symposium*, Sapienza University, Rome, 6-7 April 2017.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2018a), *Creativity in English as a Lingua Franca: Idiom and Metaphor*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2018b), "Transient international groups (TIGs): exploring the group and development dimension of ELF", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 25-58.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2018c), "Creativity, idioms and metaphorical language in ELF". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 233-243.
- Pözl, U., Seidlhofer, B. (2006), "In and on their own terms: The 'habitat factor' in English as a lingua franca interactions", *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 177, 151-176.
- Pratt, M.-L. (1991), "Arts of the contact zone", *Profession*, 91, 33-40.
- Pullin, P. (2015), "Culture curriculum design syllabus and course development in the light of BELF", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 31-53.
- Pullin Stark, P. (2009), "No Joke – This is Serious! Power, Solidarity and Humour in Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF)". In A. Mauranen, and E. Ranta, (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 152-177.
- Ranta, E. (2010), "English in the real world vs. English at school: Finnish English teachers' and students' views", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 156-177.
- Rühlemann, C. (2010), "Conversational Grammar – Feminine Grammar? A Sociopragmatic Corpus Study", *Journal of English Linguistics*, 38(1), 56-87.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. (1974), "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation", *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. (1979), "Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons in Conversation and Their Interaction". In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, New York, Irvington, 15-21.

- Santner-Wolfartsberger, A. (2015a), "Intercultural awareness, (B)ELF, and bridging the gap between theory and practice: a response to Baker and Pullin", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 55-61.
- Santner-Wolfartsberger, A. (2015b), "Parties, persons, and one-at-a-time: conversation analysis and ELF", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 253-282.
- Sato, T., Yujobo, Y.J., Okada, T., Ogane, E. (2019), "Communication strategies employed by low-proficiency users: Possibilities for ELF-informed pedagogy", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 8(1), 9-35.
- Sawir, E. (2004), "Keeping up with native speakers: the many and positive roles of repetition in the conversations of EFL learners", *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(4), https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Dec_04_es.pdf (26 March 2020).
- 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, Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981*, Washington DC, Georgetown University Press, 71-93.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996), "Issues of Relevance for Discourse Analysis: Contingency in Action, Interaction and Co-participant Context". In E.H. Hove and D.R. Scott (eds.), *Computational and Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues – An Interdisciplinary Account*, Heidelberg, Springer, 3-38.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2004), "On Dispensability", *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(2), 95-149.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007), *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis 1*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A., Sacks, H. (1973), "Opening Up Closings", *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327.
- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G., Sacks, H. (1977), "The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation", *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987), *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1993), "Consciousness, Learning and Interlanguage Pragmatics". In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, New York, Oxford University Press, 21-42.
- Schmidt, R. (2001), "Attention". In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 3-32.
- Schneider, K.P. (1988), *Small Talk: Analysing Phatic Discourse*, Marburg, Hitzeroth.

- Seedhouse, P. (2005), "Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology". In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 251-266.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004), "Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005), "Standard future or half-baked quackery? Descriptive and pedagogic bearings on the globalisation of English". In C. Gnutzmann and F. Intemann (eds.), *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 155-169.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2007), "English as a lingua franca and communities of practice". In S. Volk-Birke and J. Lippert (eds.), *Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings*, Trier, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 307-318.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2008), "Of norms and mindsets", *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 33.1-33.7.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009), "Accommodation and the idiom principle in English as a Lingua Franca", *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 195-215.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011), *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2015), "ELF-informed Pedagogy: from Code-fixation towards Communicative Awareness". In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 19-30.
- Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A., Pitzl, M.-L. (2006), "English as a lingua franca in Europe: challenges for applied linguistics", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 3-34.
- Seidlhofer, B., Widdowson, H. (2017), "Competence, capability and virtual language", *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 24 (Special Issue), 23-36.
- Seidlhofer, B., Widdowson, H. (2018), "ELF for EFL: A Change of Subject?". In Z. Tatsioka, B. Seidlhofer, N.C. Sifakis and F. Gibson (eds.), *Using English as a Lingua Franca in Education in Europe. English in Europe: Vol. 4*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 17-31.
- Sifakis, N.C. (2007), "The education of teachers if English as a lingua franca: a transformative perspective", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 355-375.

- Sifakis, N.C. (2009), "Challenges in teaching ELF in the periphery: The Greek context", *ELT Journal*, 63, 230-237.
- Sifakis, N.C. (2014), "ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: A transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), 317-335.
- Sifakis, N.C. (2018), "ELF as an opportunity for foreign language use, learning and instruction in Greece and beyond". In Z. Tatsioka, B. Seidlhofer, N.C. Sifakis and F. Gibson (eds.), *Using English as a Lingua Franca in Education in Europe. English in Europe: Vol. 4*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 13-27.
- Sifakis, N.C. (2019), "ELF Awareness in ELT: Principles and Processes", *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 288-306.
- Sifakis, N.C., Bayyurt, Y. (2018), "ELF-aware teaching, learning and teaching development". In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, and M. Dewey (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, London and New York, Routledge, 456-467.
- Sifakis, N.C., Lopriore, L., Dewey, M., Bayyurt, Y., Vettorel, P., Cavalheiro, L., Siqueira, D.S.P., Kordia, S. (2018), "ELF-awareness in ELT: Bringing together theory and practice", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 155-209.
- Sifakis, N. C., Tsantila, N. (eds.) (2018), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- Sinclair, J., Coulthard R.M. (1975), *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*, London, Oxford University Press.
- Siqueira, S. (2016), "English as a Lingua Franca: For a Critical Intercultural Pedagogy". In L. Lopriore and E. Grazzi (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*, Rome, Roma TrE-Press, 189-209.
- Skehan, P. (1998), *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Smit, U. (2010), *English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education: A Longitudinal Study of Classroom Discourse*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.
- Song, H. (2013), "Deconstruction of cultural dominance in Korean EFL textbooks", *Intercultural Education*, 24(4), 382-390.
- Stubbs, M. (1983), *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*, Oxford, Blackwell.

- Swain, M. (2006), "Languaging, Agency and Collaboration in Advanced Second Language Proficiency". In H. Byrnes (ed.), *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, London and New York, Continuum, 95-108.
- Tannen, D. (1989), *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ten Have, P. (2007), *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide (2nd edition)*, London, Sage.
- Thomas, J. (1983), "Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure", *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- Tsui, A.B.M. (1989), "Beyond the Adjacency Pair", *Language in Society*, 18(4), 545-564.
- van Ek, J.A. (1986), *Objectives for Foreign Language Learning. Vol. 1: Scope*, Strasbourg, Council for Cultural Cooperation.
- Vettorel, P. (2010), "EIL/ELF and Representation of Culture in Textbooks: Only food, Fairs, Folklore and Facts?". In C. Gagliardi and A. Maley (eds.), *EIL, ELF, Global English: Teaching and Learning Issues*, Bern, Peter Lang, 153-185.
- Vettorel, P. (2013), "ELF in international school exchanges: stepping into the role of ELF users", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(1), 147-73.
- Vettorel, P. (2014), *English as a Lingua Franca in Wider Networking: Blogging Practices*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.
- Vettorel, P. (2015), "Primary School Teachers' Perceptions: Englishes, ELF and Classroom Practices – between 'Correctness' and 'Communicative Effectiveness'". In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars, 129-155.
- Vettorel, P. (2016a), "Young Learners' Uses of ELF: Moving beyond the Classroom Walls". In L. Lopriore and E. Grazzi (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*, Rome, Roma TrE-Press, 79-103.
- Vettorel, P. (2016b), "WE- and ELF-informed classroom practices: Proposals from a pre- service teacher education programme in Italy", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5(1), 107-133.
- Vettorel, P. (2017a), "The plurality of English and ELF in teacher education. Raising awareness of the 'feasibility' of a WE- and ELF-aware approach in classroom practices", *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 24 (Special Issue), 239-257.

- Vettorel, P. (2017b), "Global Englishes: WE, EIL, ELF and English Language Teaching. An overview of research literature", *Iperstoria*, 9, 116-136.
- Vettorel, P. (2019), "Communication strategies and co-construction of meaning in ELF: Drawing on 'Multilingual Resource Pools'", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 8(2), 179-210.
- Vettorel, P., Corrizzato, S. (2012), "World Englishes and ELF in ELT Textbooks: How is Plurality Represented?". In R. Facchinetti (ed.), *A Cultural Journey through the English Lexicon*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 201-234.
- Vettorel, P., Lopriore, L. (2013), "Is there ELF in ELT coursebooks?", *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(4), 483-504.
- Vettorel, P., Lopriore, L. (2017), "WE, EIL/ELF and Awareness of Their Pedagogical Implications in Teacher Education Programs in Italy". In A. Matsuda (ed.), *Preparing Teachers to Teach English as an International Language*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 195-207.
- VOICE (2013), *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (version 2.0 online). Director: Barbara Seidlhofer. <http://www.univie.ac.at/voice> (21 May 2020).
- VOICE Project (2007), "Mark-up conventions". *VOICE Transcription Conventions* [2.1], https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf (6 March 2020).
- VOICE Project (2007), "Spelling conventions". *VOICE Transcription Conventions* [2.1], https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_spelling_conventions_v2-1.pdf (6 March 2020).
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978), *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Mental Processes*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Wagner, J., Gardner, R. (2004), "Introduction". In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (eds.), *Second Language Conversations: Studies of Communication in Everyday Settings*, London and New York, Continuum, 1-17.
- Walker, R. (2010), *Teaching the Pronunciation of English as Lingua Franca*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Watterson, M. (2008), "Repair of non-understanding in English in international communication", *World Englishes*, 27(3/4), 378-406.
- Wenger, E. (1998), *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Widdowson, H.G. (1978), *Teaching Language as Communication*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1983), *Learning Purpose and Language Use*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1990), *Aspects of Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2003), *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2004), *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2012a), “ELF and the inconvenience of established concepts”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), 5-26.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2012b), “Closing the Gap, Changing the Subject”. In J. Hüttner, B. Mehlmauer-Larcher, S. Reichl, and B. Schifner (eds.), *Theory and Practice in EFL Teacher Education: Bridging the Gap*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 3-15.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2012c), “Interpersonal positioning and genre conventions”. In C. Hopkinson, R. Tomášková, G. Zapletalová (eds.), *The Interpersonal Function of Language across Genres and Discourse Domains*, Ostrava, University of Ostrava, 9-25. A revised version is available in Widdowson, H. (2020), *On the Subject of English: The Linguistics of Language Use and Learning*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 82-95.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2015a), “Competence and Capability: Rethinking the Subject English”, *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 12(1), 1-17.
- Widdowson, H. (2015b), “ELF and the pragmatics of language variation”, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 359-372.
- Widdowson, H. (2015c), “Frontiers of English and the Challenge of Change”. In P. Vettorel (ed.), *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 227-232.
- Widdowson H.G. (2019), “The Elusive Concept of Culture”. Keynote lecture delivered at *PRIN Conference: Uses of English as a Lingua Franca in Domain-specific Contexts of Intercultural Communication*, University of Salento, 4-6 Dec. 2019.
- Williams, M., Burden R.L. (1997), *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Willis, J. (1996), *A Framework for Task-based Learning*, London, Longman.
- Wong, J., Waring, Z.H. (2010), *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*, New York and London, Routledge.
- Yule, G. (1997), *Referential Communication Tasks*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Corpus details

Group Vailati_1			
Title of the song	Non mi avete fatto niente		
Recording device	Sony PX240 Digital Voice Recorder		
Recording data			
Audio file	Vailati_1_Non mi avete fatto niente		
Duration	00:16:08		
Date	5 March 2018		
Transcription	Lines 1-333		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “G. Vailati” Genzano di Roma (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange projects	AFS (American Field Service)/Intercultura YFU (Youth for Understanding)/Navigando		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	female	ita/IT	student
S2	female	ita/IT	student
S3	male	ita/IT	student
S4	female	ita/IT	researcher
S5	male	spa/AR	student
S6	female	spa/CL	student

Group Vailati_2			
Title of the song	Non mi avete fatto niente		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Vailati_2_Non mi avete fatto niente		
Duration	00:15:19		
Date	7 June 2018		
Transcription	Lines 334-457		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “G. Vailati” Genzano di Roma (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange project	YFU (Youth for Understanding)/Navigando		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	male	ita/IT	student
S2	female	ita/IT	student
S3	male	tha/TH	student
S4	female	ita/IT	researcher
S5	female	rum/RO	student
S6	female	chi/CN	student

Group Touschek_1			
Title of the song	Los Borbones son unos ladrones		
Recording device	Sony PX240 Digital Voice Recorder		
Recording data			
Audio file	Touschek_1_Los Borbones son unos ladrones		
Duration	00:05:50		
Date	17 April 2018		
Transcription	Lines 458-495		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Touschek” Grottaferrata (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange project	Erasmus+ School Exchange Partnerships (KA 229)		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	female	ger/DE	student
S2	female	hrv/HR	student
S3	male	spa/ES	student
S4	female	ita/IT	student

Group Touschek_2			
Title of the song	Imagine		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Touschek_2_Imagine		
Duration	00:14:30		
Date	17 April 2018		
Transcription	Lines 496-776		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Touschek” Grottaferrata (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange project	Erasmus+ School Exchange Partnerships (KA 229)		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	female	pol/PL	student
S2	male	ita/IT	student
S3	female	ita/IT	student
S4	female	fin/FI	student

Group Touschek_3			
Title of the song	Obriu les portes		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Touschek_3_Obriu les portes		
Duration	00:15:48		
Date	17 April 2018		
Transcription	Lines 777-982		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Touschek” Grottaferrata (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange project	Erasmus+ School Exchange Partnerships (KA 229)		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	male	ita/IT	student
S2	female	ita/IT	student
S3	female	fin/FI	student
S4	male	spa/ES	student
S5	male	hrv/HR	student

Group Touschek_4			
Title of the song	Collapse (Post-Amerika)		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Touschek_4_Collapse (Post-Amerika)		
Duration	00:11:47		
Date	17 April 2018		
Transcription	Lines 983-1142		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Touschek” Grottaferrata (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange project	Erasmus+ School Exchange Partnerships (KA 229)		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	female	ita/IT	student
S2	female	ger/DE	student
S3	male	ita/IT	student
S4	male	pol/PL	student
S5	female	spa/ES	student

Group Touschek_5			
Title of the song	Human		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Touschek_5_Human		
Duration	00:03:50		
Date	17 April 2018		
Transcription	Lines 1143-1218		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “B. Touschek” Grottaferrata (Rome)		
Intercultural exchange project	Erasmus+ School Exchange Partnerships (KA 229)		
CEFR Levels	B1-B2		
Age	16-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	male	ita/IT	student
S2	female	fin/FI	student
S3	female	ita/IT	student
S4	female	spa/ES	student
S5	female	ger/DE	student

Group Gullace_1			
Title of the song	Africa		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Gullace_1_Africa		
Duration	00:11:38		
Date	23 March 2018		
Transcription	Lines 1219-1369		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” Rome		
Intercultural exchange project	2 Społeczne Liceum Ogólnokształcące (Warsaw, PL)		
CEFR Levels	A2-B2		
Age	15-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	male	pol/PL	student
S2	male	ita/IT	student
S3	female	ita/IT	student
S4	male	pol/PL	student

Group Gullace_2			
Title of the song	Imagine		
Recording device	Smartphone		
Recording data			
Audio file	Gullace_2_Imagine		
Duration	00:17:27		
Date	23 March 2018		
Transcription	Lines 1370-1570		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” Rome		
Intercultural exchange project	2 Społeczne Liceum Ogólnokształcące (Warsaw, PL)		
CEFR Levels	A2-B2		
Age	15-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	female	ita/IT	student
S2	male	pol/PL	student
S3	male	pol/PL	student
S4	female	ita/IT	student
S5	female	ita/IT	researcher

Group Gullace_3			
Title of the song	We are the Champions		
Recording device	Sony PX240 Digital Voice Recorder		
Recording data			
Audio file	Gullace_3_We are the Champions		
Duration	00:12:48		
Date	23 March 2018		
Transcription	Lines 1571-1752		
Location	Liceo Scientifico Statale “T. Gullace” Rome		
Intercultural exchange project	2 Społeczne Liceum Ogólnokształcące (Warsaw, PL)		
CEFR Levels	A2-B2		
Age	15-17 years old		
Speaker information			
Speaker ID	Gender	L1/Country	Role
S1	male	pol/PL	student
S2	male	ita/IT	student
S3	female	pol/PL	student
S4	male	ita/IT	student

Appendix 2 - First language and country abbreviations

List of first language abbreviations followed by the corresponding country according to the *alpha-3/ISO 639-2 Standard* (https://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/php/code_list.php) and the *alpha-2/ISO 3166-1 Standard* (<https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#search/code/>).

Alpha-3/ISO 639-2 Code	Alpha-2/ISO 3166-1 Code	Language/ Country
chi	CN	Chinese/China
fin	FI	Finnish/Finland
ger	DE	German/Germany
hrv	HR	Croatian/Croatia
ita	IT	Italian/Italy
pol	PL	Polish/Poland
rum	RO	Romanian/Romania
spa	AR	Spanish/Argentina
spa	CL	Spanish/Chile
spa	ES	Spanish/Spain
tha	TH	Thai/Thailand

Appendix 3 - Transcribed data

Vailati_1_Non mi avete fatto niente (lines 1-333)

S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: ita/IT, female; S5=L1: spa/AR, male; S6=L1: spa/CL, female

- 1 S1: erm the song is about the terrorism (1) / **[Open-M]**
- 2 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 3 S1: and (.) it's (2) it's e:rm (4) / **[possible Focus-M]**
- 4 S2: it's what? @ (1) / **[Elicit-M]**
- 5 S3: tell us @ / **[Direct-M]**
- (gap 00:00:05) {the students laugh softly}
- 6 S2: eh (.) who are the singers? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 7 S1: erm (.) francesco moro and ermal meta / **[Answer-M]**
- 8 S2: [a] okay (.) [b] so it's an italian song (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 9 S1: yes: / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 10 S2: and it talks about terrorism (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 11 S1: yeah and = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 12 S2: = only terrorism? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 13 S1: [a] <1> yeah </1> (.) [b] terrorism in (1) sp- (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 14 S3: <1> yeah </1> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 15 S2: <un> x </un>
- 16 S1: er in france (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 17 S2: [a] a:h [b] <2> okay </2> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
- 18 S3: <2> okay </2> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 19 S1: and in (1) / **[possible Upgrade-M]**
- 20 S3: <soft> england </soft> / **[Repair-M]**
- 21 S2: in (.) england / **[Repair-M]**
- 22 S1: i:n (.) / **[possible Upgrade-M]**
- 23 S2: no {SX whispers something (1)} / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 24 S3: <3> spain </3> / **[Repair-M]**
- 25 S2: <3> spain </3> / **[Repair-M]**
- 26 S1: SPAIN / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 27 S3: okay. / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 28 S2: [a] okay. (.) [b] so:: (2) / **[a. Finalizer-M + b. possible Reopen-M]**
- 29 S1: do you like it? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 30 S2: yes: (.) i = / **[Answer-M]**
- 31 S3: = can you tell us some (.) some pieces of this song? / **[Direct-M]**
- 32 SX: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 33 S2: [a] i have never (.) <4> heard it </4> [b] but i think (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. possible Evaluate-M]**
- 34 S3: <4> heard it </4> / **[Repair-M]**
- 35 S3: that would be great (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 36 S2: i =
- 37 S3: = because the idea is so good. / **[Explain-M]**
- (gap 00:00:17) {the students fix the technical equipment}
- 38 S4: <to S5> your song?</to S5> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 39 S3: [a] yeah (.) [b] <to S5> what's your song?</to S5> / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 40 S5: <soft> i was thinking about *november rain* </soft> (.) / **[Answer-M]**
- 41 S2: okay / **[Continuer-M]**
- 42 S5: <soft><un> xxx </un> (american singer) </soft> / **[Inform-M]**
- 43 S2: [a] okay (.) [b] you have to = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Direct-M]**
- 44 S3: = to speak more (.) / **[Direct-M]**
- 45 S2: to speak (.) / **[Direct-M]**
- 46 S3: loud (.) / **[Direct-M]**
- 47 S6: <soft><@> louder </@></soft> / **[Repair-M]**
- 48 S3: you have to be <pvc> louding {louder} </pvc> / **[Direct-M]**

- 49 S5: [a] @@ [b] i was thinking about (.) a november rain (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Reopen-M]**
- 50 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 51 S5: guns 'n roses (.) / **[Inform-M]**
- 52 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 53 S5: because it's a beautiful song. / **[Explain-M]**
- 54 S2: [a] uhu [b] and er <swallows> = / **[a. Continuer-M + b. possible Elicit-M]**
- 55 S5: = have you heard listened <5> it?</5> / **[Question-M]**
- 56 S2: <5> what's it about?</5> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 57 S5: have you heard listened it? / **[Question-M]**
- 58 S2: no / **[Denial-M]**
- 59 S5: <soft> (no) </soft> / **[possible Acknowledge-M]**
- 60 S3: what's <6> about </6> (.) <@> what's about (.) that song?</@> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 61 S5: <6><soft><@> (it's) </@></soft></6> / **[possible Inform-M]**
- 62 S5: no no so @@@ i don't know / **[Answer-M]**
- 63 S2: uhu / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 64 S3: how can you (do)? okay? / **[Question-M]**
- 65 S5: (sure) / **[Answer-M]**
- 66 S2: [a] mhm (2) [b] i (1) was i (.) have thought about (.) wonderwall (.) [c] d'you know the song? / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Question-M]**
- 67 S6: no <7> i don't </7> / **[Denial-M]**
- 68 S3: <7> no </7> / **[Denial-M]**
- 69 S2: [a] it's er it's by oasis (.) [b] it's a group er (.) that erm (.) sing a beautiful song songs @ beautiful songs [c] and (.) <smacks lips> it talks about (.) love er nowadays [d] and (1) <swallows> i think love is always (.) a (1) a right issue to talk about (1) [e] because (.) it's an international (.) issue. / **[a. Inform-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Focus-M + d. Evaluate-M + e. Explain-M]**
- 70 S3: [a] okay (.) [b] i <pvc> thought {thought} </pvc> about hello [c] that song <un> xx </un> song a british singer e:r an english singer [d] and (.) i think that song would be (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. c. Inform-M + d. Evaluate-M]**
- 71 S2: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 72 S5: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 73 S3: [a] <@> i think that song would be great </@> [b] cos (3) i think that song would be great [c] cos (.) that talks about depression and the sadness [d] cos (.) a people feels alone (.) / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. c. d. Explain-M]**
- 74 S2: <soft> uhu </soft> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 75 S3: [a] while she has some friends and but if she see no one she is sad too (.) [b] and if someone in social network or (2) <fast> if someone you met on social network can't st- can't come to you and hug you </fast> you will be sad too so (.) / **[a. b. Explain-M]**
- 76 S2: okay / **[Continuer-M]**
- 77 S3: <fast> that's that doesn't mind you have many friends on social networks but if you don't have a real friend real friends </fast> (.) you wouldn't be happy. / **[Explain-M]**
- 78 S2: what? (1) / **[Question-M]**
- 79 SX-m: <ono> badi badi tju.</ono> / **[Answer-M]**
- (gap 00:00:10) {the students whisper}
- 80 S2: no / **[possible Answer-M]**
- 81 S1: [a] okay (1) [b] i choose a song from the last (1) er sanremo (.) [c] and the title is <L1it> non mi avete fatto niente {you have done nothing to me} </L1it> (.) [d] the singers are francesco moro and ermal meta (.) [d] e:r the song is about the terrorism (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. c. d. Inform-M + e. Focus-M]**
- 82 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 83 S1: and (1) some (.) sentences from the lyrics (.) / **[Inform-M]**
- 84 S2: okay / **[Continuer-M]**
- 85 S1: are (2) erm <reading aloud><L1it> il sole sulla <LNsp> rambla </LNsp> oggi non è lo stesso {the sun on the rambla is not the same today} </L1it></reading aloud> erm (1) / **[Inform-M]**
- 86 S2: <LNsp> rambla </LNsp> is a: (1) beach (.) <soft> i think.</soft> / **[Upgrade-M]**

- 87 S1: erm is a: (1) do you know what is (the) <LNsp> rambla?</LNsp> / **[Check-M]**
 88 S6: <soft> no no </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
 89 S2: [a] it's something in spain (.) [b] eh? / **[a. Answer-M + b. Check-M]**
 90 S1: <soft> is a road </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
 91 S6: <8> the ROA:D.</8> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 92 S2: [a] <8> the ROA:D.</8> [b] yeah yeah okay / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 93 S6: it's an avenue (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 94 S1: [a] yeah [b] a:nd (.) so the last erm (2) {some students whisper} / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Reopen-M]**
 95 SX-f: eh / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 96 S2: erm (2) terrorism attack / **[Repair-M]**
 97 S1: [a] yeah (.) [b] in <fast> SPAIN.</fast> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M]**
 98 S2: oKAY. / **[Finalizer-M]**
 99 S5: <un> xx </un> / **[possible Finalizer-M]**
 100 S2: er <fast> i was </fast> er (1) / **[Open-M]**
 101 S3: <9><soft> thinking </soft></9> / **[Repair-M]**
 102 S6: <9><soft> thinking </soft></9> / **[Repair-M]**
 103 S2: <@> thinking about </@> erm (1) another song from sanremo (.) / **[Open-M]**
 104 S1: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 105 S2: erm the one by <smacks lips> <L1it> lo stato sociale {the social state (name of the band)} </L1it> / **[Inform-M]**
 106 S1: yeah (.) and = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 107 S2: = and i think it's = / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 108 S1: = what's the title? / **[Elicit-M]**
 109 S2: [a] i don't remember (.) [b] i was (.) asking you if you remem<1>bered it.</1> / **[a. Answer-M + b. Question-M]**
 110 S1: <1> o:h i don't remember </1> (.) no / **[Denial-M]**
 111 S2: okay but = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 112 S1: = what is about? / **[Elicit-M]**
 113 S2: [a] er it's about erm (2) the jobs of (1) people [b] and (1) and (1) so the modern life of people (.) [c] and it talks about erm (.) that the (.) people nowadays think only about work and jobs and not at famili:es and (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Focus-M]**
 114 S1: a:h okay / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 115 S2: erm (2) <smacks lips> social erm = / **[Focus-M]**
 116 S6: = so it's like capitalism (.) like only working and producing <2> money </2> no life. / **[Upgrade-M]**
 117 S2: <2> yes </2> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 118 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 119 S2: about capitalism / **[Focus-M]**
 120 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 121 S2: yes (.) and the title (.) is <L1it> una vita in vacanza. {a life on holiday} </L1it> / **[Inform-M]**
 122 S6: [a] a:h (.) okay yeah (.) [b] i know / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Inform-M]**
 123 SX-f: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 124 SX-m: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 125 S1: <to S5> and you? <un> xxx?</un></to S5> / **[Elicit-M]**
 126 S2: a:nd he (1) <soft> not agree </soft> / **[Challenge-M]**
 127 S5: <soft> (i'm agree) </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
 128 S3: <to S5> [a] [S5] talk talk us about your song [b] because we (.) i haven't understand so </to S5> / **[a. Direct-M + b. Explain-M]**
 129 SX-f: and @@ / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 130 S2: <3> @@@ </3> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 131 S3: <3> @@@ </3> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 132 S5: eh (.) <LNit> non ricordo {i don't remember} </LNit> i don't remember (1) which song = / **[Answer-M]**
 133 S3: = so choose ANOTHER if you don't remember <@> that <un> xx</un></@> / **[Direct-M]**

- 134 SS: @@ / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 (gap 00:00:04) {the students whisper}
 135 S2: no (1) <to S6> d'you want to: </to S6> = / **[Elicit-M]**
 136 S3: = <to S6> to tell us something? </to S6> {S6 shakes her head} / **[Elicit-M]**
 137 S2: no (.) okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 138 S6: i don't / **[Denial-M]**
 139 S3: that's not a problem (2) / **[Downgrade-M]**
 140 S6: but / **[possible Explain-M]**
 (gap 00:00:04) {the students whisper}
 141 S6: <4> so WHICH one </4> will we choose (.) like in general? / **[Elicit-M]**
 142 S3: <4> are you? are you? </4> / **[Question-M]**
 143 S2: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 144 S1: oh yeah (.) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 145 S2: [a] i think that the (1) i think that (2) they're all (.) good [b] but maybe (.) / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. possible Focus-M]**
 146 S1: we have to choose the (.) problem that = / **[Focus-M]**
 147 S2: = the (1) major problem of (.) this century (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 148 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 149 S2: <5> so </5> so i think it's (2) the major problem is = / **[Focus-M]**
 150 S1: <5> eh </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 151 S3: = the terrorism / **[Focus-M]**
 152 S2: the terrorism / **[Focus-M]**
 153 S3: <to S1> so the yours would be the best. </to S1> / **[Evaluate-M]**
 154 S6: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 155 S3: good job / **[Evaluate-M]**
 156 S1: okay. / **[Finalizer-M]**
 157 S5: <L1sp> (grande) {(great)} </L1sp> / **[Evaluate-M]**
 158 SS: @@@ / **[Challenge-M]**
 159 S2: [a] <@> we can't know if er the [S5] song (.) [S5] song is the best [b] because he said that he doesn't know er <6> what </6> the song is <7> about </7> [c] so @ he only said that (.) it's good and (.) it's beautiful </@> / **[a. Challenge-M + b. c. Explain-M]**
 160 S3: <6> @@@ </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 161 S3: <7><@> talking about </@></7> / **[Support-M]**
 162 S3: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 163 S5: <soft><@> november rain </@></soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 164 SS: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 165 S3: [a] if (.) do you want to choose another song [S5]? [b] cos = / **[a. Elicit-M + b. Explain-M]**
 166 S5: = *smoke weed every day* / **[Answer-M]**
 167 SS: @@@@ / **[Challenge-M]**
 168 S5: this talk about (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 169 SS: @@@ (3) / **[Challenge-M]**
 170 S3: <@> the weekend </@> / **[Challenge-M]**
 171 SS: @@@ / **[Challenge-M]**
 172 S5: <soft> ah (.) okay </soft> / **[Finalizer-M]**
 173 SS: @@@@ / **[Challenge-M]**
 174 S1: [a] okay (.) [b] so: = / **[a. Finalizer-M + b. possible Open-M]**
 175 S5: = <soft><@><L1sp> basta {enough} </L1sp></@></soft> / **[Finalizer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:19) {the students laugh and whisper}
 176 S2: okay (2) / **[Open-M]**
 177 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 178 SX-f: <@><ono> bæu bu: bu: </ono></@> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 179 SX-m: <@><ono> bæu bu: bu: </ono></@> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 180 SS: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 181 S2: [a] okay so (.) [b] <@> i think the best is the (.) <8> the </8></@> / **[a. Open-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 182 S3: <8> the (.) ermal meta </8> and fabrizio moro's song / **[Repair-M]**
 183 S2: yes (.) / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 184 S1: <soft> song </soft> / **[Support-M]**
 185 S2: [a] yes [b] the song that have chos'n (.) that [S1] (.) have chosen (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b Upgrade-M]**
 186 S6: and why? (.) why? / **[Elicit-M]**
 187 S2: haeh? / **[Loop-M]**
 188 S1: <9> WHY?</9> / **[Answer-M]**
 189 S6: <9> WHY?</9> / **[Answer-M]**
 190 S3: because the terrorism <1> is </1> a biggest problem. = / **[Explain-M]**
 191 S2: <1> because </1> / **[Explain-M]**
 192 S2: = because it's better than @@ <@> the [S5] song </@> (.) / **[Challenge-M]**
 193 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 194 S2: and because it talks about the (.) one of the biggest problem of (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 195 S5: <soft> in the world </soft> / **[Explain-M]**
 196 S2: of the twenty cen- (.) twenty-<2><pvc>oneth {first} </pvc> century </2>
 a:nd <fast> twenty-first </fast> a:nd <fast> the terrorism </fast> (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 197 S6: <2><soft> twenty-first </soft> twenty-first century yeah </2> / **[Repair-M]**
 198 S1: okay / **[Continuer-M]**
 199 S3: <soft> (it could do) </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 200 S2: and erm (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 201 S1: and why? / **[Elicit-M]**
 202 S3: because that's a great song @@ {S3 mumbles something} / **[Explain-M]**
 203 S5: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 204 S2: the = / **[possible Explain-M]**
 205 S3: = [a] because that's a great song too (.) [b] it has a great (.) great rhythm (.)
 great lyrics [c] so that (will be great.) / **[a. Explain-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Evaluate-M]**
 206 S6: [a] yeah [b] <soft><@> but </@></soft> the purpose is on the meaning
 (.) [c] so (.) read a little bit of the lyrics (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M + c. Direct-M]**
 207 S2: okay (.) yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 208 S1: okay. / **[Accept-M]**
 209 S2: <to S1> and maybe you can try to (.) translate (.) in english </to S1> / **[Direct-M]**
 210 S1: [a] in english (.) okay. [b] er (1) as i said <reading aloud><L1it> il sole
 sulla <LNsp> rambla </LNsp> oggi non è lo stesso {the sun over the rambla is not
 the same today} </L1it></reading aloud> = / **[a. Accept M + b. Inform-M]**
 211 S2: = and why is not <3> the same?</3> / **[Elicit-M]**
 212 S3: <3> the same?</3> / **[Elicit-M]**
 213 S1: because (.) there was an terrorism att- <4> attack </4> in MAdrid (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 214 S2: <4> @@ </4>
 215 S3: <4> @@ </4>
 216 S2: ah / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 217 S1: some months ago (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 218 S2: the la:st? (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
 219 S1: yeah the last year / **[Answer-M]**
 220 S2: the last year? / **[Question-M]**
 221 S3: yeah @@ / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:05) {S1 and S2 speak to each other in italian}
 222 S1: and <reading aloud><L1it> in francia c'è un concerto {in france
 there is a concert} </L1it></reading aloud> erm the (1) / **[Inform-M]**
 223 S3: <soft> in france </soft> / **[Inform-M]**
 224 S1: the (1) france ATtack terrorism (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 225 S2: aha / **[Continuer-M]**
 226 S3: <soft> (they smashed it) </soft> / **[Upgrade-M]**
 227 S1: er was in a: (2) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 228 S6: <soft> a concert?</soft> / **[Question-M]**
 229 S2: in a concert? / **[Question-M]**
 230 S1: yeah in a concert / **[Answer-M]**
 231 S3: in a concert room / **[Upgrade-M]**
 (gap 00:00:04) {S1, S2 and S3 speak to each other in italian}

- 232 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 233 S3: there was in a concert room. / **[Inform-M]**
 234 S1: *[a]* yeah. er (1) *[b]* <reading aloud><L1it> a Londra piove sempre ma
 oggi non fa male {it always rains in london but today it's fine} </L1it></reading
 aloud> (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M]**
 235 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 236 S1: always the english er terrorism ATtack (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 237 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:10) {S1 whispers something in italian}
 238 S2: on the bridge / **[Upgrade-M]**
 (gap 00:00:02) {S3 whispers something in italian}
 239 S1: <soft> okay </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 240 SS: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 (gap 00:00:04) {S1 whispers something in italian}
 241 S5: <soft><L1sp> puente de londres {london bridge} </L1sp></soft> / **[Upgrade-M]**
 242 S1: eh (.) <L1it> l'attacco {the attack} </L1it> the terrorism ATtack / **[Inform-M]**
 243 S2: i don't remember / **[Inform-M]**
 244 S1: <un> x </un>
 245 S3: *[a]* i don't remember too (.) *[b]* <5> that's </5> great. / **[a. Inform-M +**
b. Challenge-M]
 246 S1: <5> in a </5> / **[Upgrade-M]**
 247 S1: bridge in london (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 248 S2: okay / **[Continuer-M]**
 249 S1: a:nd (.) / **[Reopen-M]**
 250 S2: okay (.) tower bridge (.) maybe / **[Upgrade-M]**
 251 S5: *[a]* <soft> <L1sp> sí {yes} </L1sp> (.) *[b]* th- the tower of london
 </soft> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 252 S2: @@ / **[Challenge-M]**
 253 S1: @@ okay / **[Finalizer-M]**
 254 SS: @@ / **[Challenge-M]**
 255 S2: okay @ / **[Reopen-M]**
 256 S1: er <reading aloud><L1it> a nizza il mare è rosso di fuoco e di vergogna
 {in nice the sea is red for fires and shame} </L1it></reading aloud> / **[Inform-M]**
 257 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 258 S1: <soft><L1it> come si dice {how do you say} <un> xxxx?</un></L1it></soft> /
[Question-M]
 259 S2: <L1it> nizza {nice} </L1it> is in fra:nce and (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 (gap 00:00:20) {S1 whispers something in italian to S3: they do not know how to translate a word}
 260 S6: remember? to remember? / **[Answer-M]**
 261 S2: i don't know / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:05) {S1, S2 and S3 whisper something in italian: now they negotiate the translation of a
 word}
 262 S1: <soft><L1it> riferito? {referred to?} </L1it></soft> / **[Question-M]**
 263 S3: <soft> it's <pvc> bounding {bound} </pvc> to </soft> (.) it's linked / **[Answer-M]**
 264 S2: it's referred / **[Answer-M]**
 265 S1: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 266 S2: it refer <6> it refers to </6> / **[Repair-M]**
 267 S3: <6> it's referred it's linked </6> / **[Repair-M]**
 268 S6: *[a]* yeah (.) *[b]* it refers to or it talks about. / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Repair-M]**
 269 S1: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 270 S2: it refers to (.) the (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 271 S1: okay / **[Continuer-M]**
 272 S5: <soft> it refers to (go) </soft> = / **[possible Focus-M]**
 273 S3: = <to S5><joking><L1it> stai zitto {shut up} </L1it></joking></to S5> /
[Direct-M]
 274 S1: okay / **[possible Reopen-M]**
 275 S2: it refers to the (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 276 S1: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 277 S2: <un> x </un> <L1it> attacco. {attack.} </L1it> / **[Focus-M]**

- 278 S1: *[a]* so *[b]* <reading aloud><L1it> a nizza il mare è rosso di fuoco e di
vergogna {in nice the sea is red for fires and shame} </L1it></reading aloud>
[c] and it refers to the er french ATtack (.) / **[a. Reopen-M + b. c. Inform-M]**
- 279 S2: aha / **[Continuer-M]**
- 280 S1: in <L1it> nizza {nice} </L1it> (.) / **[Inform-M]**
- 281 S2: aha / **[Continuer-M]**
- 282 S1: there is that is er {S3 whispers something to S1 (3)} / **[Inform-M]**
- 283 S3: that's the <L1it> camion {truck} <ipa> kæmɪən </ipa></L1it> who: (.) /
[Inform-M]
- 284 S6: truck / **[Repair-M]**
- 285 S3: who <pvc> trucked {knocked down} </pvc> some people (.) / **[Inform-M]**
- 286 S6: no the truck / **[Repair-M]**
- 287 S3: *[a]* <@> no the truck </@> who kills some people (.) *[b]* cos he was on the (.) /
[a. Inform-M + b. Explain-M]
- 288 S6: on a tourist erm / **[Explain-M]**
- 289 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 290 S6: on a tourist = / **[Explain-M]**
- 291 S3: = that was a party e:r (1) that was a city party and (.) the truck (.)
<soft><ono> tu:f tu:f tu:f </ono></soft> the truck @@@ <7> hit some people.</7> /
[Explain-M]
- 292 S6: <7> it drove over people.</7> / **[Repair-M]**
- 293 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 294 S3: <ono> ta ta ta tu: tu: tu: </ono> @@ / **[Explain-M]**
- 295 S1: and erm (6) <soft><L1it> come si dice dolore? {how do
you say pain?} </L1it></soft> / **[Question-M]**
- 296 S2: pain / **[Answer-M]**
- 297 S1: *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* this song talks about the pain erm (1) / **[a. Acknowledge-M +
b. Focus-M]**
- 298 S2: of (.) th- the pain (1) of the mums. / **[Focus-M]**
- 299 S1: that lose erm (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 300 S3: their sons / **[Focus-M]**
- 301 S1: their sons / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 302 S2: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 303 S1: son = / **[Focus-M]**
- 304 S3: = <8> sons </8> / **[Repair-M]**
- 305 S2: = <8> sons </8> / **[Repair-M]**
- 306 S1: <fast> children </fast> / **[Repair-M]**
- 307 S2: aha / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 308 S1: so <fast> this song speaks about </fast> (.) the pain of the mother that (.)
lose their children. / **[Focus-M]**
- 309 S2: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 310 S3: okay = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 311 S1: = maybe because (1) they (.) are (.) they've been killed (1) in a
terrorism ATtack. / **[Explain-M]**
- 312 S3: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- (gap 00:00:07) {some students whisper}
- 313 S2: <soft> okay </soft> (4) / **[possible Open-M]**
- 314 S3: [S5] tell us something <@> about your song </@> / **[Challenge-M]**
- 315 S2: @@@ (4) **[Challenge-M]**
- 316 S2: eh eh / **[Reopen-M]**
- 317 S6: *[a]* well (.) so in summary we chose this song *[b]* because er it describes
the attacks *[c]* and it erm represents, (.) or it talks about the consequences
and the feelings the emotions the pain (.) / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Explain-M +
c. Focus-M]**
- 318 S2: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 319 S6: everything that caused (.) that was devastating to (.) our society in (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 320 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 321 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 322 S2: <9> yes </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 323 S6: <9> that </9> what caused the terrorist attack. / **[Focus-M]**
 324 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 325 S2: i think it (.) represents the (1) change that erm have a city when it
 <1> is </1> (.) the changi:ng (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 326 S1: <1><soft> changing </soft></1> / **[Repair-M]**
 327 S3: <soft> the city that become </soft> / **[Upgrade-M]**
 328 S2: the change that (.) have a city when it (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 329 S3: (come) attacked from / **[Upgrade-M]**
 330 S2: *[a]* is attacked from (.) a terrorism terrorists an' terrorist groups (.) *[b]*
 a:nd (3) hm from outside you can say that it is still the same but er you don't know
 that people of this city are er more frightened? and full of pain so (.) /
[a. b. Upgrade-M]
 331 S1: yeah i = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 332 S2: = the (.) / **[possible Focus-M]**
 333 S1: i'm agree. / **[Acknowledge-M]**

Vailati_2_Non mi avete fatto niente (lines 334-457)

S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: tha/TH, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: ita/IT, female; S5=L1: rum/RO, female; S6=L1: chi/CN, female

- 334 S1: *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* i (.) i'm thinking about a song (.) that is e:r is a song about
 the: society (.) *[c]* and the: group is dark polo gang (.) *[d]* and it could be (.)
 a stupid song (.) *[e]* but (.) it's e:r reflect the (.) erm the society (.) *[f]* because (.)
 it's talk about it talks about the: money and the (.) sometimes er talk
 about drug *[g]* and i think that is it (.) they are some problem that (.)
 the society of the (.) today so- society erm reflect (.) a lot so (1) er (.)
[h] what do you think about this? (1) this (1) this problems? / **[a. Open-M + b. c. Inform-M + d. Downgrade-M + e. Focus-M + f. Explain-M + g. Upgrade-M + h. Elicit-M]**
 335 S2: *[a]* <soft> i think </soft> i think that (1) i agree wi- with you *[b]* because
 erm (.) they're these are the problems that (.) really exist in our society
 nowadays *[c]* especially with the teenagers (.) *[d]* so (1) this song is really (.)
 makes sense in my opinion. / **[a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Evaluate-M]**
 336 S3: <soft> is really?</soft> / **[Loop-M]**
 337 S2: <1> makes sense </1> / **[Answer-M]**
 338 S1: <1><soft> makes sense </soft></1> / **[Answer-M]**
 339 S3: <soft> makes sense makes sense </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 340 S1: *[a]* <soft> a:h okay </soft> (.) *[b]* and you [S3] (.) what do you think about? /
[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Elicit-M]
 341 S3: e:r i also think (.) like Jom says (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 342 S1: <soft> okay </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 343 S3: *[a]* and i thought two different songs (.) erm (1) *[b]* and one talks about
 erm bullyism (1) erm *[c]* and one (.) <smacks lips> and the other one is like to (4)
 <soft><L1it> esortare {urge} </L1it></soft> that (.) like invites you to
 erm (.) not erm / **[a. Inform-M + b. c. Focus-M]**
 (gap 00:00:19) {some students whisper and the researcher invites them to speak up}
 344 S3: <L1it> prof non so come dire {teacher i do not know how to say} <un>
 xx</un></L1it> / **[Question-M]**
 345 S4: try to exp- to think how to say it / **[Answer-M]**
 346 S3: and this song (.) / **[Reopen-M]**
 347 S4: okay. / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 348 S3: that invites you to (.) not erm <smacks lips> (1) like minimize <2> yourself </2> (.)
 and (1) / **[Focus-M]**
 349 S1: <2> yes <un> xxx </un></2> / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 350 S2: <soft> okay </soft> / **[Finalizer-M]**
 351 S5: [a] e:r i choose a song from macklemore [b] and talk about (.)
 homosexual mar- marriage (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M]**
 352 S2: <soft> aha </soft> / **[Continuer-M]**
 353 S5: [a] erm and it's a problem that (1) is present in our society [b] and in
 particularly in italy (.) erm (1) [c] and i think er it can be a good song for (.)
 <fast> this project.</fast> / **[a. Focus-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Evaluate-M]**
 354 S1: <soft> yes (1) and </soft> = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 355 S6: = [a] and (.) i (.) choose a song called *model* [b] and it means a
 model er in a shop (.) [c] the singer (.) says that er he (.) just like a model in a
 shop or (.) something which can be (.) judged commented [d] and (1) says reflect (.)
 superficial psychological of the society. / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. d. Focus-M]**
 356 S2: <soft> uhu (.) okay.</soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 357 S1: i didn't understand the (.) singer / **[Loop-M]**
 358 S6: [a] the singer is <L1ch> li ronghao </L1ch> [b] maybe (.) <3> you </3> don't = /
[a. Answer-M + b. possible Check-M]
 359 S3: <3> a:h </3> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 360 S3: = eh <L1it> è cinese. {he is chinese.} </L1it> he (.) he's chinese. / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 361 S6: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 362 S1: [a] a:h (.) [b] okay (2) / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 363 S6: <fast> it's a chinese song.</fast> / **[Inform-M]**
 364 SS: <soft> @@ </soft> / **[Support-M]**
 365 S1: [a] <L1it> vai {go} </L1it> [S2] (.) [b] <fast> is your moment </fast> /
[a. Direct-M + b. Explain-M]
 366 SS: <soft> @@@ </soft> / **[Support-M]**
 367 S1: yes. / **[Passing Turn-M]**
 368 S2: [a] er i chose the song which is called *zombie* (.) from cranberries [b] and (.)
 it explain about the violence they cause (.) to the children (.) erm to some
 family erm (1) that really affect erm (2) erm in the society of (.) some
 countries which are in the war (.) [c] for example syria (.) / **[a. Inform-M +**
b. Focus-M + d. Upgrade-M]
 369 S3: <soft> uhu </soft> / **[Continuer-M]**
 370 S2: they represent that (.) erm (.) how people suffer from (.) from the war
 how people suffer for- from from violence and it kills some (.)
 innocent people (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 371 S3: <soft> hm hm </soft> / **[Continuer-M]**
 372 S2: and (.) i think they should (.) represent very good to our society
 nowadays (.) in these countries. / **[Evaluate-M]**
 373 S1: [a] yes (1) [b] so we can summarize the (1) er main (.) <fast> topic </fast>
 (1) [c] so (.) er i start er with (1) drug (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Open-M +**
c. Focus-M]
 374 S3: <soft> hm hm </soft> / **[Continuer-M]**
 375 S1: [a] money (.) [b] and [S3] (.) what's? = / **[a. Focus-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 376 S3: = <soft> bullyism </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
 377 S1: ballyism? bully- = / **[Loop-M]**
 378 S3: = <soft> bullyism </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
 379 S1: bullyism (1) and (1) <4> homosexual </4> marry = / **[Focus-M]**
 380 SX-5: <4> homosexual </4> / **[Focus-M]**
 381 S5: = <5> marriage </5> / **[Repair-M]**
 382 S3: = <5> marriage </5> / **[Repair-M]**
 383 S6: physical erm (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 384 S1: <pvc> judge {judgement} </pvc> / **[Repair-M]**
 385 S2: <soft><pvc> judge {judgement} </pvc> (.) and the violence </soft> / **[Focus-M]**
 386 S1: [a] okay (1) [b] can we (.) think (.) about other songs? = / **[a. Finalizer-M +**
b. Elicit-M]
 387 S3: = i think (.) i think the violence (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 388 S1: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 389 S5: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 390 S1: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 391 S3: especially against women (3) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 392 S2: against women and children / **[Upgrade-M]**
 393 S3: yes (1) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 394 S1: *[a]* and (.) sometimes when we when we (.) talk about violence (.) we: (.)
[b] in the for example in the schools (.) *[c]* we can we talk also about bally-
 bullying (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Focus-M]**
 395 S3: yes / **[Continuer-M]**
 396 S1: sometimes is = / **[Focus-M]**
 397 S5: = and there is also a violence for the homosexuals / **[Focus-M]**
 398 S1: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 399 S2: <soft> yes </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 400 SX-f: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 401 S5: i think (.) her his song is the (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 402 S3: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
 403 S5: (this) one. / **[Inform-M]**
 404 S3: yes (5) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 405 S1: and (2) other songs? / **[Elicit-M]**
 (gap 00:00:05) {the students whisper}
 406 S4: <to S5> what about yours?</to S5> / **[Elicit-M]**
 407 S5: er *same love* from macklemore / **[Answer-M]**
 408 S4: and you don't think it re- they don't think it represents (.) you
 know (.) our society more than other songs? / **[Question-M]**
 409 S5: *[a]* erm the song <pvc> rapresent {represent} </pvc> our society
[b] but his songs talk about (.) er vio- er / **[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]**
 410 S3: <6> violence </6> / **[Repair-M]**
 411 S6: <6> violence </6> / **[Repair-M]**
 412 S5: *[a]* violence *[b]* and there is also violence for homosexual and
 bullying and (1) *[c]* hi- his song <pvc> ragroup {combine} </pvc>
 our songs. (2) / **[a. b. Focus-M + c. Evaluate-M]**
 413 S3: that represents all the types of violence that (.) someone can (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 414 SX-f: can't do / **[Repair-M]**
 415 S4: can do you're saying? (.) / **[Loop-M]**
 416 SX-f: <@> can't </@> / **[Answer-M]**
 417 S4: what are the lyrics? (.) do you remember them? / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 418 S2: erm (.) the song is called *zombie* (.)
 419 S4: by?
 420 S2: by cranberries
 (gap 00:00:09) {silence; S2 reads the lyrics quietly using his smartphone}
 421 S2: *[a]* there's one of the sentences (.) it said that (.) <reading aloud> and
 the violence caused such silence (.) who are we mistaken?</reading aloud>
 and (.) it represents about (.) the violence the very very (1) erm (.) that
 very damage the society (.) *[b]* and it causes silence *[c]* and it mean it killed
 a lot of people (.) it destroyed our family (.) *[d]* so (.) mhm (.) instead
 of peace we have silence *[e]* which is (.) more (.) even more brutal (.)
 <soft> i think </soft> (1) / **[a. b. Focus-M + c. d. Explain-M + e. Upgrade-M]**
 422 S4: <to S6> what do you think (.) that he?</to S6> = / **[Elicit-M]**
 423 S6: = *[a]* i agree with him *[b]* and (.) i think violence of <un> x </un> (.)
 this violence represent (er) task of our topics. / **[a. Support-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 424 S1: <soft> yes </soft> (4) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 425 S3: <soft> yes </soft> (1) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 426 S2: <soft> yes </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 427 S1: *[a]* i think that my <pvc> tops [topics] </pvc> are a bit different between
 erm these (.) the other topics *[b]* because (.) er in the song i chose a (1) there is a little
 irony er about the society (.) of today and (1) *[c]* i said that it could be a stupid (.)
 song (.) *[d]* er (1) a song that (.) could be not (1) read in the <smacks lips>
 the good way *[e]* but it (1) this song has a lot of er <L1it> signi- {mean-} </L1it>
[f] <soft><L1it> significato come si dice? {how do you say meaning?}
 </L1it></soft> / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Explain-M + c. Downgrade-M + d. Clarify-M**
+ e. Evaluate-M + f. Question-M]

- (gap 00:00:03) {the students whisper}
- 428 S1: [a] a lot of important [b] and i think that (.) a man or a woman in t- two thousand and (.) no in two thousand and f- five hundred erm (.) [c] when erm this song will be er listening (.) [d] it could be (.) <fast> the society of today </fast> (.) could be <fast> represented.</fast> (4) / **[a. b. Evaluate-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Evaluate-M]**
- 429 S4: <to S6> and yours?</to S6> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 430 S6: my song (1) criticize (.) the superficial and psychological situation of the society. / **[Answer-M]**
- (gap 00:01:40) {the students whisper and the researcher invites them to discuss their choices}
- 431 S5: i also know (.) another song that talks about violence ag- against women (.) / **[Open-M]**
- 432 S4: against women. / **[Newsmark-M]**
- 433 S5: [a] yeah (3) [b] and it's called *salute* by li- little mix (4) [c] but *zombie* it's erm (1) talks about all types of violence [d] not t- not just against women but also against er chil<7> dren </7> (.) and also men? [e] so i think it's (2) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + d. Upgrade-M + e. possible Evaluate-M]**
- 434 S2: <7> children </7> / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 435 S4: it's? (1) / **[Elicit-M]**
- 436 S5: [a] BETter (.) than (1) maybe my song [b] because it's talk just (.) about violence <fast> against women.</fast> / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 437 SX-f: okay. / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 438 S1: [a] and now i'm thinking about another song [b] and (.) erm it's an italian song. [c] a:nd (.) ta- talk about the islamic terrorism. (.) [d] and is erm (2) <smacks lips> the name (1) the singer erm is (.) fabrizio moro and er an- also erm al meta [e] and the song (.) is (.) was (1) sang [f] <L1it> come si dice? {how do you say?} </L1it> (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + d. e. Inform-M + f. Question-M]**
- 439 S3: <8> sang </8> / **[Answer-M]**
- 440 S2: <8> sung </8> / **[Answer-M]**
- 441 S1: [a] was sung <9> in </9> sanremo (.) this year (.) [b] a:nd (.) is the topic of this song is very very important (.) [c] because (.) er it talk about er terrorism (.) and all the tragedy that (.) er nowadays (.) happens (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Explain-M]**
- 442 S3: <9> sung </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 443 S2: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 444 S5: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 445 S1: because religious problems are another (.) for me is another problem of the society (.) / **[Explain-M]**
- 446 S2: <soft> mhm </soft> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 447 S1: the difference of (1) the (.) all the religion of the world. / **[Explain-M]**
- 448 S2: <soft> a:h </soft> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 449 S4: and so? which one did you choose? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 450 S6: [a] h- his song (.) [b] it's more (1) representing our society (.) nowadays (.) [c] and also religious (.) perhaps. (5) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Upgrade-M]**
- 451 S1: and the religious problem e:r are another reason of the er <pvc> emargination {marginalisation} </pvc> <fast> of the society </fast> / **[Focus-M]**
- 452 S3: <soft> yes </soft> (3) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 453 S2: [a] i think his song is better [b] because erm his song er talked about the (1) the starting point of the violence (.) [c] because without erm any (.) <swallows> any discussion or any arguments there are going to be the violence [d] so he he was talking about erm the religious erm problem (.) the religious conflicts (.) [e] and it also related to another <swallows> erm (.) to other erm (.) conflict (.) that could cause the violence [f] so the violence is the thing that (.) came after (.) / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. c. Explain-M + d. e. f. Focus-M]**
- 454 S3: aha / **[Continuer-M]**

- 455 S2: [a] the arguments (.) [b] so i think his song is like (.) more likely to be (.)
the model song of (.) the year. (4) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
- 456 S3: [a] e:r (2) okay (2) [b] i'm agree with them on (.) i agree with them on
the (1) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M]**
- 457 S2: <soft> okay.</soft> / **[Finalizer-M]**

Touschek_1_Los Borbones son unos ladrones (lines 458-495)

S1=L1: ger/DE, female; S2=L1: hrv/HR, female; S3=L1: spa/ES, male; S4=L1: ita/IT, male

- 458 S1: what songs did you choose? (4) / **[Elicit-M]**
- 459 S2: [a] o:h (.) i chose <smacks lips> one croatian song erm (.) [b] about (.)
erm (2) helping the croatia to stand up for themselves. (1)
[c] <soft> croatian people actually </soft> / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. Focus-M]**
- 460 S1: [a] i chose an english song by the chainsmokers (.) [b] it's called *sick boy*
(.) [c] and it's about social media and so: [d] it creates (.) problems and indifference
between the people. / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. d Focus-M]**
- 461 S3: [a] i've chose a (.) spanish and also a catalan song that talks about the (.)
the monarchy and (.) and the kings [b] and they say they (.) they're thieves. /
[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]
- 462 S4: i (1) not find a song that <pvc> rapresent {represent} </pvc> (.) the
italian society (2) and (2) it (.) <soft><@> it's </@></soft> (.) / **[Answer-M]**
- 463 SX-f: <soft> so </soft> / **[possible Open-M]**
- 464 S1: why would you want to (read) some to each other (then)? / **[Elicit-M]**
- (gap 00:00:04) {unintelligible words spoken in a very soft mode}
- 465 S3: [a] hh (.) i think that this song represents the thoughts of a lot of spanish
people (.) [b] because (.) the situation of poverty in a lot of spanish cities it's (.)
very big [c] and (.) this monarchy (.) th- the family of the monarchy are (.) wasting
our money (.) so = / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. Explain-M]**
- 466 S1: = so like corruption = / **[Focus-M]**
- 467 S3: = [a] yeah corruption and (.) [b] you know? [c] so much (.) ceremonies
that (.) aren't useful (.) [d] they only (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Try-Marker-M
+ c. d. Focus-M]**
- 468 S1: <soft> waste money? </soft> / **[Repair-M]**
- 469 S3: [a] yeah (.) [b] they only waste money. / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 470 S1: [a] i think mine could be chosen [b] because (.) social media plays a very
big role in today society (.) [c] it (.) creates these standards that are (.) very high
and very hard (too huge) [d] and that (.) creates a lot of probl- mental problems
for (.) er people (.) boys and girls both (.) and everything (.) [e] and erm
<@> yeah </@> (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. d. Explain-M + e. Finalizer-M]**
- 471 S2: [a] i chose (.) a:h okay (.) i chose my song [b] because erm when was (.)
war in croatia e:r people erm are really erm scared (.) [c] and (.) er <smacks lips>
they were scared for their lives er and [d] that song talks about how croatia
is not dead yet [e] because we still er live and (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. Explain-M
+ d. Focus-M + e. Explain-M]**
- 472 S1: so (.) about hope. / **[Focus-M]**
- 473 S2: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 474 S1: so (4) @ why erm? (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
- 475 SX: <soft> @@ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 476 S1: <soft> what song do you think we should choose?</soft> (4) / **[Elicit-M]**
- 477 S4: [a] i think (.) we choose (.) the (.) [S3] <1> song [b] not?</1> (.) [c] yeah (.)
the spanish song [d] because (2) e:r the spanish song (.) talk about e:r monarchy
and (.) corruption (.) [e] and (1) m- much (.) person many person in spain
don't have much money (.) [f] so (1) it's like in italy (1) and (.) / **[a. Answer-M +
b. Check-M + c. Answer-M + d. e. Explain-M + f. Upgrade-M]**
- 478 S3: <1><soft> spanish song </soft></1> / **[Repair-M]**

- 479 S3: it <un> x </un> sense so / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 480 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 (gap 00:00:06) {the students google the lyrics using their smartphones}
 481 S1: *[a]* and social media also plays the role all that <un> x </un> (.)
[b] because (1) a lot (.) most people use facebook instagram everything (2) a lot
 of (1) different (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Explain-M]**
 482 S3: *[a]* but the (.) i think it's like (.) *[b]* d'you know the <L1sp> piramide
 {pyramid} </L1sp> of (.) of <pvc> needings? {needs?} </pvc> *[c]* you know?
 (.) *[d]* first it's (.) <smacks lips> th- the basic <pvc> needings {needs} </pvc>
 for our lives (.) *[e]* you know? *[f]* breathing (1) (know) breathing (.) eating (.) /
[a. Challenge-M + b. Check-M + c. Try-Marker-M + d. Inform-M + e. Try-
Marker-M + f. Upgrade-M]
 483 S4: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 484 S3: *[a]* habit and then (.) next level we have our (.) <fast> our happiness
 </fast> *[b]* and the next level we have (.) *[c]* you know? *[d]* our image (.)
 and it's like (2) *[e]* because (happy) a thought of a (.) a important people (.) *[f]* and
 i saw a video the other day and it was interesting *[g]* because (.) when you don't have
 (.) *[h]* you know? *[i]* you don't have to to eat (.) how to eat (.) and what to (1)
[j] you know? *[k]* a a good house (.) you don't think in social standards (.)
[l] you know? *[m]* when you don't have to what to eat you only think that (.) you
 don't have time to (.) to think (.) maybe i could be like that? or (.) maybe if i was
 like he (.) no (.) (that you know) (.) / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. Try-Marker-M + d.**
Inform-M + e. Explain-M + f. Upgrade-M + g. Explain-M + h. Try-Marker-M +
i. Explain-M + j. Try-Marker-M + k. Explain-M + l. Try-Marker-M + m.
Explain-M]
 485 S1: *[a]* that's (.) a very good point (1) *[b]* and poverty also exists everywhere
 (.) *[c]* right? *[d]* there's not a country where more people are (.)
 <soft> middle class </soft> = / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Focus-M + c. Check-M +**
d. Upgrade-M]
 486 S3: = *[a]* maybe i think in spain (.) that po- poor people that they don't
 care about (.) this type of problem *[b]* because they have bigger problems
[c] <soft> you know? </soft> (1) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Explain-M + c. Try-Marker-**
M]
 487 S1: and instead of kings you could also represent the government (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 488 S3: *[a]* okay *[b]* so = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Reopen-M]**
 489 S1: = rich people who <2> betray </2> poor (.) yeah / **[Clarify-M]**
 490 S3: <2> they <un> x </un> </2> / **[possible Clarify-M]**
 491 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 492 S1: *[a]* i think your song's <soft><@> better than mine </@></soft> (.)
[b] what do you think? / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 493 S2: i agree / **[Answer-M]**
 494 S4: so i agree / **[Answer-M]**
 495 S1: then <to S3><@> we'll choose your song </@></to S3> / **[Close-M]**

Touschek_2_Imagine (lines 496-776)

S1=L1: pol/PL, female; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: fin/FI, female

- 496 S1: *[a]* so (.) i was thinking about the red hot chili peppers (.) *[a]* d'you know
 them? / **[a. Open-M + b. Check-M]**
 497 S2: of course <1> yeah </1> / **[Answer-M]**
 498 S3: <1> yeah </1> / **[Answer-M]**
 499 S1: yeah (.) i was thinking about the song *goodbye angels* (.) **[Reopen-M]**
 500 S2: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
 501 S4: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 502 S1: *[a]* about suicide *[b]* and this is the big problem for all the past years *[c]*

- but (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Focus-M]**
- 503 S3: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 504 S1: hhh we started to talk about like (.) right now (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 505 S2: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 506 S1: *[a]* like from (.) er (.) *[b]* and i know like a lots of people that has a depression and stuff *[c]* and (.) that song is really <2> real </2> and (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Inform-M + c. Evaluate-M]**
- 507 S2: <2> a:h </2> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 508 S2: so: / **[Continuer-M]**
- 509 S1: it helps some people 'n' so / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 510 S2: actually yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 511 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 512 S1: we / **[possible Upgrade-M]**
- (gap 00:00:23) {the students listen to the song}
- 513 S3: *[a]* yeah *[b]* but it talks only about suicide that is a big <3> problem </3> = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 514 SX-f: <3><un> xx </un></3> / **[possible Acknowledge-M]**
- 515 S2: = only one problem about society (.) so = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 516 S3: = but only one. / **[Clarify-M]**
- 517 S4: *[a]* so *[b]* i was thinking about *american idiot* (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M]**
- 518 S3: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 519 S4: *[a]* by green day *[b]* because i think it's about like media and propaganda *[c]* and how there's many like fake news and the media is like (.) controlling everything and everyone *[d]* and (.) i think it does a prob- problem *[e]* but <4> i don't know if </4> / **[a. Inform-M + b. Explain-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Focus-M + e. possible Check-M]**
- 520 S1: <4> *[a]* yeah *[b]* that's a big problem </4> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 521 S2: <4> yeah yeah </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 522 S3: *[a]* <4> yeah </4> *[b]* it's another big problem *[c]* but it's always only one problem = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Challenge-M]**
- 523 S4: = yeah only one = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 524 S3: = we have to find songs <5> with </5> more problems / **[Explain-M]**
- 525 S1: <5><soft> o:h </soft></5> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 526 S2: *[a]* <soft> yeah *[b]* but (.) er::m </soft> actually (.) it is one big problem so (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Challenge-M]**
- 527 S4: *[a]* but i was thinking about another song (.) *[b]* it was the same theme and the chainsmokers *[c]* er a new song called (.) erm (.) *you owe me* *[d]* it's also about = / **[a. Reopen-M + b. c. Inform-M + d. Focus-M]**
- 528 S3: = i don't know it / **[Inform-M]**
- 529 S2: <soft> no me too </soft> = / **[Inform-M]**
- 530 S4: = *[a]* well it's new <6> *[b]* so </6> @ yeah it's also about media and news <un> x </un> stuff = / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 531 S3: <6> a:h okay </6> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 532 S3: = yeah always media? / **[Question-M]**
- 533 S4: yeah / **[Answer-M]**
- 534 S3: okay. / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 535 S1: a::nd (2) / **[possible Open-M]**
- 536 S4: <soft> did you have anything? </soft> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 537 S2: so: / **[Open-M]**
- 538 SX-f: <to S2> and you:??</to S2> @@ / **[Elicit-M]**
- 539 S2: *[a]* maybe i have a song that depicts the italian society (.) a: couple of decades <7> ago </7> *[b]* so it's called <smacks lips> <L1it> *il cielo è sempre più blu* {the sky is getting bluer and bluer} </L1it> by rino gaetano (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M]**
- 540 S3: <7> yeah </7> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 541 S3: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 542 S2: *[a]* and it starts like talking about all the (.) maybe stereotypes of about the italian society <8> *[b]* and </8> on the bad <9> things </9> and erm <smacks lips> *[c]* but the er chorus says that it always could

- could be better (.) ever- everything is going to: be just temporary [d] by
saying like the sky (.) is just going to become more blue = / [a. b. c. d. Inform-M]
- 543 SX-f: <8> aha </8> / [Continuer-M]
- 544 S3: <9> i know it </9> / [Inform-M]
- 545 S4: = so it's (.) maybe about like <1> hope </1> for the future = / [Focus-M]
- 546 S3: <1> hope </1> / [Focus-M]
- 547 S3: = [a] yeah [b] but (his) so:ng it's = / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible
Challenge-M]
- 548 S2: = [a] and there but and there are some aspects like they are in common
<2> (there) </2> all the global society [b] so it could be one song (.) / [a. Inform-M
+ b. Evaluate-M]
- 549 S4: <2> yeah </2> / [Continuer-M]
- 550 S3: [a] yeah [b] but it i think it's like more (.) the ita- italian society that
the global one (.) / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Challenge-M]
- 551 S2: [a] uhm [b] <3> maybe <un> xx </un></3> / [a. Continuer-M + b. possible
Acknowledge-M]
- 552 S1: [a] <3> all the songs </3> are <4> good </4> [b] if we can link (.) that all
of the songs will be the one song it will be the be<5>st.</5> / [a. Evaluate-M +
b. Explain-M]
- 553 SX-f: <4> but </4> / [possible Challenge-M]
- 554 S3: <5> yeah </5> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 555 S2: o:h yeah / [Oh-Receipt-M]
- 556 S3: we (.) we should do a mix of every (.) song = / [Support-M]
- 557 S2: = [a] yeah [b] and that <6> song </6> that i mentioned before has a
catchy? tune (.) (again) / [a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]
- 558 S1: <6> yeah </6> / [Continuer-M]
- 559 SX-f: @@ erm / [possible Focus-M]
- 560 S3: and erm we're talking about = / [possible Focus-M]
- 561 S2: = <un> x </un> / [possible Acknowledge-M]
- 562 S3: wh- yah okay / [Finalizer-M]
- (gap 00:00:04) {the students read the lyrics quietly using a smartphone}
- 563 S2: i don't know (it) o:h yea:h / [Open-M]
- 564 S4: <un> x </un> (got just names and things) yeah okay / [Focus-M]
- 565 S2: just your (.) / [possible Focus-M]
- 566 SX-f: <un> xx </un>
- 567 S1: uhu i don't know ITALIAN @@ / [Inform-M]
- 568 S2: is (the courage) everyone / [Focus-M]
- (gap 00:00:03) {the students play the italian song using a smartphone}
- 569 S3: the rhythm is re- really good {the students listen to the song while
discussing} / [Evaluate-M]
- 570 S2: [a] <7> yeah </7> [b] now (4) <soft> they're talking about the people </soft> = /
[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M]
- 571 S1: <7> yeah </7> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 572 S3: = the like = / [possible Inform-M]
- 573 S2: = people <8> ha</8>ve = / [Inform-M]
- 574 S3: <8> yeah </8> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 575 S3: = like <un> x </un> = / [possible Inform-M]
- 576 S2: = [a] yeah (.) [b] people <un> xxx </un> <9> like in </9> southern italy
like (4) [c] yeah (.) [d] then he i guess i think he talk about the (.) other part of
<1> italy </1> [e] and then i don't know the other one and then (.) / [a.
Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M + c. Acknowledge-M + d. e. Inform-M]
- 577 S1: <9> (i really) like this music </9> / [Evaluate-M]
- 578 S3: <1> yeah </1> / [Acknowledge-M]
- 579 S3: and south north <2> and then </2> / [Inform-M]
- 580 S4: <2> it's only </2> about italy = / [Challenge-M]
- 581 S3: = [a] yeah [b] it's only about italy (.) [c] it's about hope (.) [d] and it's
good and only <3> italy </3> = / [a. b. Acknowledge-M + c. Focus-M +
d. Evaluate-M]
- 582 S2: <3> oh yeah </3> / [Acknowledge-M]

- 583 S1: = and it must be worldwide / **[Challenge-M]**
 584 S3: [a] yeah (.) [b] it's (italy.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]**
 585 SS: <soft> @@ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]** {the students stop playing the song}
 586 S1: but it's BEAUtiful. / **[Evaluate-M]**
 587 S3: [a] <4> yeah ye- </4> (.) [b] it's really <5> nice </5> [c] but it's
 only on <6> italy </6> [d] and talking about hope (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M +**
b. Evaluate-M + c. d. Focus-M]
 588 S2: <4> yeah @ </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 589 S2: <5> it was a great </5> / **[Evaluate-M]**
 590 S2: <6> yeah and </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 591 S3: i was thinking about *imagine* by lo- john john lennon = / **[Open-M]**
 592 S1: = [a] o:h [a] i kno:w it. / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Inform-M]**
 593 S2: yeah yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 594 S3: [a] yeah [b] it talks about wars religions and everything in our world (.)
 today (.) [c] so erm (.) er it's about like (.) <7> hope </7> [d] and it says like
 imagine if all the bad things in this world aren't real (.) [e] and so i think
 that it's the best [f] <8> because </8> it talks about everything = / **[a. Acknowledge-**
M + b. d. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + e. Evaluate-M + f. Explain]
 595 S4: <7> yeah </7> / **[Continuer-M]**
 596 S4: <8> [a] yeah [b] and it's (kinda) </8> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible**
Evaluate-M]
 597 S4: = [a] yeah [b] and it's very like positive the other songs were like almost
 <9> depressing </9> yeah [c] and it's like (.) the song is about we have
 <1> hope </1> and everything's <2> gonna be better [d] so yeah so </2>
 <un> x </un> (someone will say) in the future (.) they will be like
 o:h = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Focus-M + d. Upgrade-M]**
 598 S3: <9> yeah like </9> / **[Continuer-M]**
 599 S2: <9> yeah </9> / **[Continuer-M]**
 600 S3: <1> yeah </1> / **[Continuer-M]**
 601 S2: <2> yeah i think so (.) absolutely </2> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 602 S1: <2> you know? </2> / **[Summon-M]**
 603 S1: = [a] you know? [b] i was in an international congress (.) / **[a. Summon-M +**
b. Inform-M]
 604 S3: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 605 S1: and i shou- there were lots of people from another countries like israel
 taiwan (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 606 S2: aha / **[Continuer-M]**
 607 S1: [a] korea or also german [b] and actually it was er (.) like (.) THE main
 song we were (.) we had to like learn it and sing <3> it </3> from all
 <4> all these </4> / **[a. b. Inform-M]**
 608 S3: <3> yeah </3> / **[Continuer-M]**
 609 S3: [a] <4> yeah </4> [b] because it's inter<5>national </5> = / **[a. Acknowledge-M**
+ b. Explain-M]
 610 S1: <5> yeah </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 611 S2: <5> yeah </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 612 S4: = [a] yeah [b] worldwide = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M]**
 613 S1: = it talks about (.) every<6>thing </6> / **[Focus-M]**
 614 S2: [a] <6> i think </6> it has been rewarded as the like the best
 <7> song </7> [b] like (.) john lennon was (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 615 S4: <7> yeah </7> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 616 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 617 S2: a genius <8> @@ </8> / **[Upgrade-M]**
 618 SX-f: <8> yeah </8> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 619 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 620 S2: [a] so: (.) [b] i guess that could be one. / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 621 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 622 S3: [a] yeah [b] er so (2) / **[a. Accept-M + b. Reopen-M]**
 623 S1: we can stand up and all of us can sing it. @@@ / **[Direct-M]**
 624 SS: @@@ / **[Support-M]**

- 625 S3: [a] yeah (.) [b] it's so deep (.) i think (.) / [a. **Accept-M** + b. **Evaluate-M**]
 626 S4: yes / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 627 S3: yeah / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 628 S1: [a] yeah [b] it's REAL. / [a. **Acknowledge-M** + b. **Upgrade-M**]
 629 S3: and <fast> this is the song </fast> / [**Summon-M**]
 (gap 00:01:08) {the students sing while listening to the song}
 630 S1: <singing> to die for </singing> = / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 631 S3: = or <pvc> to suicide {to commit suicide} </pvc> yeah (.) and everywhere / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 (gap 00:00:40) {the students go on singing while listening to the song}
 632 S1: <loud><singing> could be as o::ne </singing></loud> / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 633 S2: [a] o<9>kay @@ </9> (.) [b] so <1> i guess </1> / [a. **Reopen-M** + b. **possible Upgrade-M**]
 634 S4: <9> yeah @@ </9> / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 635 S3: <1> i think </1> he was a dreamer (.) / [**Upgrade-M**]
 636 S2: yeah / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 637 S1: and this song makes me <2> cry </2> = / [**Inform-M**]
 638 S4: <2> yeah </2> / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 639 S2: = it's like important that er a few (.) decades ago he thought about religion and <3> nothing </3> to kill or die for in the second <4> sentence </4> = / [**Focus-M**]
 640 SX-f: <3> things </3> / [**Support-M**]
 641 S1: <4> yes </4> / [**Continuer-M**]
 642 S3: = and now there are all these problem problems = / [**Upgrade-M**]
 643 S2: = [a] yeah [b] he <5> thought </5> about it <6> like thirty years ago </6> and <7> now </7> it's the biggest problem [c] <8> erm </8> like few days <9> ago <spel> u s a </spel></9> (.) few years ago yeah <spel> u s a </spel> france and <1> england </1> erm (.) / [a. **Acknowledge-M** + b. **Focus-M** + c. **Upgrade-M**]
 644 S3: <5> yeah </5> / [**Continuer-M**]
 645 S1: <6> war <un> x </un> suicide </6> / [**Focus-M**]
 646 S3: <6> suicide </6> / [**Focus-M**]
 647 S3: <7> and now </7> / [**possible Focus-M**]
 648 S3: <8> yeah </8> / [**Continuer-M**]
 649 S3: <9> religion suicide everything yeah </9> / [**Focus-M**]
 650 S3: <1> yeah </1> / [**Continuer-M**]
 651 S3: this proble:m = / [**Focus-M**]
 652 S1: = and he also talks about to join like all the <2> people </2> and = / [**Focus-M**]
 653 S4: <2> yeah </2> / [**Continuer-M**]
 654 S3: = [a] yeah all the <3> dreamers </3> [b] because i think that the dreamers can <4> change </4> something [c] but it's not that easy. / [a. **Focus-M** + b. **Explain-M** + c. **Evaluate-M**]
 655 S2: <3> yeah </3> / [**Continuer-M**]
 656 S4: <4> yeah </4> / [**Continuer-M**]
 657 S2: [a] yeah yeah yeah (.) [b] there are been like several dreamers <5> over </5> the years from the first (.) ancient greek <pvc> philosophics {philosophers} </pvc> philosophers [c] and then (.) for instance (.) like the last (.) century (.) martin luther king could <6> be </6> one was <7> one </7> dreamer = / [a. **Acknowledge-M** + b. **Inform-M** + c. **Upgrade-M**]
 658 S3: <5> yeah </5> / [**Continuer-M**]
 659 S3: <6> yeah </6> / [**Continuer-M**]
 660 S3: <7> also </7> / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 661 S3: = and john lennon. / [**Upgrade-M**]
 662 S2: [a] yeah (.) [b] and john also <un> xx </un> <8> then </8> / [a. **Acknowledge-M** + b. **possible Upgrade-M**]
 663 S3: <8> of course </8> / [**Acknowledge-M**]
 664 S2: yeah of course = / [**Support-M**]
 665 S1: = and lots of people living in peace. / [**Focus-M**]
 666 S3: <fast> yeah yeah yeah </fast> like (.) / [**Acknowledge-M**]

- 667 S2: uhu hm yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 668 S3: *[a]* he wanted peace *[b]* i want peace (.) everybody (.) i think that want
 <soft> peace </soft> = / **[a. Focus-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 669 S2: = *[a]* yeah *[b]* he wanted another dreamers to (.) gather <9> and </9> = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]**
 670 S4: <9> yeah </9> / **[Continuer-M]**
 671 S3: = to stay <1> together for doing something (.) changing </1> this bad
 world = / **[Focus-M]**
 672 S2: <1> for (doing better) yeah the world will be as one </1> / **[Focus-M]**
 673 S4: = and it's = / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 674 S1: = *[a]* also i think that is why we have <un> x </un> *[b]* (you know?) this
 project <2> erasmus plus </2> *[c]* cos (.) we're joining each other <3> we met
 new cultures </3> <4> people </4> / **[a. Upgrade-M + b. Try-Marker-M + c. Explain-M]**
 675 S3: <2> yeah </2> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 676 S3: <3> *[a]* yeah *[b]* to stay together </3> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M]**
 677 S2: <4> yes yeah yeah yeah </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 678 S4: yeah it sounds (.) (no) surprise that it's so famous <un> xx </un> = / **[Evaluate-M]**
 679 S2: = yeah <soft> everyone was it </soft> yeah @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 680 S3: it was great. / **[Evaluate-M]**
 681 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 682 S2: *[a]* mhm (.) *[b]* then it talks about no possessions so: (.) / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Focus-M]**
 683 S3: *[a]* yeah (.) *[b]* be<5> cause </5> everybody in these days are like (2)
 erm like (1) mhm in love with things and not person. / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Explain-M]**
 684 S2: <5> no greed </5> / **[Focus-M]**
 685 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 686 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 687 S2: hm yeah maybe that's true = / **[Evaluate-M]**
 688 S1: = maybe that's true = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 689 S2: = then <reading aloud> n- no need for greed or hunger </reading aloud>
 = {S2 reads out the lyrics} / **[Inform-M]**
 690 S3: = *[a]* yeah *[b]* <6> hunger </6> = / **[a. b. Acknowledge-M]**
 691 S4: <6><soft> (money) </soft></6> / **[Support-M]**
 692 S2: = (so) it should be yeah <soft> (started) yeah </soft> = / **[Focus-M]**
 693 S3: = *[a]* it's everywhere <7> *[b]* and it's another </7> (.) big problem (2) /
[a. Upgrade-M + b. Focus-M]
 694 S2: <7><soft> unfortunately yes </soft></7> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 695 S2: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
 696 S3: i think that everything (.) bad starts from hunger / **[Focus-M]**
 697 S1: hm / **[possible Acknowledge-M]**
 698 S2: *[a]* hm yeah *[b]* wars start from <soft><8><un> x </un></8> (.) *[c]* not all of them
 (.) lots of them </soft> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Clarify-M]**
 699 S3: <8> yeah (.) for example </8> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 700 S3: yeah. / **[Finalizer-M]**
 701 S2: yeah. / **[Finalizer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:10) {S2 reads the lyrics quietly using a smartphone}
 702 S1: *[a]* <soft> i think </soft> that like important all (.) the important thing is
 that also (.) if the hunger is a problem and we have food *[b]* so we have we can
 share <9> it </9> like to <1> other </1> (.) <soft> people </soft> / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Focus-M]**
 703 S2: <9> yeah </9> / **[Continuer-M]**
 704 S3: <1> yeah </1> / **[Continuer-M]**
 705 S2: yeah that's true / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 706 S3: *[a]* yeah *[b]* not only foods but like clothes (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 707 S1: *[a]* <2> yeah </2> *[b]* because <3> that's a big problem </3> *[c]* because
 <4> th- </4> (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. c. Explain-M]**

- 708 S4: <2> yeah yeah </2> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 709 S3: <3> that's (share) things with </3> / **[Upgrade-M]**
 710 S3: <4> (they're) </4> <un> xx </un> not fortunate (as) us / **[Upgrade-M]**
 711 S1: [a] and (we'll) we are like helping the (.) africa and stuff [b] but we still like (.) use it like (1) [c] erm rich countries (.) rich people are using the africa for like erm (1) for some sources and stuff (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M + c. Upgrade-M]**
 712 S2: hm yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 713 S1: and <pvc> on the other side {on the one hand} </pvc> they're helping th- them but <pvc> on the other side {on the other hand} </pvc> they're (.) using them / **[Focus-M]**
 714 S2: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 715 S3: because we talk everyday about these problems but (1) like anybody does something real. / **[Explain-M]**
 716 S4: [a] yeah [b] and even th- some of the organizations that are like helping (.) more people and stuff even they're like sometimes like (.) corrupted or something (.) [c] you know? / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Try-Marker]**
 717 S1: <5> yeah that's <un> x </un></5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 718 S2: <5> yeah <un> xx </un></5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 719 S4: [a] so it's like (.) if you want to help but then still your money goes to somewhere else and it's (.) [b] yeah. / **[a. Focus-M + b. Passing Turn-M]**
 720 S2: [a] yeah [b] <6> there are been </6> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible Reopen-M]**
 721 S1: <6> there's another problem </6> and it's in the song also (.) / **[Reopen-M]**
 722 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 723 S2: [a] yeah (.) [b] there will be like people who'll try to resolve the problem of (.) hunger and possessions (.) [c] just maybe (.) karl marx but @@ then (.) the way they were applied didn't succeed @@ <un> x </un> @@ / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M + c. Upgrade-M]**
 724 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 725 S2: @@@ (.) so it's just = / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 726 S3: = <soft> i think so </soft> i think that this song is perfect (.) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 727 S2: mhm yeah yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 728 S3: for th- = / **[Evaluate-M]**
 729 S2: = for the (today) society. / **[Evaluate-M]**
 730 S1: i agree. / **[Support-M]**
 731 S3: <7> yeah </7> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 732 S4: <7> yeah </7> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 733 S2: [a] so (.) [b] what d'you think people from the (1) next centuries think about this (.) song about our society when they hear the song? / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 734 S4: i think they they're thinking that (.) wow those guys like really tried to make things better <8> and </8> they had hope and = / **[Answer-M]**
 735 S3: <8> yeah </8> / **[Continuer-M]**
 736 S1: <8> yeah </8> / **[Continuer-M]**
 737 S1: = maybe the world will change for the better or for the <9> worse </9> <1> and </1> they can compare it to the song (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 738 S4: <9> yeah </9> / **[Continuer-M]**
 739 S3: <1> yeah </1> / **[Continuer-M]**
 740 S2: hh yeah yeah yeah = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 741 S3: = maybe (.) they could think that we were fortunate or maybe that it was wo- worse (.) we don't we can't know. / **[Answer-M]**
 742 S2: th- they could see like all the progress that were (.) did (.) from that moment from this moment or (.) the other (.) the other century (.) huh (2) <smacks lips> i guess that = / **[Answer-M]**
 743 S4: = we don't don't know what's gonna happen in like a few hundred (.) years but (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 744 S3: <2> no </2> / **[Support-M]**

- 745 S1: <2> yeah </2> / **[Continuer-M]**
 746 S4: when they listen to the song and they know like there's <3> hope </3>
 like even if things were bad = / **[Focus-M]**
 747 S2: <3> but </3> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 748 S3: = [a] yeah (.) [b] we can change something now? (1) some ways?
 [c] <4> but </4> i don't know how / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M +**
c. Answer-M]
 749 SX-f: <4> yeah </4> / **[Continuer-M]**
 750 S4: <soft> all the dreamers </soft> (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 751 S3: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 752 S4: <soft> can change it @ </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
 753 S1: <soft> @@ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 754 S2: [a] yeah [b] and the- <5> they sure they'll </5> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b.**
possible Upgrade-M]
 755 S1: [a] <5> and it won't be </5> a dream actually at that time (.) if we (.)
 <fast> will change something [b] so it won't finally be a dream [c] we can
 (just) </fast> (.) / **[a. b. Challenge-M + c. possible Direct-M]**
 756 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 757 S4: [a] yeah [b] like make drea::ms / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Direct-M]**
 758 SS: come true:: yeah @@@@ (1) / **[Direct-M]**
 759 S2: i think that if the song (.) is (.) if they listen to this song they'll
 have like (.) a good impression of (.) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 760 S3: <6> yeah </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 761 S4: <6> yeah </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 762 S2: <fast> of our population </fast> @@@ / **[Evaluate-M]**
 763 S3: it's really emotional and (.) deep (.) yeah / **[Evaluate-M]**
 764 S2: [a] hm hm (.) yeah (.) [b] because then (.) er he left this ba:nd (.) few
 years <7> be</7>fore making this song [c] and he had problem wi- with his wife (.)
 [d] so that like (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. c. Explain-M + d. Focus-M]**
 765 S3: <7> yeah </7> / **[Continuer-M]**
 766 S3: <soft> yoko ono </soft> / **[Inform-M]**
 767 S2: something he said to:: (1) i don't know (.) get things off his chest (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 768 S3: yeah (.) to free (.) his soul. / **[Support-M]**
 769 S2: hm yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 770 S4: and so i guess (.) that's <fast> the song. </fast> / **[Focus-M]**
 771 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 772 S2: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 773 S3: it's perfect (.) i think / **[Evaluate-M]**
 774 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 775 S2: hm hm i think so. / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 776 S3: yeah. / **[Finalizer-M]**

Touschek_3_Obriu les portes (lines 777-982)

S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, female; S3=L1: fin/FI, female; S4=L1: spa/ES, male; S5=L1: hrv/HR

- 777 S1: [a] there is a song (.) in italian (.) which is ca:ll'd like (.) *selfie's army* (.)
 something like that (.) [b] and it's terrible <1><un> x </un></1> it's terrible
 [c] but lyrics is like e:r telling (1) all of us usually (.) use the phones instead of
 communicating with people (.) <fast> personally </fast> [d] a:nd it's quite (2)
 it's quite good the melody but it (.) tires you [e] and (.) it's not good at the end
 (.) [f] so i wouldn't choose that one [g] but if we have nothing else (.)
 <fast> it's a possibility </fast> / **[a. Inform-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Focus-M +**
d. e. f. g. Evaluate-M]
 778 SS: <1> @@@ </1> / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 779 SX-f: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 780 S2: [a] and i'm [S2] (.) i'm italian [b] and (.) i think (.) i was thinking about
 erm the song that was go to sanremo [c] and er it was written by ermal
 meta (.) [d] i don't know if you (.) <fast> know them </fast> [e] and sh-
 er this song was about terrorism [f] so: (1) <fast> i don't know </fast> / **[a. b. c.**
Inform-M + d. Check-M + e. Focus-M + f. Passing Turn-M]
 781 SX-m: <soft> @@@@ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 782 S3: i'm [S3] i'm finnish (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 783 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]** {the students introduce themselves using pseudonyms,
 some of which are really funny or unexpected}
 784 S3: [a] a:nd i didn't really come up with a good song er i only came up with
 one [b] and it's not <fast> a very good one. [c] </fast> @ it's it's actually a rock
 song (.) [d] it's by avenge sevenfold (.) [e] acid rain (.) [f] and it really depends on
 how you understand the song (.) i understand it as telling about pollution (.)
 [g] but (.) yeah it's (.) if no one has a better idea it can be used but <soft>
 it won't have to be used </soft> @@@ [h] <@> okay </@> @ / **[a. Inform-M + b.**
Evaluate-M + c. d. e. Inform-M + f. Focus-M + g. Downgrade-M + h. Passing
Turn-M]
 785 S4: [a] i'm [S4] (.) er i'm spanish [b] and e:r my song is erm a catalan song
 [c] that talk that talks about refugees on the program that <smacks lips> erm
 closing borders [d] <ipa> ha ha?</ipa> [e] a:nd (.) well cri- criticize all the
 countries that don't want to (.) to open their borders to let the <soft> refugees
 pass </soft> / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + d. Check-M + e. Focus-M]**
 786 S5: [a] okay [b] <1><soft> i'm [S5] </soft></1> / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M]**
 787 S1: <1><to S4> is the melody good?</to S4></1> / **[Question-M]**
 788 S4: what? / **[Loop-M]**
 789 S1: <to S4> is the melody (.) the tune (.) good?</to S4> / **[Question-M]**
 790 S4: not for me (.) not for me / **[Answer-M]**
 791 S1: no / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 792 S2: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 793 S5: [a] er i'm [S5] (.) [b] i'm from croatia (.) [c] er i have one song that er is
 used on er (.) one cup in brazil [d] it's called *we are one* [d] and er author is shakira
 (.) [e] d'you? <2> yeah </2> <@> d'you you know? </@> [f] and it is me good but
 er [g] because (is) talk about us that we are not racist that we're like one person
 and th- we must love each other (.) [h] so (.) <soft> that's my sugg- </soft>
 suggestion @ / **[a. Reopen-M + b. c. d. Inform-M + e. Check-M + f. Evaluate-M +**
g. Explain-M + h. Close-M]
 794 S2: <2> yeah </2> / **[Continuer-M]**
 795 S2: hm / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 796 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 797 S2: yeah erm = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 798 S1: = [a] the- there should be (.) {school bell rings} [b] <soft> we're
 recording then?</soft> (.) / **[a. possible Inform-M + b. Question-M]**
 799 S2: ye- yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 800 S1: [a] there should be a song by <fast> beatles </fast> [b] <3> it's </3>
 called (.) it's called (.) *taxman* (.) i think (.) / **[a. b. Inform-M]**
 801 S2: <3> o::h </3> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 802 SX: <3> @ </3> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 803 S2: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
 804 S1: [a] a:nd <fast> don't know it [b] but (.) i've heard about it </fast> / **[a. b.**
Inform-M]
 805 S3: okay erm = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 806 S2: = we can search the lyrics <soft> for example </soft> (.) / **[Direct-M]**
 807 S3: yeah / **[Accept-M]**
 808 S2: <soft> and so (.) we can discuss </soft> / **[Direct-M]**
 809 S4: [a] aha okay (.) [b] the first song was? / **[a. Accept-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 810 S2: erm (.) wha- what was the title? / **[Elicit-M]**
 811 S1: [a] but (if) is alright [b] because it it's italian / **[a. Check-M + b. Explain-M]**
 812 SX: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- (gap 00:00:30) {the students google the lyrics using their smartphones}
- 813 S4: this? (3) / **[Question-M]**
- 814 S1: (this) / **[Answer-M]**
- 815 S4: (what) if you want to read some? = / **[Direct-M]**
- 816 S1: = i can just translate / **[Offer-M]**
- 817 SS: @@@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 818 S1: *[a]* erm erm <translating aloud> have you seen the moon on saturday night? (.) but the true one? er do you know stars and <pvc> jemmy {twin} </pvc> towers (.) er those who which don't exist anymore any longer (.) and if i talk you about football (.) if i play banjo (.) you sa:y you tell me i'm (2) i'm sad (.) and i'm not in the context (.) i smell like bi- erm litter (1) but if i take you to the wood (.) you tell me (.) take me to the <pvc> center {city center} </pvc> because there's no (.) connection to internet (.) a:nd then you get crazy last like last time </translating aloud> *[b]* and then there is the: (.) refrain which is like <translating aloud> we're selfie's army erm the one who (.) of those who er get (.) the skin darker </translating aloud> *[c]* <fast> how d'you (say) it?</fast> / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. Question-M]**
- 819 S5: erm / **[possible Answer-M]**
- 820 SX-f: tanned / **[Answer-M]**
- 821 S1: *[a]* that erm <translating aloud> and with the iphone (.) and we have no long- we have no longer contacts e:r but those (1) which we get from internet and social media like (.) we have no contacts but all likes to another post </translating aloud> *[b]* <fast> and that's like this </fast> / **[a. b. Inform-M]**
- 822 S3: okay hm / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 823 S1: that's no good th- the tune (.) is not (good) but (.) / **[Evaluate-M]**
- 824 SX-f: hm erm / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 825 S2: also my song is in italian = / **[Inform-M]**
- 826 S3: = *[a]* okay @ (.) *[b]* <@> i should've chosen a finnish one </@> <4><un> xx </un></4> song / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Challenge-M]**
- 827 S2: <4> @@@ </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- (gap 00:00:09) {some students fiddle with their smartphones}
- 828 S5: <to S4> how longer do you travel?</to S4> / **[Question-M]**
- 829 S4: what? / **[Loop-M]**
- 830 S5: <to S4> how longer do you travel (.) from sp- spain to italy?</to S4> / **[Repair-M]**
- 831 S4: er one hour and a half (.) more or less / **[Answer-M]**
- 832 S5: okay okay @ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 833 S2: *[a]* @ *[b]* this song talks about er terrorism erm *[c]* and talks about london and the concert in manCHEster *[d]* MANchester? *[e]* er also erm the terrorism attack near <Llit> nizza {nice} </Llit> in france *[ff]* and e:r also talks about e:r how we have to (.) react when er terrorism e:r went in our city (.) *[g]* so i think (.) it's a <fast> good message </fast> (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. c. Focus-M + d. Check-M + e. Focus-M + f. Focus-M + g. Evaluate-M]**
- 834 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 835 S2: *[a]* and the melody is quite good *[b]* so @ / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Finalizer-M]**
- 836 S3: uhu (.) it sounds good er / **[Evaluate-M]**
- (gap 00:00:21) {the students fiddle with their smartphones}
- 837 S2: is your song (.) in english? / **[Question-M]**
- 838 S3: *[a]* it's in english yes <5> @@ </5> @ *[b]* erm i can read it (.) a bit (.) *[c]* but it's really about how you can understand the song *[d]* because (.) *[e]* yeah <fast><@> okay.</@></fast> @ / **[a. Answer-M + b. Offer-M + c. Focus-M + d. Explain-M + e. Finalizer-M]**
- 839 S2: <5> aha @ </5> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 840 SX-m: okay / **[Accept-M]**
- 841 S3: *[a]* it starts <reading aloud> our day has come it's drawn in the sky (.) so don't shed a tear now be thankful for the time (.) life wouldn't be so precious dear if there never was an end (.) children still play in the garden (.) dance as the sun slips away (.) we stand on the edge now we've come so far (.) through all the dust it becomes clear (.) you will always be my heart there's no deat- death no end of time when i'm facing it with you </reading aloud> (.) *[b]* so it's kinda (.) like (.) it's it talks about pollution (.) <fast> in my opinion </fast> *[c]* <6> (that's) </6>

- of course my opinion (.) [*d*] like pollution and kinda it's like er (.) [*e*] they look to the future when it has come too far the pollution and earth is no longer like (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M + c. Inform-M + d. Focus-M + e. Upgrade-M]**
- 842 SX-m: <6> uhu </6> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 843 S1: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 844 S2: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 845 S3: [*a*] it's not enough (.) like (.) [*b*] yeah (.) <fast> you understood.</fast> @@@ / **[a. Upgrade-M + b. Close-M]**
- 846 S5: <7><soft><@> yeah </@></soft></7> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 847 S2: <7> hm </7> (2) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 848 S2: and what about the melody? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 849 S3: [*a*] e:rm it's a: it's a rock song [*b*] but it's a (.) calmer one (.) kinda (.) / **[a. b. Answer-M]**
- 850 S1: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
- 851 S3: [*a*] yeah <8> it's i mean </8> i like it (.) but not everyone <fast><@> likes it </@></fast> [*b*] but (.) yeah even (.) it's a (.) it's a rock song but a calmer one [*c*] it's not a <ono> krrr </ono> @ / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Answer-M + c. Clarify-M]**
- 852 S1: <8><un> xx </un> to understand </8> / **[possible Focus-M]**
- 853 S2: aha okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 854 S1: not an heavy metal one? / **[Check-M]**
- 855 S3: y- no <@> no no </@> @@@ / **[Answer-M]**
- (gap 00:00:05) {the students fiddle with their smartphones}
- 856 S2: @@@ / **[Open-M]**
- 857 S1: <to S4> is your song in spanish?</to S4> / **[Question-M]**
- 858 S4: [*a*] no in catalan (.) [*b*] it's the language spoken in one region of spain. / **[a. Answer-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 859 S2: [*a*] aha (.) [*b*] it's erm very different from (.) spanish? / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Question-M]**
- 860 S4: no (.) / **[Answer-M]**
- 861 S2: only some word? / **[Question-M]**
- 862 S4: [*a*] some words yes (.) [*b*] well i don't want to worry you but @ spanish have has a an arabic influence so (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 863 S2: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 864 S4: not like catalan (1) / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 865 S3: but the accent is probably different / **[Elicit-M]**
- 866 S4: yes / **[Answer-M]**
- 867 S3: <9> yeah </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 868 S2: <9> yeah </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- (gap 00:00:07) {the students google the lyrics using their smartphones}
- 869 S5: did they told (.) told us how much time (did) we have? / **[Question-M]**
- 870 S2: er no / **[Answer-M]**
- 871 S3: o:h @@@ / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 872 S5: [*a*] a:h [*b*] okay @ / **[Oh-Receipt-M + Acknowledge-M]**
- 873 SX-f: @@ (2) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 874 S5: well
- 875 SS: @@@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- (gap 00:00:06) {the students fiddle with their smartphones}
- 876 S5: so we can (then) listen? / **[Question-M]**
- 877 S2: <1> eh </1> / **[possible Answer-M]**
- 878 S3: <1> they're </1> listening i have = / **[Answer-M]**
- 879 S2: = actually <2> we </2> can't (.) but / **[Answer-M]**
- 880 S1: <2> (i don't) know </2> / **[Answer-M]**
- 881 S5: o:kay @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 882 SS: @@@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 883 S3: if it's not loading we can try my phone too = / **[Offer-M]**
- 884 S4: = okay = / **[Accept-M]**
- 885 S3: = if you want to / **[Offer-M]**
- (gap 00:00:15) {some students still fiddle with their smartphones}

- 886 S1: are you going straight to rome after school (.) or do you go (.) home? / **[Question-M]**
887 S3: [a] e:r actually we're going to eat somewhere <3> first </3> (.) [b] and
then we'll go to rome. / **[a. b. Answer-M]**
888 S1: <3> hm </3> / **[Continuer-M]**
889 S1: uhu / **[Acknowledge-M]**
890 S3: how about you? (2) er i mean = / **[Question-M]**
891 S1: = what <un> xxx?</un> / **[Question-M]**
892 S3: yeah @@ / **[Answer-M]**
893 S1: i go: (.) yeah i go to eat not further than that. / **[Answer-M]**
894 S2: <soft> uh uh </soft> (.) at home? / **[Question-M]**
895 S1: <LNfr> oui {yes} </LNfr> = / **[Answer-M]**
896 S5: = what? = / **[Loop-M]**
897 S1: = yeah / **[Answer-M]**
898 S2: <4> @@@ </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
899 S5: [a] <4> where we go will?</4> [b] where we go eat? [c] to home o:r
pizza? / **[a. b. c. Question-M]**
900 S1: no (.) i think erm (.) we go to <L1it> lele {name of a shop} </L1it> (.)
like erm (.) / **[Answer-M]**
901 S2: ah / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
902 S1: it it makes (.) very good sandw- sandwiches with er (.) <L1it> porchetta
{roasted pig} </L1it> (.) / **[Inform-M]**
903 S5: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
904 S1: [a] and (.) erm (2) sausages (.) [b] <fast> it's (very) good </fast> / **[a. Inform-M +**
b. Evaluate-M]
905 S5: okay <soft> @ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
906 S2: <soft> @@ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
907 S4: [a] er er well (.) [b] it says <translating aloud> the music is the (rythm) of
of the town of the people (.) and with us and (.) they bring the (.) <fast> i don't know
</fast> the (roads) and open the doors and welcome to the h- heart of the
earth (.) erm (1) (stab) the time we we come from far (.) erm from the east and from
<smacks lips> lost roads and (summer) time we have to change the dir- the
direction erm <smacks lips> when (shall to win) er welcome <LNar> salaam alai
alaikum (.) salaam alaikum {peace be upon you} </LNar></translating aloud>
[c] <5> that's it.</5> / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Close-M]**
908 S3: [a] <5> mhm </5> [b] yes / **[a. Continuer-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
(gap 00:00:45) {the students google the lyrics using their smartphones; there is some confusion}
909 S5: [a] so [b] (.) the lyrics go <reading aloud> your flags up in the sky and
wave them side to side show the world where you're from show the world we are one
</reading aloud> then it's <reading aloud><ono> oe oe oe </ono></reading aloud>
[c] they sing something <6> and </6> <reading aloud> when the moment gets tough
you've got keep going one love one life one world one fight whole world one night
one place brazil everybody put your flags in the sky and do what you feel (.)
it's it's your world my world our world today (.) and we invite the whole world
whole world to play (so) world </reading aloud> [d] and yeah (.) it's (.)
like the same text (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. c. d. Inform-M]**
910 S2: <6> @@ </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
911 S3: <6> @@ </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
912 S3: [a] okay hm <soft> [b] yes (.) thank you.</soft> (3) / **[a. Acknowledge-M +**
b. Finalizer-M]
913 S2: [a] hm (1) [b] how we can (.) use a criteria to choose <7> one of <un> x
</un> (songs)?</7> / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
914 S1: <7> (i propose) </7> <to S5> your songs.</to S5> / **[Answer-M]**
915 S3: yeah / **[Accept-M]**
916 S2: okay / **[Accept-M]**
917 S4: good / **[Accept-M]**
918 S5: wha::t? / **[Loop-M]**
919 SS: @@@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
(nrec 00:00:45) {the teacher on duty interrupts the discussion}
920 S3: [a] okay yeah (.) [b] where were we? / **[a. Open-M + b. Question-M]**

- 921 S2: erm we were talking about erm (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 922 S4: which song <8> were we </8> / **[possible Question-M]**
 923 S3: [a] <8> yeah </8> [b] okay erm (.) [b] so the problems were (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Reopen-M + c. Focus-M]**
 924 S2: what? / **[Loop-M]**
 925 S3: those <fast> yeah i mean </fast> in all over songs the problems if we just (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 926 S2: <soft> rephrase (it)?</soft> / **[Repair-M]**
 927 S3: take <9> 'em </9> again @@ / **[Direct-M]**
 928 SX-m: <9> okay </9> / **[Accept-M]**
 929 S2: o:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 930 S3: [a] so (.) [b] here was about being too much on the (.) ph<1>one </1> (.) [c] yeah (.) terrorism (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. c. Focus-M]**
 931 S4: <1> phone yeah </1> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 932 S1: <1> yeah </1> / **[Continuer-M]**
 933 S2: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 934 S3: pollution (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 935 S2: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
 936 S4: refugees / **[Focus-M]**
 937 S3: refugees / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 938 SX-m: racism / **[Focus-M]**
 939 S3: [a] yeah okay (.) [b] i (guess) they're all pretty (.) <soft> current <un> x </un> er </soft> (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 940 S2: i think we can choose er an actual problem (.) <2> for example.</2> / **[Focus-M]**
 941 S3: <2> hm yeah </2> / **[Continuer-M]**
 942 S2: erm (.) i don't know (.) er refugees? (1) / **[Elicit-M]**
 943 S4: <to S1> your song was good </to S1> / **[Evaluate-M]**
 944 S2: @ <3> yeah </3> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 945 S1: <3> (it's not) </3> quite an actual problem (3) / **[Inform-M]**
 946 S5: [a] so (.) [b] what we'll take? (.) [c] what's the best song you take? / **[a. Reopen-M + b. c. Elicit-M]**
 947 S3: what does (.) everyone want? (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
 948 SX-m: @ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 949 S3: <@> what d'you think is the best one?</@> / **[Elicit-M]**
 950 S1: <4> let's vote </4> / **[Direct-M]**
 951 S2: [a] <4> i think </4> we we have to (.) [b] yeah / **[a. Direct-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 952 S5: i'll vote for him. / **[Inform-M]**
 953 S3: hm you think *refugees*? a:nd (.) / **[Check-M]**
 954 S4: <soft><@> and you'll vote for me.</@></soft> (.) / **[Direct-M]**
 955 S1: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 956 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 957 S3: <@> [a] okay (.) i think it's pretty clear (.) we're taking *refugees* (.) [b] yeah okay it sounds good </@> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 958 SX-m: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 (gap 00:00:07) {silence}
 959 S5: [a] er if we must present e:r do presentation of that song who will be? [b] because <to S4> that's your song </to S4> / **[a. Question-M + b. Explain-M]**
 960 S3: there will be a spokesman / **[Answer-M]**
 961 S2: <5> yeah @@ </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 962 S5: [a] <5> yeah </5> [a] <to S4> because you know that song</to S4> [c] so <@> yeah </@> (2) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Explain-M + c. Finalizer-M]**
 963 S3: [a] <to S4> could you open the whole l- lyrics again? </to S4> [b] er okay yeah (.) <@> okay it was in <pvc> catalanian {catalan} </pvc> [c] okay alright </@><6> @@ </6> yeah (3) / **[a. Direct-M + b. Inform-M + c. Acknowledge-M]**
 964 S2: <6> @@ </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 965 S4: [a] so that's it (.) [b] this song? / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Check-M]**
 966 S1: yeah / **[Answer-M]**

- 967 S3: [a] yeah [b] okay [c] <7> what do we </7> / **[a. Answer-M + b. Reopen-M + c. Elicit-M]**
- 968 S1: <7> have we finished? </7> / **[Question-M]**
- 969 S3: haeh? / **[Loop-M]**
- 970 S1: have we finished? / **[Question-M]**
- 971 S3: [a] probably (.) [b] or i mean do we have to think what we'll (.) we are gonna say <soft> talk about it (.) tell about it? </soft> or (so) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 972 SX-m: <soft> i don't know </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
- 973 S1: how would we tell? (.) that? / **[Question-M]**
- 974 S2: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 975 S3: i don't think we have to say much = / **[Answer-M]**
- 976 S4: = [a] i will read maybe these verses [b] and i don't know (.) put the song. / **[a. b. Answer-M]**
- 977 S3: [a] <8> yeah </8> <@> okay </@> okay [b] i think we're ready (.) [c] right? / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M + c. Check-M]**
- 978 S2: <8> @@ </8> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 979 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 980 S2: <9> yes </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 981 S3: <9> okay </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 982 S2: i can stop / **[Close-M]**

Touschek_4_Collapse (Post-Amerika) (lines 983-1142)

S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: ger/DE, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, male; S4=L1: pol/PL, male; S5=L1: spa/ES

- 983 S1: [a] okay (.) [b] my song er is <@> *uprising* </@> by muse [c] and it is about erm <smacks lips> oppression [d] and e:r (.) like yeah oppression towards people <fast> who want to rebel </fast> [e] and they are (.) er shut down by the government and (.)er yes <fast> the people in power.</fast> (2) / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M + d. e. Upgrade-M]**
- 984 S2: [a] my song is er called *collapse post-amerika* by (.) rise against [b] and it's about (.) pollution of the environment (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 985 S3: [a] so (.) [b] the song erm that i <pvc> choosed {chose} </pvc> was *we are the champions* by queen (.) [c] and this is one of the most famous song in the twentieth century and (.) [d] erm it's about how (.) i don't know (.) how to be a champions (.) [e] and in general (.) it's an anthem to be a champion. / **[a. Open-M + b. c. Inform-M + d. Focus-M + e. Inform-M]**
- 986 S4: [a] okay (.) [b] er my song called er *to my boys* is about <smacks lips> er freedom [c] and (.) how not to forget about your family and friends while er hardworking (.) [d] and it's also about <smacks lips> (2) {parallel conversation between S3 and SX-f starts} / **[a. Open-M + b. c. d. Focus-M]**
- 987 S5: [a] my song is *mercy* (.) [b] it's of madame monsieur [c] and it's about refugees that <un> x </un> arrive to europe [d] and it's about erm maybe the (.) born er after (.) a rescue in the mediterranean. {parallel conversation between S3 and SX-f ends} / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. d. Focus-M]**
- 988 S3: a:nd i don't know (.) why do you think that your song (.) WHY have you chosen these songs? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 989 S1: [a] er er i'm a big (.) fan of muse [b] so like (.) i'm i like all the concepts they talk about in theirs lyrics [c] so (.) erm and <fast> i don't know </fast> i think (.) oppression is a BIG (.) / **[a. b. Answer-M + c. Focus-M]**
- 990 S3: yes / **[Continuer-M]**
- 991 S1: [a] is a big topic in our society [b] so i think <1> e:r it </1> is adequate <2><soft><un> xxx </un></soft></2> / **[a. Focus-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
- 992 S3: <1><soft> yes i think it is too </soft></1> / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 993 S3: <2><to S4> what about you?</to S4></2> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 994 S4: [a] cos e:r i love trap music (.) [b] and also (.) i like music with- <smacks lips> with some (.) erm <pvc> communicate {message} </pvc> (.) [c] you know d'you know what i mean? [d] <soft> so </soft> = / **[a. b. Explain-M + c. Check-M + d. Finalizer-M]**
- 995 S3: = yes i think = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 996 S4: = i need th- the music (.) need to teach you something. / **[Clarify-M]**
- 997 S1: <3><soft> hm <un> x </un> it's true </soft></3> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 998 S3: [a] <3> yes (.) yes </3> (.) [b] i think it too (.) [c] and <to S5> what about you?</to S5> [d] i don't know. (1) / **[a. b. Acknowledge-M + c. Elicit-M + d. Passing Turn-M]**
- 999 S5: [a] erm my song it's about <fast> a refugees </fast> [b] and it's an important topic now <fast> in our society </fast> (.) [c] and we have to <slow><soft><pvc> solucionate {solve} </pvc></soft></slow> now (.) [d] so this is so important. (2) / **[a. b. c. Focus-M + d. Close-M]**
- 1000 S1: [a] mhm hm and no yes [b] and like (.) do you remember a piece of the lyrics of your song? [c] so <fast> that like a little pieces </fast> <4> li:ke </4> some yeah like (.) some sentences that you can say (.) yes this is important (.) (this is why) = / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M + c. Upgrade-M]**
- 1001 S4: <4> of course </4> / **[Answer-M]**
- 1002 S3: = [a] a message a message i don't <5> know </5> [b] <to S5> you don't remember?</to S5> / **[a. Upgrade-M + b. Question-M]**
- 1003 S1: <5> yeah </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1004 S5: no / **[Answer-M]**
- 1005 S3: [a] ah okay (.) [b] <to S2> what about your song?</to S2> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 1006 S2: [a] i chose my song because it (tells) about pollution [b] and i think the pollution of the environment is one of the: <fast> biggest issues we have nowadays? </fast> [c] and it (.) needs to be <soft> acknowledged for.</soft> / **[a. Explain-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Upgrade-M]**
- 1007 S1: aha okay yes = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1008 S3: = yes i think it too = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1009 S1: = okay / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 1010 S3: [a] and (.) i don't know i think that (.) all what we said are topic are important topics of the world [b] and (.) they <pvc> rapresent {represent} </pvc> better what are the problems (.) and in (.) in our society [c] and i think that in (.) in two thousand and five hundred i hope that (.) all this will be better. / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Evaluate-M]**
- 1011 S1: [a] e- exactly yes [b] i think the world will (.) will be like sort of = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
- 1012 S3: = yes = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1013 S2: = <@> will it be destroyed by the end? <un> xxx </un></@> = / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1014 S3: = [a] <@> i hope no i hope no i hope no </@> [b] i don't think that because = / **[a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 1015 S1: = [a] who cares? [b] we won't even be here (.) and = / **[a. Challenge-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 1016 S3: = [a] yeah who cares? [b] we have to think about the <ipa> fu:t- </ipa> the future so = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 1017 S2: = <@> the food </@> @@@ = / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1018 S4: = food also @ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1019 S3: <6><@> the future so: </@></6> / **[Explain-M]**
- 1020 SS: <6> @@@ </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1021 S2: <@> a:h we get the (micky) out of the poor guy </@> @@@ = / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1022 S4: = [a] okay [b] my song (.) there are part of the words like (.) man don't worry and going to when this game called life (.) so (.) / **[a. Finalizer-M + b. Inform-M]**
- 1023 S3: [a] a:h [b] <7> okay </7> okay / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
- 1024 SX-f: <7> hm hm </7> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1025 S4: (it's rather) = / **[possible Evaluate-M]**

- 1026 S3: = so in fact i think in rap and especially in trap music in general (.) we (.)
the important topic is that (.) the singer (.) gain this success (.) <pvc> moneys </pvc>
but we don't have to forget your past. / **[Focus-M]**
- 1027 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1028 S1: hm (.) A:H / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1029 S3: <soft> i think that.</soft> / **[Focus-M]**
- 1030 S1: THAT is the concept of the trap music? REally? / **[Newsmark-M]**
- 1031 SX-f: <soft> in general yes </soft> = / **[Answer-M]**
- 1032 S4: = not all of the trap music but = / **[Answer-M]**
- 1033 S3: = not only (.) / **[Answer-M]**
- 1034 S1: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1035 S3: [a] not only that (.) [b] there are other part of trap <@> trap <8> music
</8> [c] okay </@> @@ = / **[a. Answer-M + b. Clarify-M + c. Finalizer-M]**
- 1036 S2: <8><@> ye:s </@></8> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1037 S2: = <@> e:r i fig- figured yes </@> @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1038 S3: erm / **[possible Reopen-M]**
- 1039 S1: [a] erm (.) so i don't know like (.) like i said before (.) [b] do you know like
some words or some phrases of your song that really inspire you (.) or <fast>
something?</fast> / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 1040 S4: of COURSE / **[Answer-M]**
- 1041 S1: say it / **[Direct-M]**
- 1042 S4: e:h yeah (.) but (.) should i say it? / **[Question-M]**
- 1043 S1: yah / **[Answer-M]**
- 1044 S3: yes (.) in general / **[Answer-M]**
- 1045 S4: even in polish? / **[Question-M]**
- 1046 S3: [a] NO no: [b] in english (.) try in <9> english </9> [c] the sense the
important is what does it say. / **[a. Denial-M + b. Direct-M + c. Focus-M]**
- 1047 S4: <9> okay </9> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1048 S4: i've just said (.) man don't worry and = / **[Inform-M]**
- 1049 S3: = [a] aha (.) yes yes (.) [b] i don't know (.) <to S5> what about your
song?</to S5> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 1050 S5: in general? (.) / **[Question-M]**
- 1051 S1: yes / **[Answer-M]**
- 1052 S5: [a] all the song is important (.) the message (2) [b] so: i think all the
song (.) / **[a. b. Focus-M]**
- 1053 S3: aha okay = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1054 S5: = <soft> is the message </soft> / **[Focus-M]**
- 1055 S1: okay = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1056 S3: = <to S2> what about your song: er?</to S2> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1057 S2: [a] i think part of the chorus er says erm (.) <reading aloud> of a world
too proud to admit our mistakes we're crashing into the ground as we all fall from
grace </reading aloud> [b] <fast> which yes (.) i know it's very depressing </fast>
(.) [c] but <1> @@@ </1> (.) i mean it talks about the pollution [d] and how it will
eventually (.) [e] you know? [f] <fast> end humanity in the world </fast> [g]
because <soft> the world is gonna die </soft> = / **[a. Answer-M + b. Evaluate-M +
c. d. Focus-M + e. Try-Marker-M + f. Focus-M + g. Explain-M]**
- 1058 S1: <1> NO no well </1> / **[Denial-M]**
- 1059 S3: <1> no no </1> / **[Denial-M]**
- 1060 S3: = [a] i hope i hope the world will not be destroyed about pollution [b]
but (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. possible Challenge-M]**
- 1061 S2: yea:h i <soft><un> xxx </un> (ideal) </soft> = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1062 S1: = i think people will wake up (more) = / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1063 S3: = yes = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1064 S4: = and stop produce carbon footprint. / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1065 S3: <2> now or later </2> / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1066 S1: <2> [a] a:nd yes [b] so </2> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible Reopen-M]**
- 1067 S2: end carbon footprint / **[Support-M]**
- 1068 S4: [a] yeah [b] <3> eco</3>terror = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Challenge-M]**
- 1069 S3: <3> yes </3> / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 1070 S2: = <fast> my carbon <un> xxx </un> fifty per cent carbon footprint
</fast> = / **[Inform-M]**
- 1071 S4: = @@ wow @ = / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1072 S1: = [a] ah [b] i erm i like i'm talking about all those things [c] but i don't
actually like (.) i take care every day (.) <soft> that's all.</soft> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M**
+ b. c. Inform-M]
- 1073 S4: uhu = / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1074 S1: = my carbon footprint is HUGE @ = / **[Inform-M]**
- 1075 S4: = in my opinion there's a bit of ecoterror in europe but (.) / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1076 S1: aha / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1077 S4: <smacks lips> okay. / **[Passing Turn-M]**
- 1078 S3: [a] i choose my song because you're talking about pr- problems (.) [b] i
was trying to be (.) i don't know (.) more positive about my our wor- <4> world </4>
[c] so (.) i don't know <swallows> that's the reason for my choice. / **[a. b. c.**
Explain-M]
- 1079 S1: <4> yes yes </4> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1080 S1: [a] hm no my choice like it's <un> xx </un> a positive lyric [b] and it's not
like <un> x </un> like the others (.) [c] is more but like the chorus says <reading
aloud> they will not control us we will be victorious </reading aloud> [d] like
is very like <fast><@> the song is better than i say it </@></fast> [e] but erm
and like it talks about the pol- the politicians that erm th- the singers the group
calls them the fat cats (.) [f] because they take everything just stay there a:nd like
position (.) and they don't ever go away [g] so fat cats like they (do) the power and
wealth <5> and </5> they don't actually deserve it [h] a:nd (.) er yah (.) it's actually
what any rebellion [i] and <fast> it's actually inspired by a true story [j] </fast>
like the singer was hit when he was attending a protest in london so: like (.) / **[a. b. c.**
Inform-M + d. Evaluate-M + e. Focus-M + f. Explain-M + g. Upgrade-M +
h. Focus-M + i. Inform-M + j. Upgrade-M]
- 1081 SX-m: <5> hm </5> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1082 SX-f: (welsh) = / **[possible Upgrade-M]**
- 1083 S1: = <@> that's it.</@> @@ / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 1084 S3: [a] that's it for me. [b] a:nd (.) i don't know (.) for example which (.)
which type of mu- music inspired you most? / **[a. Finalizer-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 1085 SX-f: hm / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1086 S4: probably er rap music or <5> trap </5> yeah / **[Answer-M]**
- 1087 S1: <5> rap?</5> / **[Loop-M]**
- 1088 S3: rap or tr<6>ap </6> / **[Answer-M]**
- 1089 S1: <6> a:h rap <soft> or trap </soft></6> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1090 S4: i think trap = / **[Answer-M]**
- 1091 S3: = [a] <to S4> for the reasons that you said before?</to S4> (1) [b] <to S4>
for the reasons that you said before?</to S4> / **[a. b. Question-M]**
- 1092 S4: er of course / **[Answer-M]**
- 1093 S3: <to S5> what about you? which is your favourite?</to S5> (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1094 S5: trap / **[Answer-M]**
- 1095 S3: no (.) <to S5> your favourite type of music?</to S5> (.) yes / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1096 S5: trap / **[Answer-M]**
- 1097 S1: a:h <7> trap </7> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1098 S3: <7> a:h trap too </7> (1) / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1099 S3: spanish (.) <8> spanish trap </8> / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1100 S4: <8> aFRlca trap </8> @ / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1101 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1102 S3: <@> i have to listen spanish trap </@> / **[Inform-M]**
- 1103 S1: <@> not polish?</@> / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1104 S4: @@@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1105 S3: <@> i have to listen polish trap too </@> / **[Inform-M]**
- 1106 S5: <@> or french trap?</@> / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1107 S1: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1108 SX-2: <soft> okay </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1109 S3: i know that french tr- trap is rea:lly = / **[Inform-M]**

- 1110 S4: = [a] is really <8> fast </8> (.) [b] <soft> is great </soft> / **[a. Inform-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
- 1111 S3: <8> fa- famous </8> / **[Inform-M]**
- 1112 SX-f: uhu (2) / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1113 S2: [a] i think my (.) the music genre inspires me the most is probably rock or alternative (.) rock [b] cos i like <fast> that the most i listen to that the most [c] and it has a lot of inspiring songs.</fast> / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. Explain-M]**
- 1114 S1: [a] a:nd me: (.) erm okay (.) i like alternative rock [b] like i have gone through a phase in which i only li- listen to my chemical ROMance [c] so (.) even though it's a bi- bit depressing even rock music [d] and (.) like yeah yeah (.) rock music is pretty inspiring sometimes (.) [e] but now i i'm more like inclined to erm well-done pop music [f] a:nd <swallows> alternative er a:nd no yes like it inspires me sometimes = / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M + c. d. Evaluate-M + e. f. Answer-M]**
- 1115 S3: = [a] about my favourite type of music i'm very luNAtic (.) [b] in fact (.) it depends from the situation [c] in fact i like (.) i don't know (.) when i: when i want to stay calm i usually (.) classical music or for example (.) pop also pop music [d] but in general i like also rap and trap music so: (.) i don't know (.) {parallel conversation between S2 and SX-5 starts} / **[a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Answer-M]**
- 1116 S3: what do you want to do (.) about er? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1117 S1: erm e:r (.) let's talk about (.) erm = {parallel conversation between S2 and SX-5 ends} / **[Answer-M]**
- 1118 S3: = [a] e:r we can talk (.) i don't know erm (2) how does your song that you said before feel you? [b] you feel better when you listen this song? or you (.) [c] or this make you think about something? / **[a. Elicit-M + b. Clarify-M + c. Elicit-M]**
- 1119 S2: [a] i mean the song makes me think about tha:t (.) [b] makes me more aware of the environment <fast> that we need to take care [c] but it makes me think about a lot </fast> [d] so take <un> xx </un> a few words <9><un> xxx </un></9> / **[a. Answer-M + b. Upgrade-M + c. Answer-M + d. Direct-M]**
- 1120 S3: <9><to S5> what about you?</to S5></9> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1121 S5: [a] it (1) when i (.) listen this song i feel well and also bad [b] because (.) the message is that we have to change things but (1) we can (.) we can change but (.) we don't do anything. / **[a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 1122 S3: [a] okay (.) [b] <to S4> your song (.) what does make you feel?</to S4> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M]**
- 1123 S4: e:r <smacks lips> my songs e:r makes me e- empower <1> to life </1> to fight for my rights and like <smacks lips> / **[Answer-M]**
- 1124 S3: <1> empower yes </1> / **[Support-M]**
- 1125 S3: [a] yes you're right (.) [b] i think it too about my song yes (.) for sure that (.) [c] this song make me feel better for sure but (1) i don't have to be distracted by what the song fee- says or the things too or the problems too. / **[a. b. Acknowledge-M + c. Answer-M]**
- 1126 S1: [a] no [b]mine gives me a lot of energy like <2> er (it) did you </2> [c] like <3> ye:s </3> (.) i can do this [d] <4> and </4> <un> xx </un> it's a really positive song. / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Answer-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Evaluate-M]**
- 1127 S3: <2> yes mine too </2> / **[Inform-M]**
- 1128 S3: <3> yes </3> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1129 S3: <4> okay </4> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1130 S3: [a] okay okay (.) [b] so: = / **[a. Finalizer-M + b. possible Open-M]**
- 1131 S1: = [a] so [b] we: should choose the right song. / **[a. Open-M + b. Direct-M]**
- 1132 S3: [a] okay (.) [b] i think that (.) i don't know (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible Direct-M]**
- 1133 SX-2: [a] okay [b] let's (going) to vote [c] okay? / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Direct-M + c. Try-Marker-M]**
- 1134 S1: er i think like one (.) like we (.) say a song and the ones not the person who wants to: e:r = / **[Direct-M]**
- 1135 S4: = okay. / **[Accept-M]**

- 1136 S3: = okay = / **[Accept-M]**
 1137 S1: = you can't vote your own song (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 1138 S3: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1139 S1: so and the mo:st (.) the ones with more votes of course (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 1140 S3: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1141 S1: take <6> (the) </6> (.) wins / **[Inform-M]**
 1142 S3: <6> yes okay </6> / **[Acknowledge-M]**

Touschek_5_Human (lines 1143-1218)

S1=L1: ita/IT, male; S2=L1: fin/FI, female; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: spa/ES, female; S5=L1: ger/DE, female

- 1143 S1: *[a]* well (.) *[b]* we have to discuss <1> (it) </1> about the song (.) so: (2) / **[a. Open-M + Focus-M]**
 1144 SS: <1> @@ </1> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1145 SX-f: (play) first (.) / **[Direct-M]**
 1146 S2: maybe (a bunch) just say them first? / **[Direct-M]**
 1147 S3: okay: / **[Accept-M]**
 1148 S4: <soft> okay </soft> / **[Accept-M]**
 1149 S5: <soft> [S3] you start </soft> / **[Direct-M]**
 1150 SS: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1151 S3: *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* i i thought about three songs three *[c]* but i erm i choose one that is *pray* *[d]* and it's a song made er made by sam smith (.) *[e]* d'you know sam smith? / **[a. Open-M + b. c. d. Inform-M + e. Check-M]**
 1152 S5: yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 1153 S1: yes / **[Answer-M]**
 1154 S4: yes / **[Answer-M]**
 1155 S3: *[a]* yes okay (.) *[b]* and ft logic that is a band that (.) rapper maybe (.) <soft> i think </soft> *[c]* and it's talk about homophobia and th- the marriage of gays and gay pride like things like that. / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M]**
 1156 SX-f: <soft><@> gays </@></soft> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
 1157 S1: *[a]* e:r i don't know (.) *[b]* because i have no idea about my song so (.) (try for) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1158 S5: *[a]* and so my song's name is *power* from little mix *[b]* and it's not about issues but about feminism like a positive thing *[c]* because it's er really new in the twenty-first century *[d]* and (.) it says a lot about the century. / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M + c. d. Explain-M]**
 1159 S3: mhm (.) okay. / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1160 S2: *[a]* i have one finnish song (.) called <L1 fin> *yksinaisen keijun tarina* {lonely fairy's tale} </L1 fin> (.) *[b]* it's like er the story of a lonely fairy *[c]* and er it's telling about the loneliness. / **[a. b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M]**
 1161 SX-f: uhu (1) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1162 S3: <to S4> your song?</to S4> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1163 S4: *[a]* okay (.) my song is called *human* *[b]* <2> and </2> talk about racism *[c]* and that sometimes we quarrel with each other and (1) all these (2) <fast> problems. </fast> / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. Focus-M]**
 1164 SX-f: <2> o:h </2> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 (gap 00:00:08) {the students whisper}
 1165 SS: @@@ / **[possible Acknowledge-M]**
 1166 SX-f: okay / **[possible Open-M]**
 1167 S3: *[a]* <soft> so *[b]* <3> what so:ng </3> wou:ld you:? <fast> (.) i don't know.</fast> @ </soft> / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1168 SX-f: <3> what d'you @ </3> / **[possible Elicit-M]**
 1169 S5: maybe we should er (.) like what is the MOST important thing about the twenty-first century (.) for all the songs (.) / **[Elicit-M]**

- 1170 S3: okay: / **[Continuer-M]**
 1171 S5: what is the BIGgest issue? (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1172 S4: <to S3>erm your song what about? </to S3> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1173 S3: e:r (.) <fast> homophobia </fast> (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1174 S4: <4> what </4> is the verb? / **[Question-M]**
 1175 SX-f: <4><un> xx </un></4> / **[possible Answer-M]**
 1176 S2: disap- (.) i don't know the verb like {unintelligible parallel conversation starts} / **[Answer-M]**
 1177 S4: well people er hate gay / **[Clarify-M]**
 1178 S3: okay (.) feels as {unintelligible parallel conversation ends} / **[possible Repair-M]**
 1179 S4: <fast> it's THIS </fast> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1180 SX-f: yeah okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1181 S2: when again / **[possible Focus-M]**
 1182 S4: yeah <soft> and so: </soft> <un> xx?</un> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1183 S1: i don't know. <5> that's </5> the problem (.) i've no idea about my song = / **[Answer-M]**
 1184 SX-f: <5> @@ </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1185 S4: = i can <fast> give you one.</fast> / **[Offer-M]**
 1186 S5: so we <6> have </6> (.) so we: have = / **[Reopen-M]**
 1187 S1: <6><@> okay </@></6> / **[Accept-M]**
 1188 S4: = and talk about social media (.) that in your (house) always with the mobile phone <7> internet </7> and other things = / **[Focus-M]**
 1189 S1: <7> uhu </7> / **[Continuer-M]**
 1190 S1: = the title? / **[Question-M]**
 1191 S4: ah <L1sp> para que el mundo lo vea {so that the world can see it} </L1sp> / **[Answer-M]**
 1192 S1: <LNsp> para que el mundo? {so that the world?} </LNsp> / **[Loop-M]**
 1193 S4: <L1sp> lo vea. {can see it.} </L1sp> / **[Answer-M]**
 1194 S1: <LNsp> lo vea {can see it} </LNsp> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1195 S4: eh say (.) er (2) that the world can see it. / **[Inform-M]**
 1196 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1197 S2: [a] so (.) [b] we have homophobia (.) internet and you had racism = / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1198 S1: = <@><LNsp> para que el mundo lo vea {so that the world can see it} </LNsp></@> / **[Focus-M]**
 1199 SS: @@@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1200 S1: <@> it's right?</@> = / **[Check-M]**
 1201 S5: = <soft><@> [a] no [b] (loneliness) and feminism </@></soft> / **[a. Challenge-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1202 S1: <LNsp> para que el mundo lo vea {so that the world can see it} </LNsp> / **[Focus-M]**
 1203 S5: [a] so (.) [b] what's the most important thing from that? / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1204 S4: i don't know / **[Answer-M]**
 1205 S5: like (.) <soft> it's different </soft> = / **[possible Answer-M]**
 1206 S2: = this social media (.) i think / **[Answer-M]**
 1207 SX-f: it's <un> x </un> / **[possible Support-M]**
 1208 S5: [a] yes (.) [b] because it's = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1209 SX-f: = if they know / **[possible Answer-M]**
 1210 SX-f: so the (things) <un> xx </un> / **[possible Focus-M]**
 1211 S4: and maybe the future get worse / **[Upgrade-M]**
 1212 S3: yes: = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1213 S4: = because = / **[Explain-M]**
 1214 S3: = and will be more technology and = / **[Explain-M]**
 1215 S5: = [a] racism (.) racism was there for a long time [b] and it was like the twenty-first century thing (.) <9> like </9> like (.) yeah (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1216 SX-f: <9> uhm </9> / **[Continuer-M]**
 1217 SX-f: @ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1218 S5: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**

Gullace_1_Africa (lines 1219-1369)

S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: ita/IT, female; S4=L1: pol/PL, male

- 1219 S1: [a] so [b] what are the names of your (.) songs? / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1220 S2: haeh? / **[Loop-M]**
 1221 S3: <soft><@><L1it> il nome della nostra canzone {the name of our song}
 </L1it></@></soft> / **[Repair-M]**
 1222 S4: whatever your song (is) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 1223 S2: i didn't found o:ne = / **[Answer-M]**
 1224 S1: = [a] okay (.) [b] <to S3> and yours?</to S3> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1225 S3: [a] yeah (.) one moment (.) <L1it> *il ragazzo della via gluck* {the boy from
 gluck street} </L1it> (.) [b] it's an italian song. / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M]**
 1226 S1: and what is it about? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1227 S3: i don't know. / **[Answer-M]**
 1228 SX-m: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1229 S4: [a] o:h (.) [b] <@> well </@> (.) have you ever listened to it? (.) [c] no? / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Question-M + c. Check-M]**
 1230 S3: no / **[Answer-M]**
 1231 S1: so how <1> did you choose it?</1> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1232 S4: <1> why did you choose it?</1> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1233 S3: i searched in internet e:r social er no songs of social <@><un> x </un></@> / **[Answer-M]**
 1234 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1235 S4: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1236 S1: so: okay = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1237 S4: = maybe search the lyrics so we could like (.) / **[Direct-M]**
 1238 S2: [a] a:h [b] er yes / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Accept-M]**
 (gap 00:00:16) {S3 googles the lyrics using her smartphone}
 1239 S4: [a] mhm (.) hard to understand [b] because it's in italian / **[a. Inform-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1240 S1: o:h <un> xx </un> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1241 SX-m: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1242 S3: can i translate (.) the text? / **[Offer-M]**
 1243 S4: o:h yeah (.) sure / **[Accept-M]**
 1244 S1: [a] yeah (.) [b] that would be great @ / **[a. Accept-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 (gap 00:00:20) {the students fiddle with their smartphones}
 1245 SS: @@@
 (gap 00:00:04) {S1 and S4 speak to each other in polish}
 1246 SX-m: okay / **[Open-M]**
 1247 S3: who is your italian people? / **[Question-M]**
 1248 S4: erm <LNit> francesco {francis} </LNit> er / **[Answer-M]**
 1249 S3: <L1it> (ricci?) {italian surname} </L1it> / **[Question-M]**
 1250 S4: a lot of <LNit> francesco {francis} </LNit> (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1251 S2: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1252 S4: he he's <un> xx </un> friend / **[Answer-M]**
 1253 S3: [a] a:h okay (3) [b] this is the text / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Summon-M]**
 (gap 00:00:18) {S1 and S4 read the english translation of the italian lyrics and one of them says something in polish}
 1254 S4: o:h (.) / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1255 S3: this our song / **[Focus-M]**
 1256 S4: really moody (4) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1257 S1: interesting (2) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1258 S3: more interesting (9) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1259 S4: and (.) and <to S1> what about your song?</to S1> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1260 S1: [a] my song is (.) *africa* by toto (.) [b] and @ er and i think that er (.) it's
 <clears throat> like there are many erm important er social problems er in this
 song (.) [c] for example there no water in africa (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M + c. Focus-M]**

- 1261 S2: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1262 S1: [a] so mhm (.) mhm the- there is like there really that <reading aloud>
 there's nothing that a hundred m- men or more could ever do i bless the rains
 down in africa </reading aloud> (.) [b] so it shows how men cannot do anything
 about er lack of water in africa. / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1263 S3: er is a polish song? / **[Question-M]**
 1264 S1: no: (.) it's (.) am- <@> american song </@> i <2> believe </2> / **[Answer-M]**
 1265 S3: <2> american?</2> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 (gap 00:00:30) {the students read the lyrics quietly using a smartphone}
 1266 S4: <@> it's better and better </@> <un> xxx </un> (2) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1267 SX-1: mhm tough choice (2) mhm <soft> @@@ </soft> / **[Focus-M]**
 1268 S3: <to S4> and your songs?</to S4> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1269 S1: maybe something by xxxtentacion? @@ / **[Elicit-M]**
 1270 S4: o:h yes (2) mhm mhm (3) i'm then still thinking between the two of
 them (1) e:r = / **[Answer-M]**
 1271 S1: = [a] so <to S4> maybe tell us about one and then about the other </to S4>
 [b] and we'll choose / **[a. Direct-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1272 SX-m: @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1273 S4: [a] yeah (.) er one of the most (er) *welcome to saint tropez* (1)
 [b] yeah t's really a pa- party song. [c] it tells about (.) human lifestyles [d] so
 how they're (1) partying a lot (.) buying expensive things (.) driving
 expensive cars erm (1) [e] yeah (.) partying a lot a lot in every verse [f] and (.)
 yeah (3) he spe- he says he's spending like he wants to fuck them all and
 he (.) yeah (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M + c. d. e. f. Focus-M]**
 1274 S1: <un> xx </un> / **[possible Focus-M]**
 1275 S4: [a] <LNit> dolce gucci </LNit> <LNfr> louis </LNfr> <spel> v </spel> @
 [b] yeah. / **[a. Upgrade-M + b. Finalizer-M]**
 1276 S3: <L1it> parla di? {what is it about?} </L1it> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1277 SS: @@
 1278 S1: <L1po> xxxxx </L1po> / **[possible Answer-M]**
 1279 SS: @@@
 1280 S4: another one is <un> xxxxxx </un> @@@ / **[Reopen-M]**
 1281 S3: why is it an important (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1282 S4: erm / **[possible Answer-M]**
 1283 S3: <soft> social document?</soft> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1284 S4: [a] because it tells [b] @@ (.) a:h sorry (.) [c] it tells about how humanity
 works like right now [d] and er (.) it describes [e] @@ sorry (.) [f] the: erm (.) /
[a. Explain-M + b. Repair-M + c. d. Explain-M + e. Repair-M + f. Explain-M]
 1285 S1: <@> like like people problems?</@> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1286 S4: [a] yes a bit [b] but the: e:r how do like humans behave (.) [c] how do they
 create songs right now (.) [d] how do they like how do (those) societies does all
 society look like (1) <smacks lips> er er [e] it's more like a tough one (.) yeah hm = /
[a. Answer-M + b. c. d. e. Focus-M]
 1287 S2: = like a? / **[Loop-M]**
 1288 S4: what? / **[Loop-M]**
 1289 S2: [a] like a? [b] i don't = / **[a. Answer + b. possible Explain-M]**
 1290 S1: = tough one. / **[Answer-M]**
 1291 S4: it's like tough one because (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 1292 S1: hard = / **[Repair-M]**
 1293 S4: = he says it's hard <3> lifestyle </3> / **[Explain-M]**
 1294 S1: <3> hard </3> (.) do you know what does it mean tough? / **[Check-M]**
 1295 S3: hard / **[Answer-M]**
 1296 S1: <4> yes </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1297 S4: <4> yes </4> like (.) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1298 S3: a:h okay / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1299 S4: [a] because he says about his childhood [b] and (1) how he (.) yeah (.)
 about all all (.) he's been through. / **[a. b. Explain-M]**
 1300 S3: are you like these songs? or (.) / **[Question-M]**
 1301 S4: yeah / **[Answer-M]**

- 1302 S3: <un> xxx </un> (song)? / **[Question-M]**
 1303 S4: yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 1304 S1: your favourite ones / **[possible Upgrade-M]**
 1305 S3: [a] a:h (.) [b] your favourite? / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Question-M]**
 1306 S4: [a] no @@@ (.) [b] he says that he's <reading aloud> i've been selling crack since the fifth grade </reading aloud> [c] it's like so REal [d] because they're some people that went so low in the society that (.) [d] right now there are even like (.) children sell drugs in the society (.) so broken that (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M + c. Evaluate-M + d. Explain-M + e. Upgrade-M]**
 (gap 00:00:15) {S2 whispers something in italian to S3}
 1307 S3: but we choose o:ne? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1308 S4: yeah: <slow> i think we have to choo- choose one </slow> / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:20) {S3 volunteers to ask the researcher whether choosing just a song is enough}
 1309 S2: do you like italy? / **[Question-M]**
 1310 S4: yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 1311 S1: yeah (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1312 S4: <soft> i think italy </soft> = / **[possible Upgrade-M]**
 1313 S1: = i love italian food / **[Upgrade-M]**
 1314 S2: eh @@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 (gap 00:00:23) {silence}
 1315 S3: [a] we choose one (.) one song [b] but the song (.) <soft><L1it> che piace a tutti {that everybody likes} </L1it></soft> (6) / **[a. b. Inform-M]**
 1316 S2: [a] yeah (.) [b] i i love we er i love we (.) live / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Repair-M]**
 1317 S3: this song? / **[Question-M]**
 1318 S1: okay / **[Answer-M]**
 1319 S4: <yawns>
 1320 S2: one song that i don't like (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1321 S3: what song? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1322 S1: so (.) what do you think about our songs we choose (.) chose? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1323 S2: er yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:13) {S2 whispers something in italian to S3}
 1324 S3: it's a difficult song (.) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1325 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1326 S3: and an important song / **[Evaluate-M]**
 (gap 00:00:07) {the students whisper}
 1327 S3: [a] an english song but his song is very <soft><@> difficult </@></soft> (2) [b] and er <to S1> your song?</to S1> / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1328 S1: my song? / **[Loop-M]**
 1329 S3: yeah (.) your song / **[Answer-M]**
 1330 S1: yeah my song *africa* by toto / **[Answer-M]**
 1331 S3: eh (.) it's (.) more easy / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1332 S1: [a] yeah (.) i think so (.) yeah (1) [b] it's also shorter / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 1333 S3: er (.) my <un> x </un> (2) / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 1334 S2: er *africa* i (.) / **[possible Acknowledge-M]**
 1335 S1: [a] *africa* is better than (his)? [b] yeah? / **[a. Elicit-M + b. Check-M]**
 1336 S3: <5> yeah yeah </5> / **[Answer-M]**
 1337 S4: <5> yeah okay </5> (.) what do you think [S2]? / **[a. Answer-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1338 S3: <to S4> no it's better your but it's more easy (.) his </to S4> (.) / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1339 S4: [a] a:h [b] yeah / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 1340 S3: for we @ / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1341 S4: okay okay (.) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1342 S2: a lot of (us) are okay (2) / **[Support-M]**
 1343 S4: er <fast> we choose this (.) no problem </fast> (2) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1344 S1: [a] so:: [b] like my my song <fast> will be the one </fast> [c] yes? / **[a. Reopen-M + Focus-M + c. Check-M]**
 1345 S3: uhu / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1346 S1: [a] so maybe we will hear it [b] and everyone hears it right now (.) [c] what do you think? / **[a. b. Direct-M + c. Elicit-M]**

- 1347 S3: yes please / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:13) {the students listen to the song}
 1348 S3: *[a]* a:h *[b]* <L1it> è belli:no. {it's ni:ce.} </L1it> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 (gap 00:00:05) {the students listen to the song}
 1349 SX-m: okay @@@ (2) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1350 S3: eh eh / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 1351 S1: *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* so you know IT? / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Check-M]**
 1352 S3: *[a]* yeah (.) *[b]* it's beautiful. (.) *[c]* is *[d]* <soft><L1it> aspetta{wait} </L1it> mhm (2) *[e]* <L1it> anni sessanta {the sixties} </L1it></soft> er (1) ninety-six in (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Direct-M + e. Upgrade-M]**
 1353 S2: <soft> no no </soft> / **[Repair-M]**
 1354 S1: i think it's nineteen eighty-six (.) / **[Repair-M]**
 1355 S3: ah / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1356 S1: but i'm not sure / **[Repair-M]**
 (gap 00:00:09) {S2 whispers something in italian to S3}
 1357 S3: and (.) now? (1) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1358 S1: i don't <6> know </6> / **[Answer-M]**
 1359 S2: <6> what do we have to do?</6> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1360 S4: we chose it. / **[Answer-M]**
 1361 S1: *[a]* so we're now just <fast> CHILLing </fast> (.) *[b]* we can GET to KNOW each other / **[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1362 S3: <soft><L1it> non ho capito {i didn't understand} </L1it></soft> / **[Inform-M]**
 1363 S2: can you repeat? / **[Loop-M]**
 1364 S1: we can get (1) mhm we can mhm / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:03) {S1 and S4 speak to each other in polish}
 1365 S4: he says that we can meet each other and talk about like (.) / **[Repair-M]**
 1366 S1: *[a]* us like (.) *[b]* you could could introduce yourselves to us by (.) tell us something about you / **[a. Repair-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 1367 S2: <7> a:h </7> / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1368 S3: *[a]* <7> a:h </7> *[b]* okay. / **[a. Oh-Receipt + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 1369 SS: @@@ / **[Acknowledge-M]**

Gullace_2_Imagine (lines 1370-1570)

S1=L1: ita/IT, female; S2=L1: pol/PL, male; S3=L1: pol/PL, male; S4=L1: ita/IT, female; S5=L1: ita/IT, female

- 1370 S1: *[a]* er i have cho:se e:r (1) *human* of rag'n'bone man (.) *[b]* this one {S1 plays the song using her smartphone} / **[a. Inform-M + b. Summon-M]**
 1371 S2: *[a]* o:h (.) *[b]* yeah i know (.) / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Inform-M]**
 1372 S3: aha okay i know that / **[Inform-M]**
 1373 S2: and you? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1374 S4: <smacks lips> er i choose er <L1it> *non mi avete fatto niente* di {you have done nothing to me by} </L1it> <1> ermal </1> meta / **[Answer-M]**
 1375 S3: <1> italian?</1> / **[Question-M]**
 1376 S4: yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 1377 S3: *[a]* yeah okay (.) *[b]* so i chose *imagine* by john lennon (.) *[c]* d'you know that song? / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Check-M]**
 1378 SX-f: no / **[Answer-M]**
 1379 S3: no (.) okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1380 S2: it's it was written post world war two (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 1381 S4: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 1382 S2: and it's about how peace in the world is desired (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1383 S3: yeah like = / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 1384 S2: = and we grow just given A LOT and have peace. / **[Focus-M]**
 1385 S4: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 1386 S2: very idealistic <2> song </2> / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1387 S3: <2> about </2> about re- religion yeah countries and (.) er stuff like that (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1388 S2: <un> xx </un>
 1389 S3: <un> xx </un>
 1390 S2: i chose *space oddity* by (.) david bowie (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 1391 S4: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 1392 S2: or *rocket man* by (.) elton john (.) / **[Inform-M]**
 1393 S1: uh / **[Continuer-M]**
 1394 S2: know THESE? / **[Check-M]**
 1395 S1: *[a]* no *[b]* i (.) don't listen up b- at (.) songs that (.) aren't of our period / **[a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1396 S3: *[a]* a:h *[b]* okay / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 1397 S2: (the:re's) *space oddity* is about (1) <fast> essentially about a space mission </fast> (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1398 S1: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
 1399 S2: a:nd (.) *rocket man* is about erm e:r let's say (.) (there's) ma:ny (.) many meanings to it (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1400 S4: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 1401 S2: *[a]* but it's (2) <smacks lips> it's about someone (.) who's far away from home and is missing missing the people home (.) a:nd (.) he knows that there (1) he's they think he is (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1402 S1: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
 1403 S2: and (.) er it's also <fast> about space exploration.</fast> / **[Focus-M]**
 1404 S3: *[a]* okay *[b]* so i think we can check the lyrics of all (you two) (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Direct-M]**
 1405 S1: yes / **[Accept-M]**
 1406 S3: because i don't know the lyrics of your songs (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 1407 SX-f: <ono> errrr ə </ono> {SX-f googles the lyrics using her smartphone}
 1408 S3: i think i don't know (what) it's about / **[Explain-M]**
 (gap 00:00:17) {S1 and S4 speak to each other in italian while googling the lyrics of their songs using their smartphones}
 1409 S3: *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* so (.) what is the e:r? (.) / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1410 S1: erm
 1411 S3: *human* <LNit> *testo?* {lyrics?} </LNit> / **[Elicit-M]**
 (gap 00:00:02) {S1 and S4 go on speaking to each other in italian}
 1412 S2: <to S3> *[a]* look (.) *[b]* *human* just (.) <LNit> *testo* {lyrics} </LNit> means lyrics (.) </to S3> / **[a. Summon-M + b. Inform-M]**
 1413 S1: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1414 S2: <to S3> in italian </to S3> / **[Inform-M]**
 1415 S3: *[a]* a:h *[b]* okay. / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 1416 S2: *human* by rag'n'bone (.) / **[Repair-M]**
 1417 S3: <un> xxx </un>
 1418 S2: <L1po> xx?</L1po> / **[Question-M]**
 1419 S3: yeah yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:38) {S1 and S4 google the lyrics using their smartphones while S3 talks to a friend from another group}
 1420 S2: *[a]* so *[b]* what are the question? / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1421 S3: yeah like what will we say to our (1) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1422 S1: <to S4><L1it> l'hai trovata in inglese? {have you found it in english?} </L1it></to S4> / **[Question-M]**
 1423 S3: teacher? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1424 S4: <un> xxx </un> / **[possible Answer-M]**
 1425 S2: *[a]* o:h there's translation (.) *[b]* that's great / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
 (gap 00:00:23) {the students read the lyrics quietly using a smartphone}
 1426 S2: that's interesting / **[Evaluate-M]**

- 1427 S3: uhu (3) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1428 S4: er this is the song that (.) win sanremo (.) the (.) the festival. / **[Inform-M]**
 1429 S3: a:h okay. / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 (gap 00:00:43) {S1 and S4 speak to each other in italian while S2 and S3 speak to each other in polish}
 1430 S3: [a] okay (.) [b] so erm i don't know how which is our song (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1431 S2: [a] i honestly think *imagine* is the best one (.) or [b] because i chose mine thinking that (.) in five hundred years the world (.) world as we know it would change completely (.) / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1432 S1: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1433 S2: a:nd they all (.) when they listen to *space oddity* or *rocket man* they would think th- it'll show they will see (.) how (.) interested we were in (.) exploring space (.) / **[Explain-M]**
 1434 S1: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 1435 S2: for example (.) in the sixties er the whole (.) all the world (race) (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
 1436 S3: [a] okay (.) [b] so we can say everyone like what was their meaning about for the song [c] so we can just look (.) what what is the best for us. / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M + c. Evaluate-M]**
 1437 S4: <fast> okay </fast> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1438 S3: [a] okay so for me *imagine* erm was meaning really good song to choose [b] because it shows we've got some problems (.) [c] because it is about that we are er divided into groups [d] that there's no peace in the world [e] that er er that we have to like er (2) er get rid of the (.) all the walls and <3> barriers </3> between us and just to just be (.) live as one. / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. c. d. e. Explain-M]**
 1439 S1: <3> uhu </3> / **[Continuer-M]**
 1440 S1: yes / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1441 S3: [a] so i thought that this is a good good song [b] because (.) er it'll show people in two thousand and five hundred that we had our problems that er our life wasn't perfect (.) and e:r that we dre- dreamt about being er like er really happy (.) / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1442 S1: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
 1443 S3: and stuff like that yeah. / **[Explain-M]**
 1444 S4: er can? / **[possible Offer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:06) {S1 and S4 speak to each other in italian while S2 and S3 speak to each other in polish}
 1445 S4: we can just read th- the lyrics of th- of the song? / **[Question-M]**
 1446 S3: okay okay / **[Accept-M]**
 1447 S4: er the name? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1448 S3: er *imagine* / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:05) {S4 googles the lyrics using her smartphone}
 1449 S3: lennon (.) john lennon. / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:20) {S1 and S4 read the lyrics quietly using a smartphone while S3 sings the song softly}
 1450 S4: a:h (1) <L1it> capito {understood} </L1it> / **[Oh-Receipt]**
 (gap 00:00:41) {S1 and S4 go on reading the lyrics quietly using a smartphone}
 1451 S1: [a] yes [b] i like that / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Evaluate-M]**
 (gap 00:00:14) {S1 and S4 go on reading the lyrics quietly using a smartphone and say a few words in italian}
 1452 S4: [a] i think that er the song communicate a really good <smacks lips> erm things [b] and for this reason i think that it (.) could to choose it. / **[a. Evaluate-M + b. Explain-M]**
 1453 S3: [a] ah okay (.) okay <soft> so we can choose like </soft> (.) [b] so we have to write it down or we should just discuss about it? / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Question-M]**
 1454 S4: i don't know (.) i = / **[Answer-M]**
 1455 S2: = we have to write down the one we (find) we've chosen / **[Answer-M]**
 1456 S3: [a] okay [b] but (.) we have to write down all the answers <soft> to these questions? </soft> / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Question-M]**
 1457 S2: yeah yeah / **[Answer-M]**
 1458 S3: [a] yeah? [b] so we have (.) d'you have a pen <soft> or something like that? </soft> / **[a. Check-M + b. Question-M]**
 1459 S1: yeah / **[Answer-M]**

- 1460 S3: okay / **[Acknowledge-M]**
(gap 00:00:25) {S1 looks for a pen}
- 1461 S3: *[a]* i think these two questions are really closed to each other *[b]* and i think that (.) / **[a. b. Focus-M]**
- 1462 S1: aha / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1463 S3: maybe we will do it in one answer (.) like not one sentence in like (all answers) (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 1464 S1: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1465 S3: *[a]* but only one not two *[b]* because it's very very similar and <un> xx </un> / **[a. Focus-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 1466 SX-f: mhm / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1467 S3: yeah. / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 1468 S4: we have to write the answers of the:? (.) / **[Question-M]**
- 1469 S5: have you chosen one song? / **[Question-M]**
- 1470 SS: yeah yeah / **[Answer-M]**
- 1471 S5: okay (.) now sum up (.) and say why you've chosen that song (.) okay?
- 1472 S3: *[a]* a:h okay okay (.) *[b]* <to S5> have we to write it down or discuss it? </to S5> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Question-M]**
- 1473 S5: maybe you can write it here (.) if you like (.) it's better a discussion for me.
- 1474 S3: a:h <to S5> just a discussion?</to S5> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Question-M]**
- 1475 S5: *[a]* just a discussion (.) okay (.) *[b]* so (.) are you er recording? / **[a. Answer-M + b. Question-M]**
- 1476 S4: yeah yeah / **[Answer-M]**
- 1477 S5: very good (.) excellent (.) okay. / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1478 S2: there's <un> xx </un> for some reason (.) to <un> xx </un> / **[Focus-M]**
- 1479 S3: *[a]* so yeah *[b]* we like er i have to just look at the text again *[c]* so to: (.) to see (.) / **[a. Open-M + b. c. Focus-M]**
- 1480 S2: *imagine?* / **[Question-M]**
(gap 00:00:20) {S2 and S3 say a few words in polish and then S3 reads the lyrics quietly using a smartphone}
- 1481 S3: so i think what jo- john lennon wanted to to say to us was that (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 1482 S1: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1483 S3: *[a]* it isn't hard to imagine a world being like that (.) *[b]* like you can imagine er all the people happy e:r without no walls no countries no religions no wars (.) *[c]* yeah? (.) *[d]* and i think er what he tried to con- convince us is to that if we can imagine that (.) it it will (.) it can be done (.) *[e]* yeah? / **[a. b. Focus-M + c. Try-Marker-M + d. Focus-M + e. Try-Marker-M]**
- 1484 S1: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1485 S3: *[a]* like we can achieve it like er (.) *[b]* erm yeah. / **[a. Focus-M + b. Finalizer-M]**
- 1486 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1487 S3: what is what is (.) (add that) someTHING? / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1488 S2: *[a]* no *[b]* actually it's (.) it's a very simple message (.) *[c]* yeah a very strong one (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. c. Evaluate-M]**
- 1489 S1: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1490 S3: uhu (.) yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1491 S2: it's (1) / **[possible Answer-M]**
- 1492 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1493 S2: (true) <soft><@><un> x </un></@></soft> / **[possible Answer-M]**
- 1494 S3: i wonder if the people in two thousand and five hundred would have (the same) problems as we have now (.) wi:th <4> the wars and things like that </4> / **[Focus-M]**
- 1495 S2: <4> probably (.) we gonna have </4> bigger problems than (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1496 S3: BIGGER problems = / **[Newsmark-M]**
- 1497 S2: = seriously (.) look at how gradually problems from (.) for example (.) fourteen hundreds (.) to now (.) became bigger (.) / **[Summon-M]**
- 1498 S3: ye<5>a::h </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1499 S2: <fast><5> but it's so </5> everything smaller now?</fast> (for examples) = / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1500 S3: = *[a]* but i wonder if it's not *[b]* <6> be</6>cause we just started to care

- about (.) for example human rights (.) / **[a. Challenge-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 1501 S2: <6> (demex) </6>
- 1502 S2: and now = / **[possible Challenge-M]**
- 1503 S3: = and <fast> that's why they became bigger (.) the problems WERE THERE in one thousand (.) four hundred </fast> = / **[Explain-M]**
- 1504 S2: = [a] and yeah [b] but = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible Challenge-M]**
- 1505 S3: = [a] but now it is bigger [b] because <fast> we started to care about for example human rights </fast> (1) yeah so / **[a. Focus-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 1506 S2: THOSE / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1507 S3: hh yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1508 S2: [a] with different (.) <fast> it's gonna be completely different [b] (there'll be) things we can't even (.) imagine </fast> (.) / **[a. b. Challenge-M]**
- 1509 S3: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1510 S2: <fast> how people are gonna think </fast> (.) / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1511 S3: yeah yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1512 S2: what <7> they're </7> gonna think about the song (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1513 S3: <7> so so </7> / **[possible Focus-M]**
- 1514 S3: so i wonder if they could really understand our problems (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 1515 S4: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1516 S3: here (.) for example <8> to underst- </8> = / **[Focus-M]**
- 1517 S1: <8> eh </8> / **[possible Challenge-M]**
- 1518 S2: = fro:m (.) fro:m to from nineteen hundreds (.) our history used to be pretty (.) neatly documented so (.) / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1519 S3: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1520 S2: they have all the needs all they need to: (.) / **[Challenge-M]**
- 1521 S1: [a] but i think that we can't understand that song even now [b] because (.) / **[a. Challenge-M + b. Explain-M]**
- 1522 S3: a:h (those) yeah / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
- 1523 S1: [a] when it was wrote erm there the war and now we are in peace (.) we can say {S1's smartphone rings} (1) [b] sorry (.) [c] er if we can see that and (2) if er in the future er will be some war (.) it can be more er simple to understand that song (.) / **[a. Explain-M + b. Repair-M + c. Explain-M]**
- 1524 S3: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1525 S1: <soft> i think.</soft> / **[Explain-M]**
- 1526 S2: i think that = / **[possible Focus-M]**
- 1527 S3: = [a] we are not in a complete peace (.) [b] for example (.) / **[a. Challenge-M + b. Upgrade]**
- 1528 S4: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1529 S3: war in the middle east and (.) / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1530 S2: <9> syria yemen </9> / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1531 S4: <9> korea korea </9> / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1532 S3: for example now we see erm walls and barriers (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 1533 S4: yes / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1534 S3: [a] religious <10> barriers </10> for example (.) [b] in poland we have a problem = / **[a. Upgrade-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 1535 S4: <10> yes </10> / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1536 S2: = more in the huge (towns) = / **[Upgrade-M]**
- 1537 S3: = [a] yeah yeah [b] we have other religions [c] because the main religion is christianity [d] yeah? (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M + c. Explain-M + d. Try-Marker]**
- 1538 S4: yeah / **[Acknowledge -M]**
- 1539 S3: [a] catholics [b] and er many of them because of poor education i think (.) i think that's the reason e:r do not accept any other forms of e:r the <un> xx </un> of god yeah a- atheists = / **[a. Upgrade + b. Explain-M]**
- 1540 S2: = because of poor education and great <fast> ADvertising </fast> (.) from the side <fast> of the church.</fast> / **[Explain-M]**
- 1541 S3: [a] a:h [b] yeah yeah (.) yeah. / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Acknowledge-M]**
- 1542 S2: [a] and i think that we won't we don't understand the so:ng er as if it was meant to be understood [b] but then? [c] <fast> cos the course of time has changed </fast>

- [d] but (.) the meaning will be always there that the wor- the worl- the world i:s (.) there are problems [e] and we get a lot of times imagine how it was how it would be if there were no problems (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Challenge-M + c. Explain-M + d. e. Focus-M]**
- 1543 S1: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1544 S2: [a] if there were no barriers no countries et cetera et cetera (.) [b] and i think that when they (.) when he wrote that song he was thinking about er the cold war (.) i think (.) / **[a. Focus-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
- 1545 S3: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1546 S2: [a] and now when <fast> we listen to that song we get to think about there were hunger poverty with er terrorist issues wars in the middle east et cetera et cetera </fast> (.) [b] and <swallows> <fast> in five hundred years who knows what they'll be thinking about.</fast> (.) / **[a. b. Focus-M]**
- 1547 S1: uhu / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1548 S3: [a] yeah (1) [b] like maybe they will come up with a statement that it cannot be DONE [c] like it cannot be done with no barriers no religions (.) [d] maybe nature of human is like that (.) that we cannot agree on everything (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M + c. d. Upgrade-M]**
- 1549 S4: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1550 S3: [a] and er (.) we don't know that (1) [b] but yeah (.) so i think the message that we all send to this two hundred and five hundr- TWO thousand five hundred is not so obvious like (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M]**
- 1551 S1: yeah / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1552 S3: we don't really know (.) e:r what the life would (.) look e:r there. / **[Focus-M]**
- 1553 S1: it depend of erm (.) the (.) erm what in th- two thousand and fif- five hundred (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 1554 S3: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1555 S1: e:r the people think about the mus- <smacks lips> the social problem / **[Focus-M]**
- 1556 S3: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1557 S1: or (2) erm something that <smacks lips> they can imagine (.) / **[Focus-M]**
- 1558 S3: hm / **[Continuer-M]**
- 1559 S1: if (3) i don't / **[Focus-M]**
- (gap 00:00:07) {S1 stops speaking and whispers something in italian to S4}
- 1560 S1: and (4) e:r (1) / **[Reopen-M]**
- 1561 S3: [a] i don't know what to add (.) [b] okay (.) hm / **[a. Inform-M + b. Finalizer-M]**
- 1562 S2: [a] o:h [b] <fast> i've said what i had to say </fast> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Close-M]**
- 1563 S3: [a] yeah yeah (.) [b] i think so (too) / **[a. b. Acknowledge-M]**
- (gap 00:00:08) {S2 whispers something in polish to S3}
- 1564 S2: <to S4> what about you?</to S4> / **[Elicit-M]**
- 1565 S4: okay / **[Answer-M]**
- 1566 S3: yeah (3) / **[Acknowledge-M]**
- 1567 S4: <soft><L1 it> va bene {alright} </L1 it></soft> (2) / **[Close-M]**
- 1568 S3: [a] okay (.) o:h (.) [b] there's no (.) there's (a choice) now (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Close-M]**
- 1569 S1: mhm / **[Finalizer-M]**
- 1570 S3: so er <ono> hem em em.</ono> / **[Finalizer-M]**

Gullace_3_We Are the Champions (lines 1571-1752)

S1=L1: pol/PL, male; S2=L1: ita/IT, male; S3=L1: pol/PL, female; S4=L1: ita/IT, male

- 1571 S1: [a] so: (.) [b] i think we are supposed to start again (.) now (.) [c] yes? / **[a. Open-M + b. Inform-M + c. Check-M]**
- 1572 S2: <soft> yes </soft> / **[Answer-M]**
- 1573 S3: [a] so what song have you CHOsen? [b] (say) again. / **[a. Elicit-M + b. Direct-M]**

- 1574 S4: (but if you want) = / **[possible Offer-M]**
 1575 S2: = what have you chosen? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1576 S3: nothing / **[Answer-M]**
 1577 S4: nothing / **[Answer-M]**
 1578 S1: *we are the champions* by queens / **[Answer-M]**
 1579 S4: <soft> the champions </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1580 S2: *[a] a:h [b] the queens?* / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1581 S1: <LNit> sì sì {yes yes} </LNit> / **[Answer-M]**
 1582 S2: eh it's a good <pvc><ipa> i'dea {idea} </ipa></pvc> <1> the
 champ</1>ions / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1583 S4: <1><to S2> d'you know?</to S2></1> / **[Question-M]**
 1584 S2: <singing> we are the champions </singing> / **[Answer-M]**
 1585 S4: a:h yes / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1586 S2: it's a good <pvc><ipa> i'dea {idea} </ipa></pvc> / **[Evaluate-M]**
 1587 S1: i thi:<2>nk </2> / **[possible Acknowledge-M]**
 1588 S2: <2><to S1> what's your name?</to S1></2> / **[Question-M]**
 1589 S1: [S1] (.) <to S2>and you?</to S2> / **[a. Answer-M + b. Question-M]**
 1590 S2: <fast> [S2] </fast> / **[Answer-M]**
 1591 S1: e:r <LNit> sì? {yes?} </LNit> / **[Loop-M]**
 1592 S2: [S2] / **[Answer-M]**
 1593 S1: [S2] <LNit> sì. {yes.} </LNit> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1594 S2: <to S3> your name?</to S3> / **[Question-M]**
 1595 S3: [S3] / **[Answer-M]**
 1596 S2: <to S4> your name?</to S4> / **[Question-M]**
 1597 S4: *[a] [S4] @@ (.) [b] they know my name. yes* / **[a. Answer-M + b. Inform-M]**
 1598 S2: *[a] <L1it> anche questo è il terzo {this is the third too} </L1it> <un> xxx
 </un> (1) [b] so: e:r (.) how is poland?* / **[a. possible Inform-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1599 S1: it's er = / **[Answer-M]**
 1600 S2: = where is the city of the university? / **[Question-M]**
 1601 S3: <3> warsaw </3> / **[Answer-M]**
 1602 S1: <3> warsaw </3> / **[Answer-M]**
 1603 S2: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1604 S3: the capital / **[Upgrade-M]**
 1605 S1: *[a] yeah (.) [b] the cap<4>ital </4>* / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M]**
 1606 S3: <4> yeah </4> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1607 S2: how is the situation? (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1608 S3: in poland? / **[Check-M]**
 1609 S2: yes / **[Answer-M]**
 1610 S1: politically? o:r (.) / **[Question-M]**
 1611 S2: (politics) / **[Answer-M]**
 1612 S1: it's (.) well (.) developi:ng (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1613 S2: there are: / **[possible Question-M]**
 1614 S1: into a very (2) UNPRECEdented situation. / **[Answer-M]**
 1615 S2: there is a president? / **[Question-M]**
 1616 S1: *[a] yes (.) more or less (.) [b] it's (1) it's complicated.* / **[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1617 S2: elected by the people or? (.) / **[Question-M]**
 1618 S1: this this is = / **[Answer-M]**
 1619 S3: = well it's hard to say (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1620 S1: oh it's <smacks lips> (.) <ipa> əf </ipa> i think it's that (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1621 S2: simple question / **[Support-M]**
 1622 S3: yeah / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1623 S2: poland i:s (.) fascist or communist? (2) / **[Question-M]**
 1624 S1: *[a] i suppose there's something in between (.) [b] er more more fascist (.)
 def- definitely not communist (1) er =* / **[a. Answer-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 1625 S2: = after the forty years of <5> the: <spel> u s a </spel></5> the
 <L1it> urss {soviet union} </L1it> = / **[Focus-M]**
 1626 S1: <5> well yeah </5> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1627 S1: = after well forty years we cannot (.) get over it and (settle) it. / **[Focus-M]**

- 1628 S2: <un> x </un> a good idea (.) <6> so </6> / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 1629 S1: <6> so </6> <un> xx </un> is more (of) fascist (.) i mean th- = / **[Inform-M]**
 1630 S2: = who are er? = / **[Question-M]**
 1631 S1: = no n- n- n- / **[possible Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:04) {S2 asks in italian whether the recording is on}
 1632 S1: [a] i don't know (.) [b] it works or not? / **[a. Answer-M + b. Question-M]**
 1633 S3: yes / **[Answer-M]**
 (gap 00:00:06) {the students check the technical equipment}
 1634 S3: [a] okay (.) [b] [S1] (.) why did you choose the *we are the champions* song? / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1635 S2: [a] <L1it> (va be') {(okay)} </L1it> [b] the cha:mpions (song)? / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1636 S1: because i think that this song (1) TELLS something about the <7> how people </7> / **[Explain-M]**
 1637 S2: <7><L1it> posso {can i} <un> xxxx </un></L1it> internet?</7> / **[Offer-M]**
 1638 S3: wait / **[Direct-M]**
 1639 S1: [a] <un> x </un> nowa:days and she goes away. (1) [b] <soft> i don't know it really well </soft> (1) [c] because i think (.) w- we [d] wait (.) [e] er yeah yes (we could) / **[a. Challenge-M + b. Inform-M + c. Explain-M + d. Direct-M + e. Answer-M]**
 1640 S2: eh (.) (and you?) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1641 S1: [S3] / **[Direct-M]**
 1642 S2: <L1it> no no lei {no it's not her} </L1it> eh (2) / **[Repair-M]**
 1643 S1: [a] so (.) <un> xx </un> (.) [b] <to S4> what have you chosen?</to S4> / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1644 S4: [a] e:r i've chosen (.) this this is a song by e:r system of a down [b] and it talk = / **[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1645 S3: = <fast> [a] o:h [b] i know the band </fast> / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Inform-M]**
 1646 S4: so? / **[Loop-M]**
 1647 S3: <slow> i know this band </slow> (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1648 S4: a:h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1649 S3: but i don't know the song / **[Inform-M]**
 1650 S4: er it ta:lk it talks about the er future border that it er will <pvc> destructured {destroyed} </pvc> by men (.) / **[Focus-M]**
 1651 S3: a:h okay / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1652 S4: [a] <pvc> destructured {destroyed} </pvc> by the men a:nd with gas and machine (.) [b] a:nd he (they) want to (.) see them (.) to see us that (.) they warn to the <un> xx </un> (to) our direction [c] like the man is isn't the erm god of the <un> xx.</un> / **[a. b. Focus-M + c. Upgrade-M]**
 1653 S3: [a] a:h [b] so i guess this is a good song (.) [c] (do:) / **[a. Oh-Receipt-M + b. Evaluate-M + c. possible Question-M]**
 1654 S2: eh (it's true) = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1655 S1: = [a] i'll listen to it later @ (1) [b] o:KAY = / **[a. Inform-M + b. Finalizer-M]**
 1656 S2: = this is (.) the text of *we are the champion* / **[Summon-M]**
 1657 S3: at th- =
 1658 S1: = [a] yeah [b] i know. (.) i know this. = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Inform-M]**
 1659 S3: = can you? can you search for the text lyrics for this song (.) that (.) [S4] <8><un> xx?</un></8> / **[Direct-M]**
 1660 S1: <8> tox- toxicity?</8> / **[Check-M]**
 (gap 00:01:47) {the students google the lyrics using their smartphones}
 1661 S1: <fast> okay kay kay </fast> (.) er so: (.) / **[Open-M]**
 1662 S3: [a] so [b] you have two songs (.) to choose. / **[a. Open-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1663 S1: [a] yes [b] we have two songs to choose from which we = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1664 S3: = we have the queen and the er (.) tox- = / **[Inform-M]**
 1665 S1: = the question is who do (.) which one do you (.) think is better as a SOcial document (.) that will illustrate how = / **[Elicit-M]**
 1666 S2: = as (.) song er this is better but as a social document this is better. (1) / **[Answer-M]**
 1667 S1: yeah i guess so. (1) / **[Acknowledge-M]**

- 1668 S2: *[a]* maybe (.) *[b]* what do you think? / **[a. Answer-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1669 S1: *[a]* erm yeah <un> x </un> (mine) <un> x </un> *[b]* (i mean) i i chose (.)
 th- the the champions *[c]* mostly because i thought that (1) er it shows that
 <smacks lips> (.) <ipa> əf </ipa> the idea of the song that <un> x </un> (.) *[d]*
 put it simply is (.) even though the world has problems (.) we'll (.) very optimistic
 to the future. (2) *[e]* so yeah yeah. = / **[a. b. Answer-M + c. Explain-M + d. Focus-M + e. Finalizer-M]**
 1670 S4: = if you want i have i had (.) / **[possible Offer-M]**
 1671 S2: <L1it> non ho capito niente di quello che ha detto {i understood nothing of what
 he said} </L1it> / **[Inform-M]**
 1672 S4: if you want we have er i have a headphone (.) / **[Offer-M]**
 1673 S1: <9> no </9> / **[Answer-M]**
 1674 S3: <9> no: </9> it's okay / **[Answer-M]**
 1675 S4: if you want to hear it (2) / **[Offer-M]**
 1676 S2: *[a]* the important is the text (.) *[b]* <soft> (is this) </soft> = / **[a. Focus-M + b. Summon-M]**
 1677 S1: = *[a]* yes exactly (.) *[b]* it's very important *[c]* <soft><fast><reading aloud>
 when i became the sun i shone life into the man's hearts when i </reading
 aloud></fast></soft> = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Support-M + c. Inform-M]**
 1678 S3: = *[a]* okay (.) *[b]* so which one (.) do you want? (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1679 S1: yes / **[Continuer-M]**
 1680 S3: to present? / **[Elicit-M]**
 1681 S1: well i'd say it's er i'd say *toxicity* (.) it has (.) much more depth in it (.) /
[Evaluate-M]
 1682 S2: *toxicity* is a problem. (.) / **[Challenge-M]**
 1683 S1: *[a]* yes *[b]* esp- especially = / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. possible Upgrade-M]**
 1684 S2: = in poland? / **[Question-M]**
 1685 S1: no not really but <un> xx </un> / **[Answer-M]**
 1686 S4: so can i? / **[possible Offer-M]**
 1687 S2: ah <reading aloud> what why is it an important social document? what will
 people in <ipa> ehe </ipa> learn about us?</reading aloud> {S2 reads out
 a worksheet} / **[Elicit-M]**
 1688 S1: why is th- = / **[Elicit-M]**
 1689 S4: = *[a]* <translating aloud><L1it> che cosa impareranno nel mille (.) nel duemila
 e cinquecento {what will they learn in one thousand (.) two thousand
 five hundred} </L1it></translating aloud> about us? haeh? = / **[Elicit-M]**
 1690 S2: = <translating aloud><L1it> perché è un importante documento sociale?
 {why is it an important social document?} </L1it></translating aloud> (.) /
[Elicit-M]
 1691 S4: *[a]* in my opinion is th- this song say the true (.) *[b]* er there i- er there
 aren't people that (we aren't) people (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. possible Focus-M]**
 1692 S3: *[a]* okay so *[b]* but this is about future so maybe (.) *[c]* because this is about
 what will happen *[d]* and this song the other song is about what's happening now (.)
[e] so (1) maybe it'll be easier for us to present the other song (.) *[f]* because we can
 say then that we were fighters and it was (.) *[g]* like yes this song is (.) easier to
 present (.) / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Focus-M + c. Explain-M + d. Focus-M + e. Evaluate-M + f. Explain-M + g. Evaluate-M]**
 1693 S4: a:h okay / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1694 S3: because this one is more like pessimist and this one is optimistic (.) completely. /
[Explain-M]
 1695 S4: a:h okay / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 (gap 00:00:05) {S4 and S2 speak to each other in italian}
 1696 S4: so we er / **[Open-M]**
 (gap 00:00:10) {S2 sums up S3's opinion in italian}
 1697 S4: okay / **[Open-M]**
 1698 S3: okay so / **[Open-M]**
 1699 S1: *[a]* okay *[b]* <reading aloud> why is it an important social
 document?</reading aloud> well = / **[a. Open-M + b. Elicit-M]**

- 1700 S3: = do we have to write it or (.) just SAY IT? / **[Question-M]**
 1701 S1: no i think we just have (.) i mean (.) we've been recorded so it doesn't really
 matter what we write. / **[Answer-M]**
 1702 S3: *[a]* a:h okay (.) *[b]* so write the title of the song (.) *[c]* so it's *we are the*
champions / **[a. Acknowledge-M + b. Direct-M + c. Inform-M]**
 1703 S1: no no it's the other. / **[Denial-M]**
 1704 S3: no we have we're taking this song (1) <L1po><un> xxxx </un></L1po> /
[Inform-M]
 1705 S4: with this because it = / **[Explain-M]**
 1706 S1: = okay we can yes = / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1707 S2: = <un> xxxx </un> = / **[possible Explain-M]**
 1708 S3: = optimistic / **[Explain-M]**
 1709 S1: <1> yes </1> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1710 S4: <1> i </1> i played this / **[Inform-M]**
 (gap 00:00:20) {S2 and S4 speak to each other in italian while reading a worksheet}
 1711 S2: <reading aloud> why is an important document?</reading aloud> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1712 S4: why is it a: = / **[Elicit-M]**
 1713 S2: = <soft> social?</soft> = / **[Elicit-M]**
 1714 S3: = i think we have just to say it in front of the class (.) we don't have to
 write it. / **[Inform-M]**
 1715 S2: i i don't know that = / **[Inform-M]**
 1716 S1: = *[a]* i (.) i think we have just to say it now (.) *[b]* i be- i believe that's the
 whole point of (1) this (.) thing like (.) here. / **[a. Inform-M + b. Focus-M]**
 1717 S4: aha / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1718 S3: *[a]* so (1) *[b]* d'you want to start? / **[a. Reopen-M + b. Question-M]**
 1719 S1: <reading aloud> why is an important social document? </reading aloud> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1720 S2: *[a]* i don't know the text of the song (.) *[b]* i know <2> the song </2> but
 i don't remember = / **[a. b. Inform-M]**
 1721 S1: <2> the text </2> / **[possible Inform-M]**
 1722 S1: = *[a]* actually the text is very simple *[b]* it's (.) <3> we're the </3>
 champions we're the champions we're the champions repeated over and over
 <@> really.</@> (it's) (.) / **[a. Inform-M + b. Upgrade-M]**
 1723 S2: <3> (some) <un> x </un> </3> / **[possible Inform-M]**
 1724 S2: but i didn't = / **[possible Inform-M]**
 1725 S1: = why is it erm (.) / **[Elicit-M]**
 1726 S2: *[a]* i know that *[b]* but (1) after we are the champions er what the er (.) the
 song is talk about? / **[a. Inform-M + b. Elicit-M]**
 1727 S1: <ipa> ep </ipa> well this (.) / **[possible Elicit-M]**
 1728 S2: because = {parallel conversation between S2 and S4 starts in italian} / **[Explain-M]**
 1729 S3: = *[a]* well this is i think (.) {parallel conversation between S2 and S4 ends}
 <un> xx </un> social document *[b]* because during the war you also have songs
 that say (.) something like (.) we have to fi:ght and you've to get together (.)
 do something *[c]* so (.) <fast> i think it is important *[d]* because </fast> (.) it shows
 how we're fighting NOW (.) and how we're going to be the champions not the
 losers (.) *[e]* so i think it's optimiSTIC (.) / **[a. Answer-M + b. Explain-M + c.**
Evaluate-M + d. Explain-M + e. Evaluate-M]
 1730 S2: a::h / **[Oh-Receipt-M]**
 1731 S3: a:nd (.) yes i think this is why it's important (.) <4> social </4> / **[Close-M]**
 1732 S2: <4> yeah i </4> understand understand / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1733 S4: <to S3> in your opinion (.) what er will people in er two thousand fifteen
 hundreds learn about us?</to S3> = / **[Elicit-M]**
 1734 S3: = well = / **[Answer-M]**
 1735 S4: = <to S3> with this song? </to S3> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1736 S3: i think they will (.) / **[Answer-M]**
 1737 S4: ah / **[Continuer-M]**
 1738 S3: *[a]* will show that we (.) wanted to do something *[b]* and we (.) we don't
 want to give up (.) that easily (.) *[c]* so we want to (.) move (.) on and go further
 so (1) *[d]* [S1] (.) / **[a. b. Answer-M + c. Upgrade-M + d. Summon-M]**
 1739 S1: erm

- 1740 S3: <to S1> d'you agree?</to S1> / **[Elicit-M]**
 1741 S1: [a] i agree on the second p- part (.) i i've i (.) yes i guess i could say i agree
 [b] personally i don't (.) i don't understand the whole point of social document
 [c] since i (.) i believe that you cannot (.) interpret or understand a society by
 listening to a single piece of music <5> especially </5> there's like (.) there's
 literally hundreds of thousand of (.) songs around. / **[a. Answer-M + b. Focus-M +**
c. Explain-M]
 1742 S3: <5> yeah </5> / **[Continuer-M]**
 1743 S3: <soft> @@@ </soft> / **[Acknowledge-M]**
 1744 S1: [a] so i don't know i don't really under<6> stand </6> [b] but i guess (1)
 yes your arguments were solid and (.) correct <7> in my opinion </7> / **[a.**
Answer-M + b. Evaluate-M]
 1745 S4: <6><un> xx </un></6>
 1746 S2: <7> (currently) </7> i:s (1) but practically (.) yes / **[possible Evaluate-M]**
 1747 S1: er it alw- it always dep- when it comes to what they'll think it always
 depends on (1) who listens to the song why <8> they </8> listen to the song. (2) /
[Focus-M]
 1748 S2: <8> why </8> / **[Support-M]**
 1749 SX-m: <soft> (it is) </soft> (2) / **[possible Close-M]**
 1750 S4: finish / **[Close-M]**
 1751 S2: finished (.) / **[Close-M]**
 1752 S1: [a] yeah (2) [b] <soft> i suppose we've finished.</soft> / **[a. Acknowledge-M +**
b. Close-M]

Appendix 4 - Abstract in German

Die zunehmende Verwendung des Englischen als Lingua Franca (ELF) oder Verkehrssprache erfordert wesentliche Änderungen in der Didaktik des Englischunterrichts (ELT) – sowohl in Italien als auch anderswo. Diese Arbeit untersucht die Kommunikation in ELF im schulischen Kontext und versucht in einem zweiten Schritt, Richtlinien für die Entwicklung kognitiv-erfahrungsbezogener Modelle herauszuarbeiten, die die Kommunikationskompetenz in ELF in ELT-Klassen verbessern.

Die Studie untersucht ELF-Kommunikationsstrategien im Alltagsdiskurs, etwa wenn Schüler, also heutige oder künftige ELF-Benutzer, zwanglos über ein für sie relevantes Thema sprechen, ohne Aufsicht ihres Englischlehrers und ohne Anforderungen an das Englische als Muttersprache (ENL). Im Rahmen dieser Untersuchung wurden spontane Interaktionen zwischen italienischen Schülern und Schülern zehn weiterer Nationalitäten beobachtet und aufgezeichnet. Die Schüler nahmen an interkulturellen Austauschprogrammen in drei Schulen der Sekundarstufe II im Großraum Rom teil. Die Daten wurden gemäß den Transkriptions- und Annotationskonventionen des Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) erhoben.

Die qualitative Datenanalyse wurde gemäß der Conversation Analysis: CA-Methodik unter Verwendung eines Protokolls durchgeführt das auf "Konversationsbewegungen" basiert. Diese Analyse fokussiert auf Kooperationsstrategien und pragmatische Verhaltensweisen, die ELF-Benutzer in der Sekundarstufe anwenden, um effektiv und verständlich zu kommunizieren.

Die Untersuchung zeigt nicht nur, dass sich die Teilnehmer (i) im Allgemeinen an ihren Gesprächspartnern orientieren und sich akkommodierender Praktiken bedienen, die üblicherweise in der ELF-Kommunikation Anwendung finden. Die Untersuchung legt auch dar, dass sie (ii) Sprach- und Interaktionsfähigkeiten aktivieren, um sich engagiert in die Diskussion einzubringen. Die Teilnehmer „spielen“ mit dem Englischen – aber auch mit den Sprachen ihrer Gesprächspartner –, um Bedeutung zu kreieren, Beziehungen aufzubauen und eine Gemeinschaft zu bilden. Sie bemühen sich,

ihre Aussagen auch für andere nachvollziehbar zu gestalten, und bedienen sich dabei gewisser Praktiken, die das Verständnis erleichtern und die Botschaft verstärken: etwa der Onomatopöie. Darüber hinaus kooperieren sie bei der Wortsuche und bei der Mitkonstruktion von Bedeutungen. Wie bei einem Tanz der Wörter leisten sie ihren Beitrag, um das gemeinschaftliche Kommunikationsziel zu erreichen. Diese Ergebnisse zeigen, dass ELF-Benutzer in der Sekundarstufe sowohl ihre Sprachressourcen als auch sich selbst als Individuen, ihre Identität, ihren kulturellen Hintergrund und ihre Erfahrungen einbringen.

Zusammenfassend können die Ergebnisse dieser Studie dazu beitragen, neue Unterrichtspraktiken zu entwickeln, die die ELF-vermittelte Kommunikation verbessern, die Sprache und das interkulturelle Bewusstsein fördern.

Appendix 5 - Abstract in Italian

Il sempre più frequente uso dell'inglese come lingua franca (*English as a Lingua Franca*: ELF) richiede cambiamenti sostanziali nella pedagogia dell'insegnamento della lingua inglese (*English Language Teaching*: ELT), sia in Italia che altrove. Questa tesi esplora le dinamiche della comunicazione in ELF nell'ambiente scolastico, con l'obiettivo di elaborare delle linee guida per lo sviluppo di pratiche cognitivo-esperienziali utili per promuovere la competenza comunicativa ELF nelle classi di lingua inglese.

Lo studio indaga le strategie comunicative dell'ELF attraverso sessioni in cui gli studenti – attuali o futuri utenti ELF – discutono di un argomento stimolante senza alcuna restrizione, ovvero senza la supervisione del loro insegnante di inglese e senza dover sottostare ai requisiti dell'inglese come lingua madre (*English as a Native Language*: ENL). Questa attività sperimentale è stata eseguita osservando e audio registrando le interazioni spontanee in ELF tra studenti italiani e studenti di altre dieci nazionalità, tutti partecipanti a programmi di scambio interculturale in tre scuole secondarie superiori dell'area metropolitana di Roma. I dati sono stati trascritti seguendo le convenzioni di trascrizione e annotazione del *Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (VOICE).

L'analisi qualitativa dei dati è condotta seguendo la metodologia di Analisi della Conversazione (*Conversation Analysis*: CA) mediante un protocollo basato su 'mosse conversazionali'. Tale analisi è focalizzata sulle strategie di cooperazione e sui comportamenti pragmatici che gli utenti ELF in età scolare mettono in atto per comunicare in maniera efficace e comprensibile.

L'indagine ha dimostrato che i partecipanti all'attività sperimentale non solo si adattano ai loro interlocutori, usando strategie di accomodamento normalmente utilizzate nella comunicazione ELF, ma mettono anche in atto specifiche strategie linguistiche e relazionali, manifestando un forte coinvolgimento nella discussione. I partecipanti 'giocano' con l'inglese – ma anche con le lingue dei co-partecipanti – per costruire il significato e per socializzare, creando un'atmosfera positiva e solidale. Si attivano per garantire una maggiore trasparenza della comunicazione, ricorrendo a

pratiche che facilitano la comprensione e rendono il messaggio più chiaro, come l'uso di suoni onomatopeici che rafforzano i concetti che intendono esprimere. Mostrano inoltre un atteggiamento cooperativo nella ricerca delle parole e nella costruzione del significato quando intervengono per dare il proprio contributo, raggiungendo con soddisfazione il loro obiettivo comunicativo. Questi risultati dimostrano che gli utenti ELF in età scolare mettono in gioco tutte le proprie risorse linguistiche, ma anche se stessi come individui, con la loro identità, il loro background culturale e le loro esperienze personali.

In conclusione, i risultati di questo studio possono contribuire allo sviluppo di nuove pratiche didattiche che promuovano e rendano più efficace la comunicazione in ELF, agendo sulla consapevolezza linguistica e interculturale dei discenti.