UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Modern Languages

Accommodation in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): a socio-psychological and sociolinguistic study

by

Carmen Gaete Mella

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2022

ABSTRACT

In the context of an international university, where students from diverse corners of the world meet and interact on a daily basis, English becomes a contact language used by speakers of different L1 backgrounds, a common resource which presents different realisations which are characterised by variability of communicative styles. So as to understand the richness and complexity of interactions in multilingual and multicultural settings, an inquiry into communication accommodation is vital. Thus, Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) is central to English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) research as it provides a thorough appreciation of the ways in which accommodative behaviour enhances successful language use in international settings. The present study aims at contributing to the understanding of these rich and complex interactions in multicultural settings by means of the observation of the interactional practices of a small group of international postgraduate students. In order to achieve this goal, an ethnographic qualitative approach to data collection has been the main methodological approach, and participant observation has been central to the analysis of interaction. Two main areas of inquiry have been established to achieve the main objective of this project. The first one relates to the different ways in which accommodation strategies are applied in ELF interactions, while the second one addresses participants' awareness and perceptions regarding these strategies. The main findings of this study evidence participants' ability and efficacy in the use of different accommodation strategies that are employed to enhance communicative efficiency and the establishment of positive social relations, as well as a high degree of awareness of how and why these strategies are used. The results also suggest that participants apply accommodative moves and strategies to perform acts of identity that relate to their professional persona and their roles as postgraduate students in an international academic community.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

CA:	Conversation Analysis
CAT:	Communication Accommodation Theory
BELF:	Business English as a Lingua Franca
EFL:	English as a Foreign Language
ESL:	English as a Second Language
ELF:	English as a Lingua Franca
ENL:	English as a Native Language
INLC:	Individual Networks of Linguistic Contac
NBES:	Non-bilingual English Speakers
NNSE:	Non-native Speaker of English
NSE:	Native Speaker of English
NS:	Native Speaker
SLA:	Second Language Acquisition
SRI:	Stimulated Recall Interview
TRP:	Transition Relevant Place
UC:	Utterance Completion

List of Tables

List of Exchanges

Declaration of Authorship

Print name: CARMEN GAETE MELLA

Title of Thesis: Accommodation in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): a socio-psychological and sociolinguistic study

I declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. None of this work has been published before submission;

Signature: Date: April 12th 2021

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor Jennifer Jenkins and Professor Clare Mar-Molinero, whose guidance, valuable advice, and continuous support have been fundamental to the completion of this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Alessia Cogo who contributed greatly to the initial stages of this thesis.

I wish to extend my special thanks to the five key participants involved in this project, for their contribution, motivation and patience at every stage of this research. Without their invaluable help, this thesis would not have been possible.

My appreciation also goes out to my parents, Carlos and Carmen, and my siblings Beatriz, Gabriel and María Trinidad, as well as close friends for their encouragement and support. Finally, I would also like to extend my gratitude to my colleagues who have made many concessions so that I could finish my PhD thesis.

Introduction

In the context of an international university, in order to understand the complexity and richness of interaction in multicultural settings the study of accommodation strategies is essential; thus, we need to look back to the work of scholars such as Giles & Coupland (1991) and their substantial contribution to Communication Accommodation Theory (henceforth CAT). The main tenet of CAT is that we use communication to direct our social relationships not only through *what* we say but also *how* we say it; therefore, while we interact with others we modify our communicative behaviour based on our evaluations of our interlocutors' communicative characteristics and our desire to maintain a positive social and personal identity (Gasiorek et al. 2015). According to Shepard, Giles, & Le Poire (2001), not only does CAT study communication behaviour of different varieties but it also encompasses the inquiry of attitudes, perceptions, underlying motivations and social consequences of communication shifts in communication, so CAT has a great explanatory potential.

In terms of the actual accommodation processes, CAT researchers investigate interactants' adjustments and classify these into accommodative and non-accommodative (Gasiorek et al. 2015). On the one hand, accommodative behaviour – traditionally convergence – aims at reducing social and communicative differences, while non-accommodation – divergence and maintenance – is employed to heighten those differences. In a highly multicultural setting such as the one encountered in a postgraduate course in the UK, these accommodation processes can become more salient due to the variety of linguacultural backgrounds and potential reciprocal unfamiliarity of communicative styles. According to Cogo & Dewey (2012, p. 102), given the diverse nature of ELF interactional settings, 'speakers speech styles and language forms are often less settled than in non-ELF contexts' and so, although it is an attribute of any type of interaction, accommodation becomes more accentuated in ELF communication.

The present study aims at obtaining a better understanding of how ELF speakers of diverse linguacultural background use and perceive accommodation. To fulfil this objective, a group of postgraduate international students in a British university has been the focus of investigation. In order to reach this main objective, the following research questions have been established.

1. In the context of communication accommodation theory, how are accommodation strategies applied in ELF interactions in a UK international university setting?
    1.1. What do speakers actually do when accommodating to their interlocutors from the same university group?
    1.2. To what extent do participants employ communication accommodation strategies in different ways?
2. To what extent are the participants in the study aware of their accommodative behaviour and that of their interlocutors?
    2.1. Which areas of accommodation do participants perceive as more salient and relevant in their interaction?
    2.2. What are the appropriate levels of accommodation as perceived by listeners according to the communicative needs within this academic context?
    2.3. How do participants seek social attractiveness through accommodation?

This thesis is structured around six different chapters. The first one presents a general overview of CAT, its origins and main concepts, the relevance of multilingual contexts in CAT research, and the relationship between style selection and social identity. Chapter two continues to discuss CAT in the framework of ELF research. This chapter introduces key concepts of ELF as a paradigm, including the roles and perceptions of ELF speakers, and provides an overview of phonological and pragmatic approaches to interaction in ELF. In this chapter, I will present a discussion around research conducted on strategies that are crucial to this project, namely pre-empting, repetition and rephrasing, utterance completion, simultaneous talk, and code-switching and translanguaging.

The third chapter corresponds to that of research methodology. It begins by discussing the qualitative approach to research this project is based on, with emphasis on ethnography and observation. It also includes the research questions that will guide the inquiry, the research context and the participants' details. It will continue to provide relevant information about field work, including data collection instruments, and finish with the presentation of ethical considerations.

Chapter four corresponds to the presentation of the data analysis and discussion of participants' recorded interaction in classroom activities. This chapter begins with an overview of Conversation Analysis (CA) which is the chosen analytical methodology for the study of accommodation strategies as realised by the participants in an academic setting. This chapters continues with the presentation and discussion of the results in relation to other and self repetition, self rephrase, utterance completion and simultaneous talk.

Chapter five will concentrate on the discussion of the results obtained from the three sets of interviews, which will be presented in chronological order. The results of the analysis of the first interview will provide information on participants' perceptions of communication accommodation in interactions with NNESs and NESs, as well as their awareness of ELF issues pertaining accommodation. The second interview and its analysis and discussion will focus on factors that facilitate communication from an accommodation perspective, as well as aspects that hinder understanding and effectiveness in communication. Finally, the analysis and discussion of the third set of interviews will account for participants' perceptions of their actual interaction. Finally, chapter six is a presentation of the findings of this study around the two main research questions.

Chapter 1 Communication Accommodation Theory

1.1 Introduction

Shepard et al. (2001) clarify that CAT originated in the early 1970s from Giles' work on accent shifts framed in Speech Accommodation Theory and based on social psychology, but since accommodation theory has a great exploratory potential, it then expanded to an interdisciplinary model, sociology and sociolinguistics mainly, which aims at explaining the complexities of interaction. Furthermore, (Giles et al. 1991) state that at its early stages, accommodation theory research was largely based on laboratory work which disregarded the linguistic differences of varieties and speech styles given in diverse sociocultural contexts. They also point out that later CAT included more observational studies in naturally occurring settings, thus balancing discourse analysis with sociolinguistic approaches.

After more than three decades, CAT can now be viewed as 'the description, prediction, and explanation of the underlying motivations, communication processes, and consequences of shifts in behaviour in interactions' (Shepard et al. 2001, p.33). More specifically, Shepard et al. refer to language behaviour as crucial in social interactions as it marks group and individual identity, and state that individuals use language as a device to establish a 'desired social distance' between themselves and their interlocutors (2001, p.34).

The principal objective of chapter one is to provide the background to understand CAT from a more general perspective. Therefore, the remaining sections of this chapter will concentrate on key aspects and concepts within the study of CAT, namely communication accommodation strategies, the relevance of multilingualism in CAT research, and style and social identity.

1.2 Accommodation Strategies

In order to negotiate a desired distance individuals can make use of a series of strategies that can be classified, according to Shepard et al. (2001) into four types. ***Approximation strategies*** belong to the first set and comprise *convergence*, *divergence*, *maintenance* and *complementarity.* By means of *convergence* interlocutors adjust to their conversation partners' communicative behaviour in terms of linguistic, prosodic and non-verbal features Giles & Coupland (1991); in other words, when people converge they become more similar to their interlocutors by modifying their accents, dialects, idiomatic expressions, and speech rate, for example (Shepard et al. 2001). In the context of ELF research, Cogo & Dewey (2006) explain that convergence is used for two purposes: for communicative efficiency when a speaker wishes to be more intelligible, and for showing alignment, cooperation, support and approval. Conversely, *divergence* is the means whereby speakers emphasise their individual – verbal and non-verbal - differences with respect to their interlocutors (Giles et al. 1991) and even though it signals distance from interlocutors, divergence is also an identification strategy since it might indicate a sense of belonging to a group external to the immediate communicative instance (Giles & Coupland 1991). Furthermore, *maintenance* and *complementarity* resemble divergence in that the former is used when speakers decide to continue interacting in their own styles without modifying their behaviour regardless of their interlocutors' accommodative needs, and the latter when speakers desire to accentuate differences with respect to interlocutors who have opposing roles; e.g. men and women (Shepard et al. 2001).

Shepard et al. state that compared to approximation strategies, the remaining three categories of strategies have not been part of the major focus of CAT. The second set of strategies is ***discourse management*** which concentrates on the discursive devices speakers use to facilitate their interlocutor's contribution to the conversation; i.e. how speakers attend to the others' conversational needs (e.g. topic selection, face maintenance, backchannelling and turn management). The third type relates to

interpretability strategies whereby speakers modify the complexity of their speech based on their interpretation of language performance (e.g. simplification of syntax and lexical items). Finally, there exist ***interpersonal control*** strategies whose main aim is to control and direct – explicitly or implicitly – the course of the interaction by means of interruptions, floor offering or address forms (Giles & Coupland 1991; Shepard et al. 2001).

1.2.1 Other perspectives of accommodation strategies

Shepard et al. (2001) explain that approximation strategies, namely convergence and divergence, can be characterised in other ways. One distinction is ***upward*** versus ***downward*** in relation to the power structures in the communicative situation; when speakers adjust to a more prestigious variety accommodation is said to be upward, whereas if they move towards more stigmatised forms, a downward shift is given. Also, when accommodative interactions are observed to be equal in all parties in the conversation this leads to ***symmetrical*** accommodation, but when modifications in behaviour are unequal, ***asymmetrical*** accommodation takes place. In a similar fashion, ***unidirectional*** accommodation happens when only one interlocutor converges or diverges, and ***mutual*** accommodation when all parties do so. Another crucial distinction is that of ***objective/subjective*** accommodation; the objective type refers to the tangible communicative behaviour as observed and assessed through observation of the interactions; conversely, subjective accommodation is studied by means of a more psychological perspective and looks at listeners' perceptions of the accommodative moves of the interaction. Finally, regarding interlocutors' perceptions of optimal levels of behavioural modification, the term ***overaccommodation*** makes reference to that type of miscommunication in which participants perceive others to exceed the level of adjustments which are necessary for successful interactions; while in ***underaccommodation*** speakers' efforts to accommodate are judged as insufficient.

1.3 Communication Accommodation Theory in the context of multilingualism

Sachdev, Giles and Pauwels (2013) have placed the theory of accommodation within the context of studies of multilingualism. The first argument they present to justify this is that due to globalisation and the resulting increase in communication amongst different cultures and languages, the need for bilingualism and multilingualism is greater today than it was 20 years ago. In order to understand the complexity underlying acts of multilingual communication and, thus, to contribute to research on multilingualism from a more social psychological perspective, these authors appeal to CAT and its notions of psychological and behavioural accommodation.

As stated earlier, according to Shepard, Giles and Le Poire (2001) CAT derived from Giles' work on accent shifts framed in Speech Accommodation Theory during the 1970s. However, they explain, since speech accommodation theory had a great exploratory potential, its scope then expanded to include a broader conception of communication behaviours; in other words, CAT research embraces both verbal and non-verbal communication, and attitudes and perceptions of these diverse behaviours, in an attempt to account for the complexities of interaction. In a nutshell, CAT now describes, predicts and explains the underlying motivations, communication processes, and consequences of people's moves in communicative behaviour in interactions (Shepard et al. 2001, p.33). It is crucial to bear in mind that CAT emphasizes the relevance of language behaviour in interpersonal and intergroup interaction as it is indexical of group membership and individual identity; i.e., ethnic boundaries, status differences, ingroup and outgroup boundaries, and role or norm-specific behaviour (2001, p.34).

To recapitulate the point about the relationship between accommodation theory and multilingual studies, the fact that language choice in multilingual contexts is a complex issue is a solid starting point to state that CAT research could be applied to integrate

the micro-individual and the macro-collective levels of multilingual communication (Sachdev et al. 2013). In this respect, Sachdev et al refer to three major assumptions of CAT and relate them to multilingualism. First of all, they state that not only do the immediate context and participants' positioning with respect to the communicative situation influence the choice of language(s) to be used, but also socio-historical aspects can affect multilingual communication. Thus, for example, which languages are going to be used in an encounter between the police and an immigrant will very much depend on the degree of hostility historically held by members of the different groups involved. The second assumption refers to negotiation of social categories: multilingual communication can be both a way to exchange referential information, and the means to negotiate social category memberships through accommodation. Finally, optimal levels of multilingual accommodation represent the last assumption outlined by these authors. During conversations, participants hold expectations with respect to desired levels of multilingual accommodation, and these expectations are based on stereotypes of outgroup members, ways of doing intergroup business and dominant social and situational norms (Sachdev et al. 2013, pp.393–394).

CAT research comprises two communication strategies mainly. The first one is convergence which Giles & Coupland (1991) define as the strategy used to become more similar to interlocutors' behaviour by means of linguistic, paralinguistic and non-verbal features. On the other hand, divergence can be defined as the strategy that results in the 'accentuation of language and cultural differences' (p. 395). Additionally, another strategy that has received some attention is that of maintenance; according to (Shepard et al. 2001), maintenance can be observed when speakers continue interacting in their own styles regardless of their interlocutors' accommodative needs; therefore, they explain, maintenance can be conceived as being closely related to divergent behaviour as it establishes a degree of social distance amongst the participants. Sachdev et al. (2013) also refer to a type of accommodation that takes place in multilingual environments, which allows speakers to move to a more neutral spaces between them: when speakers whose first languages are different but who know each other's language(s) well, decide to use a third language – or lingua franca –

as a way to avoid ethnolinguistic tensions, as it is the case with Flemish and French speakers in Belgium who communicate in English. This move, according to Sachdev et al., is also considered to be divergent with respect to their interlocutors' and the speakers' own language.

Sachdev et al. (2013) also refer to the motives, evaluation and stereotypes and social norms pertaining convergence and divergence. They begin this part of the argument by referring to the two main motives or causes related to convergence; namely, social attractiveness or the desire to obtain other people's approval, including their social network; and, on the other hand, communicative efficiency or enhancement of mutual understanding. With regard to evaluation, it is essential to mention that convergence might have some costs which relate to the loss of personal or social identity (2013, p.396). When it comes to divergence, the main cause can be said to respond to the desire to distinguish oneself from our interlocutor(s) on the grounds of group membership, and this happens when a participant highlights the value of his or her intergroup (social category membership) rather than his or her interindividual (personal) differences (p.396). In this respect, the authors explain that divergence can be a relevant tactic for intergroup distinctiveness for those multilinguals who esteem their ethnicity highly. Another motive of divergence refers to the intention to shape interlocutors' feelings and attributions; for example, the use of French in an English-speaking university environment could serve the purpose of reminding interlocutors about ethnolinguistic differences and different levels of linguistic competence in English (p.397).

In general terms, converging in multilingual contexts is perceived more positively than diverging or maintaining, as it is indexical of efficiency and cooperation. Nonetheless, full convergence can be negatively evaluated when, for example, in foreign language learning native-like proficiency might be seen with distrust by the target community members (Sachdev et al. 2013). In terms of evaluation again, the concept of power becomes pivotal as it relates to people's expectations of accommodative behaviour. With regard to this point, Sachdev et al. state that those in subordinate positions are

expected to converge to the powerful ones; in other words, they are likely to apply communicative moves corresponding to upward convergence, as seen in section 1.2.1.

After reviewing the basic concepts of CAT, Sachdev et al. (2013, pp.399–407) present a model for multilingual accommodation that outlines the three main variables that influence this type of communication: societal intergroup context variables, sociolinguistic setting variables, and social psychological processes.

1.3.1 Intergroup context

The authors explain that in multilingual contexts – where many ethnolinguistic groups with unequal power status coexist – the construct of ethnolinguistic vitality is essential when observing the influence of sociostructural factors in multilingual communication. The term ethnolinguistic vitality refers to the 'ability of groups to behave and survive as distinctive and active collective entities in multi-group settings' (2013, p.401) and it is affected by (a) demographic variables such as the number of group members and their distribution around territories, immigration rates among other factors, (b) group status or the sociohistorical prestige and socioeconomic status of the language groups, and (c) institutional support variables; i.e., how language groups are represented by institutions in areas such as education, politics, media, economy, etc.

1.3.2 Sociolinguistic setting

This refers to the situational norms governing multilingual communication in terms of variation. With respect to this, Sachdev et al. assert that in many cultural contexts the local vernacular is restricted to communication in private settings, while the prestigious language represented the intellectual or economic elite and serves the purpose of public formal communication. On the other hand, social networks play a crucial role in normative behaviour. In this respect, the concept of individual networks of linguistic contact or INLC (Allard & Landry 1994) is important as it is in these

networks that people live their ethnolinguistic experience fully. INLC refer to the occasions in which individuals are able to use their own languages when interacting with different people (relatives, friends, colleagues, etc.); in short, INLC comprises ingroup and outgroup instances of communication.

1.3.3 Social psychological processes

As previously stated, convergence can be described in terms of integration to a certain group, while divergence and maintenance respond to speakers' wish to differentiate from a given group. Hence, group identification is a crucial aspect in multilingual communication (Sachdev et al. 2013). In multilingual contexts, where language groups are in contact, a bidirectional transformation can take place, a sort of acculturation process that refers to 'the sharing and exchange of ingroup/outgroup cultures, values, resources, and identities' (2013, p.406). Sachdev et al. present an overview of the different orientations to acculturation: First, an integrationist perspective is the one that emphasises plurality and sharing of languages, while an assimilationist would value conformity to dominant languages and use them respecting prevailing language norms. Then, with a separatist perception a person would be able to value plurality as long as it does not lead to sharing cultural identities between groups, he or she would diverge in intergroup but converge in intragroup communication. An exclusionist possesses a more intolerant view of other languages and cultures and believes these out-groups have no right to claim membership in a given society; he or she would present divergent behaviour with respect to minority groups. Another category or orientation is that of individualism; an individualist would regard his or her interlocutors as individuals rather than as members belonging to social categories, thus the accommodative behaviour will respond to his or her own motives and needs (pp.406–407).

Before moving on to the following section in chapter one, it is essential to mention that Sachdev et al. were not the first researchers to place and draw on CAT to study interaction in multilingual context. As it will be explained in chapter 2, studies on CAT

have been conducted within the field of ELF, where communication takes place in multilingual settings and whose participants make use of their linguistic resources to communicate.

1.4 Style and social identity

Early studies on variationism in the field of sociolinguistics have been criticised on the grounds that they have neglected social meaning and the way this meaning is created by means of language (Auer 2007; Coupland 2007). Variationism has tried to understand the changes in language system rather than social action and interaction through languages (Coupland 2007, p.7). Auer (2007) adds that the concepts of social identity and style can help researchers in the area to focus their attention on social meaning. Auer's main concern is the construction and management of social identities through interaction, and more specifically the extent to which people can express heterogeneity using their linguistic repertoire so as to display their social identities (2007, p.3). The aspect of identity construction Auer is interested in is not the way in which people are classified into social categories in conversations, but how people – by choosing one variable realisation over another one – accomplish social identity display.

1.4.1 Social Identity

According to Auer (2007), an important point of departure from earlier variationist studies is the work initiated by Le Page in the late 1970s on 'acts of identity' (Le Page 1978; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). Le Page placed emphasis on the role of individuals as actors who – albeit performing with certain limitations – choose their affiliations and express these through language, thus projecting one or more identities. Le Page was also interested in the fact that people can apply socio-stylistic variation to converge to the behaviour of the social groups they want to identify with. This undoubtedly resonates with the concept of 'social attractiveness' from CAT; in fact, as Coupland (2007 Ch. 5) explains, Le Page & Tabouret-Keller (1985) admit there exists a

theoretical overlap in this respect; furthermore, the limitations on our acts of identity closely relate to the guiding principles suggested by Beebe & Giles (1984) for Speech Accommodation Theory. These restrictions on acts of identity are: (a) speakers' ability to recognise the groups they wish to identify with, (b) the extent to which speakers can access these groups and their way of speaking, this includes the analytical tools to determine the behavioural rules, (c) speakers' motivation to converge to the linguistic behaviour of that group, and the possible conflicts between retaining their own identities and acquiring the identities of that group (costs and rewards of converging), and (d) speakers ability to modify their linguistic behaviour (linguistic repertoire) (Auer 2007; Coupland 2007).

Auer favours an approach to social identities that takes into account the conversational and situational contexts as he believes the meaning of some linguistic features 'is always open to situational revision, transformation, and refinement' (2007, p.6); that is, Auer believes an identity-in interaction approach is relevant for the analysis of style and social meaning. He defines 'identity work in interaction' as the work or effort people invest so as to ascribe and claim ownership of social categories (p. 10). Pivotal to the study of identity in interaction is the distinction between discourse, situational and transportable identities as described by Zimmerman (1998). Discourse identities refer to the identity of the 'current speaker', while situational ones are closely related to institutional roles such as a lawyer in court. However, the most significant type for identity in interaction is the transportable (also called social) ones, or the latent identities individuals carry in their daily lives.

It is important to mention that Coupland aligns with Auer regarding situational revision of social meaning, as Coupland believes sociolinguistic indexicality is not stable over time, but a matter of social attribution which is amenable to discussion and renegotiation. Hence, the complexities and instabilities of meaning relationships must be considered (p.23). 'One form' does not equal 'one meaning' and this social meaning must be looked for in different places. The social meaning potential of language forms

is activated, validated, challenged or parodied in 'particular discourse frames for particular local effects' (p.24).

According to Auer (2007), social style in sociolinguistic studies is considered a holistic and multi-layered phenomenon that has come to replace the perception of earlier studies that focused on single (linguistic) variables when analysing style. He further states that the broadness of the concept is subject to debate, as linguistic variation can also embrace pragmatic patterns, choice of communicative genres, rhetorical practices, among other aspects (p.12). In a nutshell, he explains, the social meaning of linguistic heterogeneity is found in many linguistic features that have to be analysed as a group, although stylistic analysis can focus on single variables too, especially when these are salient in social-communicative styles. This salience of certain linguistic variables is relevant since style is the concept that links linguistic variability to (self and other) social categorisation; i.e., it is by means of linguistic variation that we build up social styles (p.13).

Another key point Auer discusses relates to the idea of environment; he states that social communicative styles result from communities' adjustments to the 'ecological and socio-political environment' and, thus, are strategic. In this respect, the principal motivation to find or adjust these styles is social positioning or 'finding one's place in society', so styles are tools used for distinction: they are used to distinguish *us* from *them* (p.13).

As regard the present study and its approach to identity, it needs to be clarified that Auer's concept of identity in interaction is perhaps the most relevant for the analysis of accommodation phenomena as observed in this group of graduate students. As stated in the previous paragraphs, Auer conceives identity as set in interaction and, thus, any linguistic feature that might project aspects of identity of individuals must be (re)analysed and (re)interpreted not a priori but in the social interaction itself. In other words, Auer presents a view of identity which is neither fixed nor predetermined and

which is (co)constructed as individuals interact with one another. It is precisely this emphasis on the role of interaction that makes Auer's conceptualization of identity more appropriate for this study, in which real language use is at the core. In other words, the observation of accommodation strategies as performed by these key participants will throw some light of how some people work towards the achievement of social membership. Having explained this, it is also important to state that while Auer's *identity in interaction* is crucial for this project, Le Page's *acts of identity* also plays a fundamental part in guiding the analysis, not only because he places the individual as an actor in the construction of their own identity (through language use), but also because he acknowledges certain restrictions on these acts of identity, such as the speaker's motivation to adapt their language or their ability to do so. These restrictions are important to consider, especially when it comes to the participants' own assessment of the application of accommodation strategies.

1.4.2 Speech repertoire vis-à-vis habitus

Coupland (2007 Ch. 4) discusses sociolinguistic resources, and the first concept under observation is that of constrained freedom with respect to variation; in this sense styling is conceived as 'the variation that speakers can perform within certain tolerances, dictated by the boundaries of their speech community' (2007, p.82). The concept of speech repertoire is relevant to the discussion in that it implies that speakers have control over a certain number of varieties of a language and select variables to either conform to particular situations or depart from normative expectations.

Notwithstanding this, Coupland problematizes the idea that speakers select styles from alternative (pre-existing) speech repertoires, by referring to three main objections. First, speech repertoire is an apolitical notion; i.e., it does not recognise the political and ideological implications of sociolinguistic variation. In other words, this notion does not acknowledge that some styles or varieties are (perceived to be) more valuable than others. Second, it becomes necessary to question the meaning of the

word ‘choice’: do speakers really have a choice? Do we control our repertoires or are our speech and its variations too ‘ingrained’ in our souls to ‘opt out of the identity implications’? (p.83). Finally, the speech repertoire model is too restrictive in that ‘[Speakers] can frame the linguistic resources available to them in creative ways, making new meanings from old meanings’ (p. 84).

Another key aspect in the discussion is the ideological basis of variation. First, Coupland reminds us of the work of Bourdieu (1984; 1991) on linguistic markets which emphasises the symbolic and cultural value of language varieties. Coupland explains that English, for instance, possesses a capital that provides those who speak the language with considerable advantages such as good employment opportunities. In this respect, to Coupland style is ‘a system of social distinctiveness that is ideologically structured through socialization’ (2007, p.85), and for Bourdieu, sociolinguistic variation is somehow pre-determined.

Coupland also refers to language ideology and to the fact that ideological sociolinguistics concerns itself with subordination, gate-keeping, entitlement and resistance (2007). An important concept in ideology is ‘standard language’, and with regard to this point, Coupland questions the fact that sociolinguistic variants are semantically equivalent, as implied by early variationist sociolinguistic, and instead argues that dialect or accent changes can be alternative ways to achieve the same reference, but can certainly mean very different things. In terms of the ideology of standard and non-standard languages or variants, Coupland states that western Anglophones countries ‘have set high stakes of linguistic variation’ and have made us believe that style shifting to vernacular forms is undesirable. In this sense, style shifting is to be monitored at all times and punished if it goes wrong (2007, p.89).

The argument now turns to the concepts of habitus and semantic style. The idea of habitus or embodied rituals, says Coupland, is essential in Bourdieu’s work on language and symbolic power; for Bourdieu, language and different ways of speaking

are linked to historical and political meanings. The idea of habitus counters the concept of speech repertoire, in that habitus implies we are not free to choose different styles from our repertoire and elude the ideological associations of the ways we speak, as these ways result from a slow process of socialization. In terms of semantics, styles are not meaning free. Styles are both socially constrained (coded in our social experiences) and socially constraining (Coupland 2007). By way of summary, Coupland believes there exists a problem when drawing the line between constraint and freedom, and adds that Bourdieu's main contribution is probably his warning against considering style as something opportunistic or elective. For Bourdieu, social practice consolidates a fixed social order built around class, and his concept of symbolic domination is the reflection of a hierarchical structure 'that imposes its values downwards' (Coupland 2007, p.92). And habitus – which precludes choice – guarantees that people keep to their social place in this hierarchy.

Finally, Coupland's concept of constrained freedom closely relates to performance. Coupland (2007 Ch. 6) argues for recognition of speakers' agentive role coupled with metalinguistic awareness in order to talk about speakers' performing speech, In other words, Coupland believes in speakers' capability for crafting their speech to create alternative possibilities, with a certain degree of awareness of their actions and possible outcomes, and of autonomous control over these changes. In this way, he states, speakers 'perform identities' only when they know how their designed speech displays a certain persona.

1.4.3 Authenticity

Another crucial aspect when discussing styles and identities is authenticity. Coupland 2007 (Ch. 7) suggests five qualities to determine someone's speech as authentic or fake. The first one is ontology, or real existence in opposition to a type of existence that derives from something else. The second quality is historicity: authentic things last in time. The third one is systemic coherence which means that authentic things are established in meaningful contexts and thus fit into significant systems or institutions.

Consensus is the fourth quality, as authenticity results from a process of authorisation and to claim membership to a particular identity means to overcome the challenges regarding acceptance. Last but not least is value, since things are ratified they possess cultural value. With this in mind, it becomes easier to understand why certain linguistic styles are considered more authentic than others (2007, p.181). At this stage, Coupland resumes the argument regarding standard language vs. vernaculars by saying that variationist sociolinguistics has contributed to placing vernacular speech in a higher status; i.e., variationism has demonstrated that vernaculars are authentic since their existence fulfils the five conditions. Conversely, variationist sociolinguistic has discredited standard language on the basis that is not authentic, but rather imposed. Standard language, according to this view, deviates from natural language. Coupland agrees with this and argues against the belief that style-shifting is a move away from sociolinguistic authenticity (2007, p.182).

1.4.4 Crossing and Stylisation

Rampton's work has been fundamental in order to better understand the role of agency in crossing and stylisation. The concept of crossing challenges the variationist studies and its focus on discrete communities inasmuch as it involves the use of linguistic features or varieties associated with social groups the speaker is not a member of. In a similar fashion, stylisation relates to a metaphorical move that recalls stereotyped and ideological values associated with groups that are not present in the speech event and introduces dissonant identities (Coupland 2007).

Rampton (2011) analyses the role of agency within semiotic and socio-economic systems in the context of lower socio-economic levels in a stratified society such as the British one. He explains that although users at this level have limited scope for reshaping the entire social system, one must not deny the relevance of their 'agentive engagement' with the conditions that shape their lives; in this respect, he asserts, 'speech stylisation and language crossing are practices where agency is particularly

pronounced' (2011, p.1237). As a result of his systematic observation of British adolescents, Rampton argues that style shifts to either posh or Cockney accents allow these users to emphasise and denaturalise class stratification and, second, that stylisation of Creole/Asian English reworks the ethno-linguistic imagery surrounding the prevailing ideology.

More specifically, the pattern observed by Rampton indicates that Cockney evokes feelings of solidarity, passion and bodily laxity; whereas a posh accent relates to social distance, superiority, control and sexual inhibition. Rampton strongly argues that rather than merely projecting an identity or ideological imagery these teenagers shift styles so as to address attention to aspects of a structure that they already possess, and by doing so they position themselves around that structure to, for instance, distance themselves from a particular image, such as a sexual one, or to soften social boundaries sometimes. Rampton's conclusions resonate with Coupland's idea of stylisation as having a subversive effect as a result of complexities of ownership; that is, of not speaking with one's own true voice (Coupland 2007 Ch. 6). In the context studied by Rampton, in certain institutional interactions between teachers and students, the latter shifted to Cockney or posh when threatened or humiliated by those with more authority in the interactional context (2011, p.1239).

On the other hand, the shifts to Creole and Asian English are polarised in that the former is related to opposition to authority, verbal resourcefulness and assertiveness, while the latter responds to deference and politeness. According to Rampton (2011) this polarisation is part of a wide imagery that regards black people as threat and Asian people as victims. Given such a strong polarisation and powerful imagery of both ethnic groups, stylised Creole or Asian English can become a dangerous business because shifts into either direction performed by the wrong actors can be severely punished. In the context Rampton observed, adolescents possessed an accurate sense of the shifts they could and could not do, but despite being cautious about their moves, they appropriated and reworked that imagery through crossing and stylisation. In this sense and regardless of the ethnic background of the teenagers, Creole was

much more attractive than Asian English as it represented positive values of youth culture, while Asian English was associated with the historical tradition these youngsters wished to move away from.

Not only is Creole/Asian English stylisation linked to ethnic grouping, but it is also strongly related to social class stratification. This is so because – as Rampton explains – by doing crossing and stylisation the mixed adolescent community he observed wishes to be distinguished from the very extremes of the vertical social ladder; that is, the wealthy and the (Bangladeshi) poor who are perceived as not doing stylised shifts.

Furthermore, the connection to social class is evidenced in the evaluation of Creole and non-standard English by some actors of the social group. For example, parents tend to regard certain shifts to Creole and vernacular South Midlands English as inappropriate and address their effort to eradicate these forms from their children's speech. Notwithstanding this, participants in the study did not adopt a submissive attitude and did not incorporate these corrections to their production; conversely, these Creole and vernacular forms became a token of multiracial working-class identity of the local young group (Rampton 1995; 2011). In short, regarding speakers' agency within systems socio-economic class seems to be the most powerful force, as Rampton concludes from his data, 'it seemed to be inter-ethnically shared experience of positioning within the British lower classes that gave crossing and stylisation so much of their shape, intelligibility, currency and resonance' (2011, p.1246). In other words, Cockney/posh stylisation is not clearly connected to ethnicity and migration as Asian English/Creole is to class stratification in England.

By way of summary, chapter one has dealt with communication accommodation from a general perspective and has provided an overview of how the theory has developed from its origins to more current perspectives. Chapter two will show how CAT has influenced ELF research on interaction, and how convergence seems to be the driving force in communication where English is a Lingua Franca.

Chapter 2 English as a Lingua Franca and Communication Accommodation Theory

2.1 Introduction

The growing interest in the field of ELF has given rise to a lively debate over forms and functions of the language as performed by non-native speakers of English (NNSEs), NNSEs' ownership and roles in shaping English, and ELF implications in language teaching, to name just a few points. Particularly, defining ELF has been a relevant point in this discussion. For instance, Jenkins (2009: 143) defines ELF as 'a contact language among speakers from different first languages' emphasising that ELF does not exclude communication between NNSEs and native speakers of English (NSEs) and suggesting the latter must adapt to ELF norms too. Seidlhofer (2011) also regards ELF as the communicative medium used by speakers of different first languages, but she touches on the issue of language choice by explaining that on some occasions ELF speakers prefer to use English over other languages, although it might be the case that they cannot choose as English is the only resource available for them.

Perhaps a different perspective for a definition of ELF is the one that Dewey (2009) offers, as he includes the variability component, thus defining ELF as

> A dynamic, locally realized enactment of a global resource, best conceptualized not as a uniform set of norms or practices, but as a highly variable, creative expression of linguistic resources which warrants a distinct analytical framework.' (p. 62)

Dewey's conceptualization of ELF has implications on how speakers are perceived in the ELF paradigm as opposed to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) or English as a

Foreign Language (EFL), as well as on how these speakers appropriate the language. These points will be discussed and expanded in the following sections.

More recently, (Mauranen, 2018) points out to the unparallel current status of English, by arguing that there exist two significant aspects of English; its incomparable spread around the globe on the one hand, and the idea that nowadays there are more users of English as a second or additional language than English as a native language speakers, on the other. Thus, Mauranen believes that it would be natural to find a considerable amount of heterogeneity and variability, and to use the term *Englishes* as opposed to *English* (p. 7). She adds that English is being used both as a contact language where English is a domestic or predominant language and as a non-local lingua franca for communication amongst people from different locations around the world in different domains of life such as political meetings, international businesses, or academic interactions.

Mauranen (2018) also establishes an approach to studying ELF that comprises three perspectives, which are crucial to the understanding of the relationship between ELF and CAT, inasmuch as they provide insights into the linguistic, societal, interactional and cognitive aspects of accommodation phenomena. The first one is the macro perspective which involves the linguistic and societal domains. In this respect, from a linguistic point of view it needs to be born in mind that language contact in ELF encounters is highly complex since speakers of approximately 7,000 different languages are potentially in contact with English and, thus, ELF is closely linked to multilingualism and language contact. The author explains that processes that are typical of dialect contact, such as simplification, can also be present in ELF and that speakers who use ELF as a means of communication speak English which is a result of the contact between their other languages and English. Moreover, Mauranen explains that a micro-social perspective of ELF requires a redefinition of the concept of community. In other words, the traditional concept of speech community might not be useful in the description of the complex and varied nature of ELF interaction, as this traditional term is connected to more fixed, monolingual and local communities.

Although scholars have not completely overcome the challenge of conceptualising community for ELF, argues Mauranen, it is safe to state that a concept of community that better accounts for ELF encounters must not be based solely on aspects such as speakers' physical proximity or multiple internal contacts.

The second perspective offered by Mauranen is that of meso or micro-social one, which deals with social interaction. With respect to this, the author explains that language innovations emanate from individuals and that in this process accommodation is fundamental when explaining 'the diffusion of features from one language group to another' (p. 13). For example, speakers accommodate their language forms to compensate for the lack of common ground, by simplifying their grammar or by elaborating on the content. Mauranen also states that even though observations like the previously described one stem from research on NS interactions, accommodation processes can also provide a sound explanation of how successful communication is attained. Furthermore, linguistic interaction thrust language change and, thus, some forms of language become more common or preferred than other. In ELF, this apparently means that the desire to be more explicit so as to achieve communicative efficiency is shaping English grammar to include those preferred patterns. In this respect, speakers 'tend to prefer structures that are easier to produce, and to avoid those that are hard to understand' (p.14).

Finally, the last perspective of ELF as described by Mauranen is the micro perspective which relates to the individual level and their cognitive processes. This perspective is relevant to ELF as it deals with the exposure ELF users have, i.e. second or additional language users have significantly less exposure to their later languages compared to their first one, which might lead to less deeply entrenched language representations. From this idea, it follows that reception and production in additional languages may place more burden on our working memory, and affect schema accessibility and accommodation strategies negatively. In this sense, Mauranen argues that the most relevant cognitive process in ELF is approximation because 'by approximating intended

expressions well enough, speakers can achieve communicative success' and because 'a speaker's output provides enough for the interlocutor to go on, and they can manage with less accurate detail' (p. 18).

2.2 ELF paradigm

In order to appreciate the nature of ELF interaction and speakers' role(s) it becomes indispensable to understand the ways in which ELF departs from SLA and EFL. With regard to SLA, Jenkins (2006) explains that scholars tend to have a monolingual bias since they perceive language acquisition as the attainment of native-like competence; consequently, any deviation from native speaker (NS) norms is likely to be regarded as failure. She also states that metaphors of L1 interference – albeit now replaced by a less derogatory 'transfer' – and fossilization are at the core of SLA activity, which contribute to a deficiency perspective. Notwithstanding the above, Jenkins (2006) also highlights the fact that SLA has moved away from the 'error' perspective as the target is not always the NS-like performance. In this respect, she points to sociocultural theory within SLA as being more aligned to ELF because of its emphasis on mediation of interaction, learners' transformative agency, participation metaphor, and linguistic and ethnic identities. SLA feeds EFL methodology in which learners are assessed against NSEs and are generally perceived as an outsider or failure (Graddol 2006).

Another difficulty for ELF research is what Dewey (2009) calls the *objectification* of the language; i.e., a tendency in applied linguistics to view language as an object of study or a set of rules that speakers must follow, rather than as a socially constructed system. As a result of this, in the past linguists tended to study language at a surface level and from a competence perspective; in other words, the speaker's command over disconnected items in a system was at the core, while communicative strategies are regarded as compensatory devices. ELF, on the other hand, requires as he states a different analytical framework which looks more closely at strategies and processes in ELF interactions. In an ELF theoretical framework, a degree of independence from

English as a Native language (ENL) norms is acknowledged and multilingual identities and resources are considered to play a key role in the way ELF speakers take ownership of the language (Seidlhofer 2009). Also, and closely related to its departure from SLA, House (2003) explains that since ELF is more concerned with social than with individual psychological phenomena, an interlanguage framework is less appropriate and should be replaced by a multicompetence one. Finally, despite its differences with respect to the more traditional paradigms of SLA and EFL, ELF is not meant to replace either ENL or EFL methodology; instead, it has come to coexist with these perspectives and offer learners other possibilities (Jenkins 2009).

2.2.1 A new perception of NNSEs

ELF research has contributed to a change in the way NNSEs are perceived, especially in terms of their transformative agency. Rather than following NS norms, Seidlhofer (2011) states, ELF users shape the language as well as their identities in the process of doing ELF. She further adds that ELF speakers do online interactional work as they negotiate meaning in situ, transforming the language if necessary, and that this agency ELF users exploit places them in the role of *languagers*; i.e., agents who creatively express themselves using their multilingual repertoires, and not necessarily the NSE ones, sometimes pushing the barriers of NSE standard English. This creative expression of a language that belongs to the whole globe now, as Dewey (2009) stated in his definition, is produced in communicative contexts influenced by locally determined features. Consequently, linguistic innovations in ELF reflect both characteristics of the local varieties of English and common features to all ELF speakers regardless of their L1 background (Jenkins 2009). The highly dynamic and variable nature of ELF, where meaning is constantly negotiated rather than taken for granted, brings about another issue in the relationship amongst interlocutors; this time with regard to the possession of linguistic authority within interactions; Kaur (2011) refers to evidence in her data to demonstrate that linguistic authority, that is to say the right to correct others' use of language, is not pre-determined either and is anything but constant even within the same communicative instance. The right to correct can shift from one speaker to

another depending on the communicative needs and speakers' language expertise. She also points to the fact that within ELF, repair is conducted in a non-face-threatening manner.

2.3 Accommodation research in ELF

According to Kaur (2011) ELF interactions are characterised by rich diversity in terms of varieties of English, speakers' proficiency levels, communicative styles and cultural norms, and this diverse nature can lead to understanding problems amongst speakers. It is in this context of considerable diversity where interaction becomes enriched and accommodation processes central to communication and to the ELF analytical framework Dewey (2009) refers to. In this respect, Dewey (2011) describes CAT as central to ELF studies as it has provided researchers with a better understanding of how and to what extent accommodative behaviours contribute to effective language use in those instances in which speakers present varied linguacultural backgrounds.

As it will become more evident in the following sections of this chapter, there are many links between CAT as developed by its main scholars since the 1970s and ELF research on accommodation, especially when it comes to approximation strategies, namely convergence, divergence and maintenance. To be more precise, ELF research on accommodation has provided more evidence of the convergent nature of ELF communication, probably due to the settings that have been most observed, i.e. academic and business fields. This does not mean that all ELF interaction is convergent, as it will be seen in section 2.3.3. Thus, both CAT and ELF have studied accommodation from an approximation perspective and so far little attention has been paid the other accommodation strategies described by Shepard et al. (2001), i.e. convergence, divergence and maintenance. The other accommodation strategies, that is to say discourse management, interpretability and interpersonal control have been kept outside the main scope. It has to be said, however, that approximation and the other accommodation strategies are not mutually exclusive. For example, as it will be

observed in chapter 4, other repetition can be classified as a discourse management strategy, but at the same time this type of repetition serves the ultimate purpose of converging.

2.3.1 Phonological accommodation

A milestone in ELF research is Jenkins' work on phonological accommodation (Jenkins 2000). In her work, Jenkins is mainly concerned with accommodation of those NNESs who are non-bilingual (NBESs); i.e., her data comprises the speech of learners of English whose production does not approach native-like standards. This distinction is crucial when it comes to study approximation strategies, especially of the phonological type, as linguistic convergence is strongly determined by the speaker's competence in the target language. In other words, a speaker's converging behaviour can only vary within his or her competence, or language repertoire. Regarding this complexity, Jenkins (2000) highlights pronunciation as the area of language that is likely to impede convergence the most. Similarly, in this context of NBES talk, when there is approximation this does not occur in the traditional fashion; that is to say, speakers converging to each other. Instead, speakers pronunciation shifts aim at L2 standards probably resulting from a strong desire to avoid the acquisition of their interlocutors' phonological 'errors'. Therefore, as Jenkins (2000) explains, phonological convergence in ELF interactions of the NBES type at a productive level occurs when speakers adjust their pronunciation to more target-like sounds, while from the receptive point of view it involves those mental adjustments listeners make in order to cope with their interlocutors' deviations from target sounds. This finding supports her claim about mutual intelligibility and communicative efficiency being more powerful drives than social approval for phonological convergence.

By way of summary, the factors that can hinder or facilitate phonological approximation strategies are speakers and listeners' phonological repertoire, extralinguistic context, attitudinal and linguistic ability to cope with unintelligibility,

motivation to be understood and to understand, and language processing overload (Jenkins 2000). Further research on accommodation in ELF has been conducted from a pragmatics perspective and the findings point to a cooperative, content-oriented ELF nature in which plurilingual resources are positively viewed as a means of (co)constructing meaning (Jenkins et al. 2011).

2.3.2 Accommodation studies with a focus on pragmatics

In ELF research the study of accommodation strategies has been central in this field since Jenkins published her work on phonological accommodation in 2000. Subsequent work on ELF accommodation has mainly focused on pragmatics, as well as lexicogrammatical aspects of language. This section focuses on the pragmatic area of ELF accommodation, in which special attention has been given to phenomena such as overlapping (Cogo & Dewey 2006; Wolfartsberger 2011), utterance completion (Cogo & Dewey 2006; Kalocsai 2011; Cogo & Dewey 2012; Konakahara 2015), pre-empting (Cogo & Dewey 2006; Cogo 2010; Kaur 2009; Cogo and House 2018), repetition (Cogo & Dewey 2006; Cogo 2009; Cogo 2010; Kaur 2009; Kalocsai 2011; Mauranen 2012; Kaur 2022), paraphrasing (Kaur 2009), and code-switching (Cogo & Dewey 2006; Cogo 2009; Kalocsai 2011; Klimpfinger 2009; Cogo 2018; Jenkins 2015); these phenomena can sometimes overlap with one another.

Before providing a more detailed description of these studies and their main contribution, it is essential to state that the type of data used in each of them corresponds to naturally occurring spoken conversations that take place in different communities of practice, where ELF speakers come from diverse linguacultural backgrounds. The nature of the communicative events under observation is diverse as these events range from casual conversation among friends and colleagues to more task-oriented interactions such as business meetings or university seminars.

2.3.2.1 Pre-empting

One of the pragmatic strategies that contribute to the evidence of the collaborative nature of ELF talk is that of pre-empting. In this respect, Cogo & Dewey (2006) cast doubt upon previous ELF research findings that suggest negotiation of meaning is less frequent than other strategies such as topic change (House 1999) and that speakers generally choose the 'let-it-pass' principle when misunderstandings are irrelevant (Firth 1996). Cogo & Dewey (2006) argue that in their data there exists evidence of interactional work (utterance completion, backchannelling, overlapping and latching) that shows a high degree of involvement and synchrony in the interaction, and of negotiation of meaning in the form of pre-empting. According to Cogo & Dewey (2012, ch. 5), a pre-emptive move happens when speakers foresee that their utterances can somehow impede their interlocutors' understanding and they try to prevent this, or when – without evidence of misunderstanding – they wish to support other speakers in the process of making sense of the message; in both cases, speakers make assumptions on possible sources of problems and the ways in which these can be overcome. When doing 'pre-empting' or 'pre-realizations' participants address their attention to a preceding part of the interaction – performed by either themselves or their interlocutors – and attempt to clarify it (Cogo & Dewey 2012).

More specifically, in their 2006 article and based on their data Cogo and Dewey point to the fact that speakers do 'pre-empting' when they are aware that certain culturally sensitive expressions, such as idioms, have the potential to create non-understanding; they pre-empt by framing, translating and explaining these expressions a priori. This explanation might lead to a negotiation of meaning where other interlocutors can provide other equivalent phrases from their linguacultural backgrounds to arrive to a complete understanding. It is precisely when speakers accept and agree on this equivalence that convergence takes place (Cogo & Dewey 2006; Cogo 2010).

In addition to the work of Cogo and Dewey, Kaur (2009) studies pre-emptive behaviour from a different perspective, by looking at how self repetition and self paraphrase are employed in a community of international students in an Asian university. First of all, she argues that both self- repetition and self paraphrase can be analysed as preventative strategies or as repair moves, and that the latter perspective was the preferred one in the Conversation Analysis (CA) tradition. In this paper, however, Kaur looks for evidence of these strategies as part of pro-active work. Also, although sometimes paraphrase and repetition are treated indistinctively, Kaur views them as different phenomena and defines repetition as 'the practice of re-saying some or all of the elements occurring earlier in an ongoing turn or in a preceding turn' (2009, p.110), stressing the fact that if there are changes in the repetition these are not substantial; on the other hand, paraphrase refers to delivering information in a notoriously different way, either by simplifying the message or using different words. This distinction is crucial as the choice between these two strategies does not seem to be deliberate; nonetheless, Kaur's data suggests that choosing one or the other depends on the speakers' assessment of the source of the problem or the nature of the prior talk; namely, speakers are likely to repeat when 'the potential problem is attributed to the recipient's difficulty in hearing rather than in understanding' (p.120) and, conversely, they would paraphrase when the potential problem seems to be rooted in their interlocutor's lack of understanding.

Cogo and House (2018) discuss pre-emptiveness in ELF communication in light of what they refer to as negotiation of meaning. Although meaning negotiation can also be applied to repair lack of understanding, the authors argue that interlocutors employ strategies such as repetition and paraphrasing to negotiate meaning before non or misunderstanding takes place in the interaction. They describe this strategy as a 'interactional monitoring in intercultural communication' (p. 213). Moreover, Cogo and House also refer to self-initiated repair as a pre-emptive strategy of negotiation of meaning. What this means is that when faced with a potential source of trouble, speakers are likely to repair that problematic part of the message as an attempt to increase explicitness.

From the discussion of previous works presented in this section, it could be concluded that the use of these pre-emptive moves in ELF communication refers to accommodation theory in that they relate to interpretability strategies: speakers employ self repetition and self paraphrase as a way to attune to their interlocutors' communicative needs and thus enhance communicative efficiency, by modifying the complexity of their speech (paraphrase) or increasing clarity (repetition) (Giles & Coupland 1991). In this respect, Kaur (2009) claims that when using these strategies ELF speakers engage in active negotiation. She adds that employing repetition and paraphrase after minimal sings of trouble – such as prolonged silence and minimal response on the part of the interlocutors – or overlapped talk signals speakers' perceptiveness to potential trouble and their ability to make successful use of interactional resources to avoid communication breakdowns. She finalises this paper by saying that mutual understanding in ELF is not given but jointly constructed and constantly monitored in each turn.

2.3.2.2 Repetition and rephrasing

Perhaps two of the pragmatic strategies that have received the most attention, at least in the light of accommodation theory, are repetition and rephrasing. As discussed in the previous section, for Kaur (2009), it is important to establish a distinction between repetition and paraphrase. The former refers to the practice of re-saying some or all the words from a preceding or ongoing turn with minimal changes of formal nature (modifications in morphology and prosody mainly). On the other hand, paraphrasing means expressing given information in a new way by either simplifying the message or using totally different words (110). Kaur explains that, outside ELF, CA has traditionally perceived **repetition** and **paraphrase** as **repair** strategies when these are employed to tackle real and potential problems in understanding. Conversely, she adds, it seems to be the case that in ELF interactions, speakers use these strategies for preventative purposes rather than remedial ones (pgs 108-109).

In her data taken from postgraduate students in a university in Malaysia, Kaur concluded that both self repetition and self rephrase are employed after (a) prolonged silences at transition-relevance places (i.e. where the turn at tall passes from one speaker to another one), (b) minimal response from an interlocutor and (c) overlapped talk when the message might have not been heard. In this regard, Kaur also concludes that her participants are not only perceptive to the slightest suggestions of communication breakdowns in interaction, but also capable of applying interactional resources such as repetition and rephrase to avoid such breakdowns.

There are other two important points from her conclusion that are worth highlighting here. First, even though these repair moves make the talk less smooth, reaching common understanding seems to be more important for her participants, which explains the use of repetition and rephrase. In other words, clarity of meaning prevails over language precision in Kaur's data set. The second point refers to the speaker's understanding of the source of problem. In this respect, repetition is more likely to happen when the potential problem is deemed to have resulted from the recipient's difficulty in hearing, while rephrasing seems to be used when the speaker who performs this move believes that there is a problem with the understanding of the message.

Cogo & Dewey (2006) when discussing convergence and its two principal motives – communicative efficiency and maintaining distance and identity – explain that repetition is often used to achieve the first purpose, but they add that it also indicates agreement, listenership and engagement. Unlike Kaur (2009), Cogo & Dewey (2006) analyse the phenomenon of other repetition and state that it is a frequently used strategy in their data, as a way to signal alignment, support and approval with respect to what has been stated by other interlocutors. What is more, Cogo & Dewey argue that speakers also converge by repeating other people's non-standard forms of language, and to prove their point they provide an example from their data in which one Japanese participant makes use of zero definite article in the phrase 'because of

revolution'; later in the interaction her interlocutor (Chinese) repeats the same phrase with the zero article, thus accommodating from a grammatical perspective.

What makes this instance of convergence interesting is the fact that in the rest of the interaction and in other transcripts as well, there is no evidence to state that zero article is a recurrent characteristic of this Chinese participant; therefore, Cogo & Dewey (2006) claim that she is not simply omitting a grammatical point but converging and changing her style to resemble her Japanese interlocutor's. Had the Chinese ELF speaker introduced the definite article, Cogo and Dewey argue, she would have applied a repair strategy instead of repetition, not showing alignment. It could be inferred from this example that the speaker's assessment of the value attached to this variation in her own style and the risks involved in her not converging resulted in an accommodative move that prevented her from establishing undesired social distance with her interlocutor; thus, communicative efficiency is not the only motive at stake, but it could be argued that social attractiveness is a powerful driving force for this ELF speaker from China.

Later on, in an article published in 2009, Cogo resumes the analysis of other repetition in ELF contexts and emphasises the role of this pragmatic strategy as a tool to show alignment. Here, she expands on the nature of repetition in ELF contexts arguing that rather than acting as a compensatory or face-saving strategy when non-understanding occurs, other repetition is a cooperative strategy speakers adopt to show solidarity and alignment. With regard to its cooperative nature Cogo raises three relevant points; first, when speakers repeat their interlocutor's utterances totally or partially, they are acknowledging understanding of the original turn, second, and in connection to the first point repetition is used to ensure the interaction runs smoothly and in a synchronised fashion; in this sense repair, for example, would create the opposite effect on the conversation and slow down the interaction. Finally, and in connection to the concept of social distance mentioned above, ELF speakers make use of other repetition as a request for their interlocutors' approval and claim membership into a

community of multilingual speakers, a community that is common ground for ELF speakers involved in an interaction (Cogo 2009).

In chapter 7 of her book 'Exploring ELF', Mauranen (2012) explores repetition and rephrasing in academic ELF. In the first parts of the chapter, Mauranen states that 'repetition, repairs, and rephrasing are closely interrelated' (204) in that all these phenomena aim at saying what has already been said, whether using the same words or a modified wording. Unlike Kaur (2009), who analyses repetition and rephrasing as two different strategies within the category of repairs, Mauranen (2012) argues that one could observe rephrasing and repairs as a type of repetition.

According to Mauranen, in spoken production research, repetition has traditionally been observed as problematic (together with pauses and hesitations), and especially in language learning production, where it usually indicates dysfluency and lack of competence in the second or foreign language. From an ELF perspective, Mauranen explains that repetition is a common phenomenon and that its applications resemble those found in L1 use; namely, gaining processing time (usually signalled by the repetition of single words or 'repeats'), ascertaining comprehensibility, marking discourse boundaries, displaying alignment and affiliation, and structuring monologue (206).

Pietikäinen (2018) studied a rather underexplored setting in ELF communication; that of couples with multilingual backgrounds and who interact in English. Her main objective was to determine how these couples tackle misunderstanding and ensure common ground. Even though direct clarification requests were undoubtedly the most frequently found resource, followed by repetition of problematic items or echoing, paraphrasing and self repair strategies were also observed in her data. Pietikäinen explains that paraphrasing might be less frequent than direct clarification requests and echoing due to its potential to be face threatening as the 'utterer of the phrase seems takes a superior position' (p.202). Moreover, paraphrasing can also be risky for the partner who employs it, because in case the paraphrased utterance differs from the

initial intended message, this move can be interpreted as topic divergence. In Pietikäinen's data self repair (clarifying, repeating and paraphrasing) was more common than other repair, which goes in line with other research findings so far mentioned in that speakers seem to be working proactively to avoid misunderstanding and to enhance clarity.

By way of conclusion, in her review of previous research on pragmatic strategies in ELF settings, Kaur (2022) states that these research findings show that interlocutors in ELF communication are capable of making themselves understood with few instances of misunderstandings due, and that this is the result of the employment of these pragmatic strategies that allow language users to monitor understanding when they are uncertain that understanding has been achieved. In this respect, repetition is a fundamental strategy that serves the purpose of enhanced clarity.

Another insightful conclusion made by Kaur in the aforementioned review relates to the pedagogical implications of the findings resulting from these studies on pragmatic strategies. First of all, Kaur points out that these studies 'highlight the need to increase learners' awareness of the functions and use of these strategies in interaction' (p. 49). Moreover, Kaur refers to the speaker's ability to apply modifications to their language as a key aspect for successful enhancement of understanding. In this sense, Kaur explains, learners with low levels of English language proficiency might struggle to use the pragmatic strategies that are typically found in studies performed in business or academic settings, where interlocutors are already linguistically resourceful users of the language. From the studies analysed by Kaur in her 2022 review, it can be inferred that users with fewer English language resources frequently resort to extralinguistic resources such as showing or body language in order to negotiate meaning. Although this is not the case of the participants of this present study, whose level of English proficiency is high, it is important to bear in mind when it comes to observing other ELF settings where a higher degree of heterogeneity regarding communicative competencies is present.

2.3.2.3 Utterance completion

Instances of utterance completion (UC) – when an interlocutor finishes someone else's turn (Jenkins et al. 2011; Cogo & Dewey 2006) – or collaborative utterance building provide further evidence of the highly cooperative nature of ELF communication. In a 2011 publication, Kalocsai (2011) discusses her study of various pragmatic strategies from a slightly different point of view with respect to previous studies which mainly concentrate on the communicative aspects of ELF communication; Kalocsai pays closer attention to *interpersonal functions*. In fact, she begins this paper by criticising previous work on the area on the basis that it has regarded the interpersonal factor as a side-effect of the collaborative meaning-making process, rather than the primary goal of interaction. In order to study how the interpersonal function is performed, Kalocsai looks at linguistic and non-linguistic practices of a community of practice of Erasmus exchange students in a Hungarian university. For the members of this community, she argues, it became fundamental to establish networks such as friendships and build good rapport with other members.

Kalocsai (2011) explains that the perspective of interpersonal function or involvement she adopts for her analysis is closely linked to Spencer-Oatey (2004) pragmatic notion of rapport management, which deals with the way speakers build and manage social relations by means of language. *Interpersonal involvement*; i.e., the assessment speakers make based on their interpretation and reaction to other speakers, what they say under certain circumstances, is central to rapport management theory, as it is argued that social relations – either positive or negative – are built when speakers highlight their interpersonal involvement. Within this framework, establishing the desired social relations depends on having an appropriate degree of affective involvement, as well as the right amount of conversational interaction (Spencer-Oatey 2004). Additionally, Kalocsai discusses the functions of accommodation strategies in ELF: enhancing mutual intelligibility, projection of linguacultural identities, and contribution to the interpersonal level of talk; and with regard to this she presents persuasive evidence of pragmatic strategies addressing interpersonal involvement

through talk. In this respect, collaborative utterance building appears to be an effective strategy in the building of good rapport of these exchange students; more specifically, Kalocsai argues that collaborative utterance building generally follows word search, by stating that:

> following a direct request for, or an implicit signal of, the help needed, a co-participant either provided the missing utterance, or they made attempts at constructing a local meaning on the spot (p.124)

She adds that the speaker who initiates the trouble source usually accepts this help by incorporating the utterance the interlocutor has suggested (the strategy of repetition might be used). Kalocsai's findings with regard to collaborative utterance building go in line with what Cogo & Dewey (2006) had previously stated about utterance completion; that is, utterance completion shows listener's involvement in the conversation as it is not used to take over the turn. Also, they later discuss utterance completion in relation to word search, which is usually realised through repetition of a word or hesitation marker; this shows that speakers work in a concerted fashion (Cogo & Dewey 2012).

More recently, Cogo and House (2018) refer to this strategy as 'the joint construction of utterances' (p. 215) and explain that this a negotiation of meaning strategy used to show solidarity and to reach consensus, and that might improve participants' sense of community and group identity.

2.3.2.4 Simultaneous talk

Cogo and Dewey (2006)Cogo and Dewey (2006)Cogo & Dewey (2006) briefly discuss the phenomenon of overlapped speech from an interactional discourse perspective by stating that overlapping – which has high frequency in their data – indicate the cooperative and supportive nature of ELF communication. In addition, Cogo & Dewey (2012 Ch. 6) explain that according to the Conversation Analysis perspective, there has

been a tendency to regard overlapped talk as a violation of turn-taking rules; i.e., one speaker taking the floor at a time. They further refer to simultaneous talk as a twofold phenomenon. On the one hand, it can be *cooperative* if the speaker who produces the overlapped utterances is not attempting to obtain the floor; on the other hand, *competitive* overlaps often end up in interruptions that cause the first speaker to lose the turn before expected. It must be stated, however, that the drawing the line between these two types of simultaneous talk is not a simple task, because instances of competitive overlaps that end up in interruptions can be motivated by the desire to become engaged in the conversation and actively contribute to the interaction, i.e., cooperation could be the driving force for a competitive overlap.

In her 2011 publication on simultaneous speech in Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF), Wolfartsberger explains that the cooperative aspect of overlapping has been predominant in ELF research, because of ELF's consensus-oriented nature. Nevertheless, she aims at shedding light on the competitive aspects of overlaps by observing BELF interactions; more specifically, by analysing face-to-face business meetings with participants from European background, to demonstrate that ELF interactions are not always consensual and that it can sometimes be highly competitive. The data Wolfartsberger uses differs from other research in simultaneous talk in three ways. First, her data comprises multiparty conversations as opposed to dyadic ones; in a multiparty interaction turn-taking and floor-holding might be more unstable and flexible, and it involves certain dangers such as 'schisms' (parallel conversations). In short, regulation of the distribution of 'talking' opportunities is more challenging in multiparty interactions.

Second, there exists the issue of inequality amongst the participants in business meetings. Turn-taking in this context is usually influenced and constrained by factors such as the authority of the participant who chairs the meeting; that is, turn-taking is not completely managed by participants, and the chair person has the right and responsibility to control turns. In business meetings one can usually observe a balance between participants' negotiating the turns and the chairperson allocating these. In a

later section of this article (p.176), Wolfartsberger refers to another key issue that affects the nature of simultaneous talk: time constraints. Very frequently in business meetings, participants must attain several goals in a rather limited amount of time, and this factor – says Wolfartsberger – might impact the way interruptions occur in this context. It follows that the interaction from her data is definitely outcome-oriented, unlike the one analysed by Cogo and Dewey, who concentrated on casual talk mainly. Finally, Wolfartsberger explains that the third factor that makes her data different relates to the unique nature of ELF. Turn-taking has been defined mostly from data gathered in L1 settings, so there exists a need to redefine this concept in the light of intercultural communication research (Meierkord 2000).

Based on her data Wolfartsberger concludes, first of all, that simultaneous talk in BELF is cooperative, corroborating previous ELF studies. She specifies that simultaneous talk in her data is frequently not aimed at interrupting in a competitive way and that instead it signals listenership, the desire for the current speaker to continue talking, and agreement with what he or she is saying. In terms of forms, a collaborative overlap can take the shape of a (a) pre-emptive completion, when a speaker responds to the current speaker not waiting for their turn to be over, but not trying to obtain the floor either, and (b) assistance in word search, or the offer of lexis help that overlaps with the current speaker's turn. Conversely, her data also provides evidence of competitive simultaneous speech. Due to the outcome-oriented nature of BELF convergence through interpersonal alignment is not a priority compared to, for instance, the need to disambiguate and clarify key points, which leads us to believe that divergent behaviour is frequent in these settings too. Competitive overlaps from Wolfartsberger's data take the form of interruptions aimed at showing disagreement; in business contexts these interruptions must be performed immediately and not later when they are not pertinent anymore for the expected outcomes of the meeting (2011, p.173).

Finally, Wolfartsberger raises an interesting point with respect to the relevance of context in ELF studies when she states that determining whether overlapped speech is cooperative or competitive is a highly subjective task for any researcher, a task that must be approached by looking at the context. By context she is referring to the linguistic one, more specifically to the cues provided by the interlocutors in the surrounding sequence, such as backchannels (either merely supportive or indicative of speakers wanting to obtain the turn). However, context needs to be understood as external variables such as time restrictions, or speakers' cultural background and its potential impact on the use of turns.

Another perspective of simultaneous talk in ELF settings is provided by Konakahara (2015) in her study of casual conversations among international graduate students. In her study, she makes a distinction between two types of overlapping speech; on the one hand, we can find overlapping continuers or assessments such as yeah, which are used when there is no intention to take the floor; and on the other hand, overlapping questions and statements which frequently lead to floor-taking (p. 42). Konakahara focuses on the second type and uses Conversation Analysis to study the interactional environment in which these overlapping questions occur. She concludes that this kind of simultaneous speech happens when the overlapping speaker attempts to protect the upcoming transition relevant place, almost at the same time in which the current speaker continues to develop a turn-constructional unit, whereby they exemplify, repeat or rephrase the content of the previous turn.

The overlapped speaker often surrenders their turn to the overlapping interlocutor, so as to resolve the overlap. It is significant to highlight that neither the overlapping speaker nor the overlapped one seem to consider this as an attempt to interrupt and show no signs of conflicts with respect to turn distribution. Konakahara concludes that this type of overlapping speech responds to a desire to show interest in what is being said, to clarify ambiguous aspects of the previous turn, and to contribute to the development of the conversation. The author remarks that by means of overlapping questions, speakers 'are successful in achieving mutual understanding and developing

interpersonal relationships despite the fact that they are not communicating in their first languages' (p. 50); thus, in line with Cogo and Dewey (2006 & 2012), and Wolfartsberger (2011), Konakahara's study amounts to the understanding of the cooperative nature of simultaneous speech in ELF communication.

2.3.2.5 Code-switching and Translanguaging

Code-switching is another pragmatic strategy that has received considerable attention in ELF research. First, Cogo (2009) sees repetition and code-switching as having similar characteristics: (1) they are not compensatory strategies used to solve problems that arise from speakers' 'deficient' language practices, (2) they have multiple functions, and (3) they can signal affiliation and membership in a multilingual community. Consequently, in ELF, code-switching is a convergent accommodation strategy that shows alignment and (tolerance of) diversity. Cogo argues that from a sociolinguistic perspective code-switching is used to express participants' multilingual competence and it also carries symbolic meaning, values and identities (p.264). She adds that code-switching can be a difficult business given the participants' varied linguistic repertoire, in this respect code-switches can be done in their L1s, but also other languages (Ln), and this makes the symbolic connection between the language (or variety used in this move) with social values more complicated.

Another relevant point about code-switching refers to the way it is usually performed in ELF contexts; Cogo (2009) states that this pragmatic move is realised without flagging, that is, speakers regard code-switching as something normal that does not need to be signalled with surprise, meaning negotiation or uneasiness; code-switching is then an unmarked choice. In a nutshell, code-switching serves the following functions: (1) extra resource for communication that enhances possibilities of expression, (2) a tool to ensure understanding regardless of cultural differences, and (3) a token of membership in a multilingual community where participants' associations, values and identities are found in more than one language or code within their repertoire Cogo 2009). It follows that, code-switching clearly acts as a concrete

realization of accommodative behaviour main motives (as stated by Coupland 2007): seeking social attractiveness (identification in a multilingual community) and seeking communication efficiency (a tool that enriches communication). Actually, Kalocsai (2011), in her study of interpersonal relations in a Erasmus exchange students community, provides further proof to support the occurrence of the third function Cogo referred to. Kalocsai considers code-switching as a marker of in-group status. In her data, it became evident that participants used code-switching to highlight their plurilingual resources. In this setting, one code-switch triggered chain of code-switches to other languages which indicates that resourcefulness and language play are positively evaluated by this group.

In her study of code-switching, like Cogo, Klimpfinger (2009) also shifts away from a deficiency perspective and observes this phenomenon as a creative resource. Her data comprises spoken conversations recorded during a conference in a European university; the interactions were goal-oriented and the transaction of information was pivotal for the success of the meetings. Klimpfinger (2009) concludes that code-switching can fulfil four different functions which are not mutually exclusive. These functions are: (1) specifying addressee: when speakers wish to address their speech to a particular interlocutor in another language to separate him or her from the rest of the group. Code-switches of this type relate to convergent strategies as they might be applied to obtain social approval and decrease distance from those addressed interlocutors; (2) signalling culture: ELF speakers can signal their culture by switching to a language they identify with (L1 or Ln), and by doing this they are expressing their bi/multicultural identity; (3) appealing for assistance: speakers switch to another language in search for support from interlocutors who share that language; a switch for appeal – she states – is a strategy used to enhance faster understanding, but it can be a risky move as interlocutors might not share the linguistic resources required by the main speaker; (4) introducing another idea: when speakers deem a language other than English to be more appropriate to convey a particular message they switch to that language (referred to as topic language). In this last case, speakers might be highlighting another aspect of their identity – a professional one – as they can code-

switch to the language that they often use at their work place. In other words, they might be converging to another community of practice; not the one related to their linguacultural background.

Klimpfinger (2009) adds that in terms of form code-switches ranges from single words to longer chunks of language, and that the first type is more common in her data, probably as a result of speakers' intention to avoid misunderstanding. In this regard, she claims that when a speaker perceives his or her code-switching to be rather opaque in meaning to the interlocutors, that speaker offers assistance to facilitate interlocutors' understanding, by providing a translation or paraphrasing the code-switched chunk. This speakers' collaborative attitude directly links to the significance of context: participants in this data set engage in a cooperative construction of meaning, in which they make use of their multilingual resources and at the same time carefully monitor their languages practices so as to avoid communication breakdowns that might jeopardise attainment of goals, converging because of communication efficiency purpose mainly.

The perspective of translanguaging is a more recent one in ELF studies, and rather than contradicting the more traditional concept of code-switching, it complements it. Cogo (2018) presents translanguaging as a more flexible and dynamic use of multilingual resources and code-switching as a more marked change to another language. She goes one to explain that the focus of this new perspective does not fall on geographical aspects or the first language of the speakers and that the concept of repertoire is more suitable for translanguaging, as repertoire encompasses more that the speaker's L1. Cogo states that:

> '[t]his notion is important for ELF research as it moves away from an emphasis on the L1 of speakers to the whole repertoire of sociolinguistic and cultural resources participants may bring into the exchange, which may include languages that participants may have learned or encountered in their lives, which they may know or use at different proficiency levels' (p.363)

This implies, as Jenkins (2015) states, that ELF research should not consider English as the superordinate element and other languages as subordinates. In other words, ELF is not about English only but a multilingual practice (Cogo 2018).

2.3.3 Other perspectives of ELF communication

Despite the considerably extensive evidence that supports the consensus-oriented nature of ELF, there are voices who question the generalizability of this statement. Jenks (2012), for instance, argues for a re-examination of this perception on the grounds that there are still many other communicative settings (places/spaces) and contexts (particular interactions influenced by particular spaces/places) that must be explored. More specifically, he criticises the fact that letting-it-pass strategy has been highlighted as a key characteristic of ELF communication, although he has disregarded Cogo and Dewey's claim regarding the abundance on meaning negotiation strategies – whereby speakers tackle the potential threats to communication by means of a proactive attitude – which counters the predominance of letting-it-pass behaviour. About the settings and contexts of the studies he criticises, Jenks states the following:

> The fundamental problem is that there is a potential danger in creating an image of ELF interactants as one-dimensional social beings who largely go about their communicative lives in a cooperative manner. Indeed, given the academic and business contexts investigated in many ELF studies, where institutional goals often compel interactants to build consensus, it is easy to understand why the literature has characterized ELF interactants as being largely cooperative. (p.389) (2012: 389)(2012: 389)

It needs to be reminded, however, that there have been attempts to re-examine ELF's cooperative nature. As stated in earlier sections Wolfartsberger (2011), for instance, also considered discourse management aspects that point to the direction of an ELF competitive – and divergent – behaviour, in her study of simultaneous speech. Nonetheless, Jenks emphasises the more dysfunctional aspects of ELF interactions, by examining a unique community of practice: online voice-based chat rooms. He claims

that in this setting – where there exists a high degree of anonymity – participants mock one another's 'deviant' linguistic and cultural usage and engage in reprehensive talk, by drawing attention to speech disfluencies, ungrammaticalities and unidiomatic expressions. He concludes that participants in the chat room use interactional resources to highlight communication problems without much delay (at the earliest transition relevant place) and that being supportive is not a priority for them. However, rather than questioning the cooperative nature of ELF, Jenks is trying to prove that considerations of communicative context are of the essence in ELF research, as being (un)supportive depends on 'the norms, expectations, and interactional and institutional goals' particular to the each setting and context; in this regard, Jenks poses an relevant question: is being reprehensive a characteristic typical of computer-mediated communication?

Although his findings cannot be generalised to other settings and contexts, what Jenks's study teaches us is that other considerations of context are fundamental when studying ELF communication. By way of example, Guido (2012) considers the role of the participants, and asymmetries in power as a highly relevant factors; she observes the interaction between Italian immigration officers and African asylum seekers, so as to determine the extent to which these groups adopt accommodative strategies. Additionally, she takes into consideration the way different ELF variants can create problems in communication, to conclude that the transfer of pragmalinguistic and sociocultural behaviour creates a sensation of 'deviance' in the interlocutor, which results from the lack of awareness of each other's ELF variants, and that the lack of symmetry between these two groups of participants contributes makes the Italian officials' unsuccessful accommodative moves prevail over the immigrants' attempts to accommodate.

A more recent perspective of communication accommodation in ELF contexts has been offered by Jenkins (2022), who explains that accommodation had been first studied approximately 20 years prior to the publication of her seminal work *The Phonology of*

English as an International Language (Jenkins, 2000), which was briefly discussed in section 2.3.1. In her 2022 publication, the author argues that in its earlier stages, accommodation theory (then called Speech Accommodation Theory) relied on four socio-psychological theories. The first one was similarity attraction which stated that people tend to be more attracted by those who are similar to them. The second was social exchange theory that studied the costs and rewards of accommodation behaviours as calculated by speakers. The third theory was causal attribution that observed how addressees assess other's behaviours and their motives. Finally, the fourth theory was intergroup distinctiveness which proposes that people are likely to maintain their own group identity by highlighting their distinctiveness (2022:19). Jenkins also explains that the observation of accommodation in ELF settings has 'added a new strand' (p. 20) to CAT by providing knowledge and insights into how linguistic adjustments are performed in intercultural communication where most of the interlocutors are NNSEs. In particular, according to Jenkins, ELF users modify their linguistic behaviour not to produce native standard English, but to make their production more suitable for their interlocutors.

What is more important and innovative in Jenkins's new approach to accommodation is the addition of five levels of accommodation: pre-emptive, spontaneous, responsive, oblivious and non-accommodating. The first one, pre-emptive, is seen when a speaker avoids a potentially risky item for the interlocutor(s) and uses an alternative version that she or he deems unproblematic; Jenkins adds that skilful accommodators seem to have the capacity to identify these risky items and replace them, especially when it comes to idiomatic expressions. The second level of accommodation is the spontaneous one and it happens when a speaker has used a potentially problematic item for the interlocutor(s) and immediately replaces that item by another that is considered more suitable for understanding; spontaneous accommodations, Jenkins states, can be observed in ELF-aware NESs to NNESs communication and, like the pre-emptive type, the risky item can correspond to idiomaticity. Responsive accommodation is the third type and it occurs when the speaker holding the turn rephrases their words after an interlocutor has indicated there is a problem with

understanding. Unlike the previous two levels, pre-emptive and spontaneous where there is no indication of non or misunderstanding, responsive accommodation is reparative in nature inasmuch as it evidences a speaker or writer's attempt to correct a part of the message that has already caused an issue in the ongoing interaction.

The following type of accommodation is the oblivious one and it resembles maintenance (as seen is section 1.2), that is, when a speaker decides to maintain their style and make no modifications to their behaviours disregarding their interlocutors' accommodative needs. Jenkins describes oblivious accommodation as a result of the speaker's unawareness of the problem, which remains unaddressed. Thus, the difference between oblivious accommodation and maintenance seems to reside in the speaker's state of knowledge of the source of the problem and their interlocutors' communicative needs, as the former kind is used to describe a conscious decision of not accommodating, i.e., keeping a style regardless of interlocutors' non or misunderstanding, while the latter, oblivious accommodation, applies to situations where repair work does not happen because the speaker is unaware of the problem causing non or misunderstanding. Finally, the last level of accommodation presented by Jenkins (2021) is that of deliberately non-accommodating in which a speaker purposely diverges so as to create intelligibility problems or to refer to an intergroup to which the interlocutor does not belong.

In conclusion, CAT has been at the core of ELF research for a long time and has helped us understand that speakers interacting in ELF have a plethora of communicative resources to face communication when this presents challenges to them. The reasons why speakers in ELF communication converge are twofold, and these overlap with each other. First, they need to achieve communicative efficiency, especially when understanding and getting the message across is of the essence for their professional and personal motivations. Second, as in other types of communication, speakers in ELF interactions wish to establish positive interpersonal relationships, and for this end, being understood is pivotal. While it is true that certain communicative contexts such

as online chat rooms can lead to competitiveness and divergent behaviour, there are other contexts in which cooperation and convergence is the rule, as it were. As it has been stated in this chapter, academic and professional settings lead to this type of behaviour. The present research focuses on a group of postgraduate students in an academic context, and in this respect chapter three will outline the main theoretical and practical implications on the project.

Chapter 3 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The methodological design of this research project is based on an ethnographic approach, including different types of interviews and recorded observation of naturally occurring interaction as the main instruments for data collection. Full immersion in the participants' context is considered a key tool to appreciate the complexity of their sociolinguistic behaviour. In the remaining sections of this chapter there will be a presentation on the two main aspects of the methodology of this project; that is, qualitative research, and ethnography with emphasis on observation. The following section will deal with the study itself: its context and description of the observed community, a portrayal of the participants, key points about the fieldwork conducted, and the research instruments. Finally, important issues about the ethics of the study will be presented in the last sections of the chapter.

3.2 Researching accommodation strategies in a university setting

3.2.1 Qualitative approach

The design of the study presented here is based on an ethnographic and naturalistic approach, which sits within qualitative inquiry. This choice was made considering that human behaviour of any type is socially situated, context-related, context-dependent, and context-rich; meaning-making is subject to interpretative processes and realities are multiple, constructed and holistic (Cohen et al. 2011). Thus, to understand a

situation, one needs to fully appreciate the context and the perspectives of the members of any particular group (Richards 2003).

Denzin & Lincoln (2011, p. 3 & 4) define qualitative research as a situated activity that places the researcher in the world and that consists of a series of interpretative and material practices that make the world observable. Researchers who engage in qualitative inquiry find themselves studying their objects in their natural settings through a variety of empirical materials that characterise routines, problems and meanings in people's lives. Another important aspect in qualitative studies is the researcher's commitment to employing more than one interpretative practice, with each practice depicting the observed world in a different fashion, in an effort to grasp a better and wider understanding of this world. These interpretative practices provide different appreciations for the observer that overlap and blend together resulting in a collection of representations around a central phenomenon in the world and a rich description of it.

The emphasis of qualitative research falls on the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is being studied, as well as the situational restraints that influence the researcher's inquiry which are embedded in a dynamic world (Denzin & Lincoln 2011). With regard to these points, it must be acknowledged that in qualitative research there exists an issue of evidence as objective representation of the observed reality is impossible; nonetheless, instead of thinking of this as a deficiency, Denzin and Lincoln suggest researchers embrace this difference and encourage them to look for multiple representations that can be placed alongside one another. They remark that 'we interpret, we perform, we interrupt, we challenge, and we believe nothing is ever certain' (p. 10), which points to the complex nature of relationship between the researcher ('we') and their evidence, which is not straightforward as it might be in studies of a quantitative type. In qualitative research there is 'no clear window into the life of an individual (p. 12) and the representations one can create are influenced by language and other aspects such as social class, gender and ethnicity. There is also a by-product of the engagement or relationship

between the researcher and the studied world which has to do with the transformative potential for the researcher (Richards 2003). One cannot disengage as easily from the findings and evidence in qualitative inquiry as you do in quantitative studies, and both the role of the researcher and the impact of the research on the researcher must be acknowledged and addressed.

Qualitative research looks for answers to how social experiences take place, i.e. processes, as opposed to quantitative research whose focus is on causal relationships between variables (Denzin & Lincoln 2011). Another strength in favour of the choice of qualitative research for this project has to do with capturing the individual's perspective. It is claimed that a researcher can approach the actor's point of view better from a qualitative standpoint through detailed observation and interviewing (Denzin & Lincoln 2011). Additionally, Richards (2003) states that a qualitative approach to research is a 'person-centred enterprise' (p. 9) and pivotal to understand human beings' patterns and purposes of our behaviour.

3.2.2 Ethnography and participant observation

Literature on ethnography usually presents the relevance of participant's perspective and thorough knowledge of the context as key aspects in its description. In this context, researchers working with an ethnographic approach focus on social phenomena from the participants' perspective, thus obtaining an emic 'insider's view of the social phenomenon; behaviour (and data) is socially situated, context related and context rich, and in order to understand the observed phenomena one has to understand the context, as built by the participants, as well (LeCompte et al. 1993; Lüders 2004).

Other aspects or characteristics to consider when designing a study with an ethnographic approach are those discussed by Gillham (2008): lack of prior theoretical

commitment and thick description. As for lack of theoretical commitment, what is at stake here is the open mindedness a researcher in this field should have in order to observe phenomena in a context where things do not happen without a reason and actions and intertwined. Not having a prior commitment to any particular theory does not mean that there should be no interpretation of social behaviour in context, as understanding this behaviour is crucial in ethnography and for social sciences. Gillham argues that for this interpretation to happen there needs to be thick description, a description that involves not only observational data but also participants' interpretation of situations and unobserved factors, or as Gillham himself explains 'a description that takes the reader there' (p. 45). It is important to include in this thick description the voices of the participants, through interviews and recorded observation, to avoid the researcher's bias towards one particular interpretation and construction of reality.

Observation is pivotal in ethnographic studies, as its purpose is to obtain a detailed description of events so as to situate people's behaviour in their own socio-cultural context (Hennink et al. 2011). In terms of validity it has one advantage in that it deals with what people actually do and not what they say they do (Gillham 2008). In this respect, and as Gillham (2008) states, observation is necessary because the group members might not be willing to answer questions about themselves or their self-knowledge might not be sufficiently organised that they can easily answer questions about what they do.

Observation can be challenging since it involves a number of tasks, which need to be performed sometimes simultaneously. Hennink et al (2011) state that:

> During an observation you're systematically watching, listening, questioning and recording people's behaviours, expressions and interactions as well as noting the social setting, location or context in which the people are situated (2011, p.170)

Thus, it is convenient to plan and determine what, when and whom to observe, as well as how to record these observations. Observation can be useful to find silent social norms and values and this knowledge can help a researcher follow the communities' norms and avoid inappropriate behaviours working with the observed people. Observation is systematic and is often used to provide supplementary data (Hennink et al. 2011).

As for the type of observation and whether this is participant or non participant, it must be stated at this point, that these terms are somehow unsatisfactory, as explained by Gillham (2008), in that they only refer to a generalised perspective of the researcher's role in the field. The researcher cannot be absolutely non-participant since they are not invisible and their presence can be noticed by the members of the observed community. Conversely, when acting as a participant in that community, a researcher's objective is not only to take and be part of the groups' activities and relationships, but also and perhaps more important their aim is to observe those dynamics to be able to make sense of social behaviour as this materialises in context. This perspective of the concept of participant observer was helpful for the (re)definition of my role as a researcher in charge of this project, as I is a member of the community, albeit in a different position from that of her participants. However, the challenge was to determine in which situations it was convenient and appropriate to be a participant in the group and when to step back a observe.

Although the type of observation can be divided into these two main categories, i.e., complete participant observation and non-participant observation, Hennink et al., (2011) suggest we think of this as a continuum in which the degree of participation moves from one of these extremes to the other. In participant observation the researcher takes part in the life of the community he or she is studying, adopts a certain role and follows the members' norms and values, and the level of participation will depend on the context and nature of the observation and, as it was the case of the researcher's participation, the particular needs of the group in certain situations.

According to Hennink et al. (2011, p.184) participant observation can be a really demanding task and it requires the researcher to: spend a great deal of time in the study context and with the participants, establish close relationships with the participants especially when the researchers is completely new to the group, and during observation take a great deal of notes. This has to be systematic: note taking and archiving of class documents requires a good sense of organisation, which needs to be maintained throughout). The key, according to them, is to keep an open mind, establish good rapport and empathy, and learn to distinguish between interpretation and observation. They also add that a key decision when doing participant observation is in which type of activities to take part and how much involved the researcher will be, and that these decisions need to be guided primarily by the research objective and the research questions, as well as by the type of activities which are typically carried out in the given community.

Hennink et al. (2011) suggest that while participant observation is suitable for getting involved in specific activities and the lives of the participants, non-participant observation can help the researcher become familiar with the study setting and also determine the different types of activities that are conducted in the community; in other words, it provides good contextual data. With this in mind, the researcher in charge of this project attempted both types of participation so as to have a broad picture of the phenomenon and its context.

3.3 The study

3.3.1 Research questions

The overall objective of the present study is to obtain more insights of how ELF speakers of diverse linguacultural backgrounds apply accommodation strategies in the context of an international university in the UK, as well as of their own perceptions about communication accommodation as it is put into practice in this setting. In order

to undertake this enterprise two main research questions have been devised, each one having specific areas for investigation. These are listed below:

1. In the context of communication accommodation theory, how are accommodation strategies applied in ELF interactions in a UK international university setting?
    1.1. What do speakers actually do when accommodating to their interlocutors from the same university group?
    1.2. To what extent do participants employ communication accommodation strategies in different ways?
2. To what extent are the participants in the study aware of their accommodative behaviour and that of their interlocutors?
    2.1. Which areas of accommodation do participants perceive as more salient and relevant in their interaction?
    2.2. What are the appropriate levels of accommodation as perceived by listeners according to the communicative needs within this academic context?
    2.3. How do participants seek social attractiveness through accommodation?

By investigating these questions, it is expected this research will shed light on the different approaches to communication accommodation international postgraduate students develop and/or adopt in their interaction with other group members of an academic community to ultimately understand what is important and what is relevant for them when pursuing their professional goals in the short and long term and how they use English to do so. The first question aims at unveiling what actually happens in terms of communication accommodation in ELF from the linguistic point of view in conjunction with social factors present in the studied community. With the objective of complementing this area of the research project, the second research question addresses the participants' perceptions of communication accommodation in terms of self and other in a professional/academic context.

3.3.2 Research Context

The selected context for undertaking the fieldwork was the UK, more specifically a university in South East England. According to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA 2014), in the academic year 2012-2013, nearly sixty per cent of full time postgraduate students came from outside the UK mainly from Asia (28.4%), the EU (11.6%), Africa (5.5%) and the Middle East (4%). Thus, most UK universities are highly multicultural places, and although situated in a native English speaking country, the dominant language – English – coexists and is influenced by a diverse range of communicative styles produced by international students; therefore the linguistic environment found in many postgraduate courses in UK universities is that of ELF rather than a purely native English speaking one, which makes a university setting a most appropriate environment to study communication accommodation strategies of ELF speakers in academic contexts.

The observed community is a group of 57 postgraduate students, from the 2014-2015 cohort, enrolled in four different postgraduate courses in Applied Linguistics programmes in the Faculty of Humanities of a university in South East England. Nearly ninety per cent are international students who transferred to the UK from their home countries during the length of their programme (1 to 4 years). The students in this group come from North and South America, the Middle East, North Africa, South East Asia, and Eastern and Western Europe, including Great Britain. From the 57 students, eight are NESs natural from those countries that have been traditionally labelled as native English speaking, i.e., inner circle countries (Kachru, 1985). Not only are these students international, but also their university tutors come from different parts of the world as well: continental Europe (western, central and eastern), South East Asia, South America, the UK and Ireland. It is safe to say, then, that this is a highly multicultural academic community.

With the exception of one course, these were taught postgraduate degrees and their length was one year, in which students had two semesters to complete an average of eight modules. Once the taught phase was over, students were required to write a 15.000 word dissertation on any topic of their choice within the area of applied linguistics and language teaching for which they had approximately three months. 53 out of 57 students were in full time modality and followed this regime of study, while only four of them were enrolled in part time courses and had to combine their studies with work commitments at the same time.

This distribution of full and part time students meant that most of the group members devoted a great deal of time to their studies during that year and spent considerable time at university working as well as socialising with one another. Most classes and other relevant events such as seminars, group and one to one tutorials, group work meetings and causal lunchtime gatherings took place in the Faculty's campus, which is an old and rather cramped building and one of the smallest university campuses in the city. Thus, the special and physical environment led students to be immersed in the group and interact frequently with other crucial actors in the community (other students, tutors and administrative staff) throughout their stay in the UK.

Even though each programme has its own set of compulsory and optional modules, many of these were delivered for many, if not all, students enrolled in these degrees. Therefore, students mingled and socialised with one another regardless of their course. During the taught phase (i.e., two semesters) the variety of choices offered to students included modules on sociolinguistics, research methods in applied linguistics, English phonology and grammar, pragmatics, discourse analysis, second language acquisition, and language teaching and assessment. In the second semester, students were able to do a module on sociolinguistics dealing with different aspects of English as a lingua franca. In terms of assessment, students were required to do extended essays as well as module portfolios that included a variety of genre of academic texts such as shorter essays, annotated bibliography, research reviews, workshop tasks, oral

presentations, and data analysis tasks. Those students enrolled in the one year full time degrees were also asked to do a dissertation, as stated above, while those students in the four year course were required to write an extended research proposal.

3.3.3 Selection of Participants

After four months of immersion and negotiation of entrance to the community (see fieldwork section for more details) and through purposive sampling, i.e., bearing in mind that the objective was to achieve representativeness, catch the breadth and heterogeneity of the group and identify reasons for similarities and differences among the individuals (Maxwell 2005), five key participants from the above described postgraduate student group were asked to participate in the study: three females and two males and whose ages range from 23 to 50 years old. As for the particular characteristics sought after for this research project, a variety of linguacultural backgrounds was favoured, so three participants come from South-eastern Asia, one from Latin America and one from Western Europe, thus achieving representativeness in terms of geographical origin and languages.

With regard to their career background, which was another factor to be considered while purposively identifying key participants, there is both similarity and diversity. On the one hand, the common ground is given by the fact that these five participants hold an undergraduate degree related to English language, either with an emphasis on translation and/or language teaching or general English without any professional inclination. On the other hand, variation is seen in the amount of work experience the five participants have. Three of them have professional experience relevant to their careers in English language working as translators and interpreters and/or English language teachers at different level of the education systems in their home countries. The two youngest participants in the study had no professional experience before taking part in this study. These similarities and differences in terms of professional profiles can be relevant to this project as participants are interacting in an academic

group and their goal is to complete a degree that will allow them to further their career, so the projection of their professional identity could be an influential factor when seeking social attractiveness in the community. The following table summarises their linguistic and professional/academic background, as well as their age group (F stands for 'female' and M for 'male).

Table 3.1: Summary of key participants' details

ID	Age group	Country of origin	Speaker of	Career background
F1	25-29 +	Spain	Spanish	Language teacher
F2	30-34	Japan	Japanese	High school EL teacher
F3	20-24	China	Chinese	Student
M1	40+	Chile	Spanish	Teacher and translator
M2	25-29	China	Chinese and Spanish	Student

Regarding their experiences as students in their respective educational systems, the five participants' primary and secondary education was delivered in the national/official language of their country, and English was not integrated with content but a separate subject in the school curriculum. However, the panorama changes when it comes to tertiary education as four participants did their university degrees completely in English, while only one of them did her course partially in this language. As for their experiences in other English speaking contexts prior to commencing their studies in the above mentioned postgraduate courses, these range from one month to two years and the reasons for travelling were education, holidays and other personal motivations. Participants had previously travelled to Australia, the UK and Ireland where they interacted in ELF with both native and non-native speakers.

As it was explained at the start of this section, the participants were selected through purposive sampling to aim at representativeness and at the same time acknowledging similarities and differences within the selected group, following Maxwell's idea (2005). It must also be stated at this point that as Hennink et al. (2011) point out qualitative research does not aim at generalisations and instead concentrates on detailed understanding of any issue under investigation with the goal of identifying 'socially constructed meanings of the phenomenon and the context in which a phenomenon occurs' (p. 84). They add to this argument that given this ultimate objective, qualitative research requires a special type of participant recruitment: one that results in a small number of participants so that issues can be studied more in depth, and leads to the recruitment of participants with a certain profile, i.e., people who can provide rich information on the research topic.

Therefore, participant recruitment is a non-random activity since it involves a certain degree of planning and critical consideration. In regard to the present research, it was necessary to apply non-random purposive sample to achieve more breath of language backgrounds and professional experiences within the field of applied linguistics and language teaching, as well as experiences as English language users in different contexts. However, this project's key participant recruitment was not only deliberate – as just described – but also flexible, which are the two characteristics suggested by Hennink et al. (2011) for adequate purposive recruitment in studies of the qualitative type. It was flexible in that instead of following a rigid recruitment procedure outlined from the planning phase of the project, selection criteria were redefined since the piloting stage to the first phase of data collection in terms of accessibility to participants and their frequency and richness of spoken interaction with other actors in the observed community, which was a crucial factor to the topic of accommodation strategies and this whole study.

3.3.4 Fieldwork

Fieldwork began in October 2013 with a pilot stage. Although the researcher had been immersed in the same environment as her future participants for a period of two years and already enjoyed a degree of familiarity with key actors and gatekeepers of the said community, the information about the particular group of students of that cohort was insufficient as they had just started their postgraduate studies at the university and were completely new to the community. Therefore, it was decided that instead of starting data collection at the very beginning of the academic year a one semester pilot study was necessary to begin the project, as doing otherwise could have been too intrusive and uncomfortable for the group and, thus, detrimental to the study.

The idea of spending time in the field before the start of data collection comes from the need for delimitation. In this sense it is useful to employ different methods to narrow down the focus of the observation, and one of these methods is a pilot immersion in the field (Stark, 2004). In addition to doing this, the pilot study deemed crucial for the researcher to locate the key participants, gain trust and establish rapport with the community members. A further reason why the pilot study was useful to the research design is the fact that interview questions were informally piloted with a couple of participants from the community, who were not part of the group of five key participants. The pilot study also an excellent opportunity to attempt to minimise any impact my presence in the field could have had upon they participants performance and natural interactional practices. In other words, having me as a frequent actor, as it were, since the start of their graduate studies abroad could have contributed to the reduction of said impact upon their behaviour, as these students were already used to my presence in the field when I started collecting data. Although it is hard to say whether (and to what extent) my presence affected their performance, having being part of their regular routines since the beginning might have led to a more natural unfolding of their group dynamics.

A pilot study helps to test if the researcher is able to observe and document the situation, to see how much time is needed to observe the context versus the time to observe particular activities, and to determine the amount of time you can pay attention to observing a situation (Hennink et al. 2011). When you enter a place/group a researcher might be concentrated on how things work socially and this exploratory phase is adaptive, i.e., one can act upon this observation and evaluation (Gillham 2008).

After obtaining the approval of the university's research ethics committee and participants' consent, data collection began in February 2013 and lasted for six months, finishing with stimulated recall interviews when classes were over. During the second semester of that academic year, there were eleven modules offered to students as core and optional classes. Because of practical considerations, the researcher had to choose only a few modules to do recorded observation, as attending every class as a participant-observer could have been extremely demanding and time-consuming. Therefore, only four out of those eleven modules were observed, and the selection was made based upon the presence of the participants in those lessons. In other words, the observed modules were those with more key participants in it.

Another important criterion for selecting the module was the type of class interaction, so modules with high frequency of peer and group work were preferred. Once the crucial classes were identified, permission to attend as participant observer was requested from all the tutors involved in them, via email. It is crucial to mention at this stage that one of the modules observed and to which two key participants attended, dealt with sociolinguistic issues of ELF. This is part of the narrative environment of these participants and might shape their narrative reality (see section 3.3.5.2 for more explanation about narrative environments), thus it needs to be kept in mind during the analysis stage. Observation and researcher's participation in both the pilot study and data collection was overt in order to ensure trustworthiness and maintain good rapport, not only with the five key participants but with the whole community as well.

3.3.5 Research instruments

After the immersion phase, and right at the beginning of the data collection process, participants were asked to complete a brief questionnaire to start data collection. However, the main components of the data set are, on the one hand, field notes and recorded participant observation of spoken interaction inside the classroom to determine what they actually do with respect to accommodation and, on the other hand, three sets of interviews conducted at different stages of data collection which aim at providing insights into their perception of different aspects of accommodation. Although initially the recording of spoken interaction considered social events such as conversation during lunchtime or meetings in a pub, this data had to be discarded due to its poor sound quality, that is, the background noise made the transcription and consequent analysis of the recorded interaction extremely hard, and even deciphering what was being said was simply a matter of guessing. Any analysis and conclusion drawn from data collected outside classroom would have been unreliable.

3.3.5.1 Questionnaire

The sole purpose of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) was to gather information about their linguistic background, previous experiences in multicultural and Anglophone settings and perceptions of their own linguistic skills. Since the objective was to obtain more in-depth information about each participant, no statistical analysis was conducted with the data provided by this instrument.

In terms of its design, the questionnaire was completely original in that every question in each of the four parts were planned and composed by the researcher in light of the research questions. Part one of the questionnaire aimed at obtaining personal information such as age, country of origin, and profession or undergraduate university degree, and to do so part one included a variety of question types, namely

dichotomous, multiple choice and open-ended. Second, part two was designed to gather information about participants' language background (i.e., languages they speak, and different places or residence) through a combination of dichotomous, ranking scales and open-ended questions. Then, part three of the questionnaire was similar to the previous section in terms of question types, with ranking scales, dichotomous and open- ended questions, but its objective was to invite participants to express their perceptions of the desired level of their English level (including accent), and their perceived degree of passive accommodation in interaction with native and non-native speakers of English, in and outside the university campus. Finally, part four was an opportunity for the participants to give any comments, through an open-ended question, about any of the topics of the questionnaire or other issues they needed to highlight.

During the design phase of the questionnaire, proper consideration was given to achieving equilibrium between closed and open-ended question types. However, the high frequency of open-ended questions in this instrument is a reflection of the intended semi-structured nature of the questionnaire. According to Cohen et al. (2011, p. 382) a semi-structured questionnaire is appropriate for a case study since it betters captures the particularities of the situation being observed, and it 'sets the agenda but does not presuppose the nature of the response'. Therefore, this is what the researcher looked for in the design stage, since this type of questionnaire is more exploratory and suitable when rich and personal data is sought. Once the first draft was done, and to ensure the instrument's validity and reliability, the questionnaire was piloted with other six postgraduate students (the researcher's colleagues), whose professional and personal profiles were similar to those of the actual participants', i.e., people who hold undergraduate degrees in applied linguistics (especially English language) and from various linguacultural backgrounds. With their invaluable input it was possible to arrive at a final and appropriate version of the questionnaire, as they commented on aspects of language and clarity of the questions, which proved to be very suitable and useful in the application of the instrument.

3.3.5.2 Interviews

During the data collection phase each participant attended three different rounds of individual interviews at different stages, and each round of interviews had a different purpose. First of all, the interview held at the early stage of data collection, right after participants had completed the questionnaire, was of a narrative type and participants were asked to talk and reflect upon their previous experiences using English abroad (that is, outside their country of origin). The second type of interview, conducted right in the middle of the data collection process, was a conversation with the participants about their level of awareness towards their tutors' communication accommodation behaviour. Finally, the last round of interviews was conducted after the taught element of the programme was over and its aim was to collect impressions of their own communication accommodation behaviour as well as their interlocutors' from the observed and recorded interaction in a recall interview.

The general approach to the three types on interviews conducted for this project corresponds to the description offered by Fontana & Frey (2008) who view the interview not just as a data collection tool that researchers employ in a neutral fashion to report findings that seem disassociated from their social context, but as something that is 'unavoidably historically, politically, and contextually bound' (p. 115) and an active interaction between the researcher(s) and the interviewee(s) that results into a negotiated and co-constructed product. Fontana & Frey's perspective of interview is an empathetic one, as they perceive the process of interviewing as a joint enterprise and collaborative effort of all the people involved. Furthermore this empathetic nature implies a different role for the researcher/interviewer who might need to take an ethical stance in favour of the group being studied, leaving behind any neutrality.

In the present project, the researcher's role in this particular academic community is a reflection of the empathetic nature of not only the interview, but also the whole data

collection process and the involvement with the participants. The researcher's previous experience as a postgraduate student in the same institution and her present position as a colleague with more exposure to the environment might make the researcher's empathetic stance more patent and her position in the observed community more liminal. In this respect, it is crucial to bear in mind the concept of reflexivity as explained by Holstein & Gubrium (1995) and this means attending systematically to *what* the interview is meant to be (the substantive findings) and *how* one accomplishes the task of interviewing (considerations of context, situations, people involved, manners among other points) so as to avoid influencing responses with the researcher's personal opinion about the matters at stake, but at the same time reflecting on how some personal stories resonate with the data being gathered. It must be said that this reflexive approach needs to be maintained throughout the analysis process too in order not to interfere with the participants' voices in the interviews.

The three kinds of interviews in the project can be said to belong to the semi-structured type in that although the researcher had an agenda in mind for the interview, her intention is to not disturb the participants' voices during each conversation, as their ideas around relevant topics emerge, restructure and readdress the interview. Therefore, the concept of 'joint enterprise and collaborative effort' described above was ever present in the realisation on the three rounds of interviews. The semi-structured interview is highly appropriate for this research project as its approach to data collection is person-centred. Berg's (2007) idea regarding semi-structured interviews resonates with this approach as he suggests that by using this type of interview, researchers investigate the world from the point of view of the participants. In the following paragraphs, there will be more detailed explanations of the first and third type of interviews, i.e., narratives and stimulated recall interviews, which require more clarification given their distinctive nature within interviewing.

In terms of interviewing in narrative inquiry, it needs to be stated that as a distinct form of discourse, narratives are meaning making processes through which we shape

and order our experiences (Chase 2011) and represent ourselves, both to ourselves and to others (Lawler 2002), so the attention to narratives in qualitative research results from the interest in human experiences as perceived through the eyes of those who live them rather than the eyes of the researcher solely (Chase 2011). Narrative inquiry goes beyond stories as rhetorical structures 'to an analytic examination of the underlying insights and assumptions' (Bell 2002, p.208), so in this respect rather than attempting to discover whether these stories are accurate or not, the researcher should attempt to see what meaning the narrator attaches to their own stories, as we – humans – attempt to make sense of the world around us through narratives, i.e., by narrating our experiences or the things that happen to us and others we attach meaning to the world.

Narrative inquiry is an experience-centred approach, i.e., it focuses on narrators' representations of phenomena, thoughts and feelings (Andrews et al. 2008). Researchers working with narrative inquiry have been interested in the relationship between people's stories and identity development. According to McAdams, Josselson, & Lieblich (2006), who define narrative identity as an internalized and evolving life story, in narratives we can see whether identity construction discloses self's unity or multiplicity (or both) and how self and society contribute to the construction of a narrative identity.

With regard to the self and society in narrative inquiry, another key concept to bear in mind during data collection and analysis is that of narrative environment. In this respect, Gubrium & Holstein (2009) refer to the concept of reflexive interplay which means that narrative practices – that is to say those mechanisms whereby we activate stories and create meaning – are shaped and, in turn, shape the environments in which they take place. The environment, they define, involves relationships, local cultures, occupations and organizations. To understand a narrative reality (what is and is not said, about what, why, how and to whom) it is important to understand both narrative practices and realities, and the reflexive interplay between these two.

With this in mind, the objective of the first round of interviews was to observe, by means of the participant's own narratives and perspectives, how they manage their social relations through accommodation, namely how they perceive self and other accommodation and how they accommodate to an ideal self when they have to interact in English. In order to do this, participants were asked to narrate their previous experiences in English-speaking countries as well as the current one in the UK.

As stated at the beginning of the interview section of this chapter, in the third round of interviews participants were asked to do a stimulated recall task. In order to carry out this, the researcher previously selected extracts of recorded interaction. The excerpts were chosen on the basis of communication accommodation efficiency, that is to say, the selection included both samples of successful interaction, and also instances of communication breakdowns. In each individual interview, participants listened to an average of four extracts that were presented without interruptions. Each participant was prompted to stop the audio recording whenever they wanted to comment on any aspect of the interaction.

According to Dempsey (2010), the technique of stimulated recall interviews (SRI) can bring the participants in a study 'a step closer to the moments in which they actually produce action', giving them the opportunity to listen to themselves in action, activate their memory and say 'I did instead of I might have' (p. 349 & 350), prompting them – as it were – to comment of real actions as opposed to idealised versions of them. Therefore, SRIs fit well in this research as they potentially link the actual recorded interaction (and the researcher's interpretation of it) to the participants' narratives and their perception of self and other communication accommodation. Dempsey also suggests that SRI can help the researcher uncover different aspects that influence human behaviour that can in turn reveal what is salient and what is not for each individual.

There are, of course, limitations that need to be considered when using this interviewing technique. First of all, it can be very time consuming for the researcher

and the interviewee. Second it also relies too much on people's memory and their capacity to formulate answers that correspond accurately to unconscious patterns of action (Dempsey 2010).

3.3.5.3 Recorded observation and field notes:

When it comes to the data collection stage, an ethnographic approach entails overt or covert participation on the part of the researcher for an extended period of time, as Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) explain. The observer, they say, must watch and listen to what happens, ask questions informally or formally, and also collect documents and artefacts that can help them understand the situation in terms of the focus of research. In this respect, Hammersley & Atkinson state that ethnographic observation presents the following characteristics. First of all, participants' actions have to be studied in their context and data collection needs to happen in the field, instead of under experimental conditions. Second, data must come from different sources such as documents, although a relatively informal engagement with the participants is the main source. Third, data collection is somehow unstructured because it does not follow a rigid and structured plan and also because categories for interpretation are built in the observation process and any previous existing ideas can change accordingly. Finally, the focus of research is small and investigation centres in few cases (in the case of the present research project, there are 5 key participants only) (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007).

These authors add that in participant observation, the researcher must find a role in the context of investigation. In this particular case, I was already part of the bigger community where participants were observed; so finding a role was not a difficult task. More specifically, the role I took was that of a slightly more experienced peer, from a postgraduate student perspective. Hammersley & Atkinson continue by saying that this role needs to be negotiated with participants implicitly and probably explicitly too, as there are gatekeepers who need to be aware of the situation. Also, renegotiation of

the role has to be done with the people being studied. In this respect, shifting identities from researcher to mentor or critical friend was relatively easy as participants were flexible and willing to cooperate throughout the entirety of the study. The authors also offer a word of warning, as it were, with respect to the degree of familiarity of the researcher with the group, when they state researcher should treat the setting and the group as 'anthropologically strange' (2007, p.9). This means that the assumptions he or she has taken for granted about the group will become more apparent and thus can be dealt with.

Furthermore, the orientation of an ethnographic study is exploratory, and in this sense Hammersley & Atkinson explain that since the main task is to investigate how participants live some aspects of their lives, a researcher must pay attention to how participants react to the situation they encounter in the context of investigation, how they interact and regard one another, and also to how they perceive themselves. Therefore, they state, it is expected that previously existing research questions, ideas and orientations will be (re)defined and even modified during the different research stages.

Thus, in addition to the questionnaire, the three different types of interviews, and field notes, the data set of this study comprises recordings of spoken interaction involving at least one key participant in each one. These interactions were recorded in the different classes the key participants were taking and I, as a participant observer, was present in all instances of observation (for more details on fieldwork see 3.3.4 on page 59). My participation ranged from mere observation of the class activities in which key participants were engaged, to full involvement as a participant in such activities. In this participant role, I became one of the group members, providing my opinions and ideas on the topics under discussion.

The criteria to determine in which end of the participant observation continuum corresponded to external variables rather than to my very own judgement. That is, whether to be an active part of the group and contribute to the discussion around

class activities or whether to assume an observer's role was not a deliberate or pre-conceived decision. The degree of my involvement depended on each class dynamics instead. In this sense, factors such the layout of the room and space, types of activity, group member numbers, and if and how tutors themselves assigned students to groups defined my participation and role in each observation instance. For instance, on a few occasions due to the physical proximity with some key participants, I would receive an invitation to join them in whichever activity they had to complete, and I would accept, thus becoming a participant myself. As discussed in section 3.2.2, from an ethnographic perspective observation is a continuum rather than a polar or binary approach to research and data collection (Hennink et al., 2011). In this regard, I became part of the life of the community I was studying, and apart from assuming a participant-observer role; I followed the norms and values of the community members, without changing the practices they had already established.

During each observation instance in the second semester, I took notes about participants' behaviour and other aspects of the context, taking into consideration that it is necessary to do so regularly and promptly, writing down everything even if it seems unimportant at the moment, without being obtrusive and analysing these notes frequently (Fontana & Frey 2008). At the end of the observation period, there were 26 different field notes, each one corresponding to different observation instances throughout the term and some of them accompanied by class documents. The field notes were generally focused on the description of participants' interaction (through activities) with other actors of the community, i.e., tutors and other fellow students. The complementary class documents correspond to class hand-outs which the tutors were kind to share with me and which will complement the recorded observation with contextual data.

The different audio files amount to approximately three hours of recording time and the amount of transcribed observation corresponds to one hour, twenty-four minutes and fifty-eight seconds (1:24:58). The analysed interactions have been taken from nine

different instances of observation (out of 26) conducted at the beginning, middle and final stages of data collection. It is important to mention that not all observations could be considered for the analysis due to a number of reasons: there was no student-to-student interaction in class, the key participant(s) did not participate in the conversation although she or he was present, the excessive background noise impeded the transcription process, or the interaction amongst participants was scant. Additionally, there was one key participant – F3 – who on occasions chose to take part in group activities with classmates of her same nationality, and so their conversation was held in their native language. Consequently, and due to the naturalistic nature of my data collection approach and my lack of knowledge of F3's native language, those observed interactions could not be part of the final analysis.

The following table details essential information for the identification of the nine observation instances, the key and incidental participants involved in each conversation, and the length (in minutes and seconds) of the transcribed interaction. The name of the class from which the interaction was recorded will not be provided so as to keep the anonymity of the academic community.

Table 3.2: Observations information

Observation #	Key participants	Incidental participants	Length	File identification
3	M1	F6 and F7	12.02	0303M1
4	F1 and F3	F15	5.46	0503F1F3
4	M1 and M2	M4 F16 and F17	6.01	0503M1M2
7a	F2 and M2	F8	6.1	1003F2M2a
7b	F2 and M2	M6, F8, F13 and F14	9.54	1003F2M2b
10	F3	F14	11.51	1703F3
16	F2 and M1	none	16.14	2603F2M1

Observation #	Key participants	Incidental participants	Length	File identification
19	F1	F6, M7, M3	13.4	0205F1
21	F1 and M2	F9	4.36	0705F1M2

The following chapter will develop the analysis and discussion of the observed interaction and the transcription of some exchanges from these observations will be the basis for such discussion in light of accommodation phenomena. Before chapter 4 is presented, the following section will present the ethical considerations and risks associated with the present study.

3.4 Ethics and Risks

This research's risks were considered to be very low to both the participants and the researcher. All the activities related to the research and data collection took place as part of the participants' daily activities in the university and did not involve any of them transferring to any other site to complete the requested tasks. The research and the presence of the researcher on site were completely overt, not only for the five key participants, but also to all the actors involved in any activity observed for data collection. According to the university regulations, informed written consent was obtained from each participant and from those students whose oral interaction also appears in the recordings.

Even though the detailed objectives of the research were not explained to the participants so as to avoid the risk of influencing their behaviour, the general aim of the project as well as the general requirements regarding their participations were made explicit to them in a written document, which also stated that they had the right to withdraw from the research at any time (see appendices B and). Confidentiality, anonymity, and non-traceability were ensured throughout the study. The data that

they provided was securely kept in a password protected computer and their names and other personal data was made non-traceable by means of coding.

3.5 Validity and Trustworthiness

Lew et al. (2018) explain that '[u]nlike objectivist-oriented research in which validity lies in eliminating or controlling personal biases', qualitative research will inevitably present some degree of subjectivity 'when researchers interact with social worlds with a host of assumptions about human knowledge and realities' (Ch.4). The authors go on to argue that validity within qualitative inquiry is the result of the way in which the researcher deals with that subjectivity, and of how well the appropriateness of the research design (with respect to the social setting and the researcher-subject relation) has been justified. In this respect in the research design of the present study, each step and data collection tool has been carefully designed so as to ensure that the phenomenon of accommodation has been observed and analysed from different angles that would help me, as a researcher, to obtain sufficient information to avoid a potential bias in the interpretation.

For instance, some of data collected from natural observation was applied in a stimulated record interview with each key participant, in order to compare and contrast the more objective analysis of interactions (through CA) to the participants' explanations and comments on the motives, actual accommodation moves and their consequences for the interaction itself as well as for the interpersonal relationships of the group. As stated in section 3.3.1, the second research question aimed at determining the extent to which participants are aware of their accommodative behaviour and that of their interlocutors. This research objective is naturally linked to subjective accommodation, i.e., the interlocutors' perceptions of any changes in their communicative behaviour. It follows that, despite de application of CA as an analytical tool, the participants' own interpretation of the main data (classroom interaction) was vital for the study of accommodation strategies in this context, as it would

complement my own interpretation of the phenomena, thus, alleviating the impact of the researcher's subjectivity.

Another fundamental point about the validity of this research relates to credibility, whereby a researcher employs constant comparison and searches for counter evidence, as explained by Lew et al. (2018), so as to arrive at trustworthy interpretations. As regards credibility, the thematic analysis of the classroom interaction data was performed using NVivo 12 (see section 4.1.1.4). The reason for choosing this type of data analysis software, as opposed to the manual counterpart, is that NVivo offers the possibility to code in different stages. That is to say, by means of NVivo, a researcher can initially classify data using different thematic codes that can be later regrouped into more inclusive and larger categories which correspond to the actual identified phenomena – accommodation strategies in spoken interaction in this case - and which are studied in light of the proposed theoretical framework, that is, Communication Accommodation Theory. In this way, each coded theme, strategy or move, can be contrasted and compared to other similar ones, allowing the researcher to establish clearer relationships among the different aspects of phenomena and to determine the arising categories with more certainty. What is more, software like NVivo provides easy access to the samples under each code which, in turns, gives a more solid and varied range of evidence to the researcher.

Chapter 4 Observation Analysis and Discussion:

The present chapter will present the main results of the analysis of recorded classroom observation. This analysis has been informed and guided by three main strands: Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) and its strategical framework as presented in section 1.2, pragmatic accommodation in ELF as discussed in section 2.3.2, and conversation analysis (CA). I will start with a brief description of the main methodological considerations of CA, and then move on to section two of this chapter, where I present the results of the analysis in the following order: repetition and rephrase, utterance completion, and simultaneous talk. Finally, I will close this chapter with a brief summary of the observation analysis.

4.1 Conversation analysis

The chosen methodological framework for the analysis of the observed interaction is Conversation Analysis (CA). As presented in section 3.3.1 (research questions), one of the main objectives of this research project is to understand how a group of international students use strategies to accommodate, i.e. how they 'do' accommodation. If we understand accommodation as changes in behaviours in interaction which are driven by social and psychological aspects, and CA as a style of analysis that 'focuses on how social actions and practices are accomplished in and through talk and interaction' (Rapley and Flick, 2007:74), we can appreciate a natural connection between CAT and CA.

As human beings participating in interaction, or simply put 'talking to other people', we may or may not be aware of how we perform social actions, including

accommodation. In other words, we might look at talk as something trivial or idiosyncratic, i.e. particular to the individuals engaged in any given conversation. Nonetheless, by exploring naturally occurring conversations with CA, we can uncover the complexities of human interaction, as well as the similarities and differences in patterns of social behaviour. In this regard, the principal goal of CA – as explained by Rapley and Flick (74) – is the description of richly layered practices by means of a careful examination of people's interactions. In CA these practices are uncovered through the application of **sequential analysis**, which Drew (xv) defines as one of the most important concepts of CA. He explains that sequential analysis explores the ways in which speakers, in their turns at talk, perform a range of social actions and how linguistic production is organised around a turn's position in a sequence of turns/actions. In this way, Drew adds, language is examined in its interactional environment rather than as single isolated sentences that have been taken away from their surrounding talk.

When studying talk in interaction in ELF, it is essential to remember that we are faced with a wide variety of Englishes, speakers' proficiency levels, communicative styles and cultural norms (Kaur 2011) and that variability of linguistic resources lays at the core of ELF (Dewey 2009). Given this diversity in the above mentioned aspects, interaction could eventually be complex and thus difficult to analyse. Nevertheless, this is not a severe difficulty if CA comes into play. As Pietikäinen (2021) argues, CA seems to be a reliable methodology for the examination of ELF interaction since CA has provides an emic perspective that can account for ELF linguistic and pragmatic variability.

4.1.1 Methodological considerations of CA

This following section will detail the methodological principles of CA, which were applied in the analysis of the observed classroom interaction of the participants of this study.

4.1.1.1 Naturally-occurring data

Kasper and Wagner state that CA should be based on data in which participants interact or do their business without any intervention from the researcher. The authors add that CA is centred on the standards and comparability of social practices. In this regard and closely linked to the idea of data being taken from naturally-occurring conversations, one of the key issues CA is concerned with is participants' orientations to conversational patterns (Drew, 2004:xvi). This means that speakers react and orient to some sequential patterns and, thus, a turn at talk will be linked to its previous turn both topically and in terms of the action sequence (e.g. question – answer). If there is no such connection, speakers are likely to mark this disjunction letting their interlocutor know that they should not expect a topical connection. Drew argues these behaviours are very systematic.

The data collected for the present study is naturally-occurring in that the recorded conversations correspond to class activities and discussions given by the tutors in charge of the modules the participants were taking. As a participant observer, my role was to identify the different groups my key participants were part of and record their interaction. This is to say that I did not have any agenda in mind for the conversations and participants steered the conversation in the ways they deemed suitable to complete their tasks. While I participated in some group activities, I did so following the tutor's instructions and respecting the group members' turns.

4.1.1.2 Transcription rules

Due to CA's highly empirical orientation, a detailed transcription system must accompany it, according to Sert and Seedhouse (2011). Data collected for CA needs to be transcribed according to rules which have become increasingly detailed and more complex to satisfy a wide range of analytic projects (Kasper and Wagner). The

conversations recorded for this project were carefully transcribed according to a set of norms which were combined from Richards (2003) and VOICE (2007) as they both provide a thorough basis for the analysis of the accommodation phenomena under observation. While the VOICE transcription system shares many codes with the more traditional Jeffersonian one (such as the symbols for short pauses, false starts, and latched utterances to name a few), the choice of the VOICE system as the principal transcription tool was based on the fact that some Jeffersonian codes might not be readable in some computers. As stated in their website (VOICE 2013) their conventions must reconcile some requirements, among which is 'the need to make sure that the resulting transcriptions are computer-readable'. For the complete version of transcription conventions, see page 253.

4.1.1.3 Data sessions

Kasper and Wagner explain that after, transcribing, viewing and listening to data segments, they are fragmented into actions (what speakers do) and careful attention is given to how turns develop around these actions. Following this, a collection of comparative instances is built with the objective of drawing conclusions and establishing patterns of social behaviour. The authors add that the size of the collection will depend on the frequency of the particular action or practice under observation found in the data set. In this way, corpora can be assembled according to certain fields of human activity (e.g. academia, health services, business, among others).

One can establish a clear connection between these data analysis steps as described by Kasper and Wagner and Sert and Seedhouse's bottom-up approach to data analysis. What this means is that, as Sert and Seedhouse state, data analysis in CA should not be conducted with previous theoretical assumptions in relation to aspects such as power relations or race, for instance, unless evidence is found in the data that suggests that participants behave that way. In this respect, and although the analysis was conducted with accommodation phenomena in mind, there was no prior assumption as to the

degree of convergent accommodation participants might have displayed. In other words, I did not disregard any instances of non-accommodative (divergence or maintenance) practices in the data set simply to reinforce the conclusions reached thanks to previous research into ELF interactions and state that participants orient to a convergent behaviour simply because they are interacting in ELF.

4.1.1.4 Contrasting and comparing

Another key methodological aspect of CA, which is closely connected to the previously described point, is that of comparison in CA. Kasper and Wagner assert that patterns, regularities and even rules can be established by comparing and contrasting objects in sciences in general. When individual instances are compared to one another the object becomes sharper and in this way, it is possible to state which objects are part of a given category and which are not, and also to identify subcategories of the phenomenon. In CA, Kasper and Wagner add, comparisons are distinctive when they are considered as part of a sequential context, i.e. a turn has to be studied as part of a sequence or adjacency pair. This is important because the same object (exclamation, word, phrase or sentence) found in a sequence can be attached to a particular social action such as *refusing*, but that very same object in a different sequence can represent a *request for information*, that is, a totally different social action is expressed. Comparison in CA has to contemplate these subtleties.

Sert and Seedhouse explain that from a CA perspective, talk in interaction is seen as 'systematically organised, deeply ordered and methodic' and that speakers' contributions to interaction are 'context-shaped and context-renewing' (pg. 1). This means that these contributions cannot be understood without their sequential environment. In this regard, Drew puts forward a similar claim when he highlights the normative character of CA; in other words, research in CA aims at identifying and analysing the patterns, practices and devices whereby talk is orderly and coherent in interaction. This normative character of speakers' behaviour is both social and

linguistic in nature (Drew, xvi). In the present study, all the objects that were deemed to indicate participants' accommodative moves have been analysed in their sequence organization, that is, as part of a turn-taking sequence in which the object is not independent from the context surrounding it.

Before continuing with the following section, clarification on the choice of analytical tools is needed. The reason why CA coexists with analyses of interview data lies in the fact that the second research aim of this project (regarding awareness of accommodation strategies) attempts to throw some light of accommodation aspects such as motivations and perceived consequences as described by the participants themselves, i.e. subjective accommodation. While CA relies only on evidence taken from actual conversations, an interview on the perceptions of communicative behaviour was crucial to achieve the second research objective and to understand how these participants evaluate their own, as well as others', accommodation practices. In a similar fashion, an ethnographic approach to data collection, namely participant observation and field notes, contributed greatly to the understanding of the context in which these participants conducted their academic lives and of the sense of community they had, a sense of belonging that might influence their linguistic practices and identity projection. In short, evidence obtained through the application of CA was deemed useful to answer the first research question (how accommodations strategies are actually applied in an academic setting); however, in order to answer the second question (accommodation strategies awareness), a different type of data was essential to the task.

4.2 Introduction to the analysis

The amount of transcribed observation corresponds to one hour, twenty-four minutes and fifty-eight seconds (1:24:58). The analysed interactions have been taken from nine different instances of observation conducted at the beginning, middle and final stages of data collection, and naturally each observation involves at least one key participant.

These observations come from class activities in which students worked in dyads or small groups between 3 and 6 people (more information on the different instances of observations can be found in section 3.3.5.3 on page 67).

Once the observed interactions were transcribed following the established conventions, the transcriptions were checked against the audio twice. After corrections and modifications were applied, the transcribed documents were input to NVivo 12 qualitative data analysis software. Each transcribed document was analysed at a time and all phenomena and strategies that fall within the scope of this project were identified and marked using NVivo codes. Each code was then internally compared in data sessions from a CA angle, to ensure consistency in the analysis and modifications were made when necessary.

The analysis considers occurrences in which at least one of the key participants has employed any of the accommodation strategies under observation in this study (for more information on the participants in this study, see section 3.3.3). In other words, if none of the key participants is involved in the turns where any given phenomenon is observed, either initiating the accommodative move or responding to it, the phenomenon was not considered in the final analysis. Moreover, those turns in which only incidental participants played a part in the execution of the accommodation strategy were not contemplated. This is because only key participants partook in the interviews, from which I gained access to their perceptions and opinions about accommodation phenomena.

At the end of the software assisted analysis there were 175 occurrences of overlapped talk, 21 rephrasing cases, 20 repetitions, 3 instances of utterance completion and only one pre-empting occurrence. Although the occurrence of simultaneous talk, rephrases and repetitions is frequent in the observation data set, the appearance of utterance completion instances is rather rare, and while CA requires that emphasis of the inquiry

be place on the most recurrent phenomena, the decision to include UC in the present analysis was made taking into consideration the results of the second data set, i.e., the interviews. What this means is that since the second objective of this project was to explore subjective accommodation and the perceptions that participants have regarding their own strategies as well as their classmates', it was necessary to be somehow flexible in the analysis of the observed interactions and leave some room for the inclusion of phenomena that has caught participants' attention, especially during the stimulated-recall interviews. This was the case of UC, as key participant M1 brings this phenomenon into the table (as it will be presented in section 5.3.5).

4.2.1 Repetition and rephrasing

In order to approach these two phenomena, I have used Kaur's distinction between repetitions and rephrase, as seen in section 2.3.2.2, as a starting point for the analysis. To put it concisely, repetition is re-saying some or all the words from a previous or current turn with minimal changes, while rephrasing is giving old information in a simplified fashion or with completely different words (Kaur 2009). It is also important to remember that Kaur sees repetition and rephrasing in ELF as pre-emptive strategies rather that remedial ones. This last statement seems to be in line with the final count of rephrasing within my observation data where there are considerably more occurrences of self rephrase (21 in total) and no discernible other-rephrasing. The emphasis on the 'self' rather than on the 'other' revealed in this data set suggests that, when it comes to rephrasing at least, participants might be more concerned with avoiding potential problems in their own messages rather than on repairing and clarifying their partners' oral production and ideas. On the contrary, self and other repetition appear to be more uniform in this data set, since there are 10 occurrences of each one of them. In the following subsections, I will discuss the uses of repetition, both self and other, as well as self rephrase as they appear in my data set.

4.2.1.1 Repetition

As seen in section 2.3.2.2, self and other repetition have been objects of study in ELF pragmatics. Cogo and Dewey (2006) have focused on other repetition and stated that it is frequently used as a means to improve communicative efficiency and to show agreement, listenership and engagement in the interaction. On the other hand, Kaur (2009) has studied self repetition and has ascertained that it is likely to happen after prolonged silences, minimal responses on the part of the interlocutor(s), and overlapped talk due to speakers' abilities to perceive the slightest suggestion of trouble and to act upon it by employing an interactional strategy such as self repetition for pre-emotive purposes. Similarly, Mauranen (2012) has affirmed that repetition occurs when speakers wish to obtain processing time, ascertain comprehensibility, mark discourse boundaries, display alignment and affiliation and structure monologues.

In the observation data I collected, both self and other repetition can be found and there are ten occurrences of each one. I will continue by presenting and discussing my findings around the phenomenon of other repetition.

4.2.1.1.1 Other repetition

In this study's data set, other repetition seems to fulfil two main functions; on the one hand, it is used to display engagement and listenership towards interlocutors' ideas, points and opinions and, on the other hand, other repetition is employed to ascertain comprehensibility and confirm information that has been given in a prior turn. Thus, it can be argued that other repetition is a prevailing tool to establish a desired social distance with fellow students, as all five postgraduate students who are the key participants in this study use other repetition at some point during the observed interactions. This might point to their willingness to establish and strengthen the

harmonious social relationships they had with their peers within an academic community. What is more, the uses other repetition observed in their classroom interaction can also evidence their desire to attend to their interlocutors' communicative needs and follow the topics these interlocutors bring to the table. Thus, other repetition serves two main purposes as proposed by CAT: that of reducing interpersonal differences and achieving social attractiveness, on the one hand, and accomplishing communicative efficiency, on the other.

In the data obtained from my five key speakers, one example of other repetition can be found in observation #4 (for information on observations, see Table 3.2: Observations information), with key participants F1 and F3, plus an incidental participant from China, who is not a regular member of this community of practice, but a visiting scholar who is on a short visit and is auditing this class. The class activity requires them to establish their own students' status regarding new technologies and the question they must answer is: 'are your students digital natives or digital immigrants?'

Exchange 4.1

F1: in my fourth year in high school? so it was grade four in secondary school i don't know the equivalent here but i was sixteen years old (.) so the first subject in computer computer science =
F3: = mhm
F1: was then (it) was happening then for the first time in my town? **so the first thing i i remember is a black black screen with <spel> m s </spel> two? you probably don't know [what it is]**
F3: [black screen]
F15: [really] in which year. nineteen =
F1: = it was =
F15: = two thousand (.) how many years ago

In lines 1 to 3, we can see how F1 is explaining her own experience with computers when she was a school student, and in lines 5 and 6, she introduces the concept of black screens which correspond to an old operating system: DOS. Although due to the lack of a video recorded version of the interaction it is difficult to say whether F1 is addressing F3 in lines 6 and 7 when she produces an indirect question ('you probably

don't know what it is'), or whether F3 has signalled lack of understanding through body language, it seems reasonable to believe that F1 believes the concept of MS-DOS[1] and its black screen is going to be problematic for F3, probably because of the age gap between these two participants, as F3 is much younger than F1. F1's rising intonation might signal the start of the problem for her and it is immediately followed by an indirect question as a request for confirmation and evidence that F1 is willing to steer her discourse away from her school experience to spend some time explaining to F3 how this old operating system worked. It cannot be appreciated in this exchange, but after some self repetition performed by F3, there is quite a lengthy negotiation to clarify the concept in which all participants in this group engage in, to different degrees (this self repetition and negotiation will be presented and discussed in Exchange 4.10).

What is important to highlight in this extract is how F3 in line 8 employs other repetition of black screen, presumably in an effort to show engagement in the conversation and the topic change that F1 has performed to deviate from her initial topic and explain a problematic concept. As seen in section 2.3.2.2, in her early work Kaur had stated that CA has traditionally perceived repetition as a repair strategy to tackle real and potential problem in understanding, and that it seems to be the case that in ELF interactions, speakers use these strategies for preventative purposes rather than remedial ones. Using evidence from this observation, it could be the case that F3's other repetition of 'black screen' represents an attempt to check her own understanding of F1's previous explanation that serves the purpose of pre-empting a possible misunderstanding or, in other words, a way to ensure that both interlocutors are on the same page, as it were, and that comprehensibility has been achieved in this part of the interaction. Moreover, Cogo & Dewey (2006) stated that other repetition is a frequently used strategy employed to signal alignment, support and approval with respect to what has been stated by other interlocutors. This might also explain why F3

[1] In line 6, F1 says MS Two, which might be a loose double translation. DOS was pronounced in Spanish as /dos/ which means two, this the official name MS-DOS became MS two for F1.

is using other repetition in line 8, that is, F3's might have been a way to show alignment to F1 and to demonstrate her listernership towards F1's ideas and explanations.

This exchange also demonstrates how speakers in ELF interactions engage in collaborative and pro-active work to make sure that everybody is on the same page, that is, they support their interlocutors in the process of understanding meaning fully. Pieces of information that can be sensitive and problematic to others can, of course, come from language that is potentially obscure such as idioms, but they can also originate from cultural differences of speakers' past experiences. Consequently, pre-empting to avoid non or miscommunication (as seen in lines 6 and 7, where F1 signals a change of topic to ensure F3's understanding) can be perceived and an interpretability strategy because, first, it is based on speakers' assumption of their interlocutors' proficiency level, and of previous experiences and knowledge of the world as it is the case in exchange 4.1; and second, it aims at enhancing communicative efficiency in any given interaction by preventing the source of miscommunication from happening altogether. In this particular exchange, F1 intuits F3 will not know about MS-DOS probably because of F3's age, she foresees this and at the same time shows her willingness to guide F3 through the process of clarifying the concept.

Another instance of other repetition that nicely illustrates how these key speakers show alignment and listenership in their classroom interaction can be found in observation #16 (see section 3.3.5.3 for more information on observation data). In this class, we can see M1 and F2, whose native languages are different and English is their only common language, working in a dyad and discussing the use of corpora for language teaching purposes as instructed by the tutor in charge of this class. Both participants have a hand-out five nodes or heads, which correspond to verbs such as 'run' and 'manage' and verb phrases like 'be in charge of', and their most frequent nominal collocations.

Exchange 4.2

1 **M1:** (…) <reading> the ten most frequent node plus two nominal collocates associated with
2 the phrase in charge OF? </reading> are in charge of case.
3 F2: **<soft> case </soft>**
4 **M1:** i like it
5 **F2:** mhm
6 **M1:** (.) policy? (.)
7 F2: **policy? =**
8 **M1:** = [i like it]
9 **F2:** [yes]

What is more striking here, rather than the F2's repetition of M1's the words 'case' and 'policy' in lines 3 and 7 respectively, is the use of intonation in lines 7 and 8. It could be argued that since both M1 and F2 are reading from the hand-out where they can see the nouns listed as collocations for the head verbs, these occurrences of other repetition do not exemplify the use of accommodation moves to indicate F2's engagement in the conversation or that they are not even instances of other repetition. Notwithstanding the above, F2's repetition of the collocation 'policy' in line 7 is accompanied by rising intonation (marked with the '?' symbol) which is the same intonation M1 uses in the prior turn when he first reads the word from the list.

The sequential organizations around the two instances of repetition are very similar in this exchange. First, M1 mentions the word 'case' as it appears in the list, with noticeable falling intonation, perhaps as a way to index a transition relevant place (TRP), or simply put, to give the floor to F2, and then F2 repeats said word with no notorious falling tone, although it is not rising either (lines 2 and 3). Later, a comparable turn-taking design is seen in lines 6 and 7, where M1 utters the word 'policy' with rising intonation and then F2 does exactly the same. It is difficult to say from the recording whether M1's choice of tone corresponds to his desire to keep the floor or to indicate a certain degree of surprise regarding the combination 'be in charge of policy' as there is no follow-up, as it were, in the following turns. In fact, a couple of lines after the second repetition, M1 moves to the following collocation in the list and F2 accepts this move. However, F2's choice of rising intonation might point

to her intention to converge to M1's style, regardless of motives to apply such style. In other words, it can be said about F2 that she has the capacity to identify M2's tone, repeat it and by doing so, employ a discourse management strategy whereby she is telling M1 that she is attuned to his needs and that she is willing to work towards the completion of the task.

Not all instances of other repetition are so straightforward as the previous one when it comes to their turn design. In the exchange I have just presented, the move is rather simply designed in that other repetition takes place in the turn that comes immediately after the echoed item. Nonetheless, there are occasions in which the repetition is slightly more complex. We can find an example of this in observation #7, where we have F2 and M2 working in a group of 6 students, myself included, in a class that deals with global status of English. In this particular lesson, we are discussing adherence to English native speaker norms, its opportunities and obstacles. I, in my role as a participant-observer, partook in the interaction by sharing ideas and asking my colleagues questions, but I did not hold most of the floor during the activity; key participant M2 and incidental participant M6 did.

Exchange 4.3

F14: so *M2's name* you wanted to say something
M2: yeah i could i could choose er (.) a university in mainland [place 8] i could choose [place 12] because the system is the same as here but i choose [place 14] because of the native speaker (xxx)
M6: oh yeah
M2: (xxx) so (xxx) but to my surprise it's quite international it's quite lingua franca
M6: @@@
M2: @yeah@

9 F14: is it a nice surprise or a bad surprise
10 M2: yeah it it is a nice surprise now [but in the beginning –]
11 F13: [@be honest@]
12 F2/F14: @@@
13 M6: so so basically you were surprised
14 M2: yeah
15 M6: er by the – by this – by what is [going on here
16 M2: [yeah i (.) i thought it was e:r international but it's
17 more international than i thought
18 M6: it's too international
19 M2: **yes too international =**
20 M6: = @@@@ [i see what you mean@
21 F13: [you couldn't find a native speaker to chat to him @or something like
22 that@
23 M2: @yeah i'm disappointed [(i could go shopping)@ @@@

This exchange starts with a successful attempt on my part to help M2 obtain the turn. I had previously noticed that he was trying to say something but could not, as M6's turn was not over. After my turn, in lines 2 through 6, M2 explains that he had chosen to attend a UK university as opposed to one with the same characteristics that was not located in an English speaking environment, because of the native speaker factor; that is, because he had thought that he was going to be interacting with NESs on a daily basis. He adds that to his surprise, the environment of the UK university was 'international' or 'lingua franca'. In line 9, I prompted him to expand on this point and provide some assessment on the situation he had found himself upon his arrival in the country, to which M2 responded that the university was more international than he had thought (lines 16 and 17). This is where other repetition starts to unfold in the exchange. In lines 16-17, M2 says 'it was e:r *international* but it's more *international* than i thought'. M2 uses the word 'international' twice in his turn at talk, and then he does it again in line 19, so it could be argued that this is an occurrence of self repetition.

However, what happens in between these two turns changes the nature of the repetition, since in line 18, M6 echoes M2's turn from lines 16 and 17 by saying 'it's too international', perhaps giving this cosmopolitan setting a rather negative association. What makes this occurrence different from the previously analysed

exchange is that the origin of M2's repetition is not found in the immediately prior turn (M6's one), but in M2's prior intervention. What this means is that M2 and M6 are co-constructing discourse. More specifically, M6 gives a slightly new meaning to M2's words, by adding the adverb 'too' to the adjective 'international', and M2 accepts this interpretation in his other repetition of M6's turn, as indicated by the word 'yes' at the beginning of line 19.

Although in exchange 4.3, the focus is placed on M2's move in line 19, the previous line is also crucial in the present discussion. In line 18, M6's addition of the adverb 'too' makes his intervention (it's too international') an instance of other paraphrasing, as M6 is perhaps reinterpreting M2's explanation in lines 16 and 17. Regarding this part of the exchange, what is noteworthy is M2's acceptance (line 19) of M6's move (line 18). As discussed in section 2.3.2.2, Pietikäinen (2018), who studied the rather underexplored setting of ELF couples with multilingual backgrounds and who interact in English, stated that even though direct clarification requests and echoing were the most frequently found strategies, paraphrasing was also frequently observed in her data. In this respect, Pietikäinen also explained that (other) paraphrasing might be less frequent than direct clarification requests and echoing because it could eventually turn out to be face threatening for the utterer of the original (in this exchange, M2). It has to be considered that Pietikäinen's data and mine represent considerably different sociolinguistic realities. Nonetheless, it is also reasonable to believe that in M2 and M6's interaction, as seen in this exchange, there is also a similar risk in term of M2's face saving. This is to say, M6's other rephrasing in line 18 might have turned out to be a misinterpretation of M2's ideas in lines 16 and 17, as the intensifier 'too' usually carries a negative connotation, i.e., the idea that the existence of something or someone (in this case, international students) is excessive and undesired. Pietikäinen argued that paraphrasing can be risky for the person who employs it, because in case the paraphrased utterance differs from the initial intended message, this move can be interpreted as topic divergence. It is difficult to affirm that M2's acceptance of M6's other paraphrasing resulted from the more formal and, perhaps, distant interpersonal relationship (as compared to couples). Nonetheless, it is also reasonable to believe

that M2's acceptance, as perceived in his other repetition in line 19, responds to his desire to establish a positive social distance with M6. Shepard et al. (2001) state that language behaviour can be crucial in social interaction as it marks group and individual identities, and in this respect M2's other repetition can be considered linguistic behaviour that helps him mark his positive social identity in this group of graduate students.

All the exchanges presented thus far reflect how these key participants achieve convergence by means of other repetition. This convergence is the result of these key speakers' alignment to their interlocutors' communicative needs, as well as to their positive social relations. In other words, their other repetitions serve the purpose of signalling alignment, support and approval (Cogo and Dewey, 2006). In the same line, and also within a CAT perspective, the other repetition cases analysed here can be seen as discourse management strategies (as discussed in section 1.2 on page 2) in that other repetition is employed by these speakers to facilitate their interlocutors' contribution to the development of the conversation (Shepard et al, 2001); that is to say, what these speakers do by repeating their colleagues' words is to show that their contribution has been accepted and incorporated in their understanding of the topic. In a setting where speakers are required to discuss ideas, answer questions and, sometimes, reach common ground, it is essential that everybody cooperate towards the completion of a task. With this in mind, other repetition is a sign for interlocutors to know that they are being listened to and that they can continue their turn construction and development of ideas as they had planned.

The second use of other repetition observed in this data set, namely ascertaining comprehensibility and confirming information is exemplified in an exchange from observation #4. In this class, we see key participants F1 and F3 working in groups with F15, a visiting scholar from East Asia. The task assigned by the tutor is to determine whether their students from their home countries, the ones they have taught at some points in their teaching careers, are digital natives or digital immigrants.

Exchange 4.4

1	F3:	are your students digital natives (.) e:r could you please tell me what is digital
2		natives?
3	F15:	digital natives maybe you're born to: -
4	F1:	is the generation that is born=
5	F15:	= yes =
6	F1:	= with the:
7	F15:	(xxx) **[generation**
8	F1:	[when when when is er – when did you: - er (…) when were you born.
9	F3:	**when I born?**
10	F1:	yeah
11	F3:	[nineteen ninety
12	F1:	[what year
13	F3:	nineteen ninety

The exchange begins with F3's polite request for assistance in lines 1 and 2: 'could you please tell what is digital natives?' with a notorious rising intonation (marked with ?). In the following lines, we can see how F1 and F15 construct their turns so as to provide the information F3 needed. The word 'generation' is key in the clarification of the meaning; it is first used by F1 in line 4 and then repeated by F15 in line 7. But in the following turn, which is held by F1 again, F1 seems to change her clarification strategy so as to make it more straightforward and relatable to F3, so after some struggling to produce the question as observed in her self repetition of the interrogative adverb 'when' and two false starts, F1 asks F3 'when were you born' (line 8). F3's repetition of F1's questions, albeit with a missing past auxiliary 'were', is a request for confirmation of the question in line 8 and it seems to express F3's to contribute to the development of the interaction in an effective way, that is, by giving F1 the information she needs in order to determine if F3 is a digital native or immigrant. F3's appeal for confirmation is, in turn, confirmed by F1 in line 10 and the sequential organization of this exchange is resolved when F3 provided the desired information in line 11.

The lack of auxiliary verb in F3's other repetition might offer a riveting insight into the way in which NNESs approach non-standard forms in ELF interactions. First, this other repetition is not verbatim because aside from the natural change in the subject pronoun ('you' to 'I'), this repetition does not contain the past auxiliary which supports the main verb 'bear', even if this auxiliary was present in the original utterance (F1's

line 8). Most importantly, this omission is eye-catching in that neither F1 nor F15 perform other correction on F3's other repetition 'when I born?'. At no point during the entire audio-recorded class activity did F3's interlocutors correct the syntax of this question or refer to this turn and its apparent ungrammaticality. It could be argued that F1 and F15 did not identify this, but at least in F1's case there is evidence that she does not perceive 'when I born?' as the preferred choice since her turn in line 8 does contain the auxiliary. Thus, there's a strong case to believe that this omission is not deemed problematic, at least for the development of the task. What is more pressing for F1 and F15 is to help F3's understanding of the concept of digital natives.

Cogo & Dewey (2006) state that speakers also converge by repeating other people's non-standard forms of language by giving an example from their data in which one Japanese interlocutor makes use of zero definite article in the phrase 'because of revolution'; later in the interaction her Chinese interlocutor repeats the same phrase with the zero article, thus accommodating from a grammatical perspective. Cogo and Dewey's evidence resembles the exchange presented here inasmuch as the ungrammaticality (with respect to standard English) of these forms does not create any kind of obstacle for the development of the topic or other aspects of the interactions. These two instances differ in that the one presented by Cogo and Dewey include an interlocutor's incorporation of a non-standard form (zero article), while exchange 4.4 contains no equivalent phenomenon (omission of past auxiliary). Although there is no incorporation of the non-standard form 'where I born' by either F1 or F15, the data obtained in the third round of interviews provides sound evidence to state that, at least for F1, this so called ungrammaticality is truly unproblematic and irrelevant for both the interaction and F1's priorities in terms of communicative goals. As it will later discuss in section 5.3.2, F1 is not only engaged in facilitating F3's understanding, but she is also concerned with the emotional aspect of the interaction. This means that F1 is aware of the vulnerability of acknowledging one does not know the meaning of a concept, and her interactional effort is placed on content rather than form. F1's emphasis on content applies to her own language production as well, as she explains

that she has also used an auxiliary that does not match the question according to ENL norms ('did' instead of 'were' in line 8).

Another exchange that illustrates how speakers can use other repetition to obtain confirmation is found in the same observation instance (#4), but with a different group of speakers. The task is the same, that is, establishing whether their students are digital natives or digital immigrants, and the group members are key participants M1 and M2, and incidental participants M4 (from the UK), F16 and F17 (both from China).

Exchange 4.5

1 M4: you can't print from this on the on the university –
2 M2: yeah i i can but i don't like it. i'm a digital native
3 M4: ok
4 M2: @@
5 F17: because sometimes i can make notes on the computer it's very easy to make notes =
6 M1: <surprise> **you can make notes?** </surprise> =
7 F17: = yeah
8 M2: you can check diffi er difficult words
9 M1: i didn't know that =
10 M4: = and it's very clever [(xxx)]
11 M2: [yeah]

This exchange is taken from the first part of the recorded classroom interaction and we can see how this group has taken a different approach to answering the tutor's question. What they are using a benchmark, as it were, is to find out whether they read papers from the computer screen or print them before reading them. Upon M4's suggestion in line 1, M2 explains that he does not like printing because he considers himself a digital native, a statement that is accepted by M4. Then in line 5, F17 adds to M2's point by saying that in a computer it is 'very easy to make notes' to which M1 acts surprised apparently and repeats F17's line partially in order to obtain confirmation on the fact that you can alter the document in the computer. M1's other repetition displays alignment on two different levels. On the one hand, it shows that he is following the development of the discussion closely and efficiently and, on the other, it is a sign of his willingness to accept new information from his younger fellow classmates. What is more, M1 is not withholding information regarding his state of

knowledge on different technological applications as seen in line 9, where he says he was not aware of that.

These two last exchanges demonstrate how other repetition is applied to get confirmation whenever the speaker believes it is important to ensure the right understanding of the issues discussed. In this sense, other repetition to request confirmation on speakers' comprehension can be said to have pre-emptive nature. This is to say that it seems reasonable to think that a request for confirmation in the shape of other repetition indicates the speaker's awareness of a potential breakdown and their ability to act before the problem arises. Additionally, other repetition for confirmation could also be classified as discourse management in that they are used to assist interlocutors' participation in the conversation. Simply put, if a speaker wants to answer a question, provide opinions or add something to the topic an interlocutor is developing, and if there is a minimal possibility of misunderstanding, a move such as other repetition can help a speaker to avoid an undesired breakdown and, thus, contribute to the interlocutor's efforts.

4.2.1.1.2 Self repetition

While other repetition is employed to show listenership and request or provide confirmation, self repetition seems to have a different direction as key speakers use it to obtain time to plan their discourse and to direct the course of the interaction after interruptions and overlapped talk. With regard the first use, Mauranen (2012) has referred to gaining processing time as one of the uses of repetition in ELF interaction (see section 2.3.2.2), a use of repetition that is also found in L1 interactions, she adds. Most of the occurrences of self repetition in my observation data set (6 out of 10) correspond to speakers' need to gain time to rearrange their ideas and hold their turn. Given the nature of the interaction within this academic setting, where turns are not allocated a priori and where the task or class activity requires some kind of output, it is

not surprising to observe that speakers employ self repetition for this purpose as they need to contribute to the successful completion of such task. Moreover, the students in the classes that were observed did not have access to the particular questions or instructions of the activities, although on occasions they had to do some reading related to the topic of the lesson before the class. This made their discourse spontaneous since they did not have time to prepare their answers or contributions.

For instance, in observation #19 we can see key participant F1 working with other three incidental participants from various backgrounds, namely Saudi Arabia, Great Britain and South Korea. The discussion topic given by the tutor is 'I'm struggling with…' which, in other words, refers to the issues, frustrations and problems students are facing at the early stages of their Master's dissertation. In the following exchange, F1 is explaining her struggles with her dissertation project.

Exchange 4.6

1 M3: was there any problem with yours F1's name
2 F1: with my frustration?
3 M3: yeah [yeah that's right]
4 F6: [yeah with frustration]
5 F1: **i am i am** very frustrated with the amount of the (.) ehm literature review or amount
6 of (.) things connected to the topic so i can't distinguish the boundaries.

Another example of self repetition for time-management and discourse planning is found in observation #4, with F1 and F3 interaction with incidental participant F15. This exchange was already introduced and analysed in exchange 4.4, but by way of a quick reminder, F1 and F15 are trying to help F3 understand the concept of digital natives.

Exchange 4.7

1 F1: is the generation that is born =
2 F15: = yes =
3 F1: = with the:
4 F15: (xxx) [generation
5 F1: [**when when when** is er – **when** did you: - er (…) **when** were you born.
6 F3: when I born?

One last example is seen in observation #10, with F3 and myself as a participant observer (F14) discussing F3's research questions and the implications of her data collection design.

Exchange 4.8

1 F3: @@ (.) is – but i think **it it** would be too u::h (.) **the the**: (.) **too** (.) **too too**: **too** much (.)
2 e:r things to do (.) o:n =
3 F14: = yeah [well]
4 F3: [collecting] data?
5 F14: but u:hm are the interviews going to be for all the participants for all the students in
6 one class? i don't think so

As we can observe in these exchanges, and what transpires as well in other instances of self repetition to obtain time, is that self repetition is mainly applied to functional or structural words rather than in content ones. This is to say, speakers use self repetition on functional words such as pronouns (*I* and *it*), and adverbs (*too* and *when*), rather than on words that carry more weight with respect to their meaning and its relevance to the overall message. We do not see repetition on items such as the past participle verb born (Exchange 4.7, line 5) or the adjective frustrated (Exchange 4.6, line 5), which carry more lexical bearing. This might indicate that these key speakers have fewer difficulties with the form of their discourse than with its content, and that self repetition is a helpful strategy to manage the course of the discussion and keep the floor.

Another interesting employment of self repetition, as observed in this data set, is that which relates to the management of interaction when the turn design is messy, as it were, or it has not unfolded according to speakers' expectations and objectives. In observation #3, with M1 working with incidental participants F6 and F7 from Saudi Arabia, and discussing their preliminary plans for their dissertation.

Exchange 4.9

1 F7: e:r i am certain on the topic but the problem is the research question?
2 M1: mhm
3 F7: i have to discover (xxx) a broad area i'm looking for (xxx) second language vocabulary
4 acquisition so think about age gender {inaudible because of background noise}
5 M1: have have you talked to to any of our lectures **about ideas** -
6 F7: (xxx)
7 M1: **a about ideas** to look for or someone that can guide you

After F7 has informed the group she is having difficulties with the design or her project's research questions, in line 5 M1 steps in to find out whether F7 has talked to anybody about this, but in the next turn, he is interrupted by F7. Unfortunately, the turn in lines 6 is unintelligible which makes it impossible to know whether the following turn (M1's) is in anyway linked to this intervention. In his next turn (line 7), M1 employs self repetition of the prepositional phrase 'about ideas' to continue with his request for information and finish his point. The following case is similar, albeit with a more complex turn construction, and it is found in observation #4 with F1, F3 and F15.

Exchange 4.10

1 F1: was then (it) was happening then for the first time in my town? so the first thing i i
2 remember is a black black screen with <spel> m s </spel> two? you probably don't
3 know [what it is]
4 F3: [black screen]
5 F15: [really] in which year. nineteen =
6 F1: = it was =
7 F15: = two thousand (.) how many years ago
8 F3: **windows**
9 F1: @I'm trying to think@ =
10 F3: **= windows ninety eight?**
11 F1: the – twelve years ago
12 F15: twelve years ago
13 F1: twelve thirteen years ago =
14 F3: = it's the software (was) **windows** [**ninety eight**]

15 F15: [around two thousand]
16 F1: yeah yeah (.) what sorry
17 F3: **windows ninety eight?** (.) the soft – (.)
18 F1: sorry
19 F3: the the the –
20 F15: microsoft
21 F3: yes
22 F15: <soft> windows </soft>
23 F1: the – but the [<spel> m s </spel> two]
24 F15: [(xxx)]
25 F1: do you know what I'm talking about (.) the:
26 F15: yeah
27 F1: you don't know @@
28 F15: @yeah yeah@
29 F1: (cause) microsoft (xxx) [it was before microsoft]

The construction of the turns is less straightforward to analyse since the turns in which self repetition takes places are not continuous, that is, these repetitions are interrupted by F1 and F15's turns. F1 is attempting to explain why she is not a digital native by stating that during her high school years she used to work with a different operating system, DOS, whose interface was a black screen and which appear before Windows. Then in lines 4 through 7, F1 and F15 are working together to try and determine the years in which DOS was used, but F3 relates DOS's black screen to a different operating system, Windows 98, in line 8 and then again in line 10. However, in lines 11 to 13, F1 and F15 continue with their previous task of trying to find the time when DOS was popular, but F3 does not seem to be willing to accept the course of the interaction as designed by her interlocutors and, in line 14, she paraphrases and repeats her previous turns by saying 'it's the software Windows 98'. F3's attempt to control the interaction in order to obtain the confirmation she needs is finally acknowledged by F1 in line 6 ('yeah yeah (.) what sorry') which is addressed to F3, and by F15's other repetition in line 22. From line 18 until the end of the exchange, we can observe how F1 and F15 have changed the course of their interaction to accommodate to F3's needs, as they have stopped trying to elucidate their doubt about times and DOS. Unfortunately for F3, this conundrum remains so, because in later turns (not

shown in the extract), they realise they are running out of time and they haven't fully discuss the tutor's questions; thus the conversation takes another turn.

F3's behaviour as seen in Exchange 4.10 is rather complex from the analytical point of view. On the one hand, she seems to be employing a divergent approximation strategy when she does not accept the way in which her colleagues are co-constructing the interaction, and her rejection is achieved by three occurrences of self repetition (lines 10, 14 and 17). Conversely, it is reasonable to believe that F3 is actually trying to converge to F1 specifically, as F3's self repetitions could evidence her desire to fully understand what is being discussed and, thus, engage in the conversation. To F3, understanding the distinction between these operating systems is crucial to this end.

One last example of self repetition used to control the floor is appreciated in observation #7b. As seen in exchange 4.3, the conversation revolves around the implications to adherence to English native speaker norms.

Exchange 4.11

1	M6:	but you know (xxx) an opinion. <louder> ok let's start with the first one </louder>
2	M2:	yeah
3	M6:	do YOU think – i think i don't need to repeat do i
4	M2:	er yeah [so what's your]
5	M6:	[so just let's start –]
6	M2:	**what's your** opinion
7	M6:	oh [what's my opinion]
8	F2/M2:	[@@]

This is a clear case of self repetition after overlapped talk, which is one of the uses of self repetition discussed by Kaur (2009) (see section 2.3.2.2). It happens at the beginning of the activity and M6's agenda is to start discussing the first question. Nonetheless, M2 has a slightly different plan, as he wants to know M6's opinion regarding native speaker ideology and feedback. In line 4, M2 starts the question, but his turn overlaps with M6's, which is another attempt to steer the discussion towards

the tutor's guidelines. In lines 6, self repetition takes place and M2 is finally able to complete his question initiated in that previous turn. M2 succeeds in controlling the course of the interaction as M6 provides his point of view in later turns (not shown in the exchange).

In short, speakers' objectives when using self repetition are twofold: they appear to use it to obtain more time while planning and improving their discourse, on the one hand, and to exert more control over the development of the interaction when this is not going according to their own plan, sometimes after interruptions and overlapped talk. It is also interesting to see how different self and other repetition are when it comes to accommodation strategies. As stated in the first part of this section, other repetition strongly relates to listenership and engagement, as well as the delivery and request of confirmation. In this regard, the display of other repetition as observed in this data set is aligned to discourse management skills in that other repetition is applied to facilitate interlocutor's contribution to the interaction and attend to their conversational needs. On the other hand, self repetition appears to be more closely related to interpersonal control strategies, because either explicitly or implicitly this type of repetition is used to direct the course of the interaction.

4.2.1.2 Self rephrase

Another common phenomenon found in the observation data is self rephrase with 21 clear occurrences. For analytical purposes, I have followed Kaur's distinction between repetitions and rephrases as explained in section 4.2.1. Thus, to identify cases of rephrase I have chosen those occurrences in which what is being resaid has significant lexical and/or syntactic changes, as opposed to minor phonological or morphological modifications. Having clarified this, it is worth remembering at this point that there were no clear instances of other rephrase in the data and that other repetition (section 4.2.1.1.1) prevails when it comes to using someone else's words and ideas. The lack of other rephrase might be the result of the degree of familiarity of the speakers had by

the time the data collection was conducted. Speakers were shadowed and audio recorded during the second term in university since I spent the first term doing a pilot study, selecting key participants and gaining admittance to this community of practice (as explained in section 3.3.4 on page 59). This familiarity could account for the participants' sound knowledge of one another's communicative styles, accents and idiosyncrasies. The uses of these twenty-one cases of self rephrase are threefold: (a) to repair formal aspects of language which might eventually lead to breakdown in communication, (b) to resume a point which was made when two turns have overlapped and (c) to enhance clarity even if there is no apparent danger to common understanding.

First, self rephrase as a repair strategy is closely linked to false starts and it often happens at the beginning of discourse boundaries or close to it, as seen in observation #19. In this class, students are sharing their struggles while planning their dissertation projects. Here, F1 is rephrasing her idea by using a lexical modification (lines 4 and 6), as this is marked by her abrupt cut-off, which indicates a sudden change. The word 'write' does not fit the following idea, and this is immediate corrected after the cut-off.

Exchange 4.12

1	F1:	but if i i narrow it down to self correction that's okay but (.) self correction is
2		connected to many: arguments like it is triggered by many things so =
3	M3:	= mhm =
4	F1:	= I have to **write** -
5	F6:	oh yes =
6	F1:	= **to read** about too many things and i don't know which ones - i mean i i kind of know
7		NOW but it's difficult and the structure as well the structure i'm going to follow (…) it's
8		also related to literature review because I don't know how much of the context i need
9		to (.) to know or
10	M3:	mhm
11	F1:	(xxx) how much <low> the (xxx) </low> -

The following exchange comes from observation #7a, with F2 and M2 and incidental participant F8 from the UK, and it also shows self rephrase as a repair strategy. Again, we see the key participants in a lesson where the status of English in the world is the

main theme. The group are discussing tutors' feedback in general, and F2 has brought up her experience as an undergraduate student of English in Japan and how her use of the palatal affricate voice consonant / dʒ / was a problem for one of her professors back in her home country.

Exchange 4.13

1	F2:	= yeah they like the: (.) **accura accuracy** @@ (xxx) **accurate grammar** and (.) some
2		professors are really strict to the pronunciations (.) for english? so i was /corre/ –
3		corrected the pronunciation of (.) /dʒ/ sounds? @@
4	F8:	which sound
5	F2:	/dʒ/ sound magic for example [/dʒ/ /dʒ/ sound]
6	M2:	[a:h]
7	F2:	yeah so –
8	M2:	(was that) difficult for you to pronounce
9	F2:	NO i i don't noticed i:: **pronounced** – **MISpronounced** [that word]
10	M2:	[ok]
11	F2:	but he recognised [the error]
12	M2:	[ah ok]

In line 1, we can observe self repetition ('accura accuracy') being applied in conjunction with self rephrase ('accurate grammar'). Apparently, F2 does not think that self repetition of the noun 'accuracy', which is not completely uttered the first time, is successful or that the word suited her message well, so she changes the noun 'accuracy' to the nominal phrase 'accurate grammar' in which the new focus is 'grammar' as opposed to 'accuracy'. This change is marked by F2's laughter, which might indicate a certain degree of discomfort or nervousness on her part, probably because she considers this repetition as a sign of dysfluency. The second case of self rephrase in this exchange reflects the same remedial intention. In line 9, F2 explains M2 that she was not aware of her alleged issues with the pronunciation of that English consonant, and although she initially uses the word 'pronounced' she does not seem happy with this lexical choice and after an abrupt cut-off she rephrases by using the opposite: 'mispronounced'. The extra emphasis or word stress on the first syllable of 'mispronounce' might indicate that F2 does not want this modification to go unnoticed

by her colleagues. One might argue that the occurrence of self rephrase in line 9 is actually a case of self repetition, on the basis that an addition of an affix is a minor morphological change. Notwithstanding this, a derivational prefix like 'mis' –when attached to nouns, adjectives, or verbs as it is the case in line 9 – will bring about a considerable change in the meaning of the word. In this case, the first meaning does not suit the remaining message and F3 needs the opposite meaning.

The second use of self rephrase as observed in this data is one that has already been discussed by Kaur (200): self rephrase after overlapped talk. The following excerpt is the continuation of Exchange 4.10, where F1, F3 and F15 are trying to figure out the difference between Windows and DOS.

Exchange 4.14

1	F1:	BEFORE the software	
2	F3:	<surprised> before	[software </surprised> (.) (xxx)
3	F1:		[before before software we (worked) like this (.) we had to
4			code
5	F15:		[yeah
6	F1:	**we had to create to to create folders we had to introduce the codes** =	

In this exchange, F1 is still trying to explain how DOS worked when she used it in secondary school. The fact that she had enter the computer commands by means of codes is what F1 deems as the key factor to define DOS, so in lines 3 and 4, she refers to this. However, this explanation overlaps with the on-going turns of both F3 and F15 in lines 2 and 5 respectively. Given this overlapping and the possibility of not being heard, plus the relevance F1 attaches to this information, she performs a self-rephrasing move in line 6, to resume her point about coding and introducing new information to her previous idea from lines 3 and 4; that is, coding implied creating folders and introducing codes.

Finally, the third foremost reason why speaker incorporate self rephrase in their spoken interaction is to enhance the clarity of the message, even if there is no evidence of problems or infelicities in communication. For example, in observation #16 with F2 and M1 working on verb + nominal collocations (as seen in exchange 4.2), we can see how F2 modifies part of her message, perhaps to make her point even clearer.

Exchange 4.15

1 **M1:** and they say that a corpus has been compiled on the basis of what appears in
2 newspapers or in er people who have been recorded er in their speech (.) so: (.) it it
3 makes you wonder what kind of conversations or texts they are er paying attention to
4 **F2:** <soft> yeah </soft> so it (largely) depend on their personal preference =
5 **M1:** = yes =
6 F2: = **for using the word** – **selection of the words**

After they have gone through the list of collocation from the hand-out, M1 makes some reflections about corpora, and in lines 1 through 3 he is expressing his curiosity regarding the source of the texts that are used for corpora. In line 4, F2 starts to expand on M1's previous turn by relating corpora to personal choices. Although it is not 100% clear from any of the turns in the conversation who the possessive adjective 'their' refers to (people in general or those in charge of a corpus), F2's focus in her turn at talk in line 6 is on the action rather than who performs it. 'For using the word', a prepositional phrase with a present participial non-finite clause as a complement to the preposition 'for', becomes 'selection of words', a nominal phrase with a similar meaning. It is difficult to know whether F2 associates this prepositional phrase with a source of problem or not, but this phrase does not seem problematic. F2's self rephrase might be the result of her wanting to heighten the intelligibility of her point so as to strengthen her contribution.

Self rephrase is a frequent strategy used by all key participants, it is employed as a repair strategy when there is some dysfluency in formal aspects of language that might impede interlocutors' understanding; it is also useful to regain control of the interaction after overlapped talk and when the point being rephrased is considered

important by the speaker who continues the turn, and to enhance the clarity of ideas. In this sense, self rephrase seems to be aligned to interpersonal control strategies when it is employed to recuperate a turn that has been delivered at the same time as others. It also seems reasonable to believe that self-rephrasing is linked to interpretability strategies when used as a repair strategy or for enhanced clarity, in that when a speaker rephrases their speech for such purposes, what they are doing is to modify their production in order to facilitate common understanding, and they are probably doing so based on their interpretation of their interlocutors' ability to understand. In this sense, interpretability strategies observed in these classroom interactions are somehow different from the more traditional perspective of these strategies. CAT has described interpretability as the simplification of the complexity of speech based on speaker's assessment of interlocutors' language proficiency, as what is seen in teacher's talk in a language classroom. However, what my participants do when they self rephrase is not simplification of language aspects as such; instead, they seem to offer an alternative explanation – whether a problem has occurred or not – so as to ensure the common understanding is achieved.

4.2.2 Utterance Completion

Based on the definition provided by Cogo and Dewey (2006) of utterance completion (UC) as those instances 'when an interlocutor tries to complete the utterance of the current speaker' (p. 68), the analysis of the transcripts indicates that there are considerably fewer instances of UC compared to overlapping (175 against 3). Notwithstanding this, one should not disregard the relevance of this strategy with respect to interactional behaviour. First of all, instances of UC can be considered successful in that 2 out of 3 speakers' contributions were accepted by the interlocutor whose utterance was completed. This evidences the participants' engagement and alignment in the interaction and their willingness to accept collaboration from other interlocutors, as observed in exchange 6, taken from observation #10 (see 3.3.5.3 on page 67).

In this instance, key participant F3 and myself, in my role as participant observer, are discussing F3's preliminary research questions for her Master's degree dissertation. Based on what F3 had told me about her plan and objectives, in lines 1 to 3 I suggested another approach to her research questions, related to her participants' attitudes towards corrective feedback in an EAP class. However, F3 was rather apprehensive about the observation of attitudes, as perceived in line 6.

Exchange 4.16

1	F14:	(you have) (.) and that's another perhaps research question that you can ask (.) does
2		the attitude change (.) in the first four weeks of of o:f of presessional course (.) with
3		respect to the previous experience (.) is there [any change]
4	F3:	[a::h] (.) [is the -]
5	F14:	[why]
6	F3:	**but you say if i do in observation /is/ quite hard to:: -**
7	F14:	**observe attitudes** =
8	F3:	= yeah
9	F14:	but the value of observations is that when when there is error correction? you will
10		observe what type of error correction =

F3's plan was to obtain most of her data from classroom observation. Perhaps wanting to link this plan to my suggestion about attitudes change, F3 indicates that she has a concern regarding observation (line 6). The evident lengthening of the vowel in the word 'to' prompted me to complete her idea by saying 'observe attitudes' (a concept F3 had frequently mentioned throughout our interaction). My utterance completion was accepted by F3 as perceived in line 8.

It could be argued that my strategy to converge towards F3 and attend to her needs was influenced by my role as a researcher searching for, or even deliberately prompting instances of accommodation. Nonetheless, I always perceived my role in the classroom during the data collection stage as a continuum between researcher and participant observer. In this sense, I approached every instance of observation bearing in mind Hammersley & Atkinson's conceptualization of the researcher's role and how this role needs to be negotiated, implicitly or explicitly, with participants (see 3.2.2 for discussion on participant observation). Thus, my identity moved along this continuum

and, on occasions, I acted as a slightly more experienced peer or critical friend, as it were, as it was the case in observation #10.

Another instance in which a collaborative utterance building is welcomed by the interlocutor comes from observation #16 in which the task assigned to students is to generate ideas on how to incorporate language corpora in the language classroom, particularly in the teaching of collocations. Key participants M1 and F2 are working together and have been using the handout to analyse sample collocations. Later in the conversation, they digress from the task slightly and start talking about how some expressions from the 1990s have become obsolete.

Exchange 4.17

1 **M1:** = one of the expressions from the nineties by now may may have become history
2 **F2:** mhm yeah maybe (xxx) days people use other words related to the technologies
3 [(and)]
4 **M1:** [yeah]
5 **F2:** computers (xxx) [terms]
6 **M1:** [some] some words have become obsolete
7 **F2:** <soft> yea:h </soft> (.) so maybe ipads or (xxx)
8 **M1:** do you remember in the in the nineties i suppose people in order to (.) er contact
9 them. they used a pager? that –
10 **F2:** (xxx)
11 **M1:** that in in [place 1] it was called by this name -
12 F2: **beeper?**
13 **M1:** ah you are too young

In lines 8 – 9, M1 is describing what he calls 'a pager' to F2 who is much younger than him. Later in line 11, M1 states that in his country (place 1) the object has a particular name. It's hard to say whether M1 was going to repeat the word he had used before (pager) or whether he was actually looking for a different term as there is no indication that he is hesitating or searching for a word; similarly, it is risky to state that F2 interpreted M1's intervention as a request for assistance, but the fact remains that in line 12 F2 completed M1's utterance with 'beeper' which she deemed a suitable alternative to 'pager'. Regardless of the reasons why F2 decided to intervene by

completing M1's sentence, it is safe to say that F2 contributed to the discussion by doing collaborative UC. Her contribution was later accepted by M1, who uses the word 'beeper' (not shown in the exchange due to space considerations).

Finally, there is one instance of utterance completion that was rejected by the interlocutor. In the initial section of observation #4a, key participants F1 and F3, plus incidental participant F15 are discussing the differences between digital natives and digital immigrants. Prior to this exchange, F1 had been trying to clarify the concept of digital natives to F3 by stating that unlike F3, she is not one, but a digital immigrant.

Exchange 4.18

1 F3: yes? compute:r [er phone – (.) y: you (xxx) when you born you have no computer?
2 wow
3 F1: [yeah cause when I was born there was no computers that's – so I'm a
4 (xxx) (.) yeah in schools in schools there was no computers
5 F3: <surprised> really </surprised>
6 F1: yes
7 F15: but you can use it now [(xxx)
8 F1: [I can use it but still (.) probably there is a difference that's
9 why we [should discover
10 F15: [but not a big difference]
11 F1: we have two we have two different –
12 F3: **kind of**
13 F1: **kind of** –
14 F3: **computer?**
15 F1: **students** (.) regarding that
16 F3: mhm. are you native or an immigrant

F3 seems to be rather surprised by the fact that F1 did not have nor used a computer when she was a child and probably wants to find out more about this, as evidenced in line 7. However, F1 seems to be more concerned with the task they need to fulfil which is to determine to which group their own students belong (digital natives or digital immigrants), since in lines 8-9 she tries to change the course of the interaction to the discussion of the question given by the tutor by saying 'probably there is a difference that's why we should discover'. In line 11, F1 tries to steer the discussion

towards the completion of the activity but is interrupted by F3's UC which is accepted and incorporated by F1 in line 13, including the omission of the inflectional morpheme '-s' for plural nouns. This incorporation of non-standard forms by F1 is a strong indication of how ELF users can show alignment and how this is more important that grammatical 'correctness' according to standard language. However, this convergence soon becomes the opposite in lines 13 and 14, when once again F3 completes F1's utterance by saying 'computers' probably because she wanted to learn more about F1's arguable lack of experience with this kind of machines. On this occasion, F3's collaboration is rejected by F1 as observed in line 15 when she says 'students' in an attempt to redirect to conversation back to the tutor's initial question. F1's rejection can be said to result from her desire to complete the task given by the tutor rather than an attempt to contradict F3.

From these three last exchanges, it can be concluded so far that UC closely relates to approximation strategies, namely convergence (Giles et al. 1991). Nonetheless, not only can UC be linked to approximation strategies, but since it indicates collaborative interactional behaviour as it shows attentiveness and support to the interlocutor (Kaur 2011) as seen in exchanges 6 and 7. UC also falls into the category of discourse management strategies, defined as those moves whereby speakers attune to others' conversational needs and facilitate their contribution to the talk (Giles et al., 1991). Furthermore, Cogo (2010) explains that UC may account for both cooperative and competitive behaviour; however, in ELF interactions UC is likely to be applied to show listener's involvement and support, rather than to take over the turn in the interaction according to (Cogo & Dewey, 2006). The exchanges presented in this section of chapter 4 are proof of this. While it is true that showing involvement and cooperating are the reasons behind the application of UC, one cannot deny that this strategy is sometimes used an interpersonal control to push one's own agenda as F3 does.

4.2.3 Simultaneous Talk

Following the CA methodological tools, the turn-by-turn development was analysed in the sequential order it was designed by the participants holding the turns. For the identification and analysis of simultaneous talk, instances in which two or more participants spoke at the same time were considered. The overlapped talk might correspond to the complete turn delivered by one of the participants, or to part of it only. Simultaneous talks in which the words are unintelligible or the speakers are laughing at the same time were not considered in the final count, as their analysis might have rendered unreliable conclusions.

With this in mind, the total number of overlapping talk observed in the data amounts to 175 instances, from which 141 have been classified as cooperative and 34 as competitive. In order to facilitate the difficult task of determining whether an occurrence of simultaneous talk is cooperative or competitive the following criteria were applied when analysing the transcription of the overlapped adjacency pairs:

Cooperative overlapping: (a) use of perceivable falling intonation by one or more speakers involved signalling a transition relevant place (TPR), (b) presence of short exchanges like backchannelling to indicate agreement to what is being said by one of the speakers involved, and (c) when a speaker is asking a question and the addressee's answer overlaps with such request for information or confirmation.

Competitive overlapping: (a) presence of an abrupt cut off (signalled with – in the transcription) indicating that the speaker holding the turn has been interrupted by an interlocutor, (b) linked to the previous use, the fact that the interrupted participant regained the turn in following lines, and (c) use of louder volume to obtain the turn held by another participant.

Compared to other phenomena, which are described in other sections of this chapter, simultaneous talk is by far the most frequently observed strategy in the data. This can be explained by the nature of the classroom interaction and tasks assigned to participants by their tutors. These tasks often required students working in small groups to answer questions related to the topics being discussed in class at any given moment. Roles were not assigned by tutors, and group members usually established very symmetrical relationships in which there was no clear authoritative figure among the students. Moreover, conversations around the task were spontaneous in that group members did not have much time to plan their interventions. These factors made the observed interactions rich in overlapping as turns were not previously organised and participants were free to talk at any point during the activity.

The following sections provide an account of how simultaneous talk is realised by key participants while doing these classroom tasks. I will continue by describing cooperative overlapping and will close section 4.2.3 with a discussion on competitive simultaneous talk.

4.2.3.1 Cooperative Simultaneous Talk

Within the 175 occurrences of simultaneous talk, it can be observed that most instances of overlapped turns (141) do not seem to be perceived as competitive moves or violations by the participants in this particular event. Cogo & Dewey's (2012) conceptualization of overlapping as a cooperative phenomenon seems to be in line with most of the behaviour observed in my data, in that key speakers are not attempting to obtain the floor and take the next relevant turn.

The first example of cooperative overlapping comes from observation #3 and shows class interaction between key participant M1, a Spanish speaker, and two incidental participants of Arabic background. In this class activity, students were asked to discuss plans for their dissertation projects and encouraged to share ideas with one another.

In the following exchange, M1 seems to be requesting further clarification in order to understand F7's situation:

Exchange 4.19

M1: you will not go back to your countries to do this
F7: i have to do because my father's er (xxx) visa expires (inaudible) oh yeah now it's complicated we can't i can't stay while he's not here i have to be accompanied by a male er guardian
M1: [**a:h this is because of your beliefs**
F7: [**yeah yeah that's why i had to leave <soft> (xxx) </soft>**
M1: is there is there any male guardian that you can bring?
F7: e:r there's my my brothers but er they they will not get the work re release to be here so that's why
M1: i can appLY for that
F7: @@@ to be my guardian?
M1: yes yes yes i am i am your cousin M1's name from [place 3] (.) that you haven't seen in fifty years @@
F7:

In line 1, M1 asks F7 whether she is going to do her data collection back in her home country, to which she says that she will have to go back regardless of this, because of her father's visa expire date. She adds that since she cannot stay in the UK without a male guardian, she will have to go back with her father (lines 2 to 4). In line 5, M1's overlapping turn seems to aim at obtaining confirmation regarding the underlying reasons why F7 needs a male guardian to stay in the UK. On the other hand, F7's overlapping turn in line 6 is a response to M1's clarification request. F7 does not continue speaking after providing this clarification. Therefore, the overlapping line in 6 seems not to be intended to take the floor, but simply to provide the information requested. The exchange of information about the issue continues in lines 7 and 8, where M1 asks further questions and F7 provides the answers, and finalises with M1's humorous remarks in lines 10, and 12 and 13. These final comments evidence the positive interpersonal relationship participants have at this point in their long-term interaction during the course.

From the field notes corresponding to this interaction, it can be concluded that the task they needed to perform allowed for a more casual and relaxed class environment, as the only job they needed to do was to discuss their preliminary thoughts about their dissertations. They did not need to produce a material outcome such as a brief presentation or a short document evidencing their conclusions of the discussion. This fact apparently allowed the participants to create their own agendas and diverge in terms of topic management. Had the task been different, it seems reasonable to think that participants would have had to work towards achieving a concrete task more quickly, leaving less or no room for interpersonal engagement and, if this had been the case, maybe the overlapping instances would have been of a more competitive nature such as the ones observed by Wolfartsberger (2011) (see section 2.3.2.4 for previous discussion).

As stated in the literature review chapter on page 35, determining whether an occurrence of overlapped speech is competitive or cooperative is quite a challenging

task because overlapping that results in interruptions can be driven by the intention to become engaged in the conversation, i.e., cooperation can be the driving force behind simultaneous talk that seems to be competitive (Cogo and Dewey 2012). The following exchange taken from observation #4a illustrates such difficulty. Here, key participants F1 and F3, and incidental participant F15 are discussing the question 'are your students digital natives or digital immigrants'. F3 seems to have some difficulties to grasp the distinction between these two concepts, so F1 has been providing some examples to help F3 understand this difference.

Exchange 4.20

1	F1:	so when you were born? (.) you had er – you didn't – you weren't born with a
2		mobile phone but (.) probably - (.) what what age were you when you: -
3		[**how old were you** –
4	F3:	[**e:r how old let me** (.) maybe in my: -
5	F1:	when you had a mobile phone (xxx) –
6	F3:	mobiles
7	F1:	YEAH
8	F3:	mobile phone in my m:: in my high school. i have a mobile phone
9	F1:	ok i didn't –
10	F3:	and i play computer when i was like twelve years old?

In lines 1 to 3, F1 is trying to ask F3 how old she was when she starting using a mobile phone to determine whether F3 is a digital native. In line 3, F1 is interrupted by F3 who begins to answer F1's question. F3's hesitation marker 'e:r' overlaps with such question and it is a signal for F1 to pause. Line 5 provides evidence to state that F1 had not yet finished her turn, as we can finally see the complete question 'how old were you when you had a mobile phone'. If we take into account this instance of interruption, we could state that this move corresponds to a competitive overlap and, thus a divergent move in which F3 is applying am interpersonal control strategy, trying to direct the course of interaction by interrupting. However, it could be argued that F3's intervention in line 4 is an attempt to align to F1's needs in that F3 is facilitating F1's contribution. Lines 1 to 3 evidence F1's struggle to formulate the question; there are four instances of false starts and subsequent reformulations, and despite this, F3

has been successful in understanding the question and providing the information requested from her. Based on this, it is safe to say that by interrupting and overlapping, F3 is making use of a discourse management strategy whereby she is helping her interlocutor, F1, to obtain the information she requires.

As seen in section 2.3.2.5, Konakahara (2015) studied simultaneous talk in a setting which is similar to the one that is presented in this project, albeit a different type of interaction as she analysed casual interactions of graduate students. She found that overlapped speakers often surrender their turn to the overlapping one, in order to resolve the overlap. What happens in Exchange 4.20 resembles her finding because F1, the overlapped speaker, gives up her turn momentarily so that F3 can contribute to the search for the overlapping resolution. However, it seems to be the case that F1 feels the need to finish her turn, as seen in line 5 of this exchange, probably because specifying that the question about F3's age focuses on a particular event in life (that of having access to a cellular phone for the first time) is relevant for F1. Apparently, this intention to finish the question makes F1 wait for a TRP, which is given at the end of line 4 when F3 lengthens the vowel sound in 'my', to finish her previous turn and complete her intended meaning. F1's regaining of the turn in line 5 seems to be of an uncompetitive nature and to respond to her need to complete the question and imprint more precision to her message and, if this is the case, F1 is following CAT's tenets that states that interlocutors converge for the sake of enhanced explicitness and communication success. What is more, F1's relinquishing of her turn after the overlapping goes in line with Konakahara's conclusions in that neither the overlapping speaker nor the overlapped one seem to consider simultaneous speech as an attempt to interrupt and they show no major signs of conflicts with respect to turn distribution, thus projecting their desire to clarify ambiguous aspects of previous turns, and to contribute to the development of the conversation.

A further example of how cooperative simultaneous talk can present certain characteristics that might make it appear competitive is found in the beginning of the same observation.

Exchange 4.21

1 F3: are your students digital natives (.) e:r could you please tell me what is digital natives?
2 F15: digital natives maybe you're born to: -
3 F1: is the generation that is born=
4 F15: = yes =
5 F1: = with the:
6 F15: (xxx) [**generation**
7 F1: [**when when when is er – when did you:** - **er** (…) **when were you born.**
8 F3: when i born?
9 F1: yeah

This section of the observed interaction begins with F3's request for help, namely a definition of the concept of 'digital natives'. Lines 3 to 6 provide a clear example of how ELF users collaborate to co-construct meaning, but in lines 7 and 8 this desire to collaborate and attend to F3's needs enters a somewhat competitive phase with F1, a key participant, and F15, an incidental participant who is not a frequent interlocutor in the group as she is a visiting scholar on a short visit to the university. It could be argued, however, that what F1 and F15 are doing this to collaborate in partnership to facilitate F3's understanding of the task ahead, which is to determine whether the students they teach back in their home countries are digital natives or immigrants. Again, rather than competition to keep their turn, what F1 and F15 are doing is to apply a discourse management strategy to encourage F3's participation.

In the following section, examples of simultaneous talk of a clear competitive nature will be described.

4.2.3.2 Competitive Simultaneous Talk

Although competitive overlapping occurrences are considerably fewer than their cooperative counterparts, these instances of competition are significant inasmuch as they allow us to believe that the immediate communicative context, namely the objective of the particular interaction as well as the participants' desire to control the

course of the conversation, is more important that being convergent and showing cooperation in ELF interactions.

In observation #7b (see 3.3.5.3), which corresponds to a class in which English as a Lingua Franca aspects are discussed, there are a few examples of overlapping being used to compete, gain the floor and control the course of the conversation. In this particular group activity, students were asked to provide their opinions on adherence to native speaker norms in a university where English is the medium of instruction but where most students are international. Key participant M2 seems to be very engaged with the discussion and contributes with many ideas about his current experience as a non-native speaker of English in an English-speaking context.

Exchange 4.22

1 M2: yeah i i i think in east asia people like to follow the
2 [**authority things yeah. i could go to**
3 M6: [**yeah yeah yeah there's** –
4 M2: <loud> [place 12] but [place 12] is not THAT authority as [place 14] </loud>
5 M6: m: it's a huge issue you know attitude towa toward the language um in [place 13] too
6 you know people would (xxx) you know who speak er (maybe later on) this person
7 who speak well? they mea:n? they could be like native native this is the attitude you
8 still you know (xxx) you know going on in in (xxx)

In this exchange, key participant M2 is explaining to the group how much he believes people from East Asia, where he is from, are attached to native speaker norms when it comes to using English, when he is interrupted by M6, an incidental participant from East Asia too. M6's attempt to control the interaction is not acknowledged by M2 who manages to hold his turn by using increasing the volume of his voice (line 4). It seems more important for M2 to explain his reasons for choosing an English speaking country (place 14) as opposed to a place in East Asia where English is spoken as a second language (place 12) than to attend to M6's wish to take the floor.

Later in the same conversation, M2 continues with his divergent strategies towards M6 who had also stated earlier that he chose the university in an English speaking country

to start his graduate studies because the programme he wanted to do cannot be found anywhere else. M2 wants to know whether M6 would still choose an English speaking environment over another place where English is not the spoken language outside the educational context but which has a university with a higher ranking.

Exchange 4.23

1	M2:	i have i have a question for you. what if you're you're studying in – you /have/ a choice
2		between [place 12] university or [place 14] university [**which one do you choose**]
3	F13:	[**which one** –]
4	M2:	even if the first –
5	M6:	of course of course the [place 14] university =
6	F13:	= why =
7	M2:	= yes that's (xxx) @@
8	M6:	no no actually (xxx why) because i have no idea about [place 12] university
9		[**i have** –]
10	M2:	[**i mean**] i mean the: - the university in [place 12] their ranking is even higher than
11		[[place 4]]
12	M6:	[higher]
13	M2:	so which one would you choose. you choose [[place 4].]
14	M6:	[well it] it would depend on many many things to be honest i mean e:r

In line 2, M2's turn is interrupted by F13's attempt to repeat M2's question, but this interruption is not acknowledged by M2 who attempts to finish his question in line 4. It can be argued from lines 2 and 3 that collaborative and competitive motives are faced with each other in this adjacency pair. On the one hand, F13's turn in line 3 seems to indicate that she wants to cooperate with M2's request for information. On the other hand, M2 seems to be unwilling to accept F13's assistance and give away his turn as he continues elaborating his question in line 4; in other words, it can be said that M2 is competing in order to retain the floor.

The competitive nature of this exchange is observed once more in lines 9 and 10, where M6 is interrupted by M2. In lines 8 and 9, M6 explains the reasons for his choice by saying that this is due to his lack of knowledge of the university in East Asia (place 12), but M2 resumes his point with overlapping to clarify that the East Asian university

ranks higher than the university where they are both studying (place 4). All these moves seem to indicate that M2 is applying interpersonal control strategies to direct the course of the interaction in his favour as he seems to be trying to prove a point: East Asian students prefer universities in English speaking environments regardless of their academic reputation.

Wolfartsberger (2011) had previously documented the competitive nature of overlaps in her study of Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF) interactions (see 2.3.2.4), in order to explain that convergence is not the only driving force behind ELF encounters. As the examples of simultaneous talk in this section show, Wolfartsberger's data also evidence a duality in the use of this strategy in that the overlaps she analysed were either cooperative or competitive. Based on her analysis, she stated that collaborative overlaps can take the form of pre-emptive completion, when a speaker does not wait for the current speaker to finish their turn before responding, or the form of assistance in word search, where the help that is being offered overlaps with the current speaker's turn. On the other hand, competitive overlaps in her data take the form of interruptions aimed at showing disagreement, as the need to disambiguate key concepts in the business world is more important than showing interpersonal alignment.

Based on this project's observed data, it can be stated that there are similarities in both data sets. Regarding cooperative simultaneous talk, the occurrences analysed in the present chapter seem to indicate that collaborative overlapping happens when: (a) an interlocutor chooses not to wait for the current speaker's turn to be over to show agreement and confirm that speaker's point (Exchange 4.19), (b) an interlocutor wishes to collaborate by providing requested information, especially when the current speaker is having problems with the formulation of an utterance (Exchange 4.20), and (c) when one or more interlocutors wish to cooperate when someone's understanding is at risk (Exchange 4.21). Exchanges 4.20 and 4.21 clearly resonate with the different levels of accommodation as explained by Jenkins (2022), in that they correspond to responsive accommodation strategies. Although there is not rephrasing in these two

instances, one interlocutor has indicated that there is a problem or has detected one, and the overlapping is a way to works towards finding a resolution for the problem.

With regard to competitive simultaneous talk, the exchanges presented in this chapter, in line with Wolfartberger's conclusions, also point to the fact that this type of overlapping is employed by ELF users so as to show a certain level of disagreement. Unlike BELF interaction, where the principal objective of competitive overlaps is the disambiguation of crucial ideas or concepts, in academic ELF contexts the disagreement does not relate strongly to said disambiguation, but to a desire to take control of the course of the interaction in order to provide a strong opinion and/or to question an interlocutor's idea. Rather than disambiguation, what is at stake here is the need to encourage academic discussion even, and to this end, a clear and uninterrupted presentation of one's ideas seems to be fundamental, even if this implies a divergent – sometimes face-threatening – attitude towards other participants.

4.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have applied the methodological principles of CA to attempt to answer the first research question: In the context of communication accommodation theory, how are accommodation strategies applied in ELF interactions in a UK international university setting? More precisely, I was looking to study what they actually do in order to accommodate, the factors that either hinder or contribute to accommodative behaviour, and the extent to which the use communication accommodation strategies in different ways.

For the purpose of this analysis, I have understood and applied accommodation as an umbrella term that comprises not only divergence and convergence (approximation strategies), but also discourse management, interpretability, and interpersonal control

strategies. This is because I believe it is important to go beyond divergence and convergence and to look into the different ways whereby speakers modify (or not) their linguistic behaviour. What is more, these strategies are not mutually exclusive; instead, they can complement one another to allow for a more complex way for speakers to achieve their purposes.

In this respect, there exists a strong methodological link between CAT and CA, in that they both observe social aspects and practices that are employed through interaction. Consequently, in order to study naturally occurring talk and how speakers orient to conversational patterns of accommodation, CA is the optimal choice as it allows a substantial degree of attention to detail to the sequential organization of interactive spontaneous spoken language.

Therefore, based on the analysis of the observed class interactions, it can be concluded so far that repetition and rephrasing are strategies that are used in spoken interaction frequently. On the one hand, other repetition is a strategy that seems to be applied with different purposes compared to its counterpart: self repetition. From my data, we can gather that other repetition fulfils two main functions in the development of talk: it is used to display engagement and listenership towards interlocutors' ideas, points and opinions, as well as to ascertain comprehensibility and confirm information that has been given in a prior turn. In this sense, other repetition responds to the need to apply discourse management strategies with the intention of facilitating interlocutors' participation. Thus, other repetition can be said to possess a highly convergent drive.

On the other hand, when it comes to self repetition we are facing a different approach to interaction in that it is more aligned to interpersonal control strategies than discourse management ones. When it comes to interpersonal control, self repetition is useful to obtain time to plan discourse and to direct the course of the interaction after interruptions and overlapping. Similarly, self rephrase also aims at exerting that interpersonal control when self paraphrasing comes after overlapped talk. However, there is another dimension to self rephrase, and this is reflected in the other two uses

observed in the data: to repair aspects of language which could eventually lead to breakdown in communication, and to increase clarity even if there is no apparent danger to common understanding. This means that when self-rephrasing is used as a repair strategy and a means to enhance the intelligibility of the message when there is no evidence of non or misunderstanding from interlocutors, a speaker is applying an interpretability strategy as they are modifying the language behaviour because they are likely to be making assumptions on the speaker's capacity to understand and whether this capacity is being affected by their delivery. An interpretability approach to interaction is pre-emptive by nature.

It is also interesting to see how rephrasing shows greater emphasis on the 'self' than on the 'other'. In this data set, there are instances of self rephrase only, and other rephrase is absent. This might be an indication of speakers' pro-active approach to interaction, and their remarkable capacity to identify potential conflicts that might lead to breakdowns in communication, and to act accordingly. In this regard, although there is only one instance of pre-empting, where we can see a speaker proactively working towards achieving shared understanding, it is safe to say that the interaction we have observed within this academic setting is highly pre-emptive as the cases of self rephrase are frequent.

We can also draw a parallel between other repetition and utterance completion (UC) in that both are discourse management strategies aimed at facilitating interlocutors' participation in these class activities. The pertinence of an UC move is assessed by the interlocutor whose idea has been completed, and in this sense, a completion can be accepted or rejected. According to the observed data, UCs are welcome when they do not disrupt the direction of the discourse. However, it is important to remember the context from which this data was gathered. These interactions are not casual social gatherings in which there is more freedom to change topics. On the contrary, key participants in this study had a task in hand and on many occasions they were required to share the results of their discussion. Given these conditions, it is not surprising that

an UC is rejected when the completion does not fit within the discourse students co-construct in order to complete a task. This might explain why, in my data, one instance of UC was not accepted.

Finally, the analysis of simultaneous talk provides evidence to sustain that ELF interactions can also have a competitive nature, although cooperative overlapping is still the norm. According to this data, collaborative simultaneous talk happens when an interlocutor does not wait for the current speaker's turn to finish before showing agreement and confirmation, wishes to collaborate by providing requested information when the current speaker is having problems with the construction of an utterance, and when one or more interlocutors wish to cooperate when someone's understanding is at risk. On the other hand, competitive simultaneous talk is employed to display disagreement. In the context of this university setting, overlapping becomes competitive when speakers feel the need to control of the course of the interaction so as to provide a strong opinion or to question an interlocutor's idea, which might be indicative of divergent behaviour.

In this respect, collaborative overlapping has characteristics from both discourse management and interpretability strategies, because this type of overlapping occurs when a speaker wishes to facilitate interlocutors' contributions and also because speakers' might make assumptions on the language proficiency of a speaker who holds the turn at talk with a certain degree of difficulty. However, when it comes to competitive simultaneous turns, interpersonal control strategies come to play as overlapping of this kind occurs as a result of an attempt to control the floor.

As seen in section 1.3, Sachdev et al (2013) placed the theory of accommodation within the context of studies of multilingualism, which is highly relevant for the interpretation and discussion of the results this study has yielded so far. First, these authors state that the immediate context and participants' positioning with respect to the communicative situation influence the choice of language(s) to be used. Although in this project translanguaging seem to be absent from participants' language practices

and interactions, a parallel between Sachdev et al's choice of language and the participants' choice of accommodation strategies can be drawn in that the strategies chosen and applied by the participants respond to both the immediate context (a classroom setting) and their positioning with respect to the communicative situation (students completing academic tasks). In this respect the choice of discourse management strategies (such as cooperative overlapping or other repetition) which aim at the facilitation of interlocutors' contribution to the interaction, considerably surpasses the use of interpersonal control strategies, which can be more detrimental to positive interpersonal relationships within a well-established community like this group of graduate students.

Sachdev et al. (2013) claim that there are two main motives or causes related to convergence: social attractiveness or the desire to obtain other people's approval, including their social network; and communicative efficiency or enhancement of mutual understanding. Most of the exchanges presented in the present chapter provide evidence to assure that interlocutors in academic settings, where English is the preferred language choice, have both motives in mind while interacting with one another. In other words, their accommodation behaviour helps them to not only enhance their social attractiveness and maintain their positive intragroup identity, but also to ensure mutual understanding, which is essential in an academic setting like this, where the successful completion of tasks is of the essence for the professional goals. Converging in an intercultural context like this one is perceived more positively than diverging or maintaining, as it is indexical of efficiency and cooperation, as stated by Sachdev et al. Converging in this context does not have to do with the adaptation of accents or grammatical forms, but with the application of other elements of CAT which might have been somehow underexplored in the field of ELF. In other words, convergence takes the shape of discourse management and interpretability strategies.

In the following chapter, I will provide the analysis of the three rounds of interviews conducted at different stages of the data collection process, with the objective of

answering the second main research question: the extent to which the participants in the study are aware of their accommodative behaviour and that of their interlocutors.

Chapter 5 Interview Analysis and Discussion

This chapter will present and discuss the results of the three rounds of semi structured interviews carried out with each key participant of this study. As seen in section 3.3.5.2, together with the class interaction observation, the data set comprises three different rounds of individual interviews, each one with a different objective. The first interview was held at the beginning of data collection, at the end of March 2014 and after participants had completed the questionnaire, which happened approximately a month before, in late February 2014. In this interview, participants were asked to narrate and reflect upon their previous experiences using English outside their home country, starting with their travels prior to attending their postgraduate course in the UK. The second interview was conducted in the middle of the data collection process, around two months after the first interview in May 2014, and it revolved around participants' level of awareness of the communication accommodation behaviour of other actors in their academic community, especially their tutors but also their classmates. Finally, the third set of interviews was conducted after the class interaction observation data was gathered and the taught component of the programmes finished. Depending on participants' availability, the interview took place in different months as some participants travelled around the UK and nearby countries, and others were not contactable due to personal issues. This interview aimed at looking into impressions of their own communication accommodation behaviour as well as their interlocutors' from the observed and recorded interaction.

Once this part of the data collection was finalised, the fifteen interviews (three for each one of the five key participants) were transcribed using a set of conventions taken from those used in the transcription of observation data (see Appendix F on page 253 for details). Since the analysis of the interviews was not going to performed with CA and there was no need for such a detailed battery of transcription conventions, all interviews were transcribed using a simplified set of codes (see

Appendix G on page 257). Interviews with F1 and M1 were conducted in Spanish, as it is a common language I share with these participants, but the extracts that are presented in this chapter have been translated into English. All transcribed interviews were then input into NVivo 12 for thematic analysis in which the coding of themes captured the participants' key ideas related to their experiences, conceptualizations and perceptions of communication accommodation.

Simply put, thematic analysis is the process of aggregating themes according to commonalities, relationships and differences within data (Gibson and Brown, 2009). Van Manen (2017) explains that the concept of 'theme' is used in many areas of the humanities and it refers to an element that is frequently found in a text and he defines thematic analysis as the 'process of recovering the theme or themes that are embodied and dramatized in the evolving meanings and imagery of the work' (78). Moreover, Van Manen states that interpreting meaning from a text or lived experience is 'a process of insightful invention, discovery or disclosure' and that grasping and formulating a thematic understanding is not a rule-bound process but a free act of seeing' (79). Despite the benefits of thematic analysis, the concept of theme is not free of conflict because Van Manen claims that from a phenomenological point of view themes are rather poor substitutes for the lived experiences they represent. Notwithstanding the above, Gibson and Brown refer to the phenomenological critique as a warning against careless analysis and assert that, in spite of this, thematic analysis is valuable in social research.

In thematic analysis, the concept of 'code' is central. Coding can be defined as the process of creating categories of data example, directing our attention to commonalities within data sets as explained by Gibson and Brown (1998: 130). They also see coding as a twofold activity; on the one hand, when researchers code a priori, they have already defined these codes before data analysis; on the other hand, when researchers employ empirical codes, the codes emerge through the examination of the data and not before. In this research project, even though I had a few themes in mind

during the data collection phase, I did not define any codes before the interview data analysis in NVivo, and the codes surfaced as I progressed through the data analysis.

Furthermore, since codes are categories of data that embody thematic concerns (Gibson and Brown), the idea of category is also fundamental to the understanding of this type of data analysis. In this respect, Richards (2003) considers categorization as a process that starts when research objectives are articulated since in the formulation of those objectives there is 'an element of conceptual identification' (273). He adds, however, that at this stage categories are broad and that there is a need for more refinement and to do so, one must become involved with the data itself; thus, a first approach to data analysis involves coding in order to produce a set of labels that will be the basis for categories, not categories as such. Richards later clarifies that this initial step is done line by line and without concerns for the organization of the categories which will be decided upon in later stages of data analysis. Once codes around themes are available in the data set, the researcher can start to think about categories; more specifically, how to organise the codes that arose from the line-to-line data analysis and group them around categories.

For an adequate organization of codes into categories, Richards (2003: 276) suggests bearing in mind four essential features or aspects of categories. The first one is conceptual coherence, this is to say whether a category makes sense with respect to the conceptual framework within which interpretation is framed. Then there is analytical usefulness, i.e, whether any given category contributes to the understanding of the observed phenomenon. The third feature is empirical relevance or the capacity of a category to be mapped onto the data; in other words, if a code within a data set cannot be ascribed to a category, then this category might not be empirically relevant. Finally, practical application is the last aspect of adequate categories which means having clear cut boundaries and suitable criteria to relate codes to categories. With this in mind, after the coding in each set of interviews was finalised, I started to group the codes into categories which will be analysed and discussed in the following

sections of this chapter. In other words, the presentation of the interview data analysis will be organised around the categories that emerged from the codes and that related to communication accommodation phenomena, perceptions and experiences, and codes will serve as supporting examples. I will start with the presentation of the first set of interviews, that is, the participants' narratives of their experiences in anglophone settings.

5.1 First round of interviews: Narratives

As stated in Chapter 3, the objective of the first round of interviews was to observe, by means of the participant's own narratives and perspectives, how they manage their social relations through accommodation, namely how they perceive self and other accommodation and how they accommodate to an ideal self when they have to interact in English. In order to do this, participants were asked to narrate their previous experiences in English-speaking countries as well as the current one in the UK. In section 3.3.5.2, narratives were presented as a distinct form of discourse and meaning making processes through which people shape and order their experiences and represent themselves. Narratives help us to focus our attention on human experiences as perceived through the eyes of those who live them rather than the eyes of the researcher solely (Chase 2011). In other words, narrative inquiry is an experience-centred approach as it focuses on narrators' representations of phenomena, thoughts and feelings (Andrews et al. 2008).

In section 3.3.5.2, another key concept for this research was introduced, that of narrative environment. This concept has been of significance importance in both the design of the data collection tools and its analysis, since narrative environments account for a reflexive interplay between narratives and environments. This means that narrative practices are shaped by and, in turn, shape the environment in which they unfold (Gubrium & Holstein 2009). One of the factors that make this research project special perhaps is the narrative environment in which my participants found

themselves during their stay in the UK. This environment is defined and shaped by a strong ELF discourse as the faculty providing the different courses has a research centre that is completely devoted to ELF studies of different kinds with leading experts in charge of it, and there is a number considerable number of research students, like myself, who are undertaking postgraduate studies in ELF related areas and who interact with other Masters and PhD students like the participants in this study. What is more, there are talks, seminars and conferences to which renowned scholars are invited to share their knowledge and expertise in ELF. Thus, these five key participants were frequently exposed to activities, classroom discussion and informal conversations that revolved around ELF topics. In fact, two participants – F2 and M2 – were enrolled in a class where ELF issues are at the core, and F1 - who was not registered in this module – showed keen interest in ELF and its implications on aspects such as English proficiency, language ownership, among others.

Because I shadowed my participants and followed them around, I had plenty of opportunities to spend time with them at various times other than interviews and classroom observation; on these occasions I was lucky enough to have the chance to learn about them on a more personal level and talk about different topics, so we held many conversations about ELF and F1 constantly brought up this topic without my elicitation, gave her opinions and asked for mine too. In short, either purposefully or incidentally, key participants were surrounded by an ELF atmosphere in terms of their daily interaction with other international students and of their academic activities, and the reflexive interplay between their narratives and the predominant ELF environment of this university setting can be observed in the interview data and it is evident that most participants are very much aware of ELF contributions, implications and issues, and that this ELF awareness if not free of conflict, as we will see in this section, as well as the following ones.

With the sole objective of easing participants' narratives, for this interview round I had devised a short set of questions and prompts that I used as guidelines during the

conversation with each participant and these were adapted according to the way the conversation unfolded. These prompts/questions were: tell me about your previous experiences in other countries (speaking English); how challenging/easy was it for you to communicate there?; how would you describe your experience (listening and speaking with NSs and NNSs) so far, especially the first semester?; how about lectures with tutors, how did you feel? how was communication in class?; How would you describe your interaction in English? (successful? Challenging?). Similarly, I used some of their answers to the questionnaire (see Appendix A) to ask further questions and link their narratives to what was reported in this questionnaire. This made our conversations flow more smoothly and it allowed me to contextually and make meaning out of their answers from both data collection instruments.

In the participants' narratives it was possible to identify key recurrent aspects related to their orientations to accommodation in communication with both NNESs and NESs, as well as themes regarding the shaping of their individual and professional identities within an environment with a widespread ELF discourse.

5.1.1 Perceptions of accommodative behaviour

While narrating their current experience in the UK, as well as previous ones in other anglophone settings or using English as a lingua Franca, participants came up with valuable ideas regarding accommodation, their own and others', and in interactions with NNESs and NESs.

5.1.1.1 Communication Accommodation and Interaction with NESs

Interaction with NESs was a very recurrent topic when participants referred to their success (or lack of it) when communicating with other people in English. This seems to indicate that they perceive themselves as accountable for communicative efficiency and do not leave the responsibility on their interlocutors. In their narratives, closely linked to receptive accommodation was the idea of life trajectory in sociolinguistics

(Blommaert 2010) which suggests that your linguistic repertoire is the reflection of life trajectories and environments. For example, when participant M1 gives an account of his first time in an anglophone country he immediately mentions his past experience as a learner of English to refer to the mismatch he perceived between his knowledge and 'real' native-speaker English, which he describes as lexically rich (see appendix E.1):

Exchange 5.1

M1: **it was a shock**… it happens to a lot of people who **take a degree in another language** but when it comes to going to the place where that language is spoken you realise you didn't learn everything … **the native speaker has an arsenal of expressions and words you don't know because you studied with dictionaries and teachers**

The idea of the experience, and exposure to linguistic resources, linked to these trajectories makes familiarity an important factor in their practices and roles as listeners. What is really striking, however, is the fact that M1 considers communicative success as his responsibility solely, and not a shared enterprise with his NES interlocutors: communication fails because his receptive accommodation is faulty and 'he didn't learn everything'. This resonates with Jenkins's (2012) definition of ELF and the inclusion of NESs as ELF speakers, since the implication is that NESs also need to accommodate productively when interacting with NNESs. However, M1 does not seem to see this point. When I asked if his perceived lexical deficiency became a problem while he was visiting this English-speaking country and communicating with NESs, he said that he had the feeling that although he believed he was speaking well and expressing himself in the best possible way, on occasions he was interrupted by the NES with a request for clarification such as 'I beg your pardon'. He added that this request made him realise that the sounds he was producing were different to the ones of that NES and that they both possessed different phonological repertoires. While M1 did not specify whether this different in repertoires was a positive or negative aspect, this led me to believe that in his previous interactions with NESs, accommodation might have not been bilateral as he might have related this communication breakdown and the following clarification request to his apparent lack of 'native sounds' rather

than to NESs' ability to understand diverse pronunciations. This seems to confirm my earlier point regarding communicative success and whose responsibility this is: M1 assigns this responsibility to himself, as a NNES of the language. Thus, M1 seems to perceive accommodation as a unilateral (NNES to NES) and perhaps asymmetrical, as it falls on the shoulder of the person who has learned English later in life; he or she is the one who has to adapt to the person who uses the most 'prestigious' version of the language.

Notwithstanding the above, M1 believes that NES with a background of English teaching do not display the same non-accommodative behaviour. When he referred to communication with his NES classmates in the current postgraduate course, he said the following (see appendix E.1):

Exchange 5.2

M1: well, i know that all of them, the native speakers are teachers, so their level of – i believe **their way of speaking does not reflect that of the native speaker one can find at a pub or in the street** (.) i know **they speak relatively well or at a speed that is intelligible**

A few lines after this, M1 added that he thought that the fact that these NESs are teachers has made them modify their speaking as they speak at a speed that is easy to follow. Therefore, for M1, communication accommodation is more symmetrical and mutual when it comes to NESs who have experience teaching the language. To put this in Jenkins's terms, M1's perception of NES language professionals' accommodative behaviour corresponds to the pre-emptive type as their efforts to apply interpretability strategies are not only evident but also welcome. This might indicate that NES language professionals prioritise a positive intragroup relationship over the projection of their own NES identity. In this respect, F1 agreed with this point, although she makes a distinction with respect to the setting where interaction takes place as well as the role and identity of the speakers. In one part of her narrative, F1 was telling about what had happened a few days before this interview when she had invited me to go to the pub and I could not join the group.

Exchange 5.3

F1: but with the natives, for example *M3's name* and *F9's name*? the other day we were together when i told you we were going for a pint (.) **well they started to talk to each other and i did not understand anything because they totally change the way the speak compared to how they talk to me** since **they use more slang** and other things and **i do not understand a thing**

As seen in this exchange, F1 believes that her fellow NES classmates (M3 and F9 in this case) change the way the speak depending on the NES/NNES status of their interlocutor. In other words, F1 thinks that her NES classmates accommodate their production from a lexical perspective when they are interacting with her alone, so as to make the message more accessible to her and less loaded with slang words which F1 sees as detrimental for understanding. This part of F1's story ended with a rather negative note, as she told me that as a result of her not following the conversation between M3 and F9, she 'switched off' from the interaction; that is, she lost interest in what is going on in the conversation. However, for F1 this situation changes when she is in the classroom with her NES tutors. Immediately after F1 told me about what had occurred at the pub with M3 and F9, she started talking about how different the approach to accommodation is when it comes to classroom interaction and NES tutors, and said that she felt that they adapted their speech to make it more intelligible as they needed to explain important topics related to their modules, but she also added that this tutors' accommodative behaviour stopped when they made a joke that was culturally localised and inaccessible to international students.

For M1 and F2, within the communication accommodation framework and its strategies, interpretability is a crucial strategy that some NESs apply to facilitate communicative effectiveness in NES-to-NNES interaction. M1 highlights their professional teaching background as the cause of this type of accommodative behaviour, and F1 distinguishes the behaviour of NESs outside an academic context from the one that NESs display within a classroom setting with international students. It can be gathered that F1 shows a certain degree of awareness of the different types of identities that actors may display. This resonates with Auer's approach to social

identities (2007) whereby one must observe the meaning of linguistic forms according to different conversational and situational contexts. Auer believes that forms and features must be revised, transformed and refined based on the context in which they take place, so in this sense one form may have different meanings. In other words, identities must be analysed in interaction which is naturally influenced by the setting in which it takes place. In this respect, and for F1, a NES language professional in a classroom setting might display a situational identity (Zimmerman, 1998) which allows them to project an institutional identity; that of a university tutor, and thus their communicative style will change to fit the crucial objective of delivering a clear message for international students.

Interaction with NES can sometimes have an undesired effect on speakers' affective stance as well as on linguistics performance, as perceived in the next two exchanges:

Exchange 5.4

F2: sometimes i (feel) difficult because when i talk with specially the native speakers… i (.) feel **some kind of stress to speak more faster… like a native speaker** so sometimes it's **difficult** for me to **think of words or phrases**

Exchange 5.5

F1: when i speak to native speakers? (.) i feel? that they don't give me time to pause. **so i need to produce faster**

These examples show how participants F1 and F2 want to adjust their linguistic behaviour to that of a NES; both of them from a prosodic perspective, namely speed, and in the case of F2 from a lexical point of view as well. Unfortunately, this desire also has a negative impact in their affective stance as evidenced in the choice of words: 'kind of stress' (F2) and 'they don't give me time to pause' (F1), which indicate some degree of discomfort. Once again, like M1 in Exchange 5.1, F1 and F2 perceive communicative efficiency as their responsibility somehow, so it is they who feel who have to modify (speak faster) their linguistic behaviour even if that is demanding sometimes. Accommodation is a unilateral process for them: NNES to NES, and not reciprocal according to the interactional development.

The idea of how an English teaching background helps NESs accommodate to NNESs audiences appears again, as in M1's discourse seen in exchange 5.1, this time in F2's narrative. F2, however, does not group all her fellow NES classmates in the same category. This becomes evident in the following exchange (I have identified myself as F14, just like in the classroom observation interaction).

Exchange 5.6

F2: ah so maybe *F8's name* or *M3's name*
F14: mhm
F2: have experience with speaking with non-native students and yeah they teach english to non-native speakers so **they KNOW how to deal with the non-native speakers but some – i: specially feel difficult to understand *F9's name* speaking so**
F14: ok ok
F2: maybe she's not such – **she doesn't have such an experience as a teacher** – english teacher =
F14: = yeah i think she she hasn't taught english yeah

As seen in this exchange, F2 classifies F8 and M3 as NESs with teaching experience which has provided both of them with the capacity 'to deal with NNESs'; the extra emphasis on the work 'know' could be considered an indicator of F2's conviction of F8 and M3's skills to face communication with NNEs. Nonetheless, F2 leaves F9 out of this category of expert NES ELF users, on the basis of F9's lack of both ELT experience and familiarity with NNES interaction. A few lines after this, F2 explains that F9's fast speech, strong accent and demanding lexical choices are the factors that make F9's production challenging for her. F2 uses the adjectival phrase 'difficult to understand for us' with respect to those language aspects just mentioned, and the use of the object pronoun 'us' (meaning NNESs or international postgraduate students) seems to point to the way F2 situates her identity within an international community of NNESs. From F2's narrative and supporting arguments, it could be deduced that in her interaction with her classmates, especially the NES ones, F2 highlights her intergroup membership to an international community of ELF speakers, as it were, and not her individual characteristics that may either increase or hinder the chances of achieving communicative success. When it comes to accommodation and NESs with backgrounds

other than English teaching, M2 provides a noteworthy assessment of their capacity to accommodate, when he was telling me about an encounter and brief interaction he and other Chinese students had with a member of the railway staff at a train station in London.

Exchange 5.7

M2: he first started speaking with a working staff there and the the <fast> how do you say </fast> man working in the station found that my friend's english's not so good so (.) **he: slowed down al although the accent – the british accent was still very strong he slowed down a lot**
F14: ok
M2: but when i speak to him er **he realised that my english is @better than him@** so he speak **he speak er fast faster than that** yeah

The pronoun 'he' at the beginning of this exchange refers to M2's Chinese friend, another student of the university who is not doing an English linguistics programme. It is clear from M2's anecdote at this British train station that he is very much aware of his NES interlocutor's capacity to modify his speech by reducing the speed of his delivery. As a matter of fact, M2 later affirmed that he noticed this change in his interlocutor's speed immediately. What is more, M2 explained that he feels British people, at least the ones to whom he had spoken, are very capable of accommodating their linguistics behaviour because they have considerable experience interacting with international students, especially Chinese ones, and that these NESs assume Chinese students' spoken English 'is not that good' (M2's verbatim words). What is more, M2 adds he believes that whenever a NES talks to a Chinese person whose English proficiency is high, or at least better than that of the majority of Chinese people, that NES expresses great surprise. M2's recount of this story together with his assessment of NESs' assumptions of Chinese students' level of English might throw light on his conflict of identity. On the one hand, M2 feels part of a community of Chinese people undertaking studies in anglophone settings, a feeling that is quite pervasive in all his interviews; however, he separates himself from this group when he talks of himself as an English linguistics postgraduate student and of his level of English which he considers better than that of an average Chinese person. In other words, M2 seems to

wish to project a distinctive social identity, the identity of an expert user and professional of the English language.

In line with his professional identity projection, towards the end of the interview M2 provided his evaluation of the changes in the speech delivery as an accommodation strategy by saying that he thought that it was sometimes 'too much' which seems to indicate that, to M2's mind, NESs surpass the optimal levels of accommodation in interactions with certain NNESs, that is, NESs's behavioural linguistic modifications can be perceived as overaccommodation (Shepard et al., 2001). It seems to be the case that M2's experience with NESs and his perceptions of NES accommodation differ from F1 and F2's, as seen in exchanges 5.4 and 5.5. Based on F1 and F2's experience, NESs's efforts to accommodate by slowing down are insufficient, so these female participants seemed to have experienced underaccommodation in their interaction with NESs.

To my mind, it was very interesting to learn how some of these participants' professional identity surfaces in their narratives. M2's train station story is an example of how NNES language professionals might want to project a certain identity. There was another thought-provoking example in F3's narrative about an unsuccessful interaction between F3 and her British landlady that occurred when F3 had just arrived in the UK and she went to live in a privately owned accommodation.

Exchange 5.8

F3: yeah alarm yeah a:nd so she described how to use it because i'm never used that kind of (.) equipment so (.) **she just described very fast @and@ i cannot understand i just look at her very confused** and then **she asked the other chinese students to translate for english to chinese to me**
F14: alright =
F3: = at that time **i feel m: so ashamed** because you er come here to er learn language?
F14: ok
F3: **specially you your major is linguistics**?
F14: alright

F3: <fast> i don't know why </fast> everybody er heard you said your major is applied linguistics **they would find – they would THINK your English would be VEry VEry good** (.) yeah

F3's landlady's non-accommodative behaviour, in this case her not slowing down the pace of the delivery of an important piece of information regarding safety measures in the house, triggered very negative emotions in F3. The feeling of embarrassment comes across as a relevant aspect of F3's narrative and it is a feeling that is the result of not being able to understand her landlady's message but also, and perhaps more importantly, as a consequence of her perceived low command of the language. This part of her narrative and the emotion felt in the situation she described can be related to an earlier part of the interview in which F3 reported that, although she has no significant problems expressing her ideas in interaction with fellow students and choosing the appropriate lexical items to get her message across, she would like to use words in 'the native speaker's way'. This seems to indicate that F3 has very clear objectives regarding her proficiency levels, at least what she perceives to be a high degree of proficiency. In other words, F3's idealised long-term optimal accommodation equals being able to speak the way NESs do.

Moreover, what troubles F3 the most, as reported in another section of the interview, is going back to her home country without a British accent since she feels people will question her language skills if her accent does not accommodate to a NES one, so societal expectations are critical in F3's shaping of her style and construction of a desired professional identity. In this regard, and from an identity-in-interaction approach (Auer 2007), it seems reasonable to claim that F3's long-term objective is to project a different act of identity when she uses English in the future, an identity that is different to the one that she can perform now with her current linguistic repertoire, and to be able to do so F3 needs to reach a native like proficiency. By looking back at the limitations on acts of identity (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985) as discussed in section 1.4.1, it can be argued that recognising the group she wishes to identify with and her motivation to converge to this group are no limitations to her act of identity;

F3 perceives her linguistic ability to modify here speech to make it more 'native like' as the source of the problem.

5.1.1.2 Communication Accommodation and Interaction with NNESs

In the participants' narratives, topics related to accommodation behaviours in interaction with other NNESs did not come up as prominent as the episodes, opinions, perceptions and strong emotions associated with accommodation and communication with NESs. However, when NNES communication and accommodation were mentioned, participants' reports accounted for a proactive approach. To put it another way, participants apply different strategies to modify their communicative styles when interacting with NNESs in and outside campus. One of these strategies is topic selection and falls into the category of discourse management. In the following extract, F2 is describing her interactions with her cleaning lady in the university accommodation where she lives, and the difficulties she faces because of F2's lack of familiarity with the accent.

Exchange 5.9

F2: yes sometimes (xxx) **@i couldn't understand@… @what she is talking@ so that's a challenge**
F14: and what what do you do when you don't understand
F2: oh i just (.) **choose a: top- daily topic** for example the weather @@...really understandable so the answer is er **i can expect the answers** yeah

In this exchange, F2 reports how she faces interactional difficulties with a speaker whose accent F2 is not acquainted to, so in order to overcome this challenge she steers the conversation towards a topic that she is comfortable with such as the weather. By employing this discourse management strategy, F2 is fostering her interaction with this person and working on obtaining social attractiveness; that is to say, F2's topic selection is seen by this participant as a discursive device that allows her to keep her interaction going despite the difficulties regarding accent intelligibility.

When communicative success is essential to the participants' objectives (e.g. in classroom), participants seem to adopt a more accommodative behaviour and employ some interpretability strategies to enhance the clarity of their messages. In the first case, for example, M1 is talking about his daily interaction with his NNES classmates and states that he pays attention to his pronunciation because he wants his message to get across.

Exchange 5.10

M1: it's the same when you speak to to them you try to be **as precise as you can in your pronunciation because obviously you don't want to be misunderstood**

M1 does not specify what he means by 'as precise as you can', it could be either careful articulation of sounds in general or, more specifically, approximation to NES sounds as it happens in Jenkins's 2000 study with learners of English, where speakers modify their pronunciation to approach their L2. Instead, M1 goes on to explain why accurate pronunciation is important to him and the reason is that he finds it very annoying when people ask him for clarification when they find his pronunciation to be an issue. It seems to be the case that M1 does not have a strong inclination towards convergence to a NES accent; even though at some points during the interview he refers to departures from NES pronunciation as 'problems', M1 never states that he would like to acquire a native accent unlike F3, for example, as seen in exchange 5.8. It could be argued, then, that M1's construct of 'precise pronunciation' approaches the idea of clear articulation rather than approximation to NES standards. As it happens, aside from having substantial experience as a teacher of English, M1 has received formal training as a radio announcer in his L1 and pronunciation, especially articulation, is a key element of this kind of instruction. Thus, this aspect of his professional background might influence his approach to communication, especially with international audiences. As a matter of fact, in the recorded classroom observation data there is absolutely no evidence of non or misunderstanding resulting from M1's pronunciation or any other language aspect. The same can be said about the casual observation of social interaction outside classes. Another interesting

example of interpretability strategies to enhance the clarity of the message is the following:

Exchange 5.11

F1: instead of building a complete phrase i use my **hands, gestures** or i just **point**

In this example, F1 is describing her interaction with a NNES housemate who has been in the UK for one year and is still learning English. She had previously reported that when she realizes her housemate does not understand her she simplifies her language by using less difficult words, which evidences her readiness to evaluate the situation and her interlocutor's communicative needs and act upon this evaluation by modifying her behaviour. In this case, and unlike her interaction with other people she perceives to be more proficient, she includes non-verbal communication to assist the conveyance of her message. Exchange 5.9, exchange 5.10, and exchange 5.11 exemplify how some of these participants employ different accommodation strategies, particularly discourse management and interpretability, for enhanced clarity in the delivery of their message to other NNES interlocutors. Similarly, these exchanges evidence how communicative efficiency can be a powerful underlying motive for people to modify their verbal and non-verbal behaviour so as to achieve mutual understanding in a context characterized by heightened variety of linguacultural backgrounds and communicative styles.

5.1.2 ELF awareness

Within some participants' narrative discourse, a certain degree of awareness of ELF as an area of research in applied linguistics can be observed. This is the case for F1 and F2 who refer to how acquiring some ideas about ELF implications has affected their own linguistic production and objectives regarding long-term accommodation.

Exchange 5.12

F2: and i think it's really interesting and **if i can change my way of speaking in various ways i can communicate with people more effectively** and yeah =
F14: = alright so that's the ultimate
F2: yeah
F14: of having as many accents as possible to communicate –
F2: yeah
F14: alright
F2: and i could – **i can show the models or varieties in classroom so**
F14: ok
F2: **it may benefit my students too**

In one of her answers to the questionnaire key participants had answered at the start of the data collection phase, F2 stated that she wanted to be a 'multiaccent speaker' so, during our first interview, I drew her attention to this point and her answer was the one presented in exchange 5.12. While she had previously stated that she would like to acquire a British accent, here we can perceive that she also sees real benefits in being able to shape her accents in ways that differ from the native one. As she explains very eloquently, these advantages are twofold; on the one hand she will be able to boost communicative efficiency in various contexts and with interlocutors from different backgrounds and, on the other, she could be a more suitable model for her students which might prepare them properly to face international audiences. Later in the interview (not shown in this extract), F2 told me that students in her home country are exposed to a US American variety of English through different media such as films and also through formal education, and that she believes they want more opportunities to learn other varieties too. To F2's mind, accommodating to a more neutral space and being a multiaccent speaker can pay off at not only a personal level but also a professional one as she is taking into consideration her own status as an ELF user and also her students' desire to obtain access to other ways of speaking. Having explained this, it must be said that F1 has a more conflicting approach to ELF, as observed in the following example.

Exchange 5.13

F1: i think it is has had two effects on me? One – **the positive aspect is that i don't worry that much** =
F14: = ok =
F1: = **therefore i am less nervous and can produce more**
F14: mhm

F1: **the second is that i pay less attention to the linguistic correctness i use so um it has been detrimental** – i believe – **detrimental to the development i could have had**
F14: ok
F2: **i feel it has got stuck**

At the beginning of the exchange, when she says 'it has had two effects on me', she means the ELF component present in the postgraduate programme and the ELF discourse some tutors and students use. F1's sees an ELF as a favourable yet dangerous element. To F1, having an approach to language use that incorporates an ELF mindset has a positive emotional outcome in that her affective filter is lowered and this allows her to produce longer stretches of discourse. Nonetheless, there exists a negative side to ELF and the environment that it has created in this university context, and this has to do with an undesired side effect over her language proficiency development. From the conversation, it is somehow unclear why F1 relates an orientation to ELF with insufficient linguistic growth or lack of accuracy, but a few lines after this exchange, F1 elaborates on this point by stating that the reason for her concern is the fact that she is an English linguistics student so her objective is to approach, as much as possible, a native standard. From these examples, it can be gathered that a narrative environment with ELF awareness as one of the key constituents does shape some participants' perceptions of their own identity - particularly their professional persona - in multilingual contexts, their long-term objectives and their affective stance related to their perceived levels of L2 proficiency.

Before moving on to the second set of interviews and its corresponding analysis, it should be noted that in the themes that arose from the conversations, none of the strategies presented in section 4.2 was mentioned by the interviewees. This might be a result of the design of this data collection instrument. All three instances of conversations with the participants were semi-structured which translates in the fact that while I had an agenda in mind, participants were free to develop their own answers so as to let any relevant topics emerge. During the interviews I prompted each participant by asking a question, but kept my interventions to the minimum while they

were answering so as not to force any particular response. In the case of the first round of interviews, the nature of narrative inquiry is experience-centred; that is to say, the individual uses their own life experiences to make meaning out of them. My intention was then to hear their stories according to what was important to them. On the other hand, the stimulated-recall interview served the purpose of eliciting more specific information about the strategies observed in the classroom interaction data.

5.2 Second round of interviews: Perceptions of accommodation

The second set of interviews aimed at obtaining information that could shed light on those areas of accommodation that participants perceive as more salient in their interaction within their international academic setting. These relevant areas or aspects of accommodation were explored in the second interview as a way to complement the categories that emerged from the coding of the first interview in relation to communication accommodation behaviour. In this respect, the difference between the first and second rounds of interviews lies in that in the first interview, and through their narratives of significant past and recently lived experiences, participants were encouraged to share their views of communication successes and breakdowns in interaction with NNESs and NESs alike. They assessed what went wrong or what made the conversation a success by referring to their own accommodative behaviour as well as their interlocutors'. In short, the first interview did not cover interaction within the academic community only, but it went further in its inquiry so as to explore participants' ideas about interactions in general: past and present, in and outside university contexts, and with NNESs and NESs.

By way of contrast, in the second interview participants were not asked to narrate experiences, although they were not dissuaded from telling anecdotes or stories if they wanted to. Instead, they had to answer questions about their perceptions of their current tutors' accommodative behaviour by ranking them according to how easy or challenging it is to understand them. The objective of this task was not to establish a

ranking of tutors based on their intelligibility as perceived by students, but to elicit those factors and strategies that participants deem crucial regarding key areas and optimal levels of accommodation. During the interview, participants could and did refer to their classmates' characteristics and strategies, but the task revolved around tutors mainly, as they are considered fundamental actors in any academic community and, thus, crucial players in participants' daily interactions.

Another reason that compelled me to focus on tutors and not so much on classmates has to do with my degree of acquaintance with tutors' and classmates' Englishes. Simply put, for me it was more straightforward to talk about tutors as I am quite familiar with tutors' styles, accents and language use in general. Although I knew my participants' classmates and some of them were incidental participants in my project, as a result of the large number of postgraduate students (57 in total) my interaction with all of them was not as frequent as to allow me to obtain a thorough picture of their varieties of English, communicative styles and idiosyncrasies. Having tutors as a point of reference gave me some common background knowledge from which to discuss and analyse communication accommodation behaviour. Therefore, and even if their identities have been anonymised in the transcriptions, I will not individualise any tutor in the sections where I discuss the second interview results. I would also like to stress that while they were rating their tutors according to their own perceived degree of intelligibility, all participants were emphatic when they affirmed that, despite some initial difficulties that were resolved as they became increasingly acquainted to tutors' styles, they are utterly capable of understanding all tutors. Only one participant reported struggling with one class in particular, but she also clarified that this was the result of her not being familiar and, thus, confident with the topic of the module.

While participants were discussing the reasons why certain tutors were easier to understand than others, they were encouraged to refer to the strategies they thought their tutors applied during their lectures, seminars and workshops, especially those tactics that were applied to maximise students' understanding. Participants were also

asked to provide examples of those strategies whenever it was possible for them to remember one, although it must be said that some participants gave clear and relevant examples without any prompting on my part. Whenever an example was required from any participant, I specified that they could talk about instances in which the tutor identified a breakdown in communication and acted upon this, or occurrences in which there was no strong evidence of mis or non-understanding but the tutor decided to employ any strategy to enhance clarity despite the absence of problem flagging.

Two main categories surfaced from the thematic analysis of the codes identified in the second interview: factors that facilitate participants' understanding and factors that hinder their understanding. These two categories are presented in the following sections.

5.2.1 Factors that aid understanding

The aspects that participants consider more salient and that enhance their understanding and, thus, communicative efficiency in academic settings, especially within an international classroom, can be grouped into pragmatic strategies or moves, phonological aspects, lexical choices, and non-verbal communication. Although these aspects will be presented as discrete elements in the following sections, they can overlap in tutors' discourse and participants are well aware of this.

5.2.1.1 Pragmatic strategies

In participants' answers there was sufficient evidence to state that participants perceive pragmatic strategies as a recurrent feature whereby tutors accommodate so as to heighten communicative efficiency, as this was a frequent theme in the interviews. More precisely, participants identified repetition, rephrasing and utterance completion as the pragmatic moves or tactics that tutors employ in their lectures and workshops. In relation to repetition, while participants F1 and F2 stated that they had not observed this strategy, M1, M2 and F3 affirmed that their tutors employ self

repetition on certain occasions. Although M1, M2 and F3 were not able to think of any particular instance in which a tutor reiterated part of their message, F3 claimed that some tutors single words as well as longer phrases and that they sometimes asked any given student to repeat their question when that student's utterance was not intelligible. It must be clarified at this stage that even though all participants shared at least two modules during the second semester of the observation period, they did not attend the same classes so they lived different classroom experiences depending on the tutor(s) in charge of the module. It could also be the case that F1 and F2 did not place their focus on that particular aspect of their tutors' discourse and that self or other repetition was simply not within the spectrum of their awareness. Nowhere in my 26 field notes did I find instances of tutors' repetition, but this does not mean to say that this strategy was never employed; after all, tutors' speech was not transcribed and subsequently analysed with a CA framework, unless they were interacting with key participants while they were doing group work. Thus, there is no concrete evidence to support or contradict this observation.

On the subject of rephrasing, there was absolute agreement among all participants as every one of them highlighted self rephrasing as a strategy tutors use to enhance the clarity of their message. For instance, F2 referred to the employment of self rephrasing 'to confirm students' understanding' (along with delivery speed and lexical choice) as one of the factors whereby one of her tutors created 'the atmosphere of confidence' among students, as it is seen in the following excerpt from her interview.

Exchange 5.14

F14: [(xxx)] what do you feel is the: characteristic from – from teachers or from anyone (.) for that sake (.) ehm from from a person's speech that makes: it easy to understand in an academic context (.) you mentioned speech that's that's one thing =
F2: = m
F14: what else (.)
F2: yeah (.) speech (.) speed of the speech =
F14: = mhm
F2: and (.) the choice of vocabulary =
F14: = mhm

F2: and making eye contact =
F14: = ok
F2: **or rephrasing**
F14: alright ok
F2: [(xxx)] many words to =
F14: [alright] = alright
F2: **yeah (.) confirm (.) [the students' understanding] =**
F14: [(ok)] = alright (.) mhm

In line with F2 in this exchange, F3 also offered some insights into tutors' rephrasing parts of the speech by stating that she had noted that when students did not understand a tutor's question, that tutor rephrased the question and reduced the speed of their delivery. Although the other participants offered neither examples nor any type of expansion of the topic of rephrasing, they did refer briefly to this strategy as part of tutors' pool of strategies. As discussed in sections 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.2.2, drawing a clear cut distinction between repetition and rephrasing is not an easy task to face and establishing the extent to which morphosyntactic, lexical and phonological modifications bring about rephrasing as opposed to repetition is not a straightforward business, especially in spoken communication where there is not chance to replay, as it were, parts of spoken discourse so as to observe them more carefully and tell repetition and rephrasing apart.

This difficulty might account for the difference in participants' perceptions of these two phenomena. In other words, those participants who reported having observed no repetition could have interpreted an instance of repetition as rephrasing. Conversely, those participants who identified repetition may have been in front of rephrasing instead. What is certain is that participants do recognise and appreciate repetitions and rephrases as these strategies help them process information in a more efficient way, especially when that strategy is used in tandem with another one such as slowing speech down, as explained by F3. Furthermore, no participant referred to either strategy as being used too repeatedly, nor did they complain about the absence of repetition or rephrasing and suggest that tutors should employ them more often. This leads me to think that they do not relate the presence (or lack thereof) of repetition and rephrasing to either over or underaccommodation.

Finally, only two participants alluded to utterance completion (UC) as a strategy they have seen other actors in the community using. M1, for instance, stated that while tutors do not use UC with their students, he has seen his classmates complete their peers' utterances on some occasions as a way to assist them in the delivery of the message when someone is 'somehow stuck'. Moreover, M2 gave me a different perspective on UC and its application in this academic community. He informed me that he had observed tutors completing Chinese students' utterances on many occasions. When I asked him why he though this happened, M2 said the following (see appendix E.2):

Exchange 5.15

M2: well is not say (.) **their speaking** (.) maybe uh part of reasons is because (.) **we – our speaking** (.) **competence is not as good as our other classmates** =
F14: = mhm (.)
M2: uh but (.) uh generally **the teacher will** (.) k – t – k – **guess what we are going to talk** (.) **going to speak** =
F14: = mhm (.)
M2: uhm but **we couldn't finish it very well**

When M2 says 'the teacher will guess' he was not referring to any particular tutor; in fact, he had previously stated that 'many tutors complete students' utterances'. In this sense, one aspect that comes to the surface from this exchange is M2's perception of tutors' accommodative behaviour. Put another way, M2 believes his tutors are well attuned to students' immediate needs and are ready to offer assistance when students are struggling to find suitable words or phrases to complete their messages. In addition to this, M2's answer to my question 'why do you think tutors employ UC?' could be revealing some discrepancy in his social identity projection. If we go back to exchange 5.7 on page 138 and are reminded of M2's London train station story, we can observe some more evidence of this struggle. In connection to that exchange, I discussed how M2 expresses his affiliation to a community of Chinese young people undertaking studies in the UK, and yet he departs from this group by referring to himself as an English linguistics student whose English is better than the average Chinese student. In exchange 5.15, while he explains why he believes tutors perform UC with Chinese

students in class interaction, M2 starts with the possessive adjective 'their' but after a brief pause, he changes to the personal pronoun and possessive adjective 'we' and 'our' respectively and maintains the use of the first person plural during the whole length of the answer. Although the transfer from 'their' to 'our' might be a simple false start and the wrong choice of form, this could signal M2's change of mind regarding his initial divergent behaviour as perceived in the use of 'their' which can indicate disassociation from M2's intergroup (i.e. Chinese community). In other words, by using 'their' M2 is highlighting his perceived personal differences with respect to other Chinese students as seen in the train station narrative. However, his shift to 'we/our' might signal his willingness to be considered part of a Chinese community, more specifically, a community of East Asian students with an English language academic background.

5.2.1.2 Phonological factors

Phonological aspects, both segmental and suprasegmental, were also recurrent in participants' answers, but perhaps the most salient facilitating phonological aspect for participants was tutor's L1. All of the five participants in the study, excepting F2, stated that having a shared L1 background with a tutor or classmate made their understanding of that person's spoken English easier. What is most noteworthy about these perspectives on shared backgrounds is that three participants related the idea of shared L1 to the presence of problems in their interlocutor's spoken production in English. For instance, M1 referred to this point in the following way.

Exchange 5.16

M1: and and the people whom i obviously do not have problems to understand **because they are the same errors ones makes** =
F14: = mhm
M1: are those those of us who speak spanish =
F14: = ok
M1: u:h in relation to (.) sorry those of us **who have mother** (.) **mother tongue spanish**

In the following lines after the end of this exchange, M1 specifies that those errors he refers to belong to the segmental level, i.e. individual sounds, and that he believes that the more different and distant to English an interlocutor's L1 is, the more challenging understanding becomes. To M1's mind, having the same mother tongue as some tutors and classmates is an advantage because departures from NES pronunciation, which he views as mistakes, are common ground for him and his interlocutors. A very similar error mindset is observed in M2, who explained that it is not difficult for him to understand other Chinese people, tutors and fellow students, speaking English because when faced with an 'accented' English, he knows where the problem lies. He added that he believes other Chinese students feel the same way and that for international students with a linguistic background other than Chinese, the task of understanding Chinese speakers of English can be very demanding. F1 did not expand on the topic of same L1 background much, but she did mention that it is easier for her to understand accents in English from people whose L1 is the same as her, even if these people's production is not completely fluent. It seems to be the case that, at least in this stage of data collection, M1 and M2 and to a lesser degree F1, perceive English as an additional language proficiency, namely the capacity of making oneself understood in spoken language, as closely linked to the attainment of native-like competence. It could be argued that these participants had a conventional ESL education, similar to or in line with an SLA tradition (as seen in section 2.2) that views NES norms as the desired outcome of language learning.

Other phonological factors that facilitate international students' understanding, according to participants' answers are clear articulation of sounds, especially vowels, slow delivery of speech, emphasis and extra stress on those key words that are crucial for the understanding of class content, and having an international accent that is accessible to a wide range of NNES students. The topics listed here were mentioned by one or two participants and, in their discourse, these aspects were not as prominent as same L1 background. The following exchange taken from my interview with F3 illustrate one of these points.

Exchange 5.17

F3: also i like her [teaching way yeah yeah yeah yeah] she is very kind and friendly =
F14: [alright (.) ok (.) alright] = aha
F3: in class =
F14: = ok
F3: yeah (.) and the (.) **her speaking** (.) **speed is slowly** (.) **and you can** (.) **easily to understand** (.) i think these two can be equal
F14: ok

In this excerpt, F3 refers to one of her NNES tutors as an example of someone whose slow delivery is not perceived as a negative aspect of communication, but as something that contributes to F3's comprehension greatly. In other words, F3 considers this tutor's interpretability strategy as positive and as situated within the appropriate levels of accommodation for an academic and international context.

5.2.1.3 Lexical factors

Although not a recurrent as phonological and pragmatic aspects, lexical factors were also highlighted by participants in their answers. The first lexical aspect to be discussed here is that of accessible vocabulary. While F2 was explaining why she considered a particular NNES tutor as a good speaker (tutor 7), F2 specified that she considers this tutor's choice of vocabulary suitable and accessible to non-native speakers of English like her.

Exchange 5.18

F2: and (.) also *tutor 7's name*
F14: ok
F2: **is a really (.) good [speaker i think]**
F14: [mhm mhm] mhm
F2: yeah
F14: [alright]
F2: **[her] (.) choice of s – (.) choice of vocabulary =**
F14: = mhm
F2: is =
F14: = mhm
F2: **really easy to [understand for]**
F14: [mhm mhm]
F2: **non native speakers i think =**

F14: = mhm
F2: so (.) compared to (.) *tutor 7's name* =
F14: = mhm
F2: *tutor 8's name* uses (.) much more (.) difficult words [and]
F14: [ok]

F2 also compared this NNES tutor's lexical repertoire to that of one her NES tutors (tutor 8), and affirmed that while she believes that this NES tutor is also a good speaker, the NNES tutor lexical choices are easier for her and that her NES tutor uses 'difficult words' frequently. It is interesting to note that F2 and tutor 7 do not share the same L1 background, so F2's positive perception of tutor 7's lexical repertoire is probably not based on their shared linguistic background, but perhaps on the tutor's ability to employ interpretability strategies to modify her lexical usage to adapt and converge to her international audience.

Another lexical aspect that was brought up during the second interview, particularly by participants F1, M1 and M2, was the absence of idiomatic expressions during lectures and seminars. What is more, M2 also pointed out that whenever a particular NES tutor included an idiomatic expression, this was accompanied by another strategy, i.e. self paraphrasing, as a way of pre-empting meaning and enhance clarity before any non or misunderstanding occurred. M2's comment on the use of idioms is seen in the following exchange (see appendix E.2).

Exchange 5.19

M2: and i: (.) idiomatic expressions (.) e:hm (.) <lower> idiomatic expressions </lower> (.) hm (.) i can't remember who did this @ but @ =
F14: = mhm
M2: ehm: maybe (.) maybe *tutor 12's name*? =
F14: = mhm
M2: yeah *tutor 12's name* yeah
F14: he uses some idiomatic expressions
M2: yeah and then **he would explain [them and paraphrase them of course]**
F14: [a:h (.) alright] does he usually do it after or before (.) he says that
M2: of course he would explain after
F14: alright

M2: **yeah (.) i think (.) most of the (.) teachers use the idiomatic ref – pre – expression they are (.) english native speaker =**

M2 also explains that the use of idiomatic expressions is performed by NES tutors mainly which, to a certain extent, addresses the issue of NESs' (in)ability to adapt to intercultural audiences. I will further expand on the topic of idiomatic expressions when I discuss the factors that hinder understanding; suffice to say for now, these three participants agreed that the use of idioms by NES tutors and NES fellow students is potentially problematic and it is better avoided in ELF interaction. These participants also agreed that tutors rarely use idioms as they seem highly aware of the adaptations they need to make when they are in front of an international audience.

5.2.1.4 Non-verbal communication

Even though it was not frequently mentioned by participants, non-verbal communication, i.e. body language was brought up as a factor that can contribute towards a more successful classroom experience from the point of view of students' understanding and engagement in interaction with their tutors. It was F3 who brought forward the relevance of body language and its benefits to students' interactional ability.

Exchange 5.20

F3: and uh (.) *tutor 12's name* (.) why i mentioned him (.) uh (.) and put him in the second one (.) is that (.) you know always uhm in our class (.) we need to have uh group discussion (.) (xxx) **just walk around** (.) uh **different groups and ask if you have any question and the** (.) **he always like look look at us** (.) **if we feel confused** (.) **and he can feel it and** uh **he can** (.) just **immediately** to (.) **explain something [to us]**
F14: [mhm] ok
F3: and **the way** (.) uh **he explained it** =
F14: = mhm mhm
F3: uh **is also easy to** (.) **to to** (.) **understand** (.) yeah

In this exchange, F3 is explaining why this tutor, who happens to be NES, is a good speaker in her opinion and why it is easy for her to understand him. F3 highlights this

tutor's ability to read students' facial expressions and, from this reading, determine whether they understand tasks and activities. From this exchange it is clear that there is no verbal comprehension check or any type of question on the tutor's part to find out if students have understood instructions and are working accordingly. For this tutor, eye contact and attention to students' body language is enough to learn this, and this tutor's ability to read body language is appreciated by F3. Not only is he capable of gauging students' understanding just by looking at them, but he also acts promptly to correct the source of mis or non-understanding by providing simpler instructions.

The relevance of body language is also supported by F2 who also referred to eye contact as a powerful way to capture students' attention and make them engage in lectures and workshops better. These two opinions represent positive evidence to state that participants perceive accommodation as an important aspect of communication that goes beyond verbal considerations to include more complex and perhaps less visible aspects of interaction such as body language. The episode narrated by F3 is useful to comprehend why CAT is consequential to the study of interaction in international and multilingual settings such as the one observed in this study. In this respect, CAT's great explanatory potential (Shepard et al. 2001) can account for both verbal and non-verbal shifts in communicative behaviour that can bring about social and psychological consequences in interlocutors, as it was the case for F3. Her tutor's ability to interpret facial expressions and his subsequent adaptation of verbal language allowed her to follow a set of instructions better and perform well in group discussion, but her tutor's accommodative moves might have given her more confidence to carry out a task in her additional language at a postgraduate level.

5.2.2 Factors that hinder understanding

As explained in section 5.2, all participants in the study were emphatic when they stated that apart from some initial difficulties, characteristic to a period when one is

not well acquainted to new interlocutors' styles, they did not experience major problems understanding tutors, both NNES and NES. Therefore, when participants discussed those factors that put a strain on their comprehension, they mainly referred to isolated events that did not represent the overall reality of their interaction with tutors and classmates. They did report, however, that on occasions some tutors increased the speed of their delivery and that, even though the message was eventually conveyed, this fast delivery made the task somehow more challenging. Another factor that participants considered as potentially problematic is the use of idiomatic expressions, as observed in the following exchange with M1.

Exchange 5.21

M1: he said something like (.) and there is where we have **the elephant in the room** (.) and i [(xxx)
F14: [ok
M1: he has an elephant in the room i thought (.) so what – (.) and he kept talking so when – i believe it was after a while (.) u:h when it was time to ask questions u:h **i or someone else said sorry what does the elephant in the room mean and he was surprised because apparently it is a frequent metaphor in the english language**
F14: ok
M1: and it is like the problem is in front of your eyes you =
F14: = [ok]
M1: [don't] want to acknowledge it

In the lines that come after this exchange, M1 explains that although recently people have started to use the expression in Spanish[2], M1's L1, it is not as widely used as it is in English. He also adds that he and other NNES students were confused until the meaning of the expression was explained and that he believes that reason why this type of expressions are potentially troublesome lies in their exophoric meaning; that is to say, and as explained with his own words, these expressions 'do not make meaning from the used words'. M2 also pointed out that sometimes tutors have incorporated idiomatic expressions in their lessons, but unlike M1's experience, M2 has noticed that these expressions have been explained immediately after by the tutor themselves.

[2] The expression 'elephant in the room' has been directly translated to Spanish as 'el elefante en la habitación'.

Another occurrence of inclusion of English idioms was brought up by F1, but on this occasion it was a NES student (M3) who introduced the expression (to jump the gun) and this was then repeated by the tutor, also a NES. When F1 told me about this episode she started it by saying that she feels her NES classmates change the way they speak in class, when such class is delivered by a NES tutor, and she then mentioned the time when M3 used 'jump the gun' in class as an example of this change in behaviour.

What is more, during the first interview, F1 mentioned a time when tutors and students were socialising outside class and while she was talking to a NES classmate and a NES tutor, her NES interlocutors also used idiomatic expressions and some slang words, which made F1 feel like she was not part of the conversation any longer. F1 referred to this episode as a 'native speaker moment'. While she did not use this phrase while she was narrating the 'jump the gun' interaction, I believe the sentiment remained, as she explained that she and other NNES students did not understand the idiom in class and that they had to ask M3 later, during their coffee break, to clarify the meaning of the expression. In these 'native speaker moments' presented by M1 and F1, one can observe the social psychological consequences of this supposedly divergent behaviour. What this means is that the use of idioms in an international setting can exacerbate the feeling of otherness in NNES students as their non-understanding of idiomatic expressions, which often have an obscure meaning to NNES audiences, marks their NNES status. In a space that is supposed to be neutral, such as an international university, idioms and other lexical items that are not frequently found in academic language are highly unlikely to be part of the non-native speaker's repertoire, as seen in these examples.

As discussed in section 1.3.3 on page 8, group identification is an essential aspect in multilingual communication (Sachdev et al. 2013) and acculturation processes, that is 'the sharing and exchange of ingroup/outgroup cultures, values, resources, and identities' (2013, p.406) can be approached in different ways. With regard to acculturation, it seems to be the case that participants, namely M1 and F1, might have

experienced an assimilationist approach which values conformity to the dominant language, only that in this case conformity relates to dominant (native) English variety and some of its cultural aspects, rather than language as a discrete category. It should be clarified, however, that even though these participants experienced a certain degree of uneasiness with respect to their NES interlocutor's lexical choices, nowhere in their answers did they state that idioms should be eradicated from NES discourse, even in an international setting.

The absence of problematization regarding the use of idioms on the part of participants resonates with some of the evidence presented in section 5.1.1.1, where the concepts of experience, exposure to linguistic resources, and trajectories playing an important part in participants' ability to accommodate, were discussed. In said section, we saw how M1 considered communicative success as his responsibility solely, and not a shared enterprise with his NES interlocutors. When participants referred to the use of idiomatic expressions in the second round of interviews, they did not seem to believe that NES interlocutors should avoid them when faced with an international audience in a classroom. In other words, and even though they did not explicitly hold themselves responsible for any possible misunderstandings, the inclusion of local and perhaps somewhat obscure English idioms was not perceived as a feature of non-accommodative behaviour. Once again, this seems to confirm my point regarding communicative success and whose responsibility this is: NES' or NNESs', or whether this should be a joint enterprise. It seems to be the case that participants in this study, at least when it comes to lexis, perceive accommodation as a unilateral (NNES to NES).

5.3 Third round of interviews

The third and last round of interviews was conducted after the taught element of the programme had finished and its aim was to collect impressions of their own

communication accommodation behaviour as well as their interlocutors' from the observed and recorded interaction. While the analysis of the classroom observation data in chapter 4 addressed aspects of communication regarding objective accommodation, the following sections of chapter 5 will concentrate on accommodation from a subjective point of view. By objective accommodation, I refer to the participants' tangible accommodative behaviour in classroom interaction as it was observed and analysed with the application of CA. On the other hand, subjective accommodation will complement this objective observation as the forthcoming analysis will look into participants' own thoughts, perceptions and feelings over their own accommodation in interaction, as well as their interlocutors'. In order to carry out the study of subjective accommodation, during the data collection stage and for this set of final individual meetings with participants, a stimulated recall interview (SRI) was held. As seen in section 3.3.5.2 on page 63, a SRI can bring participants one step closer to the moments in which they performed a certain action and it provides them with the chance to listen to themselves and activate their memory, prompting them to discuss real actions as opposed to idealised versions of them (Dempsey 2010).

Before the interview, I selected some extracts of recorded interaction in which the interviewee was involved. The selection included both samples of successful interaction, as well as instances of communication in which participants seemed to struggle. Participants listened to an average of four extracts from two or three different interactions and these extracts were presented without interruptions. Each participant was prompted to stop the audio recording whenever they wanted to comment on any aspect of the interaction. Seldom did they stop the playback to offer their comments, and most participants waited until the end of the audio exchange to discuss it. Whenever each extract was played uninterruptedly, I attempted to prompt participants' contributions with a general question such as 'how do you think the conversation went?' or 'is there anything in the recording that captures your attention?'. Depending on the development of their answers and ideas, on occasions I

asked a more specific question so as to facilitate participants' expansion on any given topic that I deemed significant to the analysis.

After the transcriptions of each SRI was finalised, I performed a thematic analysis, like in the two previous sets of interviews. From the coding of the SRI transcripts, the following themes or categories arose: lexical accommodation, discourse management strategies, interpersonal control strategies, interpersonal relationships, phonological accommodation, translanguaging, group identification, and interpretability strategies. However, and for the sake of clarify and organization, I will introduce and discuss the results following the order in which classroom observations, which were presented in chapter 4, took place (for more details on observations, see section 3.3.5.3 and table 3.2 on page 70). This approach will allow me, on the one hand, to present and discuss the different layers of perceptions and interpretations over any given interaction, i.e. classroom observation. On the other hand, in those observations for which I could gather more than one key participant's opinions on subjective accommodation, having the actual interaction as the starting point will give me the opportunity to establish a dialogue between the participants involved. The presentation of the SRI results will follow a chronological order based on classroom observations, and not the thematic fashion presented in sections 5.1 and 5.2, because this event-based presentation was thought to give a more exhaustive and faithful representation of each interaction as explained by each participant.

5.3.1 Observation 3

Observation number 3 corresponds to a class discussion between key participant M1 and incidental participants F6 and F7, both from the Middle East. Students have been asked to share their preliminary plans for their Master's dissertation. In the SRI and after listening to exchange 4.19 (on page 113), M1's first comment revolved around the topic of lexical accommodation, namely his own choice of words.

Exchange 5.22

M1: i believe i did that – i don't know if i did that with a question tone but it did catch my attention that she said she had to return because a member of her family in this case a male relative? was forced to and she couldn't stay because of that and **i think i intentionally said beliefs instead of religion so as avoid any kind of**

F14: @@@

M1: **@political unrest@** and she seemed to agree in a way with what i said

F14: yes

M1: but she never said because i am muslim or something like that

In the exchange M1 refers to, F7 had previously explained that she had to go back to her home country not because of her data collection for her Master's dissertation protect, but because her male guardian's UK visa was due to expire soon. In lines 5 and 6 of said exchange, there is an instance of overlapped turns in which M1 says 'this is because of your beliefs' and F7 simultaneously agrees by saying 'yeah yeah that's why I had to leave'. In the CA analysis the choice of the use of the word 'belief' was not the focus of my observation and discussion; however, this was an important point for M1. This difference in interpretations resonates with what Dempsey (2010) referred to as one of the main contributions of SRIs, that is, their capacity to uncover different aspects that influence human behaviour, in this case lexical accommodation, that reveal what is salient and what is not for each individual. What is more, M1's intentional selection and employment of the noun 'beliefs' might evidence his purposeful engagement in working towards a desired social attractiveness, since he avoids the word religion which he sees as problematic considering his interlocutor's background. In fact, in the SRI M1 explained that, in his opinion, the word 'belief' does not have a strong political connotation and it does not convey the idea of segregation or profiling. M1 seems to be very aware of the heterogeneity of his community of fellow postgraduate students, and his stylistic adaptations ('belief' over 'religion') can be said to have a pre-emptive nature; only that in this particular case, M1's pre-emptive move is not aimed at enhancing clarity or avoiding mis or non-understanding, as it is usually the case in most instances of pre-empting such as the ones observed in the previous chapter, but at establishing positive social relationships within this academic community.

In relation to the same exchange taken from classroom observation #3, M1 also referred to simultaneous talk. As stated above lines 5 and 6 in exchange 4.19 are one instance of overlapped turns between M1 and F7. Nonetheless, in the SRI M1 stated that in general he tends to avoid speaking when another interlocutor is still holding their turn and that he prefers to wait before taking his. He added that he does not like it when another person speaks while he is still talking, but that he 'surprisingly' finds himself performing overlapping, especially when he feels the interlocutor is 'struggling to find the right concept' as a way to offer assistance. This particular overlapping instance does not seem to correspond to utterance completion or any offer of assistance on M1's part, as it is F7 who is initiating simultaneous talk in line 6 by responding to M1's confirmation request ('this is because of your beliefs'), but this example of simultaneous talk might provide evidence on M1's active commitment to the interaction and his interest in the topic presented by F7, on the one hand, and on F7's employment of a discourse management strategy which is aimed at facilitating M1's understanding and contribution to the interaction, on the other. In his SRI, M1 stated that he was very interested in and surprised by the fact that in the 21st century there are people who have to follow this type of strict rules, especially because at the time the observed interaction was recorded there was a nascent feminist movement in his home country. This marked contrast of realities in women's lives might have prompted his intervention in line 5. It is precisely M1's turn in line 5 the one that changes the direction of the rest of the interaction in terms of topic selection and development; the students present in this class were supposed to discuss their dissertation project; but M1 and the other two interlocutors changed the direction of their talk towards F7's need for a male guardian instead.

5.3.2 Observation 4

Observation number 4 corresponds to a group activity in which key participants F1 and F3, and incidental participant F15, a visiting scholar from China, were involved. The activity required that they determine whether their students have been born during or after the new digital era began (digital native) or whether they have adopted new

technologies later in their lives. In their respective individual SRIs, F1 and F3 discussed different aspects of their interlocutors' accommodative behaviour and their own; and these aspects are linked to discourse management and interpersonal control strategies.

Firstly, after listening to a long extract from observation #4, F3 stated that she felt that in general the conversation went well because she felt that her questions were answered, especially by F1. With respect to this point, F3 mentioned her question at the beginning of the conversation: 'could you please tell me what is digital natives?' and specified that at that point she was not familiar with the concept and that she appreciated F1's explanation. F3's explanation on the overall success and her positive assessment that interaction may evidence her awareness of the application of discourse management strategies, i.e. how other speakers adjust the direction and development of their discourse to attend to her needs, namely her need to clarify a key concept so as to complete the task that has been assigned to them. In the interaction corresponding to this class observation and in relation to F3's initial question 'what is digital natives?', F1's discourse strategy to converge to F3's needs and clarify the concept is to ask F3 another question so as to establish whether F3 is a digital native. This strategy is observed in exchange 4.4 on page 92 and line 8, when F1 asks 'when when when is er – when did you: er (…) when were you born'. Regarding this, during the SRI I asked F1 if she had noticed F3's other repetition of her question without the auxiliary verb ('when I born') and F1 offered the following reflection (see appendix E.3).

Exchange 5.23

F1: yes i did notice when i used for example – i believe i used **was instead of were**
F14: ok
F1: at some point but when she speaks **i did not pay attention** (.) we were having a conversation and in that moment **i didn't prioritise thinking oh she has used that structure**
F14: that is what i thought because in the rest of the conversation neither you nor *F15's name* say anything about it

F1: it doesn't bother me because **she had asked a question and i think that when you ask a question about content you are exposed so it is important that you don't pay attention to how they speak**

F1's observation of her own accommodative behaviour is very similar to the one offered by F3 inasmuch as the clarification of questions, especially one that aims at explaining a crucial concept, is fundamental to the successful completion of the class activity and the development of the interaction. F1 also offers another perspective to the use of discourse management strategies. In this case, it seems safe to say that F1 is not only engaged in facilitating F3's understanding, but she is also concerned with the emotional aspect of the interaction. In other words, F1 is aware of the vulnerability of acknowledging one does not know the meaning of a concept, and her interactional effort is placed on content rather than form. In this sense, F1's attitudes and approach to communication in a multicultural setting resembles that of M1, as seen in exchange 5.22, since both participants seem very much concerned with establishing positive interpersonal relationships and achieving their desired social attractiveness. It is also noteworthy to see how F1's emphasis on content applies to her own language production as well, as in the beginning of exchange 5.23 she explains that she has also used an auxiliary that does not match the question according to ENL norms ('was' instead of 'were'). Although in the actual interaction she uses the ENL version after self repetition of the interrogative word 'when' and some hesitation and pauses, which might indicate her concern over form, in the SRI this was not salient to F1 until I pointed it out.

Another aspect that was noticed by F1 and F3 alike is that of interpersonal control strategies. However, unlike the previous reflections in which we can observe a mutual agreement on the collaborative nature of interaction and the display of positive social identities, on this occasion participants' thoughts differ in terms of the approximation strategies at stake. In this specific case, both F1 and F3 are talking about exchange 4.10 on page 98, in which we can observe F3's repetition of the nominal phrase 'Windows 98' as a way to get confirmation. During the SRI with F3, she stated that her self

repetition of 'Windows 98' aimed at obtaining more information about the concept of black screen (Windows DOS) and that she felt that her attempt to get this crucial piece of information was not acknowledged by neither F1 nor F15. F3 said that at this moment in the conversation, she felt like an outsider. What is more, F3 felt a certain degree of discomfort when F1 remarked F3's lack of understanding by saying 'you don't know@@' in line 27. It seems safe to state, then, that F3 feels her strategy of interpersonal control, i.e. self repetition to obtain her interlocutors' attention, has not been fruitful, and that F1's remark over her lack of understanding is divergent in that she has not been given an appropriate answer.

Conversely, in her SRI and after listening to exchange 4.10, F1 provided a different interpretation of F3's interpersonal control move. F1 stated that she had the impression that F3 had actually understood her when she was explaining the difference between DOS and the more contemporary version of Windows operating systems. F1 interpreted F3's self repetition as an attempt to tease her over the fact that she is older than F3. In other words, F1 construed F3's interventions as a means to establish a more playful dynamic between them. F1 did not seem uncomfortable with this, on the contrary, she affirmed that she appreciated F3's inquisitive attitude and the great interest she demonstrated in what other people said, not only in this particular classroom interaction, but in general throughout the time they spent together.

Additionally, when listening to this same extract, F1 reflected upon the presence of simultaneous talk as related to interpersonal control, more specifically how her turns frequently overlapped with F15's. Regarding this point, F1 said she felt that F15 did not let her speak and finish her turns as she wanted to, but she also conceded that F15's overlapping interventions could have been an attempt to assist her whenever she could not express herself with ease, and in this sense F15's simultaneous talk was opportune. F1's observation on simultaneous talk may be linked to an earlier section of her SRI when she stated that she did not know F15 well and that she felt that F15

wanted to highlight her status as a more experienced teacher and to make her opinions prevail over the others'. It is necessary to remember that F15 was a visiting scholar on a short visit to the UK and, therefore, her presence in this academic community was not permanent and might have not been felt as substantial by some students. It seems to be the case, then, that F1 interactional work and accommodative efforts were placed on F3 rather than on F15, as F3 is perceived as a more significant actor.

During observation #4 I also recorded key participants M1 and M2 working in the same task on digital natives, with incidental participants M4 from the UK, F16 and F17, these last two from East Asia. In the SRI with M2, he referred to his impressions about M4's amount of speaking. In this sense, M2 stated that since he was the one performing a demonstration on how to use a tablet to read articles and books, he could have spoken more, but since M4 held most of the turns in the interaction, he was not able to. When I asked him why he thought M4 did this, M2 did not bring up M4's NES status, but he said that M4 is a very outgoing and talkative person who used to do 'most of the talking', not only in this observation but in most of the interactions they had during the academic year. Although M4 was not a temporary member of the community like F15, it seems to be the case that F1 and M2 expected their interlocutors to exert less control on the course of the interaction and employ fewer turns, as it were, in the interaction.

5.3.3 Observation 7

This instance of classroom observation was recorded in a session in which key participants F2 and M2 were working together in the same group in two different class activities: in observation 7a, F2 and M2 worked with incidental participant F8, a NES from the UK, and in observation 7b, the incidental participants were F8 again, as well as M6 from East Asia, F13 from the Middle East and myself (F14) in my role as a participant observer. In their respective individual SRIs, F2 and M2 talked about

aspects of communication accommodation that relate to interpersonal control, phonological accommodation, lexical accommodation, and group identification.

During F2's SRI and in relation to interpersonal control strategies, while listening to the first part of observation #7a which includes exchange 4.13 on page 103 (F2's self rephrasing in lines 1 and 9), I drew F2's attention to the fact that F8 offers the floor to M2 after F2's turn at a transition relevant place (not observed in exchange 4.13), and F2 assigned this interpersonal control move to F8's desire to learn more about different approaches to error correction in East Asia, where M2 and F2 are from. However, F2 later reflected more on this idea and provided a different interpretation. More specifically, F2 explained that in classroom group activities, when they had to complete a task or discuss a topic in a certain amount of time, it was important to give everyone the opportunity to share their thoughts, and it was usually a NES fellow student, like F8, who would assign the turns among group members. In relation to interpersonal control strategies, in his SRI M2 listened to the recording of observation 7b, from which exchanges 4.22 and 4.23 were obtained. These two exchanges correspond to instances of competitive overlapping between M2 and incidental participant M6. Regarding this aspect of the interaction, M2 said that he found it natural or normal that M6 was holding many turns because he was the one who had read the task instructions aloud and started answering the question. M2 added that the 'first speaker always gets a lot to say' which means that other group members give some comments on the first speaker's answer, but do not contribute to the discussion much. Therefore, these instances of overlapping do not seem to be problematic to M2 and they do not appear to indicate any abnormality in the way the interaction unfolds compared to any other regular classroom discussion. Nor do they evidence any degree of hostility between M2 and M6. M2's perception of simultaneous talk seems to be in line with the interpretation of this phenomenon offered at the end of section 4.2.3.2, inasmuch as competitive overlapping in this academic community seems to serve the purpose of taking control of the course of the interaction in order to provide a strong

opinion and/or to question an interlocutor's idea, with the ultimate objective of answering a question and enriching an academic debate.

Another topic that arose from F2's stimulated recall task was that of phonological accommodation, namely F2's perception of how her accent has changed from the time in which observation 7a was recorded to the day in which I held the SRI with her and she had the chance to listen to her own production again. This perception is better presented with F2's own words in the following exchange.

Exchange 5.24

F2: i've **become** (few) **more relaxed**
F14: ok [alright]
F2: **[to] speak in english**
F14: alright ok
F2: **cause i** (.) **just** (.) **yeah** (.) **catch** [some]
F14: [mhm]
F2: **english** =
F14: = ok
F2: **ways of [pronunciation and]**
F14: [ok alright]
F2: **maybe** (.) **i** (.) **i** (.) yeah sort of **i** (.) **fit into their context**

When F2 stated that she has become 'more relaxed' she refers to how different she was feeling at the time observation #7a was recorded, compared to how she felt at the start of her postgraduate programme. Prior to this extract, F2 had explained that at the beginning she was not confident enough to give her opinion in class because she considered her accent to be too 'American' (this is how she was taught to speak in her home country) which made her believe she would not fit into the 'British context'. At this point I asked her why this was a problem for her, considering she would not interact as frequently with either US Americans or British people as she would with NNESs such as her classmates, and F2 said 'I feel in Rome do as Romas do', which evidences her desire to approximate to British native English pronunciation. In exchange 5.24, we can observe how F2's desire to fit in the British context has been achieved, in her own opinion, from a phonological perspective. This change in her way of pronouncing words was F2's first thought after listening to her own spoken

production, and although she perceived pronunciation as a key aspect, she also noticed that she has started to incorporate 'certain terminology' and 'idioms'. Therefore, her perception of this change went beyond the phonological realm to include other aspects of spoken production, i.e. lexical ones.

Nonetheless, later in her SRI F2 stated that she was also felt like she was becoming part of an international community of multilingual and multicultural members who use English to communicate, which is completely different from the 'monolingual' mindset she grew up with in her home country. This idea reflects a different approach or perception to group membership and identification. To put it in other words, F2 seems to be moving from an ENL orientation to a more neutral space where English is shared by multilingual members, or from a monolingual perspective to an integrationist one, where plurality is valued.

Before closing the discussion around observation #7, I would like to refer to an idea M2 shared with me during his SRI, although this thought was not a reflection on this specific instance of interaction, but on communication within the observed academic community in general. In this respect, M2 believes that communication among the members of the community I observed for months is successful due to a number of reasons. First, all members of this community have a good level of English and they actively engage in interactional work so as to make their audience understand their messages. Second, they speak at an appropriate rate, nor too fast nor too slowly, and also apply non-verbal communication such as facial expression to accompany the delivery of their message. Last but certainly not least, what makes communication successful is that they are all friendly to one another and that, in this sense, social behaviour is more important than language correctness. Not only does this reflection evidence a sound level of awareness of accommodation from a communication efficacy perspective, but it also points to the social aspect of CAT. In this respect. M2's thoughts resonate with Kalocsai's study on Erasmus students (2011), as this participant's ideas provide a clear interpersonal dimension to communication

accommodation. With her research, Kalocsai establishes the interpersonal factor as the main drive in interactions rather than a side effect of collaborative meaning-making processes. M2's idea of social behaviour over language accuracy can be linked the conceptualization of affective involvement as a crucial factor in successful communication.

5.3.4 Observation 10

This observation corresponds to a class activity in which students were asked to share their research questions with other group members. On this occasion, I worked with F3 and incidental participant F18, from China, and who did not speak much during our conversation. While listening to the recording during her SRI, F3 focused her answers and perceptions on self repetition and interpretability strategies. As observed in exchange 4.8 on page 97, the occurrence of self repetition performed by F3 in line 1 seems to correspond to an attempt to obtain more time to plan the rest of her discourse. Although in her SRI F3 did refer to self repetition without my prompting it, she did not relate this strategy to a means to hold her turn while organising her thoughts. What F3 noticed, instead, was her perceived lack of vocabulary as well as her frustration caused by being unable to find alternative lexical items to express her ideas. More specifically, she referred to the way in which she introduced the questions she was asking me regarding her dissertation plan, and pointed out that she overused the clause 'I'd like to know'. At this point in our SRI, I became very interested in finding out more about her feelings regarding this phenomenon, as seen in the following exchange.

Exchange 5.25

F14: and uhm (.) when you when you listen to that (.) when you listen to yourself repeating (.) how do you feel
F3: **not good**
F14: not good [why not]
F3: [hm] (.) **very** (.) **plain**

Her own descriptions of her perceived 'plain' performance can be related to my earlier discussion of exchange 5.8 on page 139 and her narrative of the house alarm episode. In relation to this, I had explained that F3 wishes to have a wider range of vocabulary similar to that of a NES, even though she has no problems getting her message across. I also concluded that F3 seemed to have well-defined objectives for her proficiency levels, and that F3's idealised long-term optimal accommodation equals being able to speak the way NESs do. This is the social identity F3 wants to display when it comes to presenting herself as a speaker of English, so in this sense her actual performance and her perceived lack of vocabulary do not contribute to that end. Notwithstanding the above, F3 did offer a more encouraging perspective of her performance during our class discussion, as she highlighted other language aspects as positive elements that facilitated interactional development. More specifically, she referred to the way in which she structured her questions as logical and easy to understand, to her pronunciation as clear, and to her delivery pace as appropriate. To F3's mind, these factors contributed to my understanding during our class discussion.

5.3.5 Observation 16

In observation #16, we can see key participants F2 and M1 the use of corpora for language teaching purposes and analysing a list of verb plus nominal phrase collocations. While it was not possible to obtain F2's opinions about what happened in this interaction since I focused on other observation instances during her SRI, I was able to talk to M1 about observation #16. During his SRI, M1 referred to F2's other repetition, translanguaging and utterance completion. In relation to exchange 4.2 (page 87), in which we can see how F2 repeats m1's 'policy' (lines 6 and 7) applying the same rising intonation, M1 did not think of this as something out of the ordinary, and considered F2's repetition of the word and the intonation pattern as her way to show her agreement. M1 also explained that the collocation 'be in charge of a policy' was not known to him and that is why he used rising intonation when he read the word aloud.

Translanguaging was not a frequent phenomenon in the observed classroom interactions, and actually it was M1 the only one that included lexical resources other than English. During his SRI, I directed M1's attention to these few instances, which happened to occur in observation #16. These instances of translanguaging correspond to M1's use of the Spanish interjection 'ay ay ay' and M1's inclusion of the word 'yakuza'. In relation to the first one, M1 offered the following explanation.

Exchange 5.26

M1: both of us were very surprised by something we read and i have been using that expression to show surprise i think ***F2's name*** **had already heard me saying it because we started to hang out since the first days** (.) she was part of the group **so i guess she knew that it is an expression of surprise in spanish** and i think she uses the english wow or something like that

It becomes clear that M1 considers the Spanish interjection as a shared resource in the group, and from that perspective he perceives F2's acceptance of said interjection as something normal. In other words, the fact that F2 did not stop to ask for clarification or to make any comment about the interjection was within M1's expectations of this group's interactional practices. However, the other instance of translanguaging stirred a slightly different reaction in M1, as seen in the following exchange.

Exchange 5.27

M1: everything started with the word attack and in my opinion attack is related to something like war (.) i think F2's name said something like life or death **so i remembered words that are associated to criminal activity and the equivalent to the italian mafia or any other criminal organization in japan is yakuza so that's why @@ i introduced the word yakuza** (.) but the strange thing is that ***F2's name*** **does not get involved in the topic and doesn't develop it** (.) who knows **maybe it is a taboo topic** for her

While F2's reaction to his use of the interjection 'ay ay ay' fits M1's expectations as it goes unnoticed, as it were, the 'yakuza' episode does not respond to what he was expecting according to the development of the interaction, as F2 does not follow up on the word 'yakuza'. It seems to be the case that M1's inclusion of the Japanese term was humorous and that F2's non-reaction might be an indication that this move was

not acknowledged or intentionally ignored. But the reason for F2's attitude, to M1's mind, might not be related to a purely linguistic divergence, but to a conflict with the cultural implications of the term. Regardless of the different reactions to these two instances, it seems safe to say that both occurrences evidence a change to another language which feels natural to speakers and the existence of a shared linguistic repertoire which is not so much based on English and speakers L1's as distinctive categories, as it is on participants diverse resources. M1's opinions on his translanguaging practices can be related to Auer's concept of social meaning and how we manage social identities through interaction. Regarding this, Auer states that people can express heterogeneity with their linguistic repertoire and using certain variables over others can display a certain social identity. In M1's case, heterogeneity is expressed by the employment of resources that do not come from English only and the social identity he displays could be the one of a multilingual speaker.

Finally, M2 also referred to one instance of UC as observed in exchange 4.17 (page 108), where F2 seems to have completed M1's turn in line 11 with the word 'beeper'. M1 explained that he might have written down the word 'beeper' in a piece of paper while he was explaining what a 'pager' is, although he was not completely sure that he did so. If this is the case, the instance of UC in exchange 4.17 cannot be considered and analysed as such, since it would correspond to an occurrence of other repetition performed by F2, a repetition that comes from written language and it is expressed in spoken mode. This lack of certainty over the nature of this strategy leads to an important reflection over the limitations of the data collection methods used in this study. The classroom interactions during the observation period were not video recorded mainly since having a camera in the classroom would have been too disruptive for students and it would have implied the use of resources that were not available at that time. However, the inclusion of a visual elements needs to be reconsidered on the basis that a visual record of the interactions could have accounted for non-verbal aspects of communication that are essential to the correct understanding of the way in which interactions unfold.

5.3.6 Observation 19

In observation #19 we can see key participant F1 in conversation with incidental participants M3, a UK national, and M7, a student from South Korea. In her SRI, F1 talked about aspects of phonological accommodation, and her reflections shed light on a certain degree of uneasiness. A few second after I started playing the audio file, F1 paused the recording to say the following (see appendix E.3).

Exchange 5.28

F1: **i don't know why i speak this way**
F14: this way how
F1: **with a very marked accent**
F14: @@@
F1: i didn't know that i - (.) **that has changed i don't like it**

I found out later in our conversation, that when F1 says her accents sounds 'marked' in this interaction, she is referring specifically to the use of plosive consonants in English. Although English and Spanish have the same plosive consonants, i.e. the voiceless plosives /p t k/ and the voiced ones /b d g/, the Spanish phonetic realisation differs from the English counterpart in that Spanish voiceless plosives do not have aspiration, especially in initial positions, and voiced plosives are realised as approximants in intervocalic positions. F1 attributes this 'marked' pronunciation to the fact that M3, a NES, was her main interlocutor in the conversation, so she felt compelled to approximate her pronunciation to ENL norms, and also to her own perceptions of the postgraduate programme requirements. However, at the moment the SRI was conducted, F1 had different perceptions on how she should approach phonological accommodation, as seen in the following exchange (appendix E.3).

Exchange 5.29

F1: maybe it had to do with ideologies or **the way i was socialised** when i was in school thinking that **english is the property of native speakers** – maybe i thought that it was a good way to **show respect for them** – now i don't think that way – now i don't think that english is theirs @**my english is mine**@

In this exchange, we can observe how F1's perceptions over the ownership of the language and how this affects language behaviour have changed, and this might be due to the ELF oriented narrative environment in which she was immersed while completing her postgraduate degree. It is clear that her perception of her own accommodative behaviour towards her NES counterpart corresponds to upward accommodation in that she feels she needs to approximate her pronunciation to that of the person who holds the symbolic power (M3). In this regard, the word 'respect' shows a relationship of subordination to that symbolic power, but when F1 says 'my English is mine' she is performing an act of resistance to that power, and it seems that she feels somehow emancipated from the ideology she grew up with. In another section of her SRI, F1 stated that listening to this conversation made her feel like she was not herself, and this perception links to the concept of authenticity as presented by Coupland (2007), more specifically to consensus as one of the qualities whereby someone's speech can be classified as authentic or fake. Coupland explains that authenticity is the result of a process of authorisation and to be able to claim membership to a particular identity a person has to overcome the challenges related to acceptance. While we do not have access to M3's thoughts on F1's authenticity and its subsequent acceptance, it could be argued that F1 feels that her attempts to succeed in this authorisation process brought about the oppositive effect in the long term, as she believes her oral production was an unfaithful representation of her identity and style. Simply put, she does not perceive her production as authentic.

5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored participants' views on subjective accommodation by means of three different interviews. In order to uncover the different layers of perceptions around subjective accommodation, I applied a thematic analysis, which is defined as the 'process of recovering the theme or themes that are embodied and dramatized in the evolving meanings and imagery of the work' (Van Manen, 2017:78). In thematic analysis, the concept of code is fundamental and it is understood as the

process of creating categories of data and discovering commonalities within data sets (Gibson and Brown, 1998). The process of coding in the analysis of the three sets of interviews was conducted with no predetermined codes and these emerged as I progressed through the data analysis, i.e. my approach to coding was empirical.

From the first round of interviews, it was possible to observe participants' perceptions over their experiences on communication with NESs. In this respect, participants seem to perceive themselves as accountable for communicative efficiency and they are not inclined to think of the success of interaction as a shared enterprise between NES interlocutors and themselves. Thus, accommodation is a unilateral (NNES to NES) and asymmetrical process. Despite this, some participants believe that NES with a background in language teaching can display a more accommodative behaviour, especially in academic settings as opposed to social ones. From participants' narratives It was also possible to see how interaction with NES may have an undesired effect on NNESs' affective stance as well as on linguistics performance. This is to say that by modifying their linguistic behaviour, namely lexical and suprasegmental adaptations, to accommodate to NESs, NNESs might experience negative feelings such as stress, as they see themselves as accountable for communicative efficiency. This is another indication that these participants see accommodation as a unilateral process. Additionally, and from an identity-in-interaction approach (Auer 2007), it can be argued that for some participants, a long-term objective regarding accommodation closely relates to the projection of a different act of identity, which goes in line with ENL standards. However, this identity is not perceived to be within their current linguistic repertoires.

With regard to communication accommodation in interactions with NNESs, like in interaction with NESs a proactive approach can also be perceived inasmuch as participants apply different strategies to modify their communicative styles when interacting with NNESs in and outside campus. The strategies reported by speakers are discourse management (e.g. topic selection), and interpretability (e.g. carefully articulated pronunciation and body language). In their interactions with NNESs,

participants see communicative efficiency as a powerful underlying motive which leads them to adapt their verbal and non-verbal behaviour so as to achieve mutual understanding in a context characterized by heightened variety of linguacultural backgrounds and communicative styles.

In the second round of interviews, participants shared their thoughts about what makes communication successful or not. In relation to those elements that can contribute to positive communicative experiences, participants highlighted pragmatic strategies, phonological and lexical elements, as well as non-verbal communication as fundamental to enhanced intelligibility. Within pragmatic strategies, repetition was mentioned by some participants, but there was more agreement around rephrasing as a strategy that is employed by their tutors to enhance the clarity of their message. Phonological aspects were recurrent in participants' answers, and the most salient facilitating phonological aspect for participants was tutor's L1. In this sense, participants believe that having a shared L1 background with a tutor or classmate as a factor that can enhance their understanding of that person's spoken English. Other phonological factors are clear articulation of sounds, especially vowels, slow delivery of speech, emphasis and extra stress on those key words that are crucial for the understanding of class content. To a lesser degree, lexical factors, namely accessible vocabulary, were also highlighted by participants as an aspect that contributes to their understanding. Finally, the relevance of body language as a way to capture students' attention and make them engage in classroom interaction signals participants' view on accommodation as an aspect that goes the purely verbal communication.

Finally, in the SRIs participants offered their views on the actual accommodative moves as performed by their interlocutors and themselves during the classroom observation period. Their observations of stylistic variations in interactions included a variety of aspects that ranged from language based modifications to more social issues such as group identification. Some of these stylistic modifications evidence a proactive attitude and active engagement in the construction of positive interpersonal relations, as it is

the case of lexical choices that aim at avoiding the feeling of uneasiness in interlocutors. Moreover, discourse management strategies or how other speakers adjust the direction and development of their discourse to attend to interlocutors' needs, such as clarification of key concepts or UC, are commonly perceived as essential to successful interactions and positive interpersonal relationships. By way of contrast, interpersonal control strategies are related to more mixed reactions amongst participants, and what is more, there are conflicting views around this topic even within the same participant's answers, depending on variables such as interlocutors' roles and identities or interactional objectives. On the one hand, interruptions and simultaneous talk can be perceived positively, as signalling engagement and interest in the interaction and even as a means of showing playfulness. Conversely, interpersonal control strategies can create a sense of discomfort in certain speakers, especially when the interlocutor employing these strategies is not significant actor in a community. Last but not least, the SRIs also provided insightful views over phonological accommodation, especially regarding the extent to which some participants (F1 and F2 specifically) have changed their perceptions of optimal levels of phonological accommodation. From their answers, it can be argued that while they were doing their postgraduate programmes they felt their pronunciation had to approach the ENL canon, but by the time the SRIs were carried out, this self imposed benchmark was not present in their discourse and was apparently replaced by a more ELF oriented perception of what their own respective Englishes should sound like.

Chapter 6 Summary and conclusions

In the present chapter I offer a more comprehensive review of the main findings of this study in light of the research questions that guided the project throughout all its stages. I will close this chapter by referring to the main limitations and implications of this thesis.

6.1 Research questions and findings

As stated at the beginning of section 3.3.1, the principal objective of this project was to learn how speakers of diverse linguacultural backgrounds employ accommodation strategies of various kinds in an international academic setting, and to study their perceptions of communication accommodation in their past interactions with NNESs and NESs, as well as the present ones. To that end, I devised two main research questions: one to uncover the objective accommodative practices of these participants, and the other one to find out their ideas regarding subjective accommodation.

6.1.1 Accommodation strategies in an international university setting

The first research question was: in the context of communication accommodation theory, how are accommodation strategies applied in ELF interactions in a UK international university setting? So as to address this question, a CA framework was the chosen analytical tool as it offers a natural connection to CAT. In other words, CA's emphasis on social practices and how they are accomplished through talk and interaction allowed me to observe how the five key participants applied accommodative moves in their actual interactions within their academic language and social practices. With the purpose of studying participants' naturally occurring talk and

their orientations to conversational patterns of accommodation, CA's detailed attention to the sequential organization of interactive spontaneous spoken language is fundamental. Moreover, in my project I have approached communication accommodation as a broader framework that comprises divergence and convergence, known as approximation strategies, and also discourse management, interpretability, and interpersonal control strategies, and I have understood these dimensions as complementary rather than mutually exclusive.

The first point if inquiry within the first main question aimed at uncovering what speakers actually do in order to accommodate in this international academic setting and based on the analysis performed on the classroom observation data, it can be stated that repetition and rephrasing are strategies that are used in spoken interaction frequently, but as I will discuss later, repetition is used in different ways depending on whether it is employed as self or other repetition. Moreover, participants seem to direct rephrasing towards 'self' and avoid the use of other paraphrasing. Another actual realisation of communication accommodation strategy, albeit one that was far less common than repetition and rephrasing, is utterance completion (UC) which is employed by participants as a convergence strategy to indicate collaborative interactional behaviour, namely attentiveness and support to the interlocutor, as well as a discourse management strategy to attend to others' conversational needs and facilitate their contribution to the interaction.

One strategy that was not frequently found in the observation data set was pre-empting. In this respect, the few instances of such strategy showed that participants use pre-empting when certain parts of the information they are delivering are potentially sensitive or problematic to others and these eventual sources of problems can come from cultural differences of speakers' past experiences. Pre-empting is then seen as an interpretability strategy since it is based on speakers' assumptions of their interlocutors' proficiency level and of previous experiences and second, and also because it is employed to heighten communicative efficiency.

Finally, another frequently found phenomenon whereby participants accommodate is simultaneous talk. In my data there are instances of both cooperative and competitive overlapping, although the latter is far less common than the former. Instances of cooperative simultaneous talk seem to indicate that participants employ collaborative overlapping in order to show agreement and confirm that speaker's point, (b) to collaborate with an interlocutor by providing requested information when this is experiencing problems constructing an utterance, and to intervene when someone's understanding is at risk. Regarding competitive simultaneous talk, instances found in the data set provide evidence to believe that this type of overlapping is employed by ELF users so as to show a certain level of disagreement, when a speaker wishes to take control of the course of the interaction so as to offer a strong opinion and question other people's ideas.

The second area of investigation regarding the first research question attempted to answer the following question: to what extent do participants employ communication accommodation strategies in different ways? In this respect, certain crucial differences can be observed regarding repetition, rephrasing, utterance completion and simultaneous talk. First, other repetition appears to be used with different purposes compared to self repetition. What this means is that other repetition mainly aims at showing engagement and listenership to interlocutors, ascertaining comprehensibility and confirming information provided in previous turns. Other repetition, then, can be aligned to discourse management strategies as its principal function is that of facilitating interlocutors' participation in interaction. Self repetition differs from other repetition in that its main functional nature relates to interpersonal control strategies rather than discourse management ones. In this respect, self repetition is applied with the objective of gaining more time so as to plan the remaining discourse, as well as directing the course of the interaction after interruptions and simultaneous talk. In the same line, self rephrasing also aims at exerting that interpersonal control when it is used after overlapped talk. As well as interpersonal control, instances of self rephrasing from the observation data also reflect an interpretability dimension to it,

since they show that participants resort to self rephrasing as a repair strategy when they consider that an aspect of language might lead to breakdown in communication. Participants employ self rephrase also to increase clarity even if there is no apparent danger to understanding. In this respect, self rephrasing has a pre-emptive drive. Another difference with respect to the many ways in which participants perform communication accommodation has to do with the fact that in the observation data set there were no clear instances of other rephrase, which evidences a strong emphasis in 'self'. In this context 'self' refers to speakers' pro-active approach to interaction, as well as to their ability to identify areas of eventual conflict and to act accordingly.

Utterance completion, like other repetition, is also applied as a discourse management strategy aimed at facilitating interlocutors' participation in interactions. UCs can be either accepted or rejected by the interlocutor whose utterance has been completed and based on the observed data, UCs are accepted when they do not disrupt the direction of the discourse and the completion of an academic task. Last but not least, the study of simultaneous talk shows that ELF interactions may present a competitive nature, although a cooperative attitude is still the norm. Collaborative simultaneous talk happens when interlocutors do not want to wait for the current speaker's turn to finish before acknowledging or agreeing with a point or idea. They also occur when a speaker wants to collaborate by providing requested information when the current speaker is having problems with the construction of an utterance, and when one or more interlocutors wish to cooperate when someone's understanding is at risk. Conversely, competitive simultaneous talk is employed to show disagreement. In a university setting, competitive overlapping is likely to happen when speakers are compelled to control of the course of the interaction in order to give a strong opinion or to question an interlocutor's idea. In this regard, collaborative overlapping corresponds to both discourse management and interpretability strategies, since it occurs when a speaker wishes to facilitate interlocutors' contributions and when speaker make assumptions on their interlocutor's language proficiency. On the other hand, competitive simultaneous talk can be aligned to interpersonal control strategies

as this type of overlapping occurs as a result of speakers' attempts to obtain the floor and exert some control over the course of interaction.

6.1.2 Accommodative behaviour awareness

As regards the second main research question, the analysis of the date moved away from objective accommodation to study participants' perceptions over subjective accommodation. The first main research question was: to what extent are participants aware of their accommodative behaviour and that of their interlocutors? In order to investigate this question, three sets of interviews were held with participants individually, and the transcriptions of these interviews were studied with thematic analysis.

The first area of inquiry in the second main research question aims at investigating which areas of accommodation are more salient and relevant to participants in their interactions. In this respect, we can rely on some data obtained from the first round of interviews to start answering this question. From some of their answers to the first interview, it can be gathered that participants perceive discourse management (topic selection), and interpretability (carefully articulated pronunciation and body language) as relevant accommodation strategies, especially in their interaction with other NNESs. By means of these strategies, participants adapt their verbal and non-verbal behaviour so as to achieve mutual understanding. When it comes to communication with NESs, participants seem to emphasise other aspects of accommodation such as lexical and prosodic modifications. Although data from the first interview provided sound evidence to determine the most salient and relevant areas of accommodation, it was the second set of interviews that allowed me to obtain a more substantiated idea of what they believe is more relevant about accommodation. In the second round of interviews and in relation to the elements that can contribute to having successful interactions, participants stressed pragmatic strategies, phonological and lexical elements, as well as non-verbal communication as fundamental to enhanced

intelligibility. In relation to pragmatic moves, rephrasing was a strategy they deem useful to enhance clarity. When it comes to phonological aspects, the most relevant aspects were shared L1 background, and to a lesser degree, clear articulation of sounds, slow delivery of speech and extra emphasis on key concepts. Regarding lexical factors, accessible vocabulary was also mentioned by participants as a factor that contributes to their understanding. Finally, body language was another element that can enhance understanding of an audience characterised by its internationality. From the SRIs (3rd set of interviews), it was possible to observe that phonological aspects of language are also crucial to accommodation, especially in communication that involves NESs.

The second area of inquiry addressed issues related to participants' perceptions of optimal levels of accommodation according to their communicative needs in academic settings. Regarding this point, it can be said that participants' perceptions of how their communicative needs are met are very positive, especially when it comes to tutors' accommodative behaviour. Participants see their tutors as good facilitators of communication who actively work towards a successful delivery of their messages. According to participants, this is mainly evidenced in their use of accessible vocabulary, which contains little use of idiomatic expressions, and of interpretability strategies such as slow delivery of speech. Another relevant point in the area of optimal accommodation relates to their NES classmates' professional background, as participants tend believe that NES with a background in language teaching usually engage in accommodative practices. Finally, with regard to the third area of inquiry, i.e. how participants seek social attractiveness through accommodation, the first relevant aspect found in the interview data set relates to participants' experiences of communication with NESs. In this respect the search for and projection of social attractiveness, namely a social identity that reflects their English proficiency (actual or desired) is a powerful influence that causes them to work hard on improving their accommodative behaviour. What is more, participant seem to perceive themselves as accountable for communicative efficiency in interactions with NESs. It can also be argued that some participants' objectives concerning English proficiency, which is

closely linked to long-term accommodation, imply the projection of an identity that is more aligned to ENL canons. This is not to say that these objectives have remained unchanged. As we can see in F1 and F3's observations on phonological accommodation, these aims can change and move away from ENL orientations towards a more ELF focused mindset.

6.2 Limitations and suggestions for further research

The first limitation to this study has already been introduced in section 5.3.5, when I discussed a supposed instance of UC and compared it to one of the participant's observations from his SRI. This limitation has to do with the data collection methods, more specifically to the recording of classroom interactions. In this study, classroom interactions were only audio recorded and there was no available visual support for the analysis of the interactions, except for field notes which could not account for all aspects of communication. Therefore, the inclusion of a visual elements in data collection should be re-examined inasmuch as visual records of interactions can provide valuable information on non-verbal aspects of communication that are essential to the correct understanding of interactions. Secondly, another limitation that I have identified throughout the process of analysis relates to the absence of points of comparison and contrast between interactions in ELF settings and interactions among NESs. Throughout the analyses chapters I have characterised interactions as realised by this group of NNES participants as highly proactive and varied in terms of accommodation strategies, and also collaborative. However, at no point during the thesis have I implied that native speaker communication in English is the opposite, i.e. uncooperative and lacking accommodative behaviour. In this respect, I believe it could have been beneficial to the understanding of ELF interaction to have included aspects of NES communication.

6.3 Implications and possible contributions

The first and perhaps main contribution of the present study has been the inclusion of other dimensions of CAT, namely discourse management, interpersonal control and interpretability. Although there have been other studies that have looked into accommodation in ELF interactions from other perspectives (e.g. Kalocsai 2011, Kaur 2009 and 2011), the main focus of research into ELF accommodation has been placed on approximation strategies, i.e., convergence and divergence. The study of different dimensions of accommodation theory can contribute to a better understanding of relevant areas of communication in ELF interactions and of NNESs' social identity and sense of empowerment as users of the language. This means that instead of looking only at native like proficiency in terms of attainment of native pronunciation, acquisition of lexis including idiomatic expressions and standard morphosyntactic patterns, it may be more fruitful to start including pragmatic strategies such as repetition, rephrasing and even utterance completion in the way we evaluate – formally or informally – language proficiency, both for NNESs and NESs.

The second contribution relates to the data collection and analytical approaches of this study, more specifically to the fact that communication accommodation was studied from an objective point of view, through the observation of interaction based on CA, as well as a subjective standpoint, especially through stimulated-recall tasks. This has allowed me to contrast and compare the actual realisations of accommodation strategies to participants' perceptions of their own accommodative behaviour. Having both perspectives has given me access to more complex and richer views on these phenomena, whereby I have been able to uncover other layers of interpretation and to validate or discard some conclusions I drew from the analysis of classroom observation. Although CA is an extremely useful analytical tool that permits an exhaustive analysis of actual interactions, it was really important to have access to participants' ideas around their actual behaviour, their motives and their perceived consequences of accommodation, because observable linguistic behaviour is shaped

by social and psychological aspects. Belonging to a community such as a group of international students, implies a different approach to interaction as compared to more intimate relationships or casual encounters with passers-by, for instance. Thus, it might be argued that communication within a community whose members hold a more stable and long-term relationship could make us take a more careful approach to interactions and, of course, to the way we accommodate, since most humans need a sense of membership and belonging, especially in professional or academic contexts like this one. In this sense, people might wish to maintain a more positive group identity and showing alignment to others' communicative needs has been proven to be essential to this task. Evidence delivered by CA is a crucial starting point, but having the interlocutors' perspective of the motivations and consequences of the decisions to modify or maintain their linguistic behaviour is of the essence to understand this very important aspect of our social lives.

Another contribution I wish to highlight has to do with the inclusion of narrative interviews as a data collection tool. As discussed in section 5.1, the concept of narrative environment in crucial to understanding participants' interpretations because it accounts for a reflexive interplay between narratives and environments and can explain how narrative practices are shaped by and shape the environment in which they take place. In that section, I also referred to the narrative environment in which my participants found themselves during their stay in the UK, and briefly described as shaped by a strong ELF discourse. I have also provided some evidence of how this narrative environment might have created new discourses in some of my participants, especially F1 and F2. This could have implications for language teacher education in that it suggests that including ELF elements to training programmes can bring about new perceptions of language ownership, NNES teacher identity and language proficiency goals.

Finally, in her 2022 book chapter, Jenkins refers to the four key areas in the future of ELF research. One of them higher education, and in this respect, Jenkins points to the

evident mismatch between the way in which most international universities are dealing with NES students' acceptance to different undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, and the actual sociolinguistic reality of university classrooms. In other words, tests such as IELTS and TOEFL and their attachment to NES rules are not effective indicators of students' performance in the international classrooms, once they have been accepted. This research has contributed to understanding how international students actually deal with communication in academia, on the one hand, and to determining which interactional aspects are deemed more effective for achieving successful communication. In this respect, this research has helped us to understand that NES-like use of language is not a determining factor in effective classroom interaction, and that accommodation strategies such as discourse management and interpretability are more important in multicultural settings. Finally, this project has also provided some evidence to believe that NNES language professionals still hold conflicting views regarding their English language competences and their desired social identity. Although some still believe that NES like proficiency is a necessary goal due to their 'English language professional persona' (despite having exposure to ELF theoretical aspects), they are well aware of the fact that accommodating to other NNESs might not be in line with having NES-like proficiency. Thus, it may be fruitful to include more discussion on CAT in English language teacher training programmes, not only about divergence and convergence in general but also about the more detailed angles of discourse management, interpretability and interpersonal control strategies.

Appendices

Appendix A

Dear Colleague,

Thank you for agreeing to take part in my PhD project and for completing this questionnaire. The general objective of the whole project is to obtain more insights of how international students of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds use accommodation strategies in an *English as a Lingua Franca* (ELF) context. More specifically, the aim of this questionnaire is to obtain basic information about you, as well as your linguistic background, the way you use English and your perceptions of your own linguistic skills.

Although you are asked to give your name, this and all the information you provide in this questionnaire will remain ***confidential at all times***, and will only be used by myself and for the purposes of my PhD project. It will take you approximately 15 minutes to complete this questionnaire and once you finish, please return it to me by Monday March 10th.

Thank you!

Carmen Gaete (cig2g11@soton.ac.uk)

Questionnaire: Accommodation in ELF: a socio-psychological and sociolinguistic study

Part I: Personal information

1.1 Please write you name: ……..

1.2 Are you a…? (circle as appropriate) ***female*** ***male***

1.3 What is your age? (circle as appropriate)

a. 20-24 years old
b. 25-29 years old
c. 30-34 years old
d. 35-39 years old
e. 40 +

1.4 In which country were you born? ……

1.5 What is your profession? …….

(please consider what you were doing before becoming a full time student at Southampton)

Part II: Language background

2.1 Have you lived in an **English speaking country** before coming to Southampton? (circle as appropriate)

YES ***NO***

2.1.1 If you answered ***yes***, please list the places you have been to and state the length of time you lived in each place.

Place (city and country)	Approximate length of time (in months)
…….	…….
…….	…….
…….	…….

2.2 Have you ever lived in other ***non English-speaking countries*** (apart from your country of birth)? (circle as appropriate)

YES ***NO***

2.2.1 If you answered ***yes***, please list the places you have been to and state the length of time you lived in each place.

Place (city and country)	Approximate length of time (in months)
…….	…….
…….	…….
…….	…….

2.3 What is your mother tongue?

……..

2.4 Do you speak any other languages apart from your mother tongue and English? (circle as appropriate) ***YES*** ***NO***

2.4.1 If you answered ***yes***, please state the languages you speak (other than English and your mother tongue)

……

……

2.5 For which purposes do you use English? (you may tick more than one)

[ ] Work
[ ] Family life
[ ] Talking to friends (including online communication)
[ ] Studies
[ ] Everyday use (e.g. shopping)
[ ] Others (please state which) ……

2.6 About your previous education (before starting your postgraduate studies in [place 4]): Please circle one alternative for each of the following three questions:

2.6.1	**Has your *primary* education been delivered in English?**	**Not at all**	**Only partially**	**Totally**
2.6.2	Has your *secondary* education been delivered in English?	Not at all	Only partially	Totally
2.6.3	Has your *university* education been delivered in English?	Not at all	Only partially	Totally

Part III: Perceptions of English

3.1 Are you happy with your accent in English? (circle as appropriate) ***YES*** ***NO***

3.1.1 If you answered **no** to the previous question, what kind of accent would you like to have?

……

……

3.2 Are you satisfied with your level of English in general? (circle as appropriate)
YES ***NO***

3.2.1 If you answered **no** to the previous question, which aspects of your English would you like to improve?

……

……

3.3 For each of the following statements, please circle the number that best represents the way you feel.

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
3.3.1	I find it easy to understand *native speakers* of English when I'm *on campus*.	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
3.3.2	I find it easy to understand *native speakers* of English when I am *outside campus* (e.g. in a supermarket).	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
3.3.3	I find it easy to understand *non-native speakers* of English when I'm *on campus*.	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
3.3.4	I find it easy to understand *non-native speakers* of English when I am *outside campus* (e.g. in a supermarket).	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*

Part IV: If you would like to make further comments on any of these questions or anything else, please feel free to use the space below to express your thoughts.

……

……

……

……

……

……

Thank you very much!

Appendix B

Participant Information Sheet (VERSION 1)

Study Title: Accommodation in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): a socio-psychological and sociolinguistic study

Researcher: Carmen Isabel Gaete **Ethics number**: 7826

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

I am a research student enrolled in the iPhD Applied Linguistics programme at this university, and I am working on my doctoral thesis. For my project I am looking at the way ELF speakers use accommodation strategies in their spoken interaction, in the context of an international university in the UK, and how these modifications relate to the projection of identity. More specifically, I will be looking at how international students apply accommodation strategies in spontaneous conversations, and at their assessment of their own accommodative behaviour and that of their interlocutors in the university context.

Why have I been chosen?

You have been chose because you are an international students enrolled in one of the following programmes: iPhD Applied Linguistics, MA Applied Linguistics, MA Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching, and MA English Language Teaching.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to fill out a simple questionnaire to find out about your experiences using English. I will also be attending some of your classes at university and observe/(audio)record your group discussions; and also I might record some of your conversations outside class provided all the people present agree for me to do so. Finally, I will also invite you to 3 or 4 interviews during the rest of the academic year to discuss your impressions of certain parts of the interaction and experiences as an international student.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

Your contribution will help to enhance the knowledge in the area. Moreover, in return for your kindness, I would be very willing to help you with your academic work: planning and discussing your assignments, proofreading your writing, for example.

Are there any risks involved?

There are no risks involved, besides the ones that may occur in everyday life.

Will my participation be confidential?

Your personal information will be at all times confidential. Your real names will be replaced by pseudonyms and will not be linked to any research material in the thesis or any future publication. Your information and the data obtained from you will be kept in a computer locked with a password.

What happens if I change my mind?

If you change your mind about taking part in this research project at any time during the process, you can choose not to participate and ask me to delete your complete data. Moreover, even if you want to continue being part of the study but at any point you feel uncomfortable with the content of any given conversation/interview, that particular audio file will be deleted upon your request.

What happens if something goes wrong?

In the unlikely case of concern or complaint you can contact the Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee Prof Chris Janaway (023 80593424, c.janaway@soton.ac.uk).

Where can I get more information?

If you would like to get further information, please do not hesitate to contact me, Carmen Gaete (mobile phone number: 07907589759, email address cig2g11@soton.ac.uk)

Thank you very much!

Appendix C

CONSENT FORM (FACE TO FACE: Version 1)

Study title: "Accommodation in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): a socio-psychological and sociolinguistic study"

Researcher name: Carmen Gaete

Staff/Student number: 25157264

ERGO reference number: 7826

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet (version 1 of participant information sheet) and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.	☐
I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study and future publications.	☐
I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected.	☐

Data Protection

I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password protected computer and that this information will only be used for the purpose of this study. All files containing any personal data will be made anonymous.

Name of participant (print name) ……

Signature of participant ……

Date ……

Appendix D

D.1 Observation 3

Speakers' ID:

M1: key male participant one
F6: incidental female participant from Saudi Arabia
F7: incidental female participant from Saudi Arabia
FX: unspecified female speaker (either F6 or F7)

<**beg** 0303M1_00:00:11>

M1: so have you already decided what to write on [(or) any ideas]
F7: [you mean the topics yes]
F6: s: sort of for me because i i i i choose one and (xxx) e:r because i i i plan to: to extEND my submission date but when i talk to e:r when i talk to *tutor 1's name* she told me it's not possible because it's gonna to be regarded as late submission (.) so i i change my plan (now) i change (of) my topic to make - to choose some topic which e:r is quite (.) possible to (xxx) a time
M1: alright did you change like dramatically?
F6: yeah yeah yeah (xxx) different e:r it's about vocabulary but (xxx)
M1: but still you will need e:r human beings in your research=
F6: =yeah
M1: (xxx) and you *F7's name*?
F7: e:r i am certain on the topic but the problem is the research question?
L: mhm
F7: i have to discover (xxx) a broad area I'm looking for (xxx) second language vocabulary acquisition so think about age gender {inaudible because of background noise}
M1: have have you talked to to any of our lectures about ideas
F7: (xxx)
M1: a about ideas to look for or someone that can guide you
F7: no
M1: me neither (but) e:r as i was telling *tutor's 2 name* i would like to get inside a a very poor school in [place 1] but same as you I might have to change my topic because my friend the headmaster says that he might change jobs
F6: m::
F7: m::
M1: so that would be like the end of my (.) i i idea but there is another possibility of checking e:r formation programs for teachers in [place 1] in that case you only need documents (like) to to see the: - each university: er programme and that can be done through the internet
FX: m::
M1: somehow i think it is EAsier but not as interesting as as seeing what teachers and and children think (.) the english we give them any any advance o:r advantage or they have

any interest in learning english in [place 1] <faster> particularly in a in a context where </faster> there's lots of crime around them
FX: [mmm] yeah
FX: [mmm]
M1: (so) i certainly i don't want to go to that context
F6: [@@]
F7: [@@]
M1: (xxx)
F6: which area (.) in in the country
M1: in in [place 2] in in the suburbs in the outskirts it's where we have more -
F6: not the capital
M1: the CApital
F6: <surprise> the capital </surprise>
M1: yes yes but in the outskirts like in all big cities you have to like most of of the poorer [communities of people]
F6: [ahh]
M1: and because e:r the the parents have not received that much education er the children don't don't see I think the (.) the point of of going to school because they live in a in a context [with violence or drugs =
F6: [ah yeah
F7: = so you are looking for what (xxx)
M1: to see first of all er in what kind of context the teachers have to work. (.) IF these teachers have lost the magic because (.) er we have seen that for instance er some teachers believe that their - they have a MIssion in life
FX: mhm
M1: i i want to see <soft>(if these)</soft> teachers have been teaching for five years ten years fifteen years twenty years (I guess that) ALL of that CHANges your appreciation of (.) of your mission
FX: m:
M1: a:nd and for them maybe if one of the of their students reaches university maybe that is enough for them e:r (.) it it's all er -
F6: okay is it that hopeless? (.) this situation i mean their -
M1: that is what i want to research? because the: (with the) -
F6: how the motivation of the teacher can affect or can (xxx) right?
M1: yes yes actually if – (.) even if the student see the teacher as a model (.) like (xx) will someone want to be a teacher because they see that the teachers treats them better than their parents at home (xx) (.) like too many questions
F6: @@ yes
M1: but who knows if (.) -
F7: but i think your topic is amazing (xxx)
M1: so do i @but let's see if it can be done@ because if my if my friend the headmaster goes i have no access to the (.) teachers students and guardians or carers (..) e:r let’s see
F7: but I think there is the purpose behind that
M1: oh yeah
F7: (xxx)
M1: like (.) er (.) maybe for some people it’s just a matter of putting more MOney into the school okay we can put more money more computers er and electronic board?
F7: but still they will not -
M1: but if the teacher doesn't know how to use that (.) or if (of) (.) or someone steals the [computers]
F6: [m: yeah]
M1: what's the use (.) anyway i i will go for a fifty

F6: [@@@]
F7: [@@@]
M1: fifty one (…) no no no that seventy is impossible
F6: it's possible
M1: (xxx) you might go for a ninety or for an eighty (...) (xx) (.) but every time i come to this class i feel like (.) we have to do a lot of
F7: yeah everybody feel the same <soft> (feels the same) </soft>
M1: we'll be fine
F6: [hopefully
F7: [that's I'm trying (xxx) to calm myself
M1: @@
F7: (xxx) cause you you feel totally lost
M1: yes
F7: this is the first time for you and you need someone to guide you [(xxx)
F6: [yeah yeah (xxx probably xxx studying for xxx)
M1: mhm
F6: (xxx) allocated to: (.) to supervisor?
M1: yes yes and then we hope that the supervisor is someone nice
F6: @yeah@
M1: we're not going to (drop) names but (.) some people are nicer than others (...) on the other hand i am hungry at this time
FX: (xxx)
M1: you will not go back to your countries to do this
F7: i have to do because my father's er (xxx) visa expires (inaudible) oh yeah now it's complicated we can't i can't stay while he's not here i have to be accompanied by a male er guardian
M1: [a:h this is because of your beliefs
F7: [yeah yeah that's why I had to leave <soft> (xxx) </soft>
M1: is there is there any male guardian that you can bring?
F7: e:r there's my my brothers but er they they will not get the work re release to be here so that's why
M1: i can appLY for that
F7: @@@ to be my guardian?
M1: yes yes yes i am i am your cousin *M1's name* from [place 3] (.) that you haven't seen in fifty years @@
F7: @@
M1: <mocking> that's very funny </mocking>
F7: yea:h that's the funny part
M1: <surprise>a:h</surprise> ok so you leave because he has to leave
F7: sometimes you feel it's er (…) (xxx part) of our culture because i feel no matter how old i am (i'm gonna) i need somebody {inaudible because of background noise}
M1: (xx) it doesn't matter if you are (.) [over thirty]
F7: [yea:h] from my perspective i think (xxx) a woman (xx) needs a male to (xxx) either a relative a husband or (someone) [(xx) women are WEAK]
M1: [so *F6's name*] can stay because she's married
F7: she is (xxx)?

M1: because you're married you can stay you-
F6: [yeah]
F7: [yeah] her her husband is is with her (xxx)-
M1: you need to get yourself a husband [so simple]
F7: [i'm married] i'm married @@
M1: @@@
F7: but my husband is selfish (xxx) go with me you know
M1: <surprise> you you HAVE a husband </surprise>
F7: mhm
M1: <surprise> but he's not here </surprise>
F7: mhm
L: <surprise> he decided to stay there </surprise>
F7: yeah
M1: a:h that's a bad husband and i would divorce
F7: @@@
M1: can you divorce?
F7: @no@
M1: opa:
F7: in in certain cases (.) not in that
M1: [i i would say -
F6: [you're talking about a @lo:ng story now@
M1: a::::h (.) that's very funny because today my my land lady is going to the courts of justice to help a friend of hers diVORCE from <slow> this friend's husband </slow> and i said why <fast> because i am very (curious) </fast> and she said that this friend of hers was being emotionally blackmailed by this bad husband who by the way was discovered by this lady that he was being unfaithful but he denies it so now he is e:r saying that he will kill himself if she separates or divorces from him (..) give me a break (..) but that happens when people get married
F7: yeah
M1: that's why [i am single]
F7: [so you] aha so you are /against/ marriage
M1: ah sorry
F7: so you are against marriage
M1: m:: i am against bad marriages but i know that (.) i think that when we want to get married we have this ideal that everything will be fine but if not everything goes fine you must have one way out <soft> of marriage </soft> you are not condemned for life (.) in the case that she finds out that i am not good enough (xxx) but in a civilised way i wouldn't have to (.) threaten her and she will not have to threaten me i [understand]
FX: [aha]
M1: but fortunately there are laws bu:t (.) it's really bad when things don't go the way that you -
F7: so you're afraid of commitment? or
M1: [maybe]
F7: [usually] usually male think that
M1: maybe <coughs>
F6: @@
F7: but at least you've got the: um (.) you know your point of view to be away or to be away from commit- yeah i mean to get married with someone and then leave her (without) reason
M1: {inaudible because of background noise}
F7: it's better than someone who (xxx) woman (it is important) in a relationship then

M1: er
F7: leave for a for a reason
M1: but I think one has to commit oneself to be with the other person the thing is what happens if one (month or one year) in the relationship they change they change completely i can't i cannot be there

<**end** 0303M1_00:11:55>

D.2 Observation 4

Speakers' ID

F1: key female participant one
F3: key female participant three
F15: incidental female participant, a visiting scholar from East Asia

<**beg** 0503F1F3_00:00:03>

F3: are your students digital natives (.) e:r could you please tell me what is digital natives?
F15: digital natives maybe you're born to: -
F1: is the generation that is born=
F15: = yes =
F1: = with the:
F15: (xxx) [generation
F1: [when when when is er – when did you: - er (…) when were you born.
F3: when I born?
F1: yeah
F3: [nineteen ninety
F1: [what year
F3: nineteen ninety
F15: [maybe (.) possibly
F1: [so you you are a native probably
F3: [oh so I am a digital natives
F1: [so if if you have –
F15: yeah
F1: if you have been born (.) in in a era where the digital –
F3: mhm
F15: do you use a lot of things
F3: yes? compute:r [er phone – (.) y: you (xxx) when you born you have no computer? wow
F1: [yeah cause when I was born there was no computers that's – so I'm a (xxx) (.) yeah in schools in schools there was no computers
F3: <surprised> really </surprised>
F1: yes
F15: but you can use it now [(xxx)
F1: [I can use it but still (.) probably there is a difference that's why we [should discover]
F15: [but not a big difference]
F1: we have two we have two different –
F3: kind of
F1: kind of –
F3: computer?
F1: students (.) regarding that
F3: mhm. are you native or an immigrant
F1: so when you were born? (.) you had er – you didn't – you weren't born with a mobile phone but (.) probably - (.) what what age were you when you: -

[how old were you –]
F3: [e:r] how old let me (.) maybe in my: -
F1: when you had a mobile phone (xxx) –
F3: mobiles
F1: YEAH
F3: mobile phone in my m:: in my high school. I have a mobile phone
F1: ok I didn't –
F3: and I play computer when I was like twelve years old?
F1: so you (xxx)
F3: mhm
F1: did you have the subject in er – in school. [computer science]
F3: [yes] yes primary school –
F1: in primary –
F3: yes yes –
F1: so we – I didn't for example
F15: (xxx)
F1: she's a native
F15: yeah
F3: yeah yes –
F1: (xxx) native (.) [digital]
F3: [yeah]
F15: I'm immigrant. [@completely immigrant@]
F1: [(I'm immigrant too)] yeah (xxx) we are trying to – can you use it now
F15: yeah =
F1: = yes =
F15: = with my students (xxx) learn something better and later (.) um it is so necessary i have to learn (.) how to use it =
F1: = I know =
F15: = yeah to follow maybe –
F3: <slow> so er for your situation </slow> if somebody (xxx) to use (it)
F15: yeah yeah we have to do so because there's some requirements – teaching requirements sometimes we have to use the facebook the computer to teach to to give them assignments and to – for self study after class
F1: (xxx) yeah
F15: yeah
F1: our mini – ministry – the ministry of education in [place 7] is saying er we need to use technology new technology so first @we need to know how to use it@ =
F15: = yeah =
F3: = yes?
F1: and normally students know more than you
F3: yes
F1: so sometimes they help you maybe (.) you don't say that you don't know how to use it but you just elicit =
F15: = yeah so sometimes for me i have to er receive some er training
F3: mhm =
F1: = yeah yeah =
F15: = and also (them) from my students or from my my my @daughter@
[yes so that's – yeah
F3: [o::h yeah yes yes
F1: [yeah that's a good good source of knowledge
F3: I don't know I [just use it (.) @yeah@
F1: [@for you is normal@ yeah@@

F3: yeah it's normal [yes
F1: [you're lucky though you have to know it (.) you are lucky
F15: [yeah]
F1: [cause] for some people it's very difficult
F15: yeah =
F1: (I mean) maybe (.) when I was in high school some computers were starting (.) [to use (xxx) -
F3: [so when you: begin to use computer
F1: in my fourth year in high school? so it was grade four in secondary school i don't know the equivalent here but i was sixteen years old (.) so the first subject in compute:r computer science =
F3: = mhm
F1: was then (it) was happening then for the first time in my town? so the first thing i i remember is a black black screen with <spel> m s </spel> two? you probably don't know [what it is]
F3: [black screen]
F15: [really] in which year. nineteen =
F1: = it was =
F15: = two thousand (.) how many years ago
F3: windows
F1: @I'm trying to think@ =
F3: = windows ninety eight?
F1: the – twelve years ago
F15: twelve years ago
F1: twelve thirteen years ago =
F3: = it's the software (was) windows [ninety eight]
F15: [around two thousand]
F1: yeah yeah (.) what sorry
F3: windows ninety eight? (.) the soft – (.)
F1: sorry
F3: the the the –
F15: microsoft
F3: yes
F15: <soft> windows </soft>
F1: the – but the [<spel> m s </spel> two]
F15: [(xxx)]
F1: do you know what I'm talking about (.) the:
F15: yeah
F1: you don't know @@
F15: @yeah yeah@
F1: (cause) microsoft (xxx) [it was before microsoft]
F15: [<soft> (xxx) </soft>] (xxx)
F3: yeah [i don't know w w w I don't know what kind of computer like (.) black screen
F15: [<soft> but we didn't talk about implications </soft> (.) yes
F1: [implications means that we have to train a lot more
F3: what kind of computer have black screen (.)
F1: BEFORE the software
F3: <surprised> before [software </surprised> (.) (xxx)

F1: [before before software we (worked) like this (.) we had to code
F15: [yeah
F1: we had to create to to create folders we had to introduce the codes =
F15: = something [very very busy (.) very (xxx)
F3: [<surprised> really </surprised> @@
F1: [yeah (.) I had – my my first course in computer science
F3: aha
F1: I had to have a notebook with a lot of codes to (.) to create a folder and stuff in the computer
F3: you not just turn on and it will appear =
F1: = <fast> no no no no no </fast> =
F3: <surprised> o:h </surprised>
F1: the windows surface was um – [maybe it]
F15: [(another)]
F1: was not that late but maybe about three years later or something like that
F3: <surprised> wow </surprised>
F15: so that means the er the computer technology is <soft> updating (xxx) </soft>
F1: yeah

<**end** 0503F1F3_00:05:49>

D.3 Observation 7a

Speakers' ID:

F2: key female participant two
M2: key male participant two
F8: incidental female participant from the UK

<**beg** 1003F2M2a_00:00:27>

F8: ok so: (.) these errors here may be acceptable or not <soft> (xxx) </soft> (.) use of prepositions
F2: yeah
M2: (.) <soft> use of prepositions </soft>
F8: (.) countable nouns
F2: @@
F8: um (.) how about you in this university have you had any feedback on (.) um assignments?
F2: er the oral ones?
F8: um yeah. oral and written [assignments]
F2: [e:r] (.) so: (.) usually the written words are assessed <emphatic> very very </emphatic> specifically [so]
M2: [yeah]
F2: every grammar /errors/ are co – were corrected by the prefesso:rs?
F8: and here or outside
F2: er in [place 10]
F8: in [place 10] ok =
F2: = yeah they like the: (.) accura accuracy @@ (xxx) accurate grammar and (.) some professors are really strict to the pronunciations (.) for english? so I was /corre/ – corrected the pronunciation of (.) /dʒ/ sounds? @@
F8: which sound
F2: /dʒ/ sound magic for example [/dʒ/ /dʒ/ sound]
M2: [a:h]
F2: yeah so –
M2: (was that) difficult for you to pronounce
F2: NO I I don't noticed i:: pronounced – MISpronounced [that word]
M2: [ok]
F2: but he recognised [the error]
M2: [ah ok]
F2: yeah
M2: I see
F2: I used to (.) made yeah
F8: (.) (xxx) did they correct the mistake they couldn't understand? or just because they wanted you to speak more like a native speaker <soft>(xxx) corrected </soft>
F2: the course is for the english teachers so he thought yeah he thinks (.) english teachers HAVE to pronounce (.) correctly so that's why he correct everyone's pronunciation

M2: @@
F2: @in the course@ yeah @@
F8: and and how did that make you feel did you feel comfortable with that?
F2: YEAH I'm really happy about it yeah (.) because no one can correct the pronunciations especially in [nationality 10] teachers or professors (.) HE is a [nationality 10] english teachers @@
F8: how about you *M2's name*
M2: er for the mistakes (.) because I'm making this kind kind of mistakes myself (.) and I I couldn't recognise when I'm speaking (xxx) teachers speaking er notice that. and I think (.) er it's acceptable
F8: I agree (.) but um what about in written assignments here have you had any [any feedback?]
M2: [yeah I feel surprised because] in my country if you write a phrase like this of course you'll get the wrong feedback – the negative feedback here (.) teachers doesn't care much about the grammatical mistakes
F2: I think so but I got a feedback from *Tutor 1's name* and she: correct every articles like the or a:
F8: how (.) quite surprising
F2: @@ not everything but yeah [she (xxx)
F8: [(xxx)
F2: @@
F8: articles
F2: articles and (.) [past participles or –]
M2: [it's very difficult for] for me to er use the articles correctly @
F2: mhm
M2: cause we don't have that
F2: yes @@ the major [problem]
M2: [yeah]
F2: for asian people to use the correct articles =
M2: = yeah (they teach you) very difficult never use that @
F8: I mean in – when I did my undergrad in [place 11] they were very strict on using language correctly? so I think a couple of times I used apparently the wrong prepositions
F2/M2: @@@
F8: and they corrected the mistakes there (.) they were quite strict and a lot of my lecturers (.) um followed very old grammar books (.) they say that you shouldn't put er you shouldn't split an infinitive they say no you shouldn't split two parts of an infinitive so they used to correct things
F2: wow =
F8: = like that very very small things
F2: mhm
F8: I mean I think it depends on on the lecturers
F2: yeah =
F8: = but I think (.) maybe here they are a bit more tolerant in – I think in my department in [place 11] where I studied (xxx) they would correct a lot of the language (xxx) and I had um a polish friend who who – her english was s: so – honestly she could speak very fluently and I looked at her writing (.) to me I think she was fine and she got (xxx) apparent errors things like (xxx) countable nouns things like that (xxx) underlined and her marks were lower that I thought they should have been
F2: o:h
F8: yes so (xxx) so I think that it it is something which is a problem for some international students (xxx)

F2: yeah
F8: yeah
F2: and some lecturers (.) prefer the complex sentences rather than the simple sentences and (.) I think it (.) sometimes cause the (.) low marks of international students

<**end** 1003F2M2a_00:06:37>

Appendix E

E.1 First interview with M1

Identificación de los participantes

M1: participante clave, hombre chileno
F14: investigadora

F14: en todo caso quería partir preguntándole (.) e:: algunas partes de su cuestionario gracias señor
M1: <eng>tell me</eng>. necesita en inglés o en español
F14: no en español si es posible si tú quieres usar inglés en algún parte de la entrevista? por supuesto que le puede hacer <eng>codeswitching</eng>
M1: <eng>go ahead made my day</eng>
F14: e:: sí no. da lo mismo ok? tú estuviste antes en estados unidos y después en en aquí en inglaterra en londres un año=
M1: =así es=
F14: =y un mes en estados unidos
M1: sí
F14: quiero que me cuentes - pero eso fue en ese orden no cierto primero primero estados unidos y después inglaterra
M1: sí en en en países angloparlantes
F14: angloparlantes perfecto y en estados unidos que hiciste exactamente
M1: @vagar@
F14: @@@
M1: yo iba a estados unidos con la: peregrina idea de buscar un trabajo y estudiar porque tenía un primo allá
F14: ya
M1: y resulta que el primo era un sicópata así que dije na::: aquí no duro mucho y voy a aprovechar de de pasear
F14: ya
M1: y:: y claro para pasear había que tener un poquito más de plata y: por último dedicarse a a escuchar lo que la gente decía como hablaban y:: solamente estuve un mes
F14: ya=
M1: =entre entre washington <spel> d c </spel> que es donde más más tiempo pasé y creo que pasé un fin de semana en nueva york porque tenía una amiga de la universidad (.) y el resto arriba de un tren viajando entre (.) washington <spel> d c </spel> y miami para tomar el lloid aéreo boliviano que me trajera de vuelta a casa@
F14: @@ vale ok oye y bueno tú dijiste que fuiste más que nada con la idea de escuchar como habla la [gente]
M1: [sí]
F14: cómo te sentiste y cómo fue tu experiencia en eso
M1: fue: fue un shock
F14: aha por qué

M1: porque (.) creo le pasa a mucha gente que estudia un idioma una carrera por así decirlo en otro idioma pero al momento de de de ir a al lugar donde se habla ese idioma que (.) que estudiaste te das cuenta que si aprendiste no lo aprendiste todo
F14: ya
M1: y hay cosas que simplemente te dejaron plop
F14: ya
M1: porque obviamente el el hablante nativo tiene un arsenal de (.) e: expresiones y: vocabulario que uno desconoce porque uno estudio con diccionarios y con profesores. no estudió con con lenguaje de la calle. NO LO aprendió repitiendo lo que decían los papás y esas cosas. con quien.
F14: y ese arsenal de expresiones es el que te costó: (.) digamos en tu comunicación con con los no nativos en estados unidos - con los nativos [perdón en estados unidos
M1: [m:::: sí recuerdo que había – y lo mismo le pasa a muchos de los alumnos y gente de acá cuando tú sabes o o crees que estás hablando muy bien y expresándote de la mejor manera posible el hablante nativo es como - te te dice <eng>sorry pardon i beg your pardon</eng> y:: y claro te das cuenta que él o ella tiene sonidos diferentes o o un repertorio distinto
F14: vale=
M1: =al que a uno le enseñaron
F14: vale ya ok (.) m: interesante. y: e: en ese aspecto en esto mismo de la comunicación con nativos especialmente <fast and soft> pero también con no nativos </fast and slow> cómo fue tu experiencia en londres después. notaste que cambiar algo o:
M1: sí yo diría en en londres por lo menos escuché e:: la música musicalidad y la:- el vocabulario que me enseñaron en la universidad.
F14: ya
M1: porque también mis profesores de la universidad de de chile eran en su mayoría formados en el reino unido
F14: la *FO1's name* te hizo clases
M1: la *FO1's name* y el *MO2's name*
F14: el *MO2's name*
M1: la *FO2's name* y el *MO3's name* (.) la única que hablaba con con idioma perdón con acento relativamente norteamericano y más o menos de negro era la *FO3's name* que a todo esto era hija de uno de los que alguna vez fue miembro de la junta de gobierno el *MO4's name*
F14: wow
M1: el *MO4's name*
F14: uf
M1: adivina porqué estaba en la chile
F14: @@
M1: ahí le encontraron una pega (.) por lo tanto ahí sentí que: (.) que había aprendido algo porque el shock no fue tan grande como con estados unidos
F14: ya ok. tú fuiste a estudiar ahí no cierto? hiciste tu master de: (.) [de traducción
M1: [sí pero la primera vez que fui a inglaterra yo iba detrás de una peuca
F14: aha:::
M1: y la segunda también@ pero la tercera vine a estudiar@
F14: @@@
M1: o sea pasaron diez años entre=
F14: = @vale@ la primera y la se- la tercera
F14: @ok@ @@@ ay este *M1´s name*=
M1: =así que también podía escuchar a: al hablante nativa=
F14: =perfecto @oye pero-@

M1: @cuando hablaba@
F14: dejemos de lado a las peucas por un la- por un momento después nos metemos en eso
M1: bueno ya
F14: en en CLAses cuando estabas allá en londres
M1: mhm
F14: como te sentías tú.
M1: ahí ningún problema. (.) los profesores-
F14: [eran nativos o como más mezclado]
M1: [los profes (a ver déjame ver xx)] (.) nativo nativo (…) sí eran eran nativos los que habían de profesores tenían buen hablamiento@
F14: @@
M1: como diría este chico del terremoto
F14: a qué te refieres con buen hablamiento
M1: que: a pesar de que eran extranjeros tenían un nivel de inglés que era entendible era comprensible (…) incluso incluso mejor de lo que yo he escuchado acá en [place 4] con algunos profesores
F14: ah sí
M1: sí sí los profesores de acá de [place 4] que vienen de alguna parte de china tienen (.) sonidos que no llegan a ellos entonces [uno]
F14: [vale]
M1: o yo por lo menos por mi (.) tendencia a buscar como el defecto <acting> ahí ahí ahí viene ahí viene </acting> en el sonido entonces es como la otra vez cuando hablamos de las muletillas en en español al final te vas fijando demasiado en la muletilla y se te va todo el mensaje pero en en londres los profesores en general (.) tenían buen nivel de inglés (…) los alumnos nuevamente también los amigos chinos (.) eran quienes presentaban más - mayores problemas de de comprensión por la calidad de sus sonidos
F14: ok
M1: ignoro como ellos lo hacían para comprender supongo que (.) que comprendían lo que ellos escuchaban pero cuando emitían ellos (.) e: mensajes tú tenías que concentrarte mucho
F14: mhm ok
M1: yo supongo que acá también pasa=
F14: =y eso te pasa con algún otro grupo determinado de acá
M1: (…) a ver los chicos árabes les entiendo. sí yo - mira acá hay un el caso de un profe que viene de corea
F14: mhm
M1: que es mayor que que yo. pero todos coincidimos en que es difícil entenderlo
F14: ya
M1: sus sonidos no son muy muy precisos
F14: mhm
M1: PEro al mismo tiempo (.) yo pienso que él para su segmento de estudiante es muy entendible porque él (.) se seguramente usa sonidos del coreano interferidos con el inglés y para sus alumnos es más fácil entenderlo.
F14: mhm ya [ok]
M1: [lo] mismo pasa acá con algún algún chileno que usa sonidos del español al hablar inglés y (.) e: <slow> en general yo tiendo a entender </slow> a la persona que

no es nativa del inglés porque más o menos sé cuáles son los los (.) sonidos problemáticos (…) las (.) la (xxx) una <spel> k </spel> por una <spel> g </spel> una <spel> b </spel> por una <spel> p </spel> (.) sí

F14: ya

M1: como que uno trata de acomodar el

F14: vale

M1: lo que que te van diciendo

F14: m::

M1: y uno también -

F14: acomodar desde el punto (de vista) de cuanto escuchas

M1: CLAro lo mismo uno cuando se - habla con con ellos tratas de ser lo más prolija en tu pronunciación porque obviamente uno no QUIEre que que lo malentiendan

F14: ya

M1: o que le pregunten a cada rato <acting> perdón perdón </acting> es bien molestoso

F14: aha. y en ese sentido cuando tú hablas de tus compañeros que - bueno como nosotros que vienen de países de otras partes del mundo donde el inglés no es la lengua principal tú crees que te comunicas distinto con ellos que con por ejemplo con *M4's name* con *M3's name* con *F9's name* no sé

M1: no creo lo que sí puede que cambie son los los los temas=

F14: =ya=

M1: = um con e: con *M3's name* con *M4's name* y con *F9's name* (.) me gusta mucho preguntarles acerca de de de la cultura inGLEsa porque ellos obviamente crecieron (en ella) (.) Y y con los chicos de afuera e: a veces hasta me olvido de dónde vienen

F14: @@vale

M1: me da me da un poquito de vergüenza (decir) si viene de arabia saudita o de iraq

F14: de pudor ponte tú

M1: claro pudor (.) porque también a mí me daría cierta vergüenza que alguien me digiera oye allá en bolivia (xxx)

F14: @@@

M1: @que me ha pasado@

F14: sí a mí siempre me pasa me dicen y cuando vas a españa de vacaciones y yo @perdón@

M1: @@@ coño (xxx)

F14: @@@

M1: el asunto es que (.) quizá e: también uno uno opta por temas más más neutrales

F14: ya

M1: de política no voy hablar con esta gente porque desconozco cuáles son sus tendencias o de o de de religión

F14: mhm vale o sea - pero en cuanto a lenguaje no hay ninguna no no no has notado y de ellos hacia ti

M1: bueno yo sé que (.) todos todos ellos los nativos (de) inglés son profeSOres por lo tanto su: su nivel de de- (.) <smacks lips> su forma de hablar yo creo que también no refleja el hablante nativo que que uno puede encontrar en un pub o en la calle

F14: ya=

M1: =yo sé que ellos hablan relativamente bien a una velocidad que es entendible

F14: aha

M1: bueno también por el hecho de ser profesor ha ido cambiando su forma de hablar

F14: vale ok o sea tú crees que el hecho de que sean (.) profesores eso les facilita la comprensión de otras- [de otros acentos]

M1: [yo creo que sí] en cierto modo e: (.) con conciencia y sin conciencia. ellos hablan <faster> yo diría hasta mejor que </faster> que una persona de la calle

F14: vale ok entretenido eso. eso me me recuerda a a la respuesta de del cuestionario la tres punto tres recuerdas este cuadro que les puse yo
M1: sí sí
F14: <eng>how EAsy it was to understand</eng> tú pusiste en desacuerdo cuando te pregunté acerca de los nativos afuera de la universidad afuera en- digamos (.) [en la calle
M1: [claro en el contexto (.) de afuera
F14: ok recuerdas alguna situación en que te haya sido particularmente difícil comunicarte
M1: cuando a veces tú tienes que comprar un servicio o un bien a una persona que viene @particularmente de la india@
F14: @ya ok@
M1: porque para mí siem siempre fue: difícil entender su su forma de hablar (.) y quedé absolutamente vacuNAdo cuando trabajé en falabella y había que:: (.) interpretar lo que decían por teléfono.
F14: ya
M1: miércoles no había caso no había caso por más que uno decía perdón perdón perdón perdón y insistían <imitates indian speech> lo único que tú escuchas es <imitates indian speech>
F14: @@@
M1: y:: y a veces la gente de europa del este así como de polonia o de bulgaria de (.) de rusia? hay c:iertas estructuras que (.) para mí son así como (xx) está usando esta palabra ya debe ser algo así como (.) y por supuesto con con todos los los hispanohablantes bueno al español altiro para qué hacerse mala sangre (...) y: y chinitos generalmente uno habla con gente de del medio oriente en restaurantes (.) como que no son mu:y muy de comercio aparte del restaurante
F14: exactamente
M1: eso es lo que puedo reportar
F14: ya=
M1: =bueno y lo otro es cuando te encuentras en alguna parte y justo te sale un <eng>cockney</eng>
F14: aha
M1: a mierda (.) ahí prefiero simplemente
F14: @@
M1: sí
F14: y aquí en [place 4] te salen muchos de esos o no
M1: encontré más <eng>cockneys</eng>en londres que acá
F14: claro por la zona geográfica pero pero gente que tiene un acento así como muy fuerte no? aquí
M1: no no me he encontrado con con mutros como diría mi mamá e: (.) que yo recuerde acá en [place 4] no pero pero sí en londres como vas a ciertas zonas en londres (.) a veces cerca de un estadio y te encuentras con con gente que te está preguntando la hora o algo tan simple como no sé si pasa por aquí el cuatrocientos cinco por la avenida grecia@
F14: @@
M1: @y ahí uno dice@ ah caramba me cagó @@
F14: @@@es verdad es verdad e:h y eso te pasaba en londres te pasaba con frecuencia o: -

M1: sí claro con de repente simplemente salía yo andar y me perdía preguntaba por dónde está el metro y me decían-
F14: y cómo te sentías tú en ese momento
M1: m:: mira las primeras veces uno se siente como: desamparado
F14: ya
M1: pero después te vas dando cuenta con el tiempo que no solamente le pasa a uno le pasa a mucha gente en londres porque sin mapa? estás frita. entonces yo a veces salía a perderme caminar caminar caminar sin mapa porque tampoco (.) e: no es la gracia andar con un libro un libro más o menos grande y:: y bueno sabiendo llegar sabiendo llegar al próximo: metro?
F14: mhm=
M1: =tú estás salvada. pero la primera vez que era un tantito- bueno la primera vez andaba más asustado que perro sin amo porque como no tenía pega no conocía la ciudad y andaba buscando pega (era) ya po llevar currículum por aquí por allá e::h pero la última vez ya ya sabía dónde llegar en las noches a dormir
F14: ya
M1: así que (.) debe ser como en toda situación tú tú eres primeriza en una ciudad y no cachai pa donde está el norte y el sur no hay cordillera
F14: y entonces el hecho de que no te- por ejemplo no te entendieron o tú no les entendieras cuando preguntabas por direcciones o:: no sé (.) información eso te hacía sentir desamparado no cierto?
M1: en cierto modo un poquito claro desesperanzado pero era tan simple como
F14: (qué hacías ahí) qué hacías en esos casos
M1: bueno le preguntaba a otra persona
F14: @@@
M1: generalmente tú te vas dando cuenta que las mujeres hablan mejor que los hombres
F14: ah sí? vale
M1: y: claro o quizá para ellas es más fácil ayudar
F14: ok
M1: pero claro siempre siempre uno encuentra una solución e: no era tan- (.) por lo demás no no es un ambiente como tú sabes yo creo que allí- el estar conscientes de que hay ciertos sectores que son peligrosos en tu ciudad santiago tú dices <acting> ay mejor me =
F14: =mejor no me meto por ahí=
M1: =voy entrando de espaldas </acting> o algo así pero en en londres uno no sabe dónde estaban los los chicos buenos y los chicos malos así que todo era igual y si uno pasa por un sector peludo no se dio cuenta. <eng> ignorance is bliss</eng>
F14: @aha@
M1: dicen en inglés
F14: y por suerte no te pasó nada estás enterito
M1: mire por acá@@
F14: @@
M1: @una punzada@ (xxx) no.
F14: mhm (…) bueno aquí precisamente ésta lo que me decías un poco. tu comentario de que de que como no eres nativo te es más fácil comunicarte con otros no nativos
M1: <eng> yes </eng>
F14: <soft> sí </soft>
M1: sus sonidos son tan e::h (.) extraños pero porque aquí también tú cambias de región y ya alguien usa- cambia cambia las cómo se llama éstas- cuando tienes dos tienes dos vocales juntas los diptongos
F14: <eng> clusters </eng> perdón el diptongo
M1: claro los clusters también

F14: claro tienes razón
M1: así que (.) eso me pasa
F14: mhm
M1: no tengo mayor problema en entender ciertos textos pero (.) la la tele me gusta escuchar <spel> b b c </spel> porque porque entiendo más que no sé programas de conversación done - tipo la jueza una señora
F14: @@ <eng> judge judy</eng> <soft> no sé si lo has visto </soft>
M1: inaudible
F14: esas cuestiones medias escabrosas
M1: sí son como de estados unidos. como na que ver
F14: (…) otra pregunta
M1: dígame
F14: cuando- acerca de tu nivel de satisfacción de tu de tu propio inglés
M1: mhm
F14: estás contento con tu acento ciertamente ok pero no: con tu nivel en general de inglés
M1: no porque con el tiempo he ido perdiendo la (.) la confianza en migo mismo@
F14: @en migo mismo@
M1: @estoy hablando como el murci rojas@ no puedo decir a qué país voy pero hablan brasileño
F14: @@@
M1: con el tiempo me he puesto más consciente de de de de cómo hablo y cuáles son mis limitaciones por lo tanto
F14: ya
M1: e:h (.) tengo la impresión de que estoy llegando a ese punto como de saturación de de mi repertorio lingüístico y estoy como retrocediendo
F14: ah
M1: hubo un momento en que tenía mucho vocabulario y quizás era vocabulario BIEN académico porque era la primera vez que fui a la universidad en chile
F14: ya
M1: entonces hace unos cinco años VI la tesis que escribimos con dos chicos más. una maravilla de tesis dije wow está está como para-
F14: <acting> y eso lo hice yo </acting>
M1: eso lo hicimos lo hicimos de noche y con
F14: el día antes=
M1: =máquinas de escribir así y realmente: hay palabras que ya ni me acuerdo lo que significan (.) y después debe ser que uno también se pone más crítico e: la cantidad de: traducción que uno hace una palabrita que de repente usa y que: y que ya no es la palabra <eng>thing</eng> por ejemplo
F14: ya
M1: e:h tengo la impresión que en el pasado yo tenía esa habilidad de de de usarlas con mayor precisión frecuencia (.) o será que me estoy cansando de hablar
F14: @@ pero eso tú lo notas aHOra en tu interacción aquí
M1: sí claro
F14: ya

M1: claro que (.) puede ser que que en un principio uno uno quería destacarse e: incluso luCIrse frente al inter interlocutor (.) creo que ahora no me importa tanto (.) pero: creo que hasta en español uso uso palabras e: (.) más comunes
F14: ya
M1: o sea no estoy muy feliz con con el nivel de lengua que tengo ni inglés ni español
F14: @ah sí?@ vale quieres aprender más coa @@@
M1: @@@ claro ese es un problema en chile
F14: por ser
M1: en chile porque al final el coa es como que está presente en toda la sociedad
F14: ah ah ah ah
M1: y no se puede hacer en inglés
F14: ya te gustaría más que nada aumentar tu vocabulario en tus dos lenguas
M1: sí sí
F14: y no te gustaría aprender otra? lengua
M1: he tratado
F14: así que que-
M1: pero ya no es tan fácil. hace a ver el dos mil quin- cuando venían detrás de la peuca
F14: @@
M1: fuimos fuimos a: a grecia dije ah este idioma me gusta porque suena como italiano o español volví a chile y tomé un mes de griego aprendí a decir sí o no buenos días buenas tardes
F14: y y la peuca era griega
M1: no: era galesa
F14: a:h
M1: sí
M1: pero dije bueno si alguna vez vuelvo a grecia voy a ir a (.) toma cachito de goma y claro ahí aprendí como te digo unas cinco palabras (.) y: después de eso me fui a francés porque francés nos enseñaron en el en el liceo siete y claro ahí me fue un poquito mejor pero era algo que yo aprendí como a los diez años
F14: aha si yo también como a los doce (lo hacía) en el colegio era obligatorio
M1: y era relativamente entretenido y fácil
F14: sí sí
M1: y después me metí a: cuál fue mi nueva aventura en dos mil doce ruso
F14: wow o sea le has dado a (.) a varias a varios idiomas tú
M1: sí pero pero pero uno nota que ya no es tan fácil aprender entonces el ruso bueno no tenía mucho tiempo pero el puro aprender el alfabeto una una cosa es la imprenta y la otra es la manuscrita nunca lo aprendí. y después el mismo texto no tenía ninguna traducción entonces tenías una una foto de un gato y abajo había unas palabras más encima manuscrito. entonces tenías que ir a ver a tu alfabeto en letra imprenta y abajo manuscrita ah ok parece que dice gato (.) después escuchar el el disco que estaba todo en ruso y @incluso te decían@ así como (.) <imitates russian language> no sabías que estabas escuchando. un hueveo (.) y: bueno al final lo típico uno aprende a saludar a presentarse: decir sí o no quiero de pollo quiero de carne

E.2 Second interview with M2

Participants ID

M2: Key participant from East Asia
F14: Participant-researcher

F14: right i:'m going to begin with ehm: question that's ehm perhaps is going to ask you to make some recollection about your lessons here at the university and i'm going to ask you to think about your lecturers (.) ehm maybe the ones from the first semester but (.) basically the ones from the second semester because you: eh i mean it's it's [more]
M2: [(xxx)]
F14: like (ready) available in your head ok? (.) so have you heard about repetition paraphrase (.) ehm (.)
M2: oh yeah [i know (.) yeah sure]
F14: [(xxx) (.) ok right] i have a list here of eh accommodation strategies you know accommodation [is] my topic ok
M2: [yeah]
F14: some of it is not exhaustive right (.) and i i'm gonna ask you to eh (.) read this list ok?
M2: yeah
F14: and think about instances and examples (.) or simply tell me (.) whether you think your teachers here your teachers do this or not (.) ok? right (.) so it's
M2: ok
F14: (xxx) (.)
M2: for the (.) teachers (.) here =
F14: = mhm
M2: i think (.) maybe: (.) they use all of them =
F14: = mhm
M2: i think (.) <faster> so what was the f – </faster> for the articulate sounds
F14: eh for example when you speak more eh carefully and you ehm (.) like pronounce every sound
M2: ok
F14: ehm
M2: (xxx)
F14: alright [alright]
M2: [yeah] some teachers [do this]
F14: [alright] ok and can you think of some of teachers i mean give m – give me names or
M2: ehm for all of them [or]
F14: [mhm] hm no not for all of them for the o – for the ones you remember only
M2: for repeat ehm (.) i think everybody repeat =
F14: = mhm ok
M2: paraphrase ehm (.) yeah (.) most most teachers would [paraphrase maybe] (xxx)
F14: [mhm mhm mhm] and when do you think they paraphrase (.)

M2: it's fine (.) is is better for us to [understand maybe for last weeks]
F14: [yeah (.) (alright])
M2: on this week's lecture =
F14: = mhm
M2: *tutor 8's name* =
F14: = mhm
M2: yeah he's a (.) ehm mentioned something about the how to (design) a =
F14: = m
M2: dissertation [and some] concepts =
F14: [mhm] = mhm [i see]
M2: [(xxx)] paraphrase =
F14: = mhm
M2: slow down (.) ehm (.) i can't remember tch yeah i i think (.) they would (.) to slow down sometimes =
F14: = mhm
M2: and i: (.) idiomatic expressions (.) e:hm (.) <lower> idiomatic expressions </lower> (.) hm (.) i can't remember who did this @ but @ =
F14: = mhm
M2: ehm: maybe (.) maybe *tutor 12's name*? =
F14: = mhm
M2: yeah *tutor 12's name* yeah
F14: he uses some idiomatic expressions
M2: yeah and then he would explain [them and paraphrase them of course]
F14: [a:h (.) alright] does he usually do it after or before (.) he says that
M2: of course he would explain after
F14: alright
M2: yeah (.) i think (.) most of the (.) teachers use the idiomatic ref – pre – expression they are (.) english native speaker =
F14: = mhm
M2: i think (.)
F14: and and eh have you - do you recall any example when you didn't understand an idiomatic expression and the teacher did not explain that
M2: did not explain i can't most of the t – as to far as i remember they all explain [i think yeah]
F14: [ok alright]
M2: mhm
F14: and how often do you think they use idiomatic expressions
M2: not very often =
F14: = mhm (ok) (.)
M2: on a very: (.) (xxx) occasionally
F14: alright
M2: yeah
F14: ok i see (.) right (.)
M2: unless they are going to tell something about this =
F14: = mhm
M2: expressions [(xxx)]
F14: [ok] alright
M2: (to say that) (.) they are not use as eh (.) as a part of their speech =
F14: = mhm

M2: (xxx) (use) a very (.) ehm (.) not very native speaker =
F14: = mhm
M2: yeah
F14: i see
M2: quite (.) international [it's] unusual @@
F14: [mhm] alright ok (.) o:k i see
M2: (xxx) articulate so – articulate sounds and (.) yeah because we have a (.) phonetic class =
F14: = mhm
M2: phonetic workshops (.) yeah we keep (.) (she's a) (.) teaching every module =
F14: = mhm
M2: (for the) (.) (workshop) (.) and she do that a lot
F14: [mhm]
M2: [other] classes (.) eh cause we mentioned a lot of the (genre) =
F14: = mhm
M2: this semester and the (.) many teachers (.) use this =
F14: = mhm
M2: articulate the sounds [of] (genre) or (xxx)
F14: [mhm] hh
M2: because people have different (.) way (of) (.) pronouncing and =
F14: = mhm
M2: yeah i think (.) an:d ask for (.) clarification (.) e:h yeah i th – i think so
F14: mhm
M2: maybe for today's class (is being) asked to us (.) clarification after the presentation finished =
F14: = mhm mhm (.)
M2: yeah i think the (.) complete students' utterance (.) eh yeah i think this happens a lot when the (.) especially with the chinese students
F14: @@
M2: @ speaking @ yeah
F14: why do you think is that (.)
M2: well is not say (.) their speaking (.) maybe eh (part of reasons) is because (.) we our speaking (.) competence is not as good as our other classmates =
F14: = mhm (.)
M2: eh but (.) eh generally the teacher will (.) k – t – k – guess what we are going to talk (.) going to speak =
F14: = mhm (.)
M2: ehm but we couldn't finish [it very well]
F14: [@@]
M2: (the) speech [so]
F14: [alright]
M2: yeah so –
F14: do you remember anyone who has (said) that
M2: ehm: (.) most of them i think =
F14: = alright ok but you ehm remember any name (.) [lately]
M2: [name] lately maybe (.) e:h (.) *tutor 3's name* =

F14: = mhm
M2: yeah because (xxx) (discuss) [and] e:h (.) ehm: (.) also *tutor 12's name* @ yeah @ because (the so –)
F14: [mhm] mhm
M2: ehm cause (there) (.) classes that are there are (.) chinese students speaking (.) they would (.) correct =
F14: = mhm
M2: some class like i can't remember [because]
F14: [mhm]
M2: in this kind of class (.) there are not many [chinese] students @@
F14: [mhm] yeah
M2: eh [(speaker so) (xxx)]
F14: [yeah ok] and eh that's very interesting *M2's name* how does it make you feel when you know (.) someone (.) being the teacher or another student (.) tries to help you like for example completing the the the idea that you want to [convey] how do you feel about that (.)
M2: [yeah] ehm (.) (xxx) (.) emotionally or [(xxx)]
F14: [emotionally] yeah
M2: i think is fine
F14: mhm (.) [mhm]
M2: [is not] very (.) i will not get angry about that
F14: alright ok and do you think other chinese students get angry (.) [or]
M2: [no no] no [(xxx)]
F14: [alright]
M2: because (.) we are not very proud of [this]
F14: [alright]
M2: yeah for (.)
F14: [proud of]
M2: [if] eh we are not a very proud of our (.) english speaking @@
F14: @ alright @ [ok (.) alright (.) m]
M2: [yeah even (someone)] chinese do never very good at speaking yeah =
F14: = mhm
M2: only (diphthong) make (.) (those) [kind of mistakes] but =
F14: [mhm mhm] = mhm
M2: i think you are (.) maybe you asked this because some people would get angry [or] feel uncomfortable =
F14: [mhm] = mhm (.) mhm
M2: yeah
F14: [ok]
M2: [maybe] (.) whe the:y are speaking something the – they are familiar with =
F14: = mhm
M2: or they are proud of =
F14: = mhm
M2: in their first language =
F14: = mhm mhm
M2: and you (.) you suddenly eh interrupt him or her [it will]
F14: [yeah]
M2: feel uncomfortable
F14: [yeah exactly]
M2: [but for the] second language or foreign language that's =

F14: = yeah
M2: not a problem (i think)
F14: alright ok (.) yeah because i guess that in in asian cultures (.) is not a very good eh thing to do to interrupt someone when when they are speaking is it is it the case in china as well
M2: [yeah]
F14: [(you know)] it's the case in japan (.)
M2: yeah ei – normally people don't like interrupt each other but a teacher can
F14: @@
M2: yeah (xxx) yeah
F14: yeah [ok]
M2: [a teacher] can
F14: of course [ok (.) (xxx)]
M2: [yeah of course]
F14: alright that's that's interesting (.) right I'm going to ehm: move on to the next question and and [for that]
M2: [(xxx)]
F14: i give you this piece of paper (.) you may use it you may not use it that's up to you [(xxx)]
M2: [ok]
F14: it depends on (.) on how good your memory is
M2: @ ok @
F14: is not a memory test don't worry (.) eh i'm going to ask you again to think of the set of teachers that you had this semester and maybe last semester b – mainly this semester =
M2: = ok
F14: and and and rank them (.) right? ok eh in terms of how easy (.) it is for you to understand them (.) right (.) eh their english i mean just just their english maybe not so much thinking about the content because that's [you] know
M2: [yeah]
F14: eh something else ok (.) so (.) take your time (.) think about the question ok (.) you can give me for example number one is the easiest to understand and number five is the most difficult one mostly alright ok?
M2: ehm (.) all of them (.) or just the –
F14: ehm the ones that [you know come to your head yeah exactly]
M2: [one most difficult (.) (ah)]
F14: maybe maybe (.) don't give me a a number for all of them but i'm very interested in the extremes [ok so] the most eh difficult and the easiest to understand =
M2: [(oh yeah)] = yeah
F14: ok (.)
M2: ehm: the thing is that (.) is – the the situation is getting [better and better]
F14: [mhm mhm] ok (.)
M2: yeah so fo – for now is (.) is all (.) easy @ for me @
F14: alright (.) yes of course you are at the [end of the] semester
M2: [(yeah)]
F14: but thinking back you know [trying to recall the first] classes and the (.)

M2: [yeah maybe i think] yeah i think maybe the most difficult is eh (.) *tutor 13's name*'s class
F14: [alright ok]
M2 [yeah] (.) cause her accent is quite (.)
F14: mhm
M2: very brittish =
F14: = ok
M2: [yeah very high toned]
F14: [alright ok] alright
M2: although i (.) eh practice (them:) =
F14: = mhm
M2: (xxx) =
F14: = mhm
M2: pronunciations [accents like this (.) before but] (.) really in a class it's too difficult
F14: [mhm (.) hm (.) mhm (.) mhm] alright
M2: [yeah (.) s – i – it doesn't mean] i couldn't follow =
F14: [ok (.) alright wi – with] = mhm
M2: i can follow most of =
F14: = mhm
M2: (xxx)
F14: no of course [(xxx) (.) yeah yeah (.) yeah]
M2: [yeah but is difficult for me compared to other teachers] =
F14: alright ok (.) and do you think eh in terms of speed (.) ah eh talking about *tutor 13's name* alright
M2: yeah
F14: do you think she she is right or she should slow down perhaps or the speed [is (.) is ok]
M2: [hh (xxx)] is not there is no problem with her (.) ehm teaching speed [or]
F14: [mhm mhm]
M2: he:r teaching method just that her accent [i think]
F14: [alright]
M2: yeah
F14: ok (.)
M2: and is is is getting better
F14: alright
M2: in a maybe two or three weeks later
F14: [alright (.) yeah alright]
M2: [but in the week is a very difficult for me]
F14: i see
M2: yeah
F14: ok (.) good (.) so *tutor 13's name* (.) anyone else in the difficult end of the (.)
M2: difficult ehm (.) hm: (.) <lower> let me see </lower>
F14: maybe not as much as as *tutor 13's name* but (.) kind of (.)
M2: eh yeah ehm there's a: one case not
F14: [mhm (.) mhm]
M2: [not very difficult for me but i heard]
F14: mhm
M2: i heard some =
F14: mhm
M2: other student they say eh (.) *tutor 2's name*'s eh

F14: ok
M2: eh pronunciation is (.) a little bit difficult [to understand]
F14: [ok] and why do you think they think that way
M2: i think maybe also (.) because accent
F14: [mhm]
M2 [(xxx) the] way of (.) [speak]
F14: [mhm] mhm
M2: and because (.) is not difficult for me [because i could understand we are]
F14: [mhm (.) mhm]
M2: we are all chinese we [know what was the problem there so i can understand but for]
F14: [mhm (.) mhm (.) mhm mhm mhm (.) mhm]
M2: som:e some other international students =
F14: = mhm
M2: the feel they feel a little bit
F14: alright (.) you mean other international students (have been) non non [chinese]
M2: [no – non chinese]
yeah
F14: international students
M2: yeah
F14: ok for example
M2: e:h let me see (.) ehm: (xxx)
F14: ok
M2: eh f – f – f (xxx)
F14: mhm yeah
M2: and eh (.) (xxx) maybe (.) eh yeah maybe (xxx) @ i (xxx) @
F14: [alright ok alright (.) ok alright]
M2: [yeah @@ (is also mentioned about) *tutor 2's name*'s accent]
F14: ok interesting
M2: yeah @@
F14: yeah yeah well i'm gonna ask her the same questions some maybe she is going [to come up with the same answer as well]
M2: [yeah maybe yeah (.) yeah] is this this [because she mentioned that (xxx) (.) so (.)]
F14: [alright (.) alright ok good (.) ok (.) excellent] and (.) in the other extreme the easiest (.) another ones that you you think ok right this is you know (.) an accent [that i can follow easily]
M2: [easiest] (.) ehm easiest ehm (.) is difficult to tell =
F14: = mhm
M2: the easiest because –
F14: or not easiest but eh less challenging [perhaps]
M2: [less challenging] (xxx) (.) i think apart from =
F14: = mhm
M2: a – apart from *tutor 13's name* =
F14: = mhm
M2 i think they are (.) ehm all of them are =
F14: = mhm
M2: are very challenging (because) –
F14: alright

M2: e:h
F14: are very challenging [or not]
M2: [no not] not [very challenging (because]
F14: [oh not very challenging] alright
M2: ehm listening is ehm (.) is my =
F14: = mhm
M2: kind of advantage
F14: a:h (but) –
M2: [(xxx)]
F14: [alright ok (.) alright ok (.) right] so you're a good listener
M2: yeah i'm a good listener (.) (xxx)
F14: do you like music (.)
M2: eh yeah
F14: alright do you play music
M2: no no no [@ i can't play @]
F14 [alright (.) m] @ alright ok @ yeah but that's why maybe you're a good listener because (.) and you like music (.) you have a: an intuition for sounds perhaps
M2: yeah maybe =
F14: = mhm yeah interesting good (.) mhm so so i mean you wouldn:'t (.) i mean apart from *tutor 13's name* and perhaps *tutor 2's name* for other students (.) ehm:: all the teachers all the teachers have a very (.) perhaps ehm: u – understandable accent (.) udn – [understandable] english
M2: [yeah] [yeah]
F14: [right] ok (.) good excellent ehm so this is about understanding we have discussed understanding inte – intelligibility basically (.) ehm: now we're going to talk about likes ok which is a little bit different because i mean one thing is to understand one thing is to like something right =
M2: = yeah
F14: ok? so ehm: (.) which accent do you like the most from your teachers (.) whose accent do you like the most
M2: like the most ehm: (.) so @ is dif – difficult question @
F14: @ yeah @ they are all difficult questions (there) [@@]
M2: [(xxx)]
F14: sorry (.)
M2: hm: (.) well actually (.) (xxx) (.) because ehm (.) before i come here [i]
F14: [mhm]
M2: always receive kind of (.) more similar to american [accent but]
F14: [mhm mhm] mhm
M2: i think (.) no (.) no american teachers here
F14: mhm no yeah (.)
M2: yeah so (.)
F14: and do you like in general do you like the american accent (xxx)?
M2: eh (.) it's not like eh (.) i – because i =
F14: = mhm
M2: ehm: my (.) english teachers [they all]
F14: [mhm]
M2: they all (.) prefer american accent
F14: mhm mhm
M2: yeah i think =

F14: = mhm
M2: and i used to (.) listen to american accent [(xxx) movies and all my listening materials] =
F14: [ok (.) yeah] = yeah
M2: [(xxx)
F14: [yeah yeah yeah music as well]
M2: yeah
F14: yeah ok (.) i see (.) alright (.) ehm: so there is no particular eh teacher whose accent do you like
M2: yeah not particular
F14: alright it's ok (.) any particular accents from your teachers that you would like to have for example (.) or you're quite happy with your with your accent (.)
M2: ehm no – not (.) particular i want to have [yeah]
F14: [mhm]
M2: i think =
F14: = mhm
M2: i think it's fine [is i – it is] good for you to (.) ehm control your accent =
F14: [alright] = yeah [ok]
M2: [i think is good]
F14: alright [ok]
M2: [yeah i eh] (.) whether you can have british accent =
F14: = [alright]
M2: [when you] talk to british people [or] american (ks) when we have (.)
F14: [alright]
M2: talk with american people =
F14: = ok so it's good to change (xxx) (.) [alright?]
M2: [yeah] it's good to change –
F14: and when you talk to people who are not (.) eh native speakers of english (.) like me for example when you (talk like) me win – wh – what's the best (.) ehm way of communicate what's
M2: ehm i think eh (.) best way ehm i would not consider about accent =
F14: = mhm [ok (.) alright]
M2: [yeah (.) but] normally if i
F14: [alright]
M2: [talk to] american people i would (.) in more american like =
F14: alright ok
M2: accent
F14: and when you talk to *M1's name* when you talk to me or when you talk to others
M2: (xxx) (.) is more –
F14: you don't think about your accent very much
M2: i don't think yeah i just (.) naturally
F14: mhm ok
M2: (xxx) yeah
F14: alright (.) ok
M2: i don't have to =
F14: = mhm
M2: ehm: (.) pretend i have the @ american accent @

F14: alright ok
M2: yeah
F14: alright and that's good?
M2: yeah that's go –
F14: or: ok
M2: ehm: that's not a problem =
F14: = [mhm]
M2: [i think] i – is good to you for you to control your =
F14: = mhm
M2: accent
F14: = mhm
M2: yeah
F14: alright
M2: <lower> yeah </lower>
F14: so for example le – let me put this question in a (.) different way =
M2: = yeah
F14: if i you know the (.) ehm (.) genies you know the – the – they grant you a wish (.) someone comes
M2: [yeah]
F14: [they say] i will grant you a wish (.) but this wish has to do with accents ok
M2: @ ok @
F14: i will grant you the wish (.) eh to get the accent that you like alright (.) just by (.) eh by doing this ok
M2: ok
F14: @@ would you reject that wish or would you perhaps (.) think hm i want (.) perhaps for example *tutor 8's name*'s accent (.)
M2: ehm: not *tutor 8's name* eh (.) (but) because ehm my perception has changed during this year =
F14: = mhm
M2: before i come here of course i would i would like to (.) have american accent because is is popular in china =
F14: = mhm
M2: or in many other asian countries =
F14: = mhm
M2: and now i think e:h accent is not very important
F14: ok alright
M2: but if i could get (xxx) i would still (.) like to maintain american [accent]
F14: [alright (me too)]
M2: because i have to work in china and (.)
F14: (xxx) ok
M2: that accent is (.) popular [i think]
F14: [alright] ok
M2: but if you could (.) ehm (.) maintain a very good british accent that's also fine
F14: alright ok
M2: s – is also (.) i – i – i think it doesn't matter is british or [american or]
F14: [mhm mhm mhm]
M2: some other (xxx) (.) it – i the more important is that you could (.) (have it) very well
F14: alright ok
M2: yeah
F14: but you would use to prefer american accent

M2: eh because ehm (.) is more popular in china
F14: i see i see (.) right and ehm last question you were in eh the *module 4* =
M2: = yeah
F14: i'm thinking on that module in particular because you have th:ree people with VERY different accents (.) you have *tutor 14's name* of course
M2: [yeah]
F14: [you have] *tutor 6's name* and you have *tutor 15's name* [right]
M2: [yeah]
F14: ok (.) eh from f – thinking about the – we are going to narrow it down a little bit now ok
M2: yeah
F14: ehm: (.) which accent from those three accents do you like the most (.)
M2: like the most (.) yeah maybe (.) i think eh (.) *tutor 14's name*'s accent =
F14: = mhm alright ok
M2: yeah
F14: alright
M2: eh (.) although it's a (.) because (i:) (.) she speak in a – in a very british way but =
F14: = mhm
M2: her accent is not [very strong (.) and (xxx) (.) her speech is quite clear and]
F14: [mhm (.) mhm (.) mhm alright (.) alright] ok
M2: yeah i think (.) maybe *tutor 6's name* is also very fine but she's (.) ehm (.) she is from [place 17] is a (.) very similar to =
F14: = mhm (.) mhm
M2: (xxx) chinese [people speak as]
F14: [mhm (.) mhm]
M2: a little bit mixed with american
F14: @@
M2: a – a little bit american influence but =
F14: = alright
M2: not very =
F14: = ok
M2: a very (xxx) [so]
F14: [alright]
M2: is it also clear for me =
F14: = mhm
M2: and for tutor 15's name i think is also fine =
F14: = mhm
M2: because ehm she spanish and i know how how spanish people speak [english] eh some
F14: [mhm]
M2: some points they (would) =
F14: = mhm
M2: some kind of (.) ehm confuse (.) confuse points (xxx) yeah it's not not a [problem for me]
F14: [(mhm)]
M2: but [i think]
F14: [alright] you understand *tutor 15's name* without a problem
M2: without a problem may maybe because i have eh some phonetic =

F14: = alright
M2 knowledge about Spanish [but]
F14: [a:h ok]
M2: but maybe i think (.) for some of my (.) eh friends (.) they would (.) have a little bit of problem (.) at the beginning
F14: ok (xxx) (.) alright
M2: yeah
F14: eh i mean i – ehm (.) comparing *tutor 15's name* and *tutor 6's name* which one is the one that you like the most
M2: i think (.) *tutor 14's name* i: mean (.) p – compare
F14: *tutor 15's name* [and *tutor 6's name*]
M2: [*tutor 15's name* and *tutor 6's name*]
F14: *tutor 14's name* yeah
M2: @ yeah @
F14: she's the top one here (.) alright
M2: ok yeah i think maybe (.) *tutor 6's name*?
F14: alright ok
M2: yeah
F14: hm
M2: there s – there's not (.) a very much difference
F14: mhm
M2: yeah
F14: ok
M2: eh ehm (.) thi – they are two excellent (xxx) no problem
F14: alright
M2: yeah (.)
F14: excellent *M2's name* (.) [very very good]
M2: [so (.) @ that's all @]
F14: yeah yeah that's all i told you it was going to be a very short interview is there anything else you would like to add or you you're ok with the the answers (.) i'm more [than happy]
M2: [(xxx] it's ok
F14: @@
M2: yeah is not not not i'm (.) cause i'm (.) after one years of learning =
F14: aha
M2: here ehm: accent is not eh (.) that important =
F14: = ok
M2: (xxx)
F14: alright ok
M2: is like a more <spel> e l f </spel>
F14: (oh ok)
M2: and (perce –) although i (.) i'm not totally believe in [(xxx)]
F14: [ok (.) alright]
M2: a lot of (.) eh problems (xxx)
F14: alright ok
M2: so (.) [i'm not very crazy about eh (norm) (.) than before (.) yeah so]
F14: [alright (.) yeah (.) yeah ok (.) alright] excellent (.) alright good
M2: yeah
F14: [excellent]
M2: [(xxx)]

F14: well thank you very much
M2 you're welcome (.)
F14: you have a ni –

E.3 Third interview with F1

Participants ID

F1: key participant from Spain
F14: researcher

F14: quiero tu opinión acerca de lo que hiciste porqué lo hiciste qué hizo la otra persona porqué lo hizo todo lo que se te venga a la cabeza no hay agenda aquí no hay como quieroque me digas tal cosa no (.) la idea es que tú te escuches y me hables libremente de lo quepasó ya? (.)
F1: vale
F14: entonces vamos a empezar con la primera? que es una conversación que tú tuviste con *M3's name*, te acuerdas de *M3's name*?
F1: mhm
F14: ya
F1: sí
F14: a ver en esa clase fue una clase de *module's 2* me parece que era a la cual tú no asistías regularmente a esa clase fuiste de oyente esa clase –
F1: de *tutor 11's name* y de:
F14: exactamente pero esa clase en particular la hacía *tutor's 7 name* y la pregunta que ella les puso – que hablaran de sus desafíos o sea la pregunta que ella puso en inglés era what are you struggling with (.) what are your frustrations
{now listening to observation 19, extract 4.6 and 4.12}
F1: {F1 pauses the recording after a few seconds} estoy (…) no sé porqué hablo así por si te interesa =
F14: = así cómo?
F1: así tan marcando el acento
F14: @@@
F1: no sabía yo que: - (.) eso ha cambiado no me gusta
F14: a sí:? [(xxx)]
F1: [te lo digo porque –] no me gusta que hiciera esto
F14: aha
F1: pero bueno perdón (.) a lo mejor es porque está *M3's name* ahí
F14: vale
F1: {now listening to observation 19, the rest of extract 4.6 and 4.12} *M2's name* está también aquí con nosotros?
F14: no es este chico de place 9 M7's name
F1: es que es muy flojo y no:
F14: no a él no se le entiende nada de hecho no lo pude transcribir
{now listening to observation 19, the rest of extract 4.6 and 4.12}
F1: {extract is over} bueno ya está
F14: eso era
F1: quieres que te hable de lo que he odio
F14: qué cosas se te vienen a la cabeza con eso

F1: bueno, evidentemente me fijo en como – en lo que yo digo porque bueno no me acuerdo y todo el mundo lo hace también la voz y todo eso cuando te oyes en un – también en español da igual pero me llama la atención de que intentara yo hablar así o no sé si hablo así también en los otros recordings pero m: si era – si lo hacía siempre?

F14: mhm

F1: eh: (.) pues quizás es porque – por las exigencias que yo percibía del master o de hacer {clicks toungue} no sé o lo que yo pensaba –

F14: y cuándo tú dices – perdona – pero cuándo tú dices que hablas marcado te refieres a::

F1: eh: no me refiero a que e:h a que no hablo como yo a que hablo: - no lo sé porque tampoco nunca me escucho pero hay veces (.) aquí también me pasa y pasa mucho aquí – o te vas formando tu manera – ay yo qué sé – la cosa es que por ejemplo aquí hay algunas profesoras – como que tienes que imitar mucho el acento nativo y no solamente cualquier nativo porque aquí por ejemplo si yo hago – de hecho me lo marcaban al principio que yo ni sabía que lo hacía algunas palabras que: que se pronuncian así en british – diferentes aquí – aquí les gusta el acento americano

F14: @ah sí mira tú@

F1: y: bueno total aquí los acentos es todo una cosa – no tengo idea pero la influencia es mucho más americana – pero igual pienso que es porque *M3's name* estaba ahí y *M3's name* estaba dirigiendo la conversación quizás entre él y yo – me preguntaba y yo contestaba - con los demás no

F14: de hecho había dos personas más en esa conversación uno de ellos era *M7's name* y el otro era: *F6's name* la chica de [place 16] y ellos casi no aparecen en la conversación (.) esto me recuerda a una cosa que tú dijiste en la primera entrevista cuando hablábamos de la diferencia entre cómo te comunicas tú con nativos y con no nativos y tú dijiste que te daba la impresión que los naTIvos no te daban tiempo para hacer pausa ya? entonces tú como sentías esa presión o hablabas más rápido o hablabas menos (.) una cosa así ya? e:h se nota en la conversación en este caso por ejemplo *M3's name* habla mucho – en esta parte que te mostré hablas tú también porque él te preguntaba y tú muy amablemente le respondías pero en el resto de la conversación es *M3's name* el que habla más

F1: pero es que *M3's name* tenía ese rol (.) él se sentía e:l (.) el rey pero bueno todo el mundo hacía que él se sintiera así

F14: @@

F1: @@

F14: @perfecto perfecto muy bien@

F1: pero por ser nativo no por ser *M3's name* – el rol del nativo está claro

F14: ya perfecto (.) gracias por eso vamos a la segunda? vamos a usar otra conversación en esta conversación vas a escucharte hablando con *F3's name F3's name* también es una de mis participantes estrellas

F1: recuerdo que era muy divertida

F14: esto es otra clase en otro módulo esta clase es de *module 3* que se daba entre *tutor 3's name* y *tutor 1's name* en esta clase en particular era *tutor 3's name* la que estaba a cargo de la clase y tú estabas trabajando con *F3's name* y con otra persona de [place 8] ella estuvo de intercambio por tres meses solamente (.) entonces en esta clase lo que les había pedido *tutor 3's name* que discutieran era el tema de los nativos digitales entonces la pregunta era are your students digital natives or digital immigrants (.) la conversación empieza con *F3's name* preguntándoles a ustedes dos qué era digital natives

{now listening to observation 4}

F1: {stops the recording} es que era muy joven me rio – cuándo nacieron - a lo mejor para ser un poco más educada pregunto {recording continues} @es que era muy divertida@ {recording stops} @me acuerdo mucho de esta conversación ahora – me dijo tú no tenías computadora en el colegio@

F14: @@@@@@

F1: @y la verdad es que no@ no teníamos es asignatura de: - {recording continues} se oye a *M3's name* por detrás

F14: no es *M4's name*

F1: no aunque *M4's name* hacía exactamente lo mismo (.) eran como teacher-like {recording continues and then after a few seconds it stops}

F14: hay algo que te llame la atención de esta conversación

F1: @bueno aparte de *M3's name* hablando ahí detrás@

F14: @@@

F1: que al final era *M4's name* – no que ellos siempre acaparando – pero como he escuchado eso antes {meaning her conversation with *M3's name*} puedo decir que aquí no lo hago marcar eso no

F14: mhm

F1: aquí es más como hablo yo

F14: vale

F1: eso quiere decir sin prestar tanta atención a a los plosives y a esas características que yo no me sabía que lo hacía porque no me gusta hacerlo – o sea en la otra conversación – a lo mejor ahora no no haría – a lo mejor ha cambiado algo

F14: es buena – es un punto muy interesante eso (.) y por qué crees tú que hacías eso cuando estabas con *M3's name* o con otro hablante nativo y con otros compañeros no

F1: (..) m:: (.) {clicks toungue} no sé es buena pregunta (.) e:m (...)

F14: o a lo mejor lo hacías inconscientemente es algo que te nacía no más

F1: no o sea ahora yo puedo ver que tiene que ver con la ideología con – o como más como yo como me he socializado yo en la escuela e:m pensando que el inglés es propiedad del nativo y que por lo tanto es como – a lo mejor era mi manera de pensar de que es para respetarlos a ellos – ahora no lo pienso porque – ahora no pienso que el inglés sea suyo @el mío es mío@ pero también puede ser que sea por la persona porque *F3's name* por ejemplo era un chica muy relajada muy – que no te juzga tanto a lo mejor es por eso que *M3's name* y *M4's name* bueno con los nativos sientes que te pueden juzgar un poco más – o que te juzgan no es que te puedan juzgar – de hecho esto puede pasar – igual no tiene tanto que ver con que sean nativos (.) igual tiene que ver con que sean autoridad o algo así porque aquí me pasa co:n con profesoras que que también hacen eso – es decir que yo noto que hacen eso – porque *M3's name* y *M4's name* a lo mejor también estaban marcando su ace – su: - estaban actuando también (.) era el papel suyo yo creo

F14: mhm pero ellos actuaban porque a lo mejor necesitaban hacer resaltar su rol de profesor con experiencia o porque son nativos y a lo mejor eran unos de los pocos nativos dentro del grupo

F1: yo creo que los dos pero no porque fueran teachers sino que porque eran ENglish teachers (.) conm *M3's name* a lo mejor se notaba menos pero *M4's name* te corregía siempre de hecho es que yo pasaba de hablar con él porque siempre te estaba corrigiendo y entonces claro tienes que estar siempre a la perfección – es como estar de vuelta en el colegio ya pues yo me socialicé igual eh no mistakes y no mistakes

significa pues eso no translanguaging – hacer todo imitado lo máximo posible – es que lo odio porque suena super artificial y aparte suena posh porque british siempre index esto (.) pero cuando hablo contigo o con otra persona para mí es normal mezclar

F14: hay una cosa que me llamó la atención (.) casi al comienzo de la conversación tú le preguntas a *F3's name* – le dices when were you born. ya? y ella te responde y ahí es donde hay other repetition – te dice when i born? como confirmando la pregunta (.) ahora en ese caso tú utilizas la forma estándar when were you born o sea el auxiliar were y el participio del verbo born pero *F3's name* en su repetición omite el auxiliar eso a ti te llamó la atención

F1: no para mí es normal

F14: para ti es normal ya

F1: sí que me he fijado cuando yo he utilizado por ejemplo creo que he utilizado was en vez de were

F14: ya

F1: en algún momento pero cuando ella habla no (.) estábamos teniendo una conversación y en ese momento no prioricé pensar uy ha utilizado esta estructura

F14: perfecto eso es lo que me pareció a mí porque en el resto de la conversación ni tú ni *F15's name* la corrigen

F1: es que eso no me molesta porque en ese momento además ella hizo una pregunta que yo considero – cuando tú haces una pregunta sobre un contenido? (.) te estás exponiendo entonces es importante que tú – o sea estábamos discutiendo algo – el contenido de eso no – no le presté atención – no recuerdo ni ahora tampoco prestarle atención a cómo hablan

F14: o sea tú le entendiste y seguiste no más

F1: sí

F1: ya, súper

F14: oye y e:h (…) te das cuenta por ejemplo que *F15's name* habla paralelo a ti con frecuencia (.) como que hay mucho overlapping entre tú y ella?

F1: que yo soy más impaci – que yo no doy turno?

F14: no no no tú no das turno?

F1: quieres que lo vuelva a escuchar?

F14: como quieras

F1: no me he fijado

F14: no es necesario

F1: no recuerdo muy bien a esta persona pero creo que era alguien – no quiero decir molesto pero creo que era alguien que como ella era profesora nos quería también – es que la verdad no lo recuerdo

F14: yo no la recuerdo pues esta fue la única instancia en que la grabé pero sí lo que me fijo es que ella te interrumpe harto
{F1 plays the extract again}

F1: m es que no me deja hablar – no me deja terminar como yo estoy haciendo mucho hesitation eso si es verdad – no encuentro las palabras y ella simplemente salta a la ayuda pero no – sí es verdad - yo he notado que a veces me cuesta encontrar – pero eso también es porque con *F3's name* a lo mejor tengo tiempo de pensar un poco más (.) pero ella no me molesta que haga eso yo sigo buscando mis palabras

F14: no te interrumpe el stream of thoughts o te hace por ejemplo distraerte
{F1 plays the remaining of the extract again}

F1: es que sabes lo que pasa yo recuerdo que en esta conversación estábamos hablando *F3's name* y yo y *F15's name* estaba ahí pero *F3's name* me mira a mí creo

F14: mhm eso es importante

F1: cuando yo le estaba preguntando eso porque recuerdo que a mí me hizo gracias pues que de qué año debe de ser ésta y luego que ella me dijo a mí tú no tenías (ordenador) entonces era un poco más como una conversación entre tú y yo y como *F15's name* estaba siempre de oyente (.) no sé antes que te he dicho lo de molesta a lo mejor era eso porque ella parecía que lo sabía todo y yo no sabía porqué estaba ahí esa mujer (.) era más una conversación entre *F3's name* y yo quizás

F14: bueno vamos a la última parte ahora es la misma conversación pero es la última parte {now listening to observation 4, towards the end of the recording}

F1: {after F1 stops the recording} aquí vuelvo a marcar el acento

F14: sí?

F1: yo lo noto {she plays the recording from where it was stopped and then after a minute stops it again} yo creo que *F3's name* se fascinaba de todo lo que preguntaba ella – y cualquier cosa que le decías ella se interesaba – con sus expresiones se interesaba y por eso te olvidabas un poco que estabas hablando inglés pero aquí lo vuelvo a hacer en algún momento supongo que me olvido de que estábamos hablando pero cuando ella vuelve a fascinarse por el tema volvemos las dos al tema y ya no lo hago lo de – {recording continues}

F14: esta conversación es muy divertida porque ustedes no hacen lo que *tutor 3's name* les había pedido que hicieran

F1: pero al final yo creo que ella ya sabía de lo que estábamos hablando yo creo que ella luego quería jugar conmigo porque ella veía que yo me estaba entusiasmando tanto y ella luego yo creo que siguió un poco o a lo mejor me estaba vacilando porque yo era muy vieja

F14: @@@@

F1: de lo demás no he notado nada más que eso del acento pues a lo mejor es lo que me fijo en mí

F14: bueno en esta parte de la conversación tú misma lo notaste Windows 98 windows Windows Windows que es todo lo contrario a lo que tú estabas tratando de explicar que era la pantalla negra pero *F3's name* insistía con Windows

F1: porque ella yo creo que en todo momento no me escucha – o sea no sé si me escucha o yo no me explico bien

F14: está claro lo que tú querías decir

F1: sí pero *F3's name* no lo ha visto nunca entonces es muy difícil

F14: ya

F1: saber lo que yo estoy diciendo por eso en ese momento no sé si ya lo ha pillado o me dice algo

F14: no creo que lo pilló al final

F1: no?

F14: no si lo entendió no lo expresa

F1: alguien que no ha visto eso no lo puede entender

F14: ya claro

F1: porque es como qué dices si siempre has visto la pantalla de Windows

F14: aquí también pasa otra cosa y tiene que ver con la relación de ustedes tres porque con *F3's name* están conversando de la diferencia entre DOS y Windows y pero *F15's name* dice pero no hemos hablado de las implicaciones que era la segunda parte de la tarea que ustedes tenían que hacer

F1: no la escucho yo

F14: no?
F1: no la escucho porque estoy tan fascinada con *F3's name* intentando – porque para mí a lo mejor también era la (xxx)
F14: bueno tienes una pregunta

Appendix F

KEY TO TRANSCRIPTION (Observation Transcripts)

(.)	: brief pause (of up to 2 seconds)
(…)	: long pause (between 2 and 6 seconds approximately). Longer pauses are specified in curly brackets and the reasons for those pauses are explained whenever it is possible
–	: abrupt cut-off or false start
[ ]	: overlapping speech. When it is not possible to determine the end of the overlapping speech, the final square bracket is omitted
(word)	: parentheses indicate unsure transcription
(xxx)	: unable to transcribe
CAPS	: emphasis. All the letters in the emphasised syllable are capitalised
:	: sound stretching
.	: noticeable *falling* intonation
?	: noticeable *rising* intonation
=	: latched utterances
< > </ >	: utterance spoken in a particular mode (eg. <loud> </loud>)
<lang> </lang>	: utterance spoken in a language other than English. The four first letters of the English name of language are used to indicate the language the speaker switches to.
@@	: laughter
{ }	: contextual information is given in curly brackets when it is relevant to the understanding of the interaction

/ /	: for phonemic transcription when pronunciation is deviant
	: all repetition of words and phrases are transcribed
hh	: noticeable breathing is represented by letter 'h'
Anonymity	: when speakers involved in the interaction are referred to, their names are replaced by their italicized *ID* (e.g. *MS2's name*). When it is not possible to determine the ID of the speaker referred to '*Student's name'* is used. Names of places are anonymized in order to protect the speakers' identity and their environment. They are put into square brackets, e.g. [place1]. When tutors who are not part of the interaction are mentioned, their names have been replaced by *Tutor's name* and numbered according to the overall order in which observations and interviews have been transcribed, so their assigned numbers might not appear consecutively in any given transcription.
Parallel conversations	: when two or more conversation threads emerge only the main one is transcribed. The threads which are not transcribed are treated as contextual events and indicated between curly brackets {}
Speaker noises	: noises produced by the current speaker are transcribed using <>, e.g. <coughs>. Noises produced by other speakers are only transcribed if they affect the intelligibility of the speech
Spelling	: the tags <spel> </spel> are used to mark words and abbreviations that are spelled out by speakers
Transcription borders	: the beginning and the end of the transcription are noted by indicating the recording ID and the exact position of the track in minutes and seconds. A gap in the transcription is given in () with the length in hh:mm:ss, and curly brackets are used to provide the reasons for the gap

These transcription conventions have been adapted from Richards (2003) and VOICE (2013).

Appendix G

KEY TO TRANSCRIPTION (Interview Transcripts)

(.)	: pause
–	: abrupt cut-off or false start
[ ]	: overlapping speech. When it is not possible to determine the end of the overlapping speech, the final square bracket is omitted
(word)	: parentheses indicate unsure transcription
(xxx)	: unable to transcribe
CAPS	: emphasis. All the letters in the emphasised syllable are capitalised
:	: sound stretching
.	: noticeable *falling* intonation
?	: noticeable *rising* intonation
=	: latched utterances
< > </ >	: utterance spoken in a particular mode (eg. <loud> </loud>)
<lang> </lang>	: utterance spoken in a language different from the main language used during the interview (English or Spanish). The four first letters of the English name of language are used to indicate the language the speaker switches to.
@@	: laughter
{ }	: contextual information is given in curly brackets when it is relevant to the understanding of the interaction
/ /	: for phonemic transcription when pronunciation is deviant
/phoneme/	: when speakers produce a speech sound in isolation.
	: all repetition of words and phrases are transcribed

hh	: noticeable breathing is represented by letter 'h'
Anonymity	: when speakers involved in the interaction are referred to, their names are replaced by their italicized *ID* (e.g. *MS2's name*). Names of placed are included, with the exception of the university and city where the interview took place. These are referred to as place 4 and place 5.
Spelling	: the tags **<spel> </spel>** are used to mark words and abbreviations that are spelled out by speakers
Transcription borders	: the beginning and the end of the transcription are noted by indicating the recording ID and the exact position of the track in minutes and seconds. A **gap** in the transcription is given in () with the length in hh:mm:ss, and curly brackets are used to provide the reasons for the gap

These transcription conventions have been adapted from Richards (2003) and VOICE (2007).

List of References

Allard, R. & Landry, R., 1994. Subjective ethnolinguistic vitality: A comparison of two measures. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 108(1), pp.117–144.

Andrews, M., Squire, C. & Tamboukou, M., 2008. *Doing Narrative Research*, London: SAGE.

Auer, P. ed., 2007. *Style and social identities: Alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*, Walter de Gruyter.

Beebe, L.M. & Giles, H., 1984. Speech-accommodation theories: A discussion in terms of second-language acquisition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 46, pp.5–32.

Bell, J.S., 2002. Narrative Inquiry: More Than Just Telling Stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), pp.207–213.

Berg, B.L., 2007. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* 6th ed., Long Beach: Pearson.

Blommaert, J., 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*, Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chase, S.E., 2011. Narrative inquiry: still a field in the making. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE, pp. 421–434.

Cogo, A., 2009. Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: a study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta, eds. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 254–273.

Cogo, A., 2010. Strategic use and perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 46(3), pp.295–312.

Cogo, A. 2018. ELF and multilingualism. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 357-368). Routledge.

Cogo, A. & Dewey, M., 2012. *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-driven Investigation*, London: Continuum.

Cogo, A. & Dewey, M., 2006. Efficiency in ELF Communication: From Pragmatic Motives to Lexico-Grammatical Innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), pp.59–93.

Cogo, A., & House, J.,2018. The pragmatics of ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 210-223). Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K., 2011. *Research Methods in Educaction* 7th ed., London and New York: Routledge.

Coupland, N., 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dempsey, N.P., 2010. Stimulated recall interviews in ethnography. *Qualitative Sociology*, 33(3), pp.349–367.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., 2011. Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE, pp. 1–19.

Dewey, M., 2011. Accommodative ELF talk and teacher knowledge. In *Cambridge Scholars Publishing*.

Dewey, M., 2009. English as a lingua franca: Heightened variability and theoretical implications. In *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings*. pp. 60–83.

Drew, P., 2004. Foreword: Applied Linguistics and Conversation Analysis. *In:* Richards, K. & Seedhouse, P. (eds.). London: Macmillan.

Firth, A., 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On “lingua franca”English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), pp.237–259.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J.H., 2008. The interview: from neutral stance to political involvement. In

N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, eds. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 115–159.

Gasiorek, J., Giles, H. & Soliz, J., 2015. Accommodating new vistas. *Language & Communication*, 41, pp.1–5.

Gibson, W. & Brown, A. 2009. *Working with Qualitative Data,* London, SAGE.

Giles, H., Coupland, J. & Coupland, N., 1991. *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J., 1991. Accommodation theory: communication, context and consequence. In H. Giles, J. Coupland, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation* (pp. 1-68). Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H. & Coupland, N., 1991. *Language: Contexts and consequences*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Gillham, B., 2008. *Observation Techniques: Structured to Unstructured*, London and New York: Continuum.

Graddol, D., 2006. *English Next*, London: British Council.

Gubrium, J.F. & Holstein, J.A., 2009. *Analyzing Narrative Reality*, Los Angeles: SAGE.

Guido, M.G., 2012. ELF authentication and accommodation strategies in crosscultural immigration encounters. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca2*, 1(2), pp.219–240.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P., 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* 3rd ed., London: Routledge.

Hennink, M., Hutter, I. & Bailey, A., 2011. *Qualitative Research Methods*, London: SAGE.

HESA, 2014. Student introduction 2012/13: student population. *Higher Education Statistics Agency*. Available at: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/intros/stuintro1213 [Accessed March 26, 2015].

Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J., 1995. *The Active Interview*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

House, J., 2003. English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of*

Sociolinguistics, 7(4), p.pp.556-578.

House, J., 1999. Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In *Teaching and learning English as a global language,*.

Jenkins, J., 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J., 2006. Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), pp.137–162.

Jenkins, J., 2009. English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), pp.200–207.

Jenkins, J. 2009. *World Englishes: a resource book for students* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Jenkins, J., 2012. English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), pp.486–494.

Jenkins, J. 2015. Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *English in Pratice, 2*(3), 49-85.

Jenkins, J., 2022. Accommodation in ELF: Where from? Where now? Where next? *In:* Walkinshaw, I. (ed.) *Pragmatics in English as a Lingua Franca: Findings and Developments.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A. & Dewey, M., 2011. Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), pp.281–315.

Jenks, C., 2012. Doing being reprehensive: Some interactional features of English as a lingua franca in a chat room. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(4), pp.386–405.

Kalocsai, K., 2011. The show of interpersonal involvement and the building of rapport in an ELF community of practice. In *Latest trends in English as a Lingua Franca research*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 113–138.

Kachru, B., 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. *In:* Quirk, R. & G, W. H. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. & Wagner, J., 2014. Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of*

Applied Linguistics, 34**,** 171-121.

Kaur, J., 2009. Pre-empting problems of understanding in English as a lingua franca. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta, eds. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 107–123.

Kaur, J., 2011. Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), pp.2704–2715.

Kaur, J. 2022. Pragmatic strategies in ELF communication: Key findings and a way forward. In I. Walkinshaw (Ed.), *Pragmatics in English as a Lingua Franca: Findings and Developments* (Vol. 14, pp. 35-54). De Gruyter.

Klimpfinger, T., 2009. She's mixing the two languages together. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta, eds. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 348–371.

Konakahara, M. 2015. An analysis overlapping questions in casual ELF conversation: Cooperative or competitive contribution. *Journal of Pragmatics, 84*, 37-53.

Lawler, S., 2002. Narrative in social research. In T. May, ed. *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 242–258.

LeCompte, M.D., Preissle, J. & Tesch, R., 1993. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* 2nd ed., SanDiego: Academic Press.

Le Page, R., 1978. Projection, Focussing, Diffusion: Or, Steps Towards a Sociolinguistic Theory of Language, Illustrated from the Sociolinguistic Survey of Multilingual Communities, Stages I--Cayo District, Belize (formerly British Honduras) and II--St. Lucia. *Society for Caribbean Linguistics*.

Le Page, R.B. & Tabouret-Keller, A., 1985. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*, CUP archive.

Lew, S., Her Yang, A., & Harklau, L., 2018. Qualitative Methodology. In A. Phakiti, P. De Costa, L. Plonsky, & S. Starfield (Eds.), *Tha Palgrave Handbook of Applied Lingusitics Research Methodology*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Lüders, C., 2004. Field observation and ethnography. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff, & I. Steinke, eds. *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.

Mauranen, A., 2006. Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 177, pp.123–150.

Mauranen, A. 2018. Conceptualising ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 7-24). Routledge.

Maxwell, J.A., 2005. *Qualitative Research Design: an Interactive Approach*, CA: SAGE.

McAdams, D., Josselson, R. & Lieblich, A., 2006. *Identity and Story: Creating Self in Narrative*, Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Meierkord, C., 2000. Interpreting successful lingua-franca interaction. An analysis of non-native-/non-native small talk conversation in English. *Linguistik online*, 5(1), p.0.

Pietikäinen, K. S. 2018. Misunderstandings and Ensuring Understanding in Private ELF Talk. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(2), 188-212.

Rampton, B., 1995. Language crossing and the problematisation of ethnicity and socialisation. *Pragmatics*, 5, pp.485–513.

Rampton, B., 2011. Style contrasts, migration and social class. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), pp.1236–1250.

Richards, K., 2003. *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sachdev, I., Giles, H. & Pauwels, A., 2013. Accommodating Multilinguality. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie, eds. *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing, pp. 391–416.

Seidlhofer, B., 2009. Accommodation and the idiom principle in English as a Lingua Franca. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), pp.195–215.

Seidlhofer, B., 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca: A complete introduction to the theoretical nature and practical implications of English used as a lingua franca.*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. 2011. Introduction: Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Research on Youth and Language,* 5**,** 1-14.

Shepard, C.A., Giles, H. & Le Poire, B.A., 2001. Communication accommodation theory. In W. P. Robinson & H. Giles, eds. *The New Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. Chichester: J. Wiley, pp. 33–56.

Spencer-Oatey, H. ed., 2004. *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*, A&C Black.

Stark, S. & Torrance, H., 2004. Case study. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin, eds. *Research Methods in the Social Siences*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 33–40.

Van Manen, M., 2017. *Researching Lived Experience : Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy* Taylor & Francis Group.

VOICE, 2013. Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English. Available at: https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/ [Accessed March 29, 2015].

Wolfartsberger, A., 2011. ELF business/business ELF: Form and function in simultaneous speech. *na*.

Zimmerman, D.H., 1998. Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe, eds. *Identities in Talk*. California: SAGE Publications, pp. 87–106.