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INTRODUCTION
When trying to communicate in a second or foreign language (henceforth L2 or FL) learners confront a variety of frequent and inevitable communicative difficulties directly resulting from their deficient command of the target language (TL). They need, in general, more time than native speakers (NSs) in order to express and understand meaning. They do not always comprehend their interlocutors’ messages and often have to negotiate for meaning in order to prevent miscommunications. Furthermore, when trying to make contributions to the discourse, they do not always find in their interlanguage (IL) systems the linguistic resources that enable them to contribute precisely what they intend to.

The present investigation is prompted by an interest in the latter of these problems. That is, it examines how FL learners manage to communicate meaning when the desired TL items or structures that help convey this meaning are not available. Gaps in language knowledge, lapses of memory or recall difficulties, which may also come up in first language (L1) communication are extremely frequent when the command of the TL is limited. Despite these difficulties, learners are generally able to manage FL communication. The question is how do they do it?

In order to maintain steady communication, learners sometimes circumvent linguistic difficulties by changing or reducing the content of their messages. They avoid reference to a topic or simplify their contributions in order to overcome the lack of the TL term or expression needed to convey their messages as originally intended. More often, however, they are able to keep their communicative intentions and develop an alternative means of expression to convey the content of these messages. They make use of synonyms, descriptions, native language (NL) transfers or even gestures that compensate for the unavailable TL form and allow for the communication of the originally intended idea. All these different techniques language learners use to communicate in a FL despite their IL shortcomings are known in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research as communication strategies.

Communication strategies (hereafter CSs) play a major role in L2 and FL communication, widely recognized by FL teachers and SLA researchers alike. Learners, even advanced level learners, need to confront recurrent linguistic difficulties in their FL interactions and to make frequent use of these strategies. The learners’ use of a FL is to a considerable extent strategic, regardless of whether they use it in the L2 classroom.
context or in a more natural non-academic setting, or while interacting with NSs or with other NNSs of similar or different linguistic background.

CSs have attracted a lot of attention in the field of SLA research. The concept of CS and its study has now more than 30 years of history and during this time a considerable amount of both theoretical and empirical research has been accumulated in the area. An overview of this research reveals, however, that most of these studies have been conducted from a clearly learner-centered approach. Attention has been focused on the learner, that is to say, on the cognitive processes they engage in when becoming aware of a linguistic difficulty and the strategic utterances they produce as a result of these processes. This kind of research has been able to describe and explain how learners manage to compensate for or circumvent linguistic deficiencies in order to express their messages. It has not been able to explain, however, how these messages are actually communicated in face-to-face FL interaction. In other words, it has provided much evidence on the cognitive and linguistic aspects of CSs, but not on their interactional and communicative functions –that is, on how, through CS use, learners and their interlocutors manage to establish a mutual agreement on meaning and achieve the successful communication of their messages despite their shared, or non-shared, IL shortcomings.

Communication of meaning as we understand it is always a joint and collaborative activity. It involves at least two different individuals trying to agree on a meaning. This implies that, with face-to-face oral interaction, individuals are working together to reach a common goal. Communication cannot be understood by looking only at one side of the page, that is, at what the speaker says or at what the listener understands. We believe that, in order to understand how communication of meaning is achieved, attention needs to be paid to the actions, efforts and beliefs of all the interlocutors taking part in the communicative act.

We have found that the role of CSs in the communication process has always been acknowledged. However, they have been generally studied as part of the speech production process, in other words, as part of the learner’s use of the FL, not of the interaction taking place between this learner and at least another interlocutor.

Researchers adopting what is known as the interactional perspective on the study of CSs have pointed out the need of research to move in this direction. Tarone has
always conceived CS use in relation to “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981: 288), but she never described in a systematic way the specific role of the listener in this mutual endeavor. In 1991 Yule and Tarone suggested the possibility of combining CS and negotiation of meaning frameworks of analysis in order to look at both sides of the page, that is, at the speaker’s and the listener’s actions in strategic communication. These scholars found that negotiation of meaning strategies used during interaction to solve comprehensibility difficulties, such as clarification requests or confirmation checks, are often followed by strategic attempts to communicate the initially intended message through an alternative means of expression. Mutual comprehension is thus achieved through the combination of the listener’s use of a negotiation of meaning strategy and the speaker’s use of a CS.

Attempts to describe strategic communication as an interactive activity, involving the learner’s and interlocutor’s coordinated use of communication and negotiation of meaning strategies as suggested by Yule and Tarone (1991), have been made by Suni (1996), Williams, Inscoc and Tasker (1997), Wagner and Firth (1997), or Anderson (1998). However, this research is still limited in scope; and it has often paid more attention to comprehensibility problems and negotiation of meaning strategies than to CSs.

Other researchers have looked at the interlocutor in their analyses of strategic communication, but consider this to be a passive receiver. They have acknowledged the interlocutor’s influence on the learner’s decision about which CS to use, but denied their active participation in the strategic communication of meaning process –cf. for instance Poulisese, Bongaerts and Kellerman (1990), or Luján-Ortega (1997). In part, this is due to the fact that a large amount of the research carried out in this field has been centered on the cognitive aspects of CS use. Researchers have adopted a predominantly psycholinguistic perspective to the study of CSs. As already mentioned, they have been more interested in the cognitive processes underlying CS use and in the factors that may have an influenced on these processes than in the interactional or communicative value of CSs. Consequently, they have paid attention to the individual and mental actions of the FL learner, rather than to the context of the interaction.
As previously stated, with this study we aim to understand how communication of meaning is achieved in face-to-face FL strategic interaction. We believe that meaning is not sent and received, but jointly created in ongoing and socially situated interaction. Like Tarone (1981), we consider that strategic communication involves a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning. On this basis, we will analyze FL learners’ use of CSs and their interlocutors’ reactions in order to try to identify and describe the actions that all the conversational participants take together in the pursuit of one common goal: the successful communication of their messages. We expect to be able to explain communication of meaning through CS use as a collaborative activity involving the joint action and effort of all the interlocutors.

For this purpose, we will draw on L1 communication studies. Research carried out on NL non-strategic interaction has been able to outline a theoretical framework that accounts for communication of meaning as a collaborative activity: the collaborative model of communication (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986; Clark and Schaefer, 1987, 1989; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997). This model describes how speakers and addressees coordinate their individual actions and beliefs in order to reach the successful communication of their messages. We intend here to build on the collaborative prototype in order to develop a paradigm of analysis able to account for strategic communication in face-to-face FL interaction as a collaborative creation of meaning process.

The present research project will be conducted in the context of a Spanish university institution, the University of Santiago de Compostela, with Galician learners of English as a FL. These learners begin their English Philology studies with an average intermediate level of the FL and, after four or five years of English language and literature courses, they are expected to reach an advanced, highly proficient command of this language. The learner’s proficiency level in the FL has been found, in previous research, to play a significant role in CS use – cf. Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Hyde (1982), Paribakht (1985), Poulisse et al. (1990), Liskin-Gasparro (1996) or Jourdain (2000). On this basis, and taking into account the specific context of our research, we intend to analyze FL interactions involving English language learners with two different proficiency levels: intermediate and advanced. A proficiency pre-test will be administered to students enrolled in beginner and advanced courses. We expect to be
able to select two homogenous groups of participants that may be considered representative of the assumed intermediate and advanced language level of our average first and last year students.

Since one of the main aims of our research is to account for the role of the interlocutor in the strategic communication of meaning process, we also feel necessary to analyze at least two different interactional conditions: learner-learner and learner-NS. This does not mean, however, that we intend to compare these two different conditions. The purpose of this project is to demonstrate that interlocutors, independently of their TL command, collaborate with the learner in a mutual attempt to communicate meaning through CS use and to describe how this mutual attempt is accomplished. Whether or not native speaking interlocutors, because of their higher command of the TL, can offer more efficient support to the learner is an issue that extends the limits of this investigation. Here we will try to establish a framework of analysis able to describe FL strategic interaction as a joint and collaborative activity, and that will be general enough to account for both learner-learner and learner-NS interactions. If this framework proves to fit the purposes of our research, it may then be used in future investigations to compare native and non-native speaking interlocutors’ behavior in strategic interaction.

As explained above, FL learners make use of a CS when they find that the desired TL lexical item or structure to convey their intended message is not available in their IL system. NSs may find similar problems in their L1 communications. Sometimes they are unable to retrieve a word –the tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon, or they may lack knowledge of the vocabulary necessary to communicate about highly specialized topics. These problems are, however, certainly less frequent than the linguistic problems the FL learner experiences. We may then assume that in learner-NS interactions, learners will often make use of a CS to compensate for an unavailable TL word or expression that is part of the NS’s knowledge of the TL. In their attempt to collaborate with the learner to build a mutual agreement on a meaning, or trying to provide corrective feedback on learners’ non-target-like strategic utterances, NSs may provide this TL form. In other words, we believe that CS use in face-to-face FL interaction can elicit new and relevant input. While collaborating to communicate meaning, interlocutors may provide the TL item or structure the learner is struggling for. Furthermore, we should also assume that other NNSs can also provide this new input. A word unknown by one learner may be
known by another learner from the same proficiency level and used for the purposes of agreeing on a meaning within the context of strategic interaction.

In a second stage of our research we will analyze native and non-native speaking interlocutors’ responses to learners’ CSs to identify if, in their attempts to collaborate in the meaning creation process, these interlocutors are able to provide new input for the FL learner. That is, they may collaborate not only to create meaning but also to construct accurate and appropriate TL forms to convey this meaning. If this occurs, as we expect it will, we will pay attention to the nature of the strategic interactional exchange, trying to find out whether this also offers the necessary conditions for this new input to become intake. In sum, we will analyze strategic communication as a possible occasion for L2 development and we will try to demonstrate that CS use in face-to-face FL interaction can be a source for SLA.

Previous research on CSs has overlooked their potential role in the SLA process. In the origins of this field of study scholars had to define the limits of the fuzzy and sometimes ambiguous concept of CS. With this in mind, Tarone (1981) distinguished CSs from learning strategies on the grounds that the latter are used by the learner in order to learn the language while the former are employed to use the language. Although Tarone made explicit that a CS used to communicate meaning may, consciously or subconsciously, help the learner to acquire language –cf. Tarone (1981: 67-68), the definition of CSs on the basis of the language use criteria prompted subsequent research to approach the study of these strategies as a study of language use, not of language learning.

Some claims have been made on the possible relationship between CS use and SLA. It has been argued, for instance, that transfers can be used as a strategy to communicate meaning but also to test hypotheses (Corder, 1978). It has also been postulated that appeal for assistance strategies can be used as generators of new input (Færch and Kasper, 1980), and that strategic generalizations and word coinages may be incorporated to the learner’s IL system when they elicit positive feedback (Færch and Kasper, 1980). It has been suggested that CS use can make already existing FL knowledge more accessible (Færch and Kasper, 1986), and that, by enabling learners to keep their conversations continuous, these strategies provide them with more opportunities for negotiation of meaning and comprehensible input (Larsen-Freeman...
and Long, 1991). Finally, other scholars, such as Kasper and Kellerman (1997), have also maintained that certain psycholinguistic strategies develop learners’ analyzed lexical knowledge. However, all these different claims have been made from a theoretical approach without clear attempts to test them empirically.

In general, most researchers have acknowledged that CS use may have an indirect influence on the SLA process, although arguments have also been raised in the opposite direction – cf. for instance Kellerman (1991). Yet, none of these researchers has attempted to investigate this issue in a systematic way. They seem to have followed Poulisse et al.’s claim that “when conducting a study of compensatory strategies [a subset of CSs] it is irrelevant whether or not the use of particular compensatory strategies happens to have an additional learning effect” (Poulisse et al., 1990: 8). As a result, Cook’s claim that “at present the research is second language research rather than second language acquisition research” is still completely valid (Cook, 1993: 137).

We believe, however, that it is time to pay attention to the role of CSs in the SLA process. By approaching the study of these strategies as an analysis of FL interaction, many and interesting new insights can be obtained on this issue. The study of interaction as a source for L2 development is one of the most dynamic areas of research in the field of SLA. In recent years sociocultural approaches in this field have revealed that one form of interaction directly promoting the SLA process is what Swain (2000) has called collaborative dialogue. Collaborative dialogue is described as a communicative and cognitive activity, in which speakers and interlocutors use language as a tool to collaborate not only in the creation of meaning but also in the construction of accurate and appropriate TL forms to convey this meaning. This collaborative construction of language builds new TL knowledge for the FL learner and can thus be seen as an occasion for the learner’s IL system to develop towards the TL norm.

During this investigation we will analyze CS use as a possible trigger for collaborative dialogue. As suggested above, we will try to demonstrate that in FL interactions, when the TL items or structures desired to convey a message are unavailable, learners and interlocutors collaborate to create meaning. Within this process, interlocutors might also collaborate to generate TL and TL knowledge. In other words, the interlocutor might be able offer to the learner previously unavailable TL items or structures. They may thus collaborate with the speaker to create accurate and
appropriate TL forms in order to convey their messages, and to build new TL knowledge for the learner.

In sum, within the limits of this research we intend to answer two different but closely related questions: how is communication achieved through CS use in face-to-face FL interaction? Can CS use in an interactional context be an occasion for L2 development? Specifically, we aim to demonstrate that communication is achieved through the joint collaboration of the learner and their native or non-native speaking interlocutor; and that this collaboration can also be a source of new TL knowledge for the FL learner.

For this purpose we are going to draw on three different areas of knowledge that have already been mentioned throughout this introductory chapter: CS research, L1 communication studies and interactionist perspectives on SLA. In Chapter One a survey is presented concerning the most relevant literature in these domains. We study those theoretical frameworks that will constitute the basis of our research.

The first section of this chapter concentrates on CS research. Attention is paid to the theoretical discussion existing in this field around the issue of the definition and classification of CSs. The relatively wide range of definitions and taxonomies of CSs that have been proposed by previous scholars is reviewed and evaluated in an attempt to obtain a better understanding of the concept of CS and of the different types of CSs available. We describe previous empirical studies on CS use conducted within the field of SLA. We then evaluate their findings, discuss their contributions to the development of this area of study and appraise the current state of empirical research on CSs.

In the second and third sections of Chapter One we discuss L1 communication studies and the theoretical and empirical investigation of the relationship between interaction and SLA. It is not our intention to review all the studies or theoretical proposals existing in these two areas of knowledge. We introduce section two clarifying the relationship existing between L1 communication and L2 CS research. On this basis, we provide a justification for the use of L1 communication models in order to explain L2 strategic communication. We then describe the collaborative model of communication as well as give an overview of the most relevant empirical studies supporting the suitability of this archetype for the description of face-to-face oral interaction. In section three of this chapter we introduce interactionist perspectives on
SLA by providing an overview of the development of this area of research. Swain’s (1997, 2000) theoretical approach to the analysis of L2 interaction, the concept of collaborative dialogue and the results of previous empirical research within this theoretical framework are explained and assessed.

In Chapter Two we introduce our empirical research on CSs describing the object of study: CSs and strategic communication in face-to-face FL interaction. Building on the theoretical background outlined in Chapter One, a working definition of CSs is proposed. This working definition underlies and guides the methodology adopted for the collection of the data, the analyses conducted on this data and the conclusions drawn. It illustrates not only what we consider to be a CS and strategic communication, but also our theoretical approach to the study of the phenomena. It thus helps to clarify the objectives of this research and how we intended to achieve them. In this chapter the scope of the research is also narrowed down to the study of CSs used to solve lexical difficulties, that is, the unavailability of a TL lexical item or structure, therefore leaving out of our investigation phonological, syntactical or pragmatic problems.

Chapter Three is devoted to methodological issues related to the collection of the data. The first section describes how we selected and grouped the English language learners and English language NSs that took part in our project. We give details of the instruments used for the elicitation of the data. These include a communicative task aimed at eliciting representative samples of FL interaction and a post-interview to obtain learners’ and interlocutors’ retrospective comments on their interactional performance. In the final section of this chapter we explain and evaluate our data collection procedure.

The analysis of the data is conducted in Chapter Four, Chapter Five and Chapter Six. First we analyze the transcripts of the FL interaction samples elicited for the purposes of our research in order to identify lexical difficulties and subsequent CS uses. The procedure employed for this purpose is based on a triangulation of three different sources of evidence: performance features or problem indicators, NL data and retrospective comments. This procedure is outlined and considered in the first section of Chapter Four. The identified CSs are also described and classified into a coherent taxonomy of CSs. In the second section of Chapter Four, we describe this categorization and the procedure employed to assign each CS to the proposed categories. In the final
section of this chapter, on the basis of the evidence provided by the previous identification and classification analyses, we also introduce and define the concept of CS episode. We present this as a framework of analysis able to account for CS use and for the whole complexity of strategic communication, understood as an interactional collaborative process involving the joint actions of at least two different interlocutors.

Chapter Five is expected to provide an answer to the first major question which prompted our research: how is communication achieved through CS use in face-to-face FL interaction? Using the CS episode as the unit of analysis and the collaborative theory of communication as the theoretical framework, we analyze strategic interactional exchanges. In this chapter we aim to identify and describe what actions are taken by the learner and their interlocutor when the TL lexical item desired to convey their intended message is not available, how the two of them coordinate these actions and their individual beliefs in order to build a mutual agreement on a meaning, how they solve the problems encountered along this process, and to what extent the communicative outcome of a CS is the result of the collaborative effort of all the participants in the interaction. In sum, we intend to demonstrate that communication of meaning through CS use during face-to-face FL interaction is a collaborative activity.

In Chapter Six strategic interaction is examined in an effort to look for evidence of collaborative dialogue occurring within the limits of CS episodes. We aim to demonstrate that CSs may trigger collaborative dialogue. In other words, in strategic interaction learners and their interlocutors may collaborate not only to create meaning, but also to produce language and linguistic knowledge. We expect, therefore, to offer a positive answer to the second major question of our research: can CS use in an interactional context be an occasion for L2 development? In the final section of the chapter we explore the pedagogical implications of the results. If, as we have been arguing, strategic communication can be seen as an occasion for L2 development, CS use should certainly be taken into account more seriously in the FL teaching practice.

The concluding chapter contains a general appraisal of the project and a summary of our findings. It intends to clarify the relationship between the insights gained in the preceding chapters as well as their research and pedagogical implications, and to highlight the main contributions of our study to both the SLA research field and
the FL teaching practice. This chapter and the present work finish with some suggestions for future research.
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
CHAPTER 1

LITERATURE REVIEW
This first chapter presents the theoretical background of the current investigation. As explained in the introduction to our work, this study draws on three primary areas of knowledge: CS research, L1 communication studies and interactionist perspectives on SLA. We intend to build on previous advances made in these three different but closely related fields, show that their theoretical and empirical frameworks can fit together, and relate them to the analysis of CS use in face-to-face FL interaction.

In this chapter attention is therefore paid to previous work carried out in these three different areas. In the first section we review the most influential literature published to date on CSs within the field of SLA. Theoretical and empirical approaches to the study of strategic communication are here surveyed with the aim of gaining a better and more comprehensive understanding of the concept of CS, the different types of CSs available for the FL learner, the use that this learner makes of these problem-solving devices and the current state of the research on this issue.

The next section is centered on L1 communication studies. We highlight the relationship existing between this area of study and L2 CS research, justifying the use of analytical frameworks originally devised to account for L1 non-strategic communication in the analysis of L2 strategic interaction. As also explained in the introduction, for the purposes of the present study we will draw on the collaborative theory of communication. We intend to apply the collaborative model –as devised by Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989) and Wilkes-Gibbs (1997), to the analysis of CS use in FL interaction, and to explain thus strategic communication as a collaborative creation of meaning process. In the second section of the present chapter we discuss the principles of the collaborative theory and describe the collaborative model. Some attention is also paid to previous empirical research carried out within this theoretical paradigm.

In the final section we review the work conducted on interaction within the field of SLA. We intend to build on sociocultural approaches to the study of interaction in order to try to find evidence of SLA processes occurring within the limits of strategic communication. More specifically, we will draw for this purpose on Swain’s theoretical proposals and the concept of collaborative dialogue (Swain, 1997, 2000). In this chapter, we provide first a general overview of the current state of the research in this area, locating thus the collaborative dialogue theory in current views on the role of
interaction in SLA. We then concentrate our attention on this theoretical construct, reviewing both theoretical and empirical studies conducted within this framework.

1.1. CS RESEARCH

The concept of CS and its study dates back to 1972, when Selinker, in his classical article “Interlanguage”, introduced for the first time the notion of strategies of L2 communication. One year later Váradi carried out the first theoretical and empirical investigation specifically devoted to this issue. This would be followed by the work of Tarone who, in collaboration with other scholars, coined the term CS and prepared the ground for what would soon become a fruitful and prolific area of SLA research—cf. Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1976), Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1976), and Tarone (1977).

However, in order to arrive at a full understanding of the origin of CS research we need to go one decade backwards. Certain advances made in the field of SLA at the end of the 60s made it possible the appearance in the 70s of this new area of study. The strong development of mentalistic theories played a major role in this issue. Behaviorism principles started to be abandoned and emphasis shifted towards the mental processes at work in the learner’s use of the language. As a result, the notion of strategy, either learning or communication strategy, became to be considered a relevant object of research.

The change in the view of errors produced in 1967 with the publication of Corder’s article “The significance of learners’ errors” also contributed to readjust the direction of SLA research, at this moment dominated by Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis studies. In general, the increasing interest in learner performance, comprising both erroneous and non-erroneous language use, and the quick expansion of IL investigations favored the development of CS research.

At a different level, the rise of communicative approaches to FL teaching and the emphasis on the development of communicative skills also prompted the interest for CSs. Scholars and teachers alike, realizing the impossibility of providing L2 learners with all the linguistic resources they may need for present and future communication,

---

1 Váradi’s (1973) paper is generally considered the first systematic investigation on CSs, but it is not the first study published in this area. This paper was presented at a conference in 1973 and, although it circulated among researchers during the 70s, it did not become published until 1980.
started to recognize the value of CSs, to encourage their use among L2 learners, and to call for more and systematic work in this area of SLA.

At the beginning of the research scholars were mainly concerned with theoretical issues. It was necessary to establish a clear definition of the notion of CS, and to identify and classify the different types of CSs available in order to delimit the object of study and thus set it apart from other related IL phenomena, such as production or learning strategies. Initial studies were therefore basically directed at defining the concept of CS and developing taxonomies that could be used to classify these strategies – cf. Váradi (1973), Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1976), Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1976), Tarone (1977), Corder (1978), or Færch and Kasper (1980, 1983a, 1983b). When empirical observation was carried out, it was subordinated to theory. It was usually intended to collect data that could sustain the definitions or taxonomies proposed from a theoretical point of view.

In some of these initial studies researchers pointed out the possibility that certain factors, such as proficiency level, L1 background or personality could affect CS use, but without attempting to study these issues in a systematic way – cf. Tarone (1977) or Corder (1978). Once the scope of CS research had been established, there started to appear more empirical investigations, aiming at studying these and other related questions that could help to understand CS use in FL communication – cf. Ervin (1979), Palmberg (1979, 1982), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Hyde (1982), Bialystok (1983), or Haastrup and Phillipson (1983). In 1983 Færch and Kasper published a volume, *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, that incorporated the most influential papers written on CSs to that date and that served to consolidate this area of study (Færch and Kasper, 1983a). This publication was followed by a constant and increased interest in strategic communication, and nowadays a considerable amount of literature, reporting on a variety of aspects concerning both the nature and the use of CSs, has accumulated in the field of SLA research.

In the present chapter we review the most influential work conducted in this area, with the aim of providing a fair and comprehensive view of the development of CS research from its very beginning up to date. To clarify the notion of CS and the scope of this area of study, we first concentrate on the theoretical issues of the definition and classification of CSs. We then turn to CS empirical research in order to identify and
assess what is known so far about the use that the FL learner makes of CSs, and the role that these strategies play in the processes of L2 use and acquisition.

1.1.1. DEFINITION OF CSs

The question of the definition of the CS concept is obviously central for the development of the field. A clear and consistent characterization of what constitutes a CS is not only necessary to describe the limits and nature of the object of study, but it is also important to establish the basis of any attempt to identify and classify CSs, and to determine the methodological approach that needs to be taken to the analysis of the FL learner’s strategic language use.

This issue has therefore received a great deal of attention, particularly, as already pointed out, in the early years of the research. However, despite the amount of work conducted and the relevance of the question, scholars have not yet been able to reach a consensus on the conceptualization and description of the CS construct. In fact, the definition of the CS concept has become one of the most controversial issues in this area of SLA studies.

Since the notion of CS first appeared in the literature, there has been an open debate among scholars centered on the criteria that should be adopted to distinguish strategic from non-strategic communication. As a result of this controversy, there exists nowadays a considerable variety of definitions for the concept of CS that sometimes cover different ranges of devices and account for different aspects of the strategic communication process.

The main reason for this lack of agreement among scholars is that the study of CSs has been approached from two different, though generally compatible, theoretical perspectives: the interactional and the psycholinguistic. These two perspectives do not only underlie the variety of definitions available for the concept; as we will soon see, they also account for differences in the taxonomies proposed to classify CSs, the methodological design of the empirical investigations carried out in this field and the position adopted by different scholars on the issue of the possible teachability of CSs.

---

2 In 1997 Yule and Tarone referred to these two approaches as the Pros and the Cons. They were thus accounting for the fact that whereas interactional researchers have been very prolific in the number of CS types they have identified, psycholinguistic scholars, such as Poulisse et al. (1990), have tended to be more conservative, trying always to reduce the number of CS categories as much as possible.
From an interactional perspective CSs are viewed as “discourse strategies that are evident in interaction involving learners” (Ellis, 1994: 396). CSs result from the “negotiation of an agreement on meaning” between two interlocutors (Tarone, 1981: 288) and therefore the discussion concerning CS use is considered to belong to the study of learner interaction. On this basis, interactionist researchers have focused their studies on the analysis of variability in linguistic performance. This approach began with Váradi (1973) and Tarone (1977, 1980, 1981). Researchers adopting an interactional perspective, such as Hyde (1982), Paribkaht (1985), and more recently Williams et al. (1997), Wagner and Firth (1997), or Anderson (1998), have generally drawn on Tarone’s (1980, 1981) definition of the concept of CS for their empirical analyses of this IL phenomenon.

Within the framework of the psycholinguistic approach, CSs are treated as “cognitive processes involved in the use of the L2 in reception and production” (Ellis, 1994: 396). More specifically, CSs are conceived as “mental plans implemented by the L2 learner in response to an internal signal of an imminent problem, a form of self-help that did not have to engage the interlocutor’s support for resolution” (Kasper and Kellerman, 1997: 2) and located within cognitive models of speech production. This is the approach taken by authors such as Færch and Kasper (1980, 1983b, 1984), Bialystok (1990), Poulisse et al. (1990), Poulisse (1993, 1997), or Kellerman and Bialystok (1997).

Here we intend to provide a general overview of the development of this theoretical issue, reviewing some of the most influential definitions proposed to date from both perspectives. Special consideration is given to Tarone’s (1980, 1981), Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) and Poulisse et al.’s (1990) definitions of the CS concept. These three different conceptualizations of the notion of CS illustrate the principles that have been generally used to distinguish strategic from non-strategic communication and, in some way or another, they have influenced the whole of the research carried out in this area.

We have already explained that the concept of CS has its origin in the notion of strategies of L2 communication, introduced by Selinker in 1972 and accounted for as a learner’s attempt to express meaning with a limited IL system. Selinker, however, never tried to develop this notion or to go into detail about the nature of CSs.
The first attempts to provide a systematic definition for the CS concept were made by Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1976), and Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1976).

A systematic attempt by the learner to express meaning in the target language, in situations where the appropriate systematic target language rules have not been formed.

(Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker, 1976: 100)

A systematic attempt by the learner to express or decode meaning in the target language, in situations where the appropriate systematic target language rules have not been formed.

(Tarone, Cohen and Dumas, 1976: 78)

These two definitions rely on the same principles. The proposal made by Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1976) represents an extension of the previous definition, i.e. Tarone, Frauenfelder and Selinker (1976), aiming at relating the notion of IL strategies to language comprehension as well as language production.

These authors’ interpretation of the CS concept is still firmly rooted in the tradition of Error Analysis. At this moment any language form that was erroneous compared to the TL norm, irrespective of whether this was in accordance with the learner’s IL system or not, was being taken as evidence of CS use. This explains why the notion of CS appears restricted to learners’ use of the language.

One year later Tarone, realizing that communicative problems “may occur when one speaks in one’s L1, as well as when one attempts to communicate in an interlanguage” (Tarone, 1977: 195), proposed a more developed definition for the term CS.

Conscious communication strategies are used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual’s thought.

(Tarone, 1977: 195)

This was not, however, Tarone’s last proposal on this issue. With the intention of recognizing the previously overlooked interactional function of CSs, this scholar built a new definition of CSs – presented in Tarone (1980, 1981), that also accounts for the role played by the interlocutor in the strategic communication process.

A mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared.

(Tarone, 1981: 288)

This definition makes reference to two features that Tarone considers are the two basic defining characteristics of CSs: language use and interactional function. CSs are
seen as directly related to language use and not as part of the speaker’s linguistic knowledge. Quoting Tarone, “they are descriptive of the learners’ pattern of use of what they know as they try to communicate with speakers of the target language” (Tarone, 1981: 287). This interpretation also implies that CSs are used only when a communication problem arises and that, therefore, Tarone considers them to be problem-oriented.

CSs are also said to be characterized by having an interactional function. They are used to negotiate an agreement on a meaning between two interlocutors and, in this way, ensure that both of them are talking about the same thing (Tarone, 1981: 288).

The notion of consciousness has been excluded from the definition on the grounds that it is not clear whether all instances of CS use really occur with the awareness of the speaker. Tarone argues on this basis that it is preferable not to specify the degree of consciousness in a description of CSs (Tarone, 1981: 287).

Finally, taking all the previous considerations into account, the author proposes the following criteria to characterize CSs:

1. a speaker desires to communicate meaning x to a listener;
2. the speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning x is unavailable, or is not shared with the listener; thus
3. the speaker chooses to
   (a) avoid – not attempt to communicate meaning x – or
   (b) attempt alternate means to communicate meaning x. The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning.

(Tarone, 1981: 288)

This set of criteria serves not only to clarify what is meant by the term CS, but also to differentiate these devices from other related IL phenomena, such as learning, production and reception strategies which, at this stage of the research, were not yet clearly delimited. CSs are distinguished from production strategies – defined as “an attempt to use one’s linguistic system efficiently and clearly, with a minimum of effort”, e.g. the use of prefabricated patterns, discourse planning or rehearsal (Tarone, 1981: 289); on the grounds that although the latter also belong to language use they have not an interactional function, i.e. criteria 3b is absent. Learning strategies – “an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language” (Tarone, 1981: 290); are differentiated from CSs on the basis of the first criterion, i.e. motivation. The basic force behind a learning strategy is the desire to learn the TL, whereas the basic motivation of a CS is to communicate meaning, although Tarone recognizes that CSs
can also indirectly contribute to IL development. Finally, the first criterion can also be used to distinguish CSs from perception strategies—described as “the attempt to interpret incoming utterances efficiently, with the least effort” (Tarone, 1981: 291). These defining criteria also have the advantage of being valid for the description of L2 performance as well as for L1 communication.

In general the three conditions established by Tarone for the presence of a CS have been widely exploited in later research and proved to be extremely helpful for the identification of CS uses in IL performance. However, this does not mean that Tarone’s definition has been generally accepted without being questioned. It has been widely criticized by those authors who prefer to adopt a psycholinguistic view on CS use. Færch and Kasper (1983b) argue, for example, against the interactional condition because they consider it excludes the possibility of using CSs in a monologue, and Dörnyei and Scott (1997) believe that, by introducing an interactional perspective, Tarone has blurred the distinction between CSs and negotiation of meaning devices.

Whereas Tarone (1980, 1981) describes CSs in interactional terms, Færch and Kasper (1983b) locate these strategies in the individual user. They assume that the speaker is the person who experiences the problem and, subsequently, the only one involved in developing a strategic plan for its solution. For these authors, CSs are mental plans that belong to the speech production process; they need therefore to be explained in terms of a speech production model.

On this basis, Færch and Kasper (1983b) locate CSs into Clark and Clark’s (1977) cognitive model of speech production. In this model the process of language production is divided into two phases: the planning and the execution phase. In the planning stage the speaker sets up a communicative goal and develops a plan to reach it. This means that the speaker decides the verbal act they wish to perform, the content they want to communicate and how to define the relationship with the interlocutor. That is, they establish the actional goal, the propositional goal and the modal goal. Once the goal has been instituted, the speaker assesses the situational conditions and selects, from the communicative resources available, the rules and items considered most appropriate to reach this goal, i.e. the speaker develops the plan. This plan is then carried out in the execution phase. At this stage the neurological and physiological processes which will
lead to the verbal behavior expected to satisfy the original goal take place. These include the articulation of speech organs as well as the use of gestures.

During all these stages speakers monitor the communicative process and, if they find that the original plan cannot be carried out successfully, they either change their communicative goal or develop an alternative plan; that is, they activate a CS to solve the problem encountered—a reduction or a compensatory strategy. CSs are usually placed in the planning phase, when the individual finds that the required linguistic means to construct their plan are not at their disposal. Nevertheless, problems can also appear when the speaker attempts to execute the plan. These problems usually have to do with retrieving the items or rules contained in the plan.

On the basis of this description of the speech production process, Færch and Kasper (1983b) propose the following definition for the CS concept:

*Communication strategies are potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal.*

(Færch and Kasper, 1983b: 36)

We can see in this definition that Færch and Kasper (1983b) consider the criteria of problematicity and consciousness as the two basic features to be taken into account in a description of CSs. CSs are problem-oriented because they are employed when the speaker does not have the resources required to express the intended meaning. The criterion of consciousness is secondary because it is derived from the first one. In order to experience a problem, one needs to be conscious that some kind of difficulty exists.

Færch and Kasper (1983b) recognize, as Tarone (1981) had previously pointed out, that consciousness is a graded phenomena and that strategies can be used in a more or less conscious way. It can also be the case that an initially conscious plan becomes automatic after a time. For this reason they talk about “potentially conscious plans” (Færch and Kasper, 1983b: 35-6).

This description also accounts for the two main categories of CSs, i.e. reduction and compensatory strategies, explained as the result of two different processes. It shows as well that strategic language use is more complex than non-strategic language production, because it always involves the extra process of developing and executing a second plan, i.e. a sub-plan. Poulisse (1993), however, considers that the explanation is too general and vague. It cannot account for the different types of CSs within each category, e.g. for the differences between paraphrase and transfer strategies, and it
cannot be used to explain CS use, e.g. to explain why lower proficiency level students use more transfer strategies than more advanced ones. Poulisse et al. (1990) and Poulisse (1993) recognize the value of Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) attempt to embed CS use in a speech production model, but they consider that they have not gone far enough.

The strongest criticism to this approach has come from Bialystok (1990). On the grounds that non-problematic language uses, such as giving definitions, result in the same overt behavior as circumlocutions and other kinds of strategic behavior, Bialystok argues that she does not see a clear distinction between non-problematic production plans and problematic strategic plans. She does not either agree with the consciousness criterion. She rejects it because it excludes the possibility that small children, who are not capable of conscious reflection, can make any use of a CS in their learning of the L1.

Bialystok (1990) aims at a more general concept of CS, able to account for any attempt to reach a communicative goal, conscious or unconscious, problematic or not, in the first or in the L2, by a child or by an adult. This broader conceptualization of CSs explains her disagreement with Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) view. Bialystok recognizes that “at the core of CS … is a real phenomenon that is in need of explanation” (Bialsytok, 1990: 46). That is, she accepts that there can be a distinction between strategic and non-strategic language use, but she does not accept the criteria previously used to account for this distinction and she does not propose a plausible alternative able to draw this division in a systematic way.³

Bialystok’s work has served to point out the similarities existing between L2 learners’ CS use and speech adjustments made in the L1, such as caretaker speech, foreigner talk or the speech of children acquiring the L1. However, by generalizing the original notion of CS and by failing to draw a clear distinction between strategic and non-strategic language use, some of the defining characteristics of the concept are lost and, as a result, this becomes too vague a concept. In fact, from a practical point of view, i.e. the empirical study of L2 learners’ abilities to deal with lexical problems, Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) definition has turned out to be much more useful.

³ For a more detailed view of Bialystok’s concept of CS and the cognitive model she has used to account for this phenomenon see Bialystok (1990), or Kellerman and Bialystok (1997). For a critical revision of this approach see Poulisse et al. (1990) or Poulisse (1993).
An alternative to Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) approach to the concept of CS is the definition proposed by Poulisse et al. (1990). Notice, however, that this characterization is restricted to those strategies which involve an attempt, on the part of the speaker, to achieve their originally intended meaning. That is, Poulisse et al. (1990) account only for a subset of what are generally considered to be CSs, i.e. the subset of compensatory strategies –CpSs.

Compensatory strategies are strategies which a language user employs in order to achieve his intended meaning on becoming aware of problems arising during the planning phase of an utterance due to his own linguistic shortcomings.

(Poulisse et al., 1990: 22)

This description was built drawing on Færch and Kasper (1983b) and was proposed as an initial working definition to be used for CS identification purposes. Here we can see that these authors, like Færch and Kasper (1983b), adopt problematicity as a defining criterion. However, they prefer the term awareness to consciousness. Awareness is thought to be a more restricted notion, which makes reference only to the language user being aware of having a problem and not to the decision of making use of any particular strategy.

Taking this definition as the starting point of their analyses, but aiming at a more psychologically plausible description of CpSs, Poulisse et al. (1990) embed these strategies in Levelt’s (1989) model of speech production. In Levelt’s (1989) view of the mechanisms of speech production, speakers first conceptualize their messages, then they formulate their linguistic representation, i.e. encode them, and finally they articulate them. In this model, the speech production process has four steps: message generation, grammatical encoding, phonological encoding, and articulation. These fours phases are covered by three processing components: the conceptualizer, the formulator and the articulator.

At the conceptualizer the messages are generated. This process involves the conception of a communicative intention and the planning of the contents and the form of the message. This conceptualization process can be repaired by a monitor. The output of the conceptualizer is a preverbal message, consisting of a conceptual structure which can be accepted as input by the formulator. In the formulator the grammatical and the phonological encoding of the message takes place. For this process to work the formulator has to have access to the mental lexicon, a store of information about the
words in one’s language. Finally, the articulator is the processing component which executes the phonetic plan bit by bit, thus resulting in the overt speech, which constitutes the input to the first step of the listener’s speech reception process.

Levelt’s (1989) model had been designed as a L1 model and therefore needed to be adapted to be valid for L2 communication. In this sense, Poulisse et al. (1990) argue that the mental lexicon can contain not only lexical items for L1 words, but also items for words of a second or any other possible language.

Lexical problems appear when the speaker does not find the lexical item in the mental lexicon or when this item cannot be accessed. As a result, the preverbal message cannot be encoded. If the speaker does not want the communicative process to breakdown, they can do three different things: (1) to give up their original communicative intention, which means using an avoidance or reduction strategy; (2) to appeal to the interlocutor for help by means of an interactional strategy; or (3) to attempt to find an alternative way to encode their original message. In this last case they will be making use of a CpS (Poulisse et al., 1990: 59).

This description establishes a clear distinction between strategic and non-strategic language uses. If the learner is able to retrieve the appropriate words to encode the message as initially planned, language use is non-strategic. However, if the required words are not contained in the lexicon or cannot be retrieved, the speaker needs to make use of one of the above mentioned three types of CSs.

Taking into account the principles of this model and the results of an empirical investigation carried out on learners’ use of CpSs, Poulisse et al. (1990) developed a final version of their original working definition of CpSs.

Compensatory strategies are processes, operating on conceptual and linguistic knowledge representations, which are adopted by language users in the creation of alternative means of expression when linguistic shortcomings make it impossible for them to communicate their intended meanings in the preferred manner.

(Poulisse et al., 1990: 192-3)

This new definition has the advantage of accounting for problems arising not only in the planning phase but also at later stages in the speech production process. It does not only define CpSs as processes but also specifies the outcome of these processes. Like the first proposal, it is general enough to cover both L1 and L2 communication. It is carefully worded to give an explanation for cases in which the
adjustment of the message is not due to speakers’ linguistic problems but to an 
anticipation of hearers’ processing difficulties. At the same time, it is specific enough to 
be used in the field of IL studies, since the presence of a linguistic problem is retained 
as a conditioning factor for CS use. However, since, like Færch and Kasper’s (1983b), 
this definition is based on a model of speech production and not on a model of 
communication, it can only account for CSs as cognitive production processes and has 
little to say about the role of these strategies in interaction, i.e. about the interactional 
function of CSs.

As clearly stated in the introduction to our work, the present research project 
intends to analyze CS use in face-to-face oral interaction and to account for strategic 
communication as an interactional collaborative process, involving the joint actions and 
mutual effort of at least two interlocutors. We will therefore follow Tarone’s approach 
to the conceptualization and definition of CSs. However, in Chapter Two we will 
discuss Tarone’s view in more detail, proposing an alternative version to Tarone’s 
(1981) definition and characterization of CSs that will serve to clarify our position on 
this issue and to delimit our object of study, i.e. what we consider to be a CS under the 
scope of our investigation.

1.1.2. CLASSIFICATION OF CSs
A productive first approach in the investigation of a new area of knowledge is the 
identification and classification of the phenomena one is looking at. Taxonomies are 
systems of description. They serve to organize and classify the data obtained, but they 
also play a main role in the description of the phenomenon. This explains the major 
importance of taxonomies in the early studies of CSs. At this moment, taxonomic 
distinctions needed to be established in order not only to organize the empirical data 
collected, but also to clarify the specific kinds of cognitive processes and linguistic 
structures that were considered to belong to the domain of CSs.

This also justifies in part the great amount and variety of CS taxonomies that 
have been proposed within this field of research, from its beginning to present date. We 
have just seen that different scholars have been attracted by several aspects of strategic 
behavior and, as a result, have a different concept of what is meant by the term CS. 
These different conceptualizations surface in their descriptions and classifications of the
CS phenomenon. Interactionist researchers, considering that CSs belong to the field of discourse, have distinguished different types of CSs on the basis, mainly, of the different forms of the linguistic utterances they produce. Psycholinguists, however, have tried to describe and classify mental cognitive processes.

Ultimately, all taxonomies are descriptions of linguistic utterances. As Yule and Tarone (1997) point out, even when the researcher’s ultimate intention is to identify and classify the processes that underlie these utterances, the only real evidence they have is the form of language produced. On this basis the researcher claims that a particular mental process or behavior has produced them and therefore that the learner has used a specific type of strategy. In other words, the differences in the organization of taxonomies depend on the level of inference concerning these processes. Interactional researchers are more neutral in the process issue and give more prominence to the linguistic form of strategic utterances. Psycholinguistic scholars confer less importance to the linguistic form and more to their inferences on the mental processes that underlie these surface forms.

At the same time, we need to bear in mind that language use is always complex, unpredictable and unlimited in its variability. We believe, like Tarone (1977: 196, 2002: personal communication), that any system that tries to reduce linguistic behavior to a fixed and organized set of categories is always somehow arbitrary and incomplete. From this perspective we can even consider that any attempt to develop a consistent and systematic taxonomy of CSs is in itself futile, since this taxonomy will never do full justice to the variability and complexity of CS use. This can also help to explain the variety of taxonomical systems available in this field of research and why researchers have not been able to reach an agreement on the issue of the identification and classification of CS types.

Nevertheless, taxonomies are necessary for the development of the field. The researcher needs to systematize the data obtained, to describe and organize them into manageable entities in order to be able to establish comparisons and find patterns of strategic behavior that may help to understand the strategic phenomenon. However arbitrary or limited in their explanatory value they may be, taxonomies are essential for our understanding of the nature of the CS concept and the use that the FL learner makes of these problem-solving devices.
Taking into account these limitations of CS taxonomies, we will now review the most relevant taxonomical proposals made to date by SLA scholars. This will help us to obtain a more clear idea of the notion of CS and of the different approaches that exist to the study of strategic communication. Within the interactional approach, we will pay special attention to Tarone’s (1977) classification of CSs. This is one of the first taxonomies proposed and one of the most commonly used frameworks of analysis, and it also constitutes the background of other classification systems that, in one way or another, rely on this initial model –cf. Corder (1978) or Paribakht (1985). We will then comment on the most representative taxonomies proposed from the psycholinguistic perspective, in particular, Færch and Kasper’s (1983b), Poulisse et al. (1990) and Poulisse (1993). We will end this discussion with a review of Dörnyei and Kormos’s (1998) taxonomy. This framework constitutes the most updated proposal made for the classification of CSs. It draws on previous work made by researchers from both approaches and, therefore, is the more comprehensive CS taxonomy available to date.

The first attempt to identify and categorize different instances of CSs was made by Váradi in his already mentioned 1973 study. This scholar distinguishes two broad categories of CSs: adjusted meaning strategies and adjusted form strategies. The rationale behind this binary division is that when a speaker feels unable to get their original message across, they have only two possible solutions for their problem: one of them is to adjust the meaning they intend to communicate by either reducing or replacing it; the other is to adjust the form of expression, also by means of reduction or replacement. In the first case the speaker manipulates the meaning whereas in the second they manipulate the linguistic form. We will see that this binary opposition underlies most of the taxonomies proposed to date for the classification of CSs.

Without doubt, as said above, one of the most frequently cited and widely used taxonomies of CSs is the one proposed by Tarone in 1977. One year before, in collaboration with Cohen and Dumas, Tarone had identified a relatively wide range of CSs types used in L2 communication to overcome phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical IL deficits. However, this cannot yet be strictly considered a taxonomy of CSs. As the authors themselves recognize, what they present is a catalogue, that is not even meant to be all-inclusive, rather than a systematic or organized classification of CSs.
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This experimental categorization constitutes, however, the starting point of Tarone’s 1977 taxonomy of lexical CSs. Building on this previous work and on the analysis of empirical data obtained from a small sample of L2 students this scholar was able to develop a classification system that has proven robust and thorough across numerous empirical studies of CS use.

### TABLE 1.1. TARONE’S TAXONOMY OF CSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Avoidance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Topic avoidance</td>
<td>The learner simply does not talk about concepts for which the vocabulary is unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Message abandonment</td>
<td>The learner begins to talk about a concept but is unable to continue and begins a new sentence (e.g. ‘the water (mumble)’ for ‘the water spills’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Paraphrase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Approximation</td>
<td>The learner uses a single TL vocabulary item or structure, which they know is not correct, but which shares enough semantic features with the desired item to satisfy the learner (e.g. ‘worm’ for ‘silkworm’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Word coinage</td>
<td>The learner makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g. ‘person worm’ to refer to ‘an animated caterpillar’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Circumlocution</td>
<td>The learner describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate TL structure (e.g. ‘I don’t know what’s its name. that’s uh, Persian, and we use in Turkey, a lot of’ to describe ‘a waterpipe’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Conscious transfer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Literal translation</td>
<td>The learner translates word for word from the NL (e.g. ‘he invites him to drink’ in place of ‘they toast one another’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Language switch</td>
<td>The learner simply uses the NL term without bothering to translate (e.g. ‘balon’ for ‘balloon’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Appeal for assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The learner asks for the correct term: asks the experimentor, any NS, or even refers to a dictionary (e.g. ‘what is this? What called?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Mime</strong></td>
<td>The learner uses a nonverbal device to refer to an object or event (e.g. ‘and everybody says [clap hands]’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tarone, 1977: 197-199)

---

4 Notice that, although in their definitions of CSs researchers do not restrict the scope of these devices to lexicality, i.e. to solve problems arising from lexical deficits in the learner’s IL system, in their actual analyses of strategic language behavior attention is generally focused on this particular kind of CSs. As a result, most of the taxonomies we are going to review here and most of the empirical studies we will analyze in the next section are restricted to lexical CSs.

5 In 1981 Tarone refers to this group of strategies as *borrowing*. 
Although Tarone (1980, 1981) makes in her definition of CSs a binary distinction between avoidance and *achievement* or compensatory strategies – cf. present chapter, p. 25, her taxonomy, as illustrated in table 1.1, is constituted around five major categories. These reflect five different sorts of decisions on how to solve a lexical communicative problem and five different sources of knowledge.

Corder (1978), adopting an approach to the description and classification of CSs that can be considered quite similar to Tarone’s (1977), sets out, like Váradi (1973), a productive means of assigning CSs to two broad categories. In Corder’s (1978) model when a speaker finds a problem to achieve a communicative goal they have two possibilities: either to change the original goal or to change the route to this goal. If they choose the first option, that is, if the speaker decides to “tailor his message to the resources he has available”, they will be using a *message adjustment strategy* (Corder, 1983: 17). If they decide to change the route but not the goal, that is, if they choose to “attempt to increase his resources by one means or another in order to realize his communicative intentions”, they will be making use of a *resource expansion strategy* (Corder, 1983: 17).

These two broad categories are further subdivided into different types of strategies that more or less correspond to the CS types identified by Tarone (1977). Corder, however, distinguishes four types of message adjustment strategies whereas Tarone recognizes only two. To the topic avoidance and message abandonment categories Corder adds *semantic avoidance* – “saying something slightly different from what you intended but still broadly relevant to the topic of discourse”, and *message reduction* – “saying less, or less precisely, what you intended to say” (Corder, 1983: 17).

Data collected by different researchers for different purposes has confirmed the coherency and utility of Tarone’s (1977) classification. Either following Tarone’s combination of CS types into five major categories or Corder’s binary division, many scholars in the field have adopted Tarone’s framework of analysis, obtaining results that support the consistency and reliability of this model. Furthermore, alternative taxonomies proposed by other researchers – cf. for instance Paribakht (1985), can usually be traced to Tarone’s original categories. As Bialystok (1990: 61) explains it, there is a core group of strategies that appears invariably in almost all taxonomies and Tarone’s is probably the one that best captures these strategies.
From a different, though not incompatible perspective, Faerch and Kasper (1983b) propose, in line with their conceptualization of the notion of CS, a taxonomy that represents an attempt to distinguish CS categories reflecting internal mental processes rather than external linguistic features.

The classification that Faerch and Kasper (1983b) suggest is based on the model of speech production that also informs their conceptualization and definition of CSs, i.e. Clark and Clark’s (1977). We have already seen that this framework makes it possible to draw a distinction between two main types of CSs: reduction and compensatory strategies. These two categories operate by altering different aspects of the production process. In the first case the learner changes or modifies their communicative goal; in the second, they change the initially devised plan to reach this goal.

**TABLE 1.2. FAERCH AND KASPER’S TAXONOMY OF CSs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduction strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Formal reduction strategies</td>
<td>The learner communicates by means of a ‘reduced’ system, in order to avoid producing non-fluent or incorrect utterances by realizing insufficiently automatized or hypothetical rules/items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) phonological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) morphological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) syntactic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) lexical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Functional reduction strategies</td>
<td>The learner reduces their communicative goal in order to avoid a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) actional reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) modal reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) reduction of the propositional content:</td>
<td>topic avoidance message abandonment meaning replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement strategies</td>
<td>The learner attempts to solve a communicative problem by expanding their communicative resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) compensatory strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code switch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlingual transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter-/intralingual transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL based strategies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word coinage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restructuring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-linguistic strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) retrieval strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Faerch and Kasper, 1983b: 52-3)
As can be observed in table 1.2, within these two groups of CSs Færch and Kasper (1983b) make further subdivisions. The result is quite a complex taxonomy containing more distinctions and more subtypes than any of the previous ones. However, a careful analysis reveals that most of the CS types proposed by Færch and Kasper (1983b) can be traced to Tarone’s (1977) initial ones. A subset of the functional reduction strategies coincides with Tarone’s avoidance strategies and within the group of achievement strategies most of those included in the CpS category had already been identified by Tarone back in 1977.

Whereas the overall CS categories proposed by Færch and Kasper (1983b) are based on a cognitive analysis of strategic behavior, the subtypes they establish seem to reflect linguistic rather than cognitive features. In fact, as also pointed out when discussing these authors’ definition of the CS concept, Poulisse (1993) has criticized Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) approach to the description of strategic language use for being too general to account, in a psychologically plausible way, for different CS types within overall categories. To a certain extent we can see Færch and Kasper’s (1983b) taxonomy as a compromised position between the interactional and the psycholinguistic approach, general categories reflecting the psycholinguistic perspective and specific subtypes the interactional one.

Adopting a strict psycholinguistic approach to the description and classification of CSs, Poulisse et al. developed in 1990 a new taxonomy from the basis that any CS classification system needs to be parsimonious –i.e. to use a minimal number of CS categories because when there are too many strategy types generalizations can be easily missed; generalizable to different individuals and different communicative situations; and psychologically plausible –that is, it has to fit into a psychological model of speech production (Kellerman, 1991: 145).

These scholars reject all previous taxonomies without exception, criticizing them for being product-oriented, i.e. based on the surface structures produced rather than on underlying psychological processes. In order to show the fallacy of these classifications they review some of Tarone’s (1977) categories. For instance, in their study a ‘hairdresser’ is referred by one learner as ‘a person who cuts people’s hair’ and by other as ‘a haircutter’. The first example would be classified by Tarone as a circumlocution and the second as a word coinage strategy. According to Poulisse et al. (1990: 29), the
process underlying these two utterances is the same. They are similar in terms of semantic content and they both respond to an attempt made by the learner to communicate the intended referent by mentioning some of its most distinctive attributes. Therefore, they need to be considered as different linguistic realizations of one only type of strategy (Bongaerts and Poulisse, 1989: 254; Poulisse et al., 1990: 29-31).

According to Poulisse et al. (1990), this focus on linguistic form is characteristic not only of Tarone’s (1977) taxonomy, but also of the following ones. Building on their conceptualization of the CS notion, on Levelt’s (1989) model of speech production, and on the empirical analysis of a considerable amount of data obtained from 45 Dutch learners of English, these scholars developed a classification system that, they argue, strictly reflects differences in cognitive processing. This scheme is the result of quite a comprehensive research project carried out during the second half of the 90s at Nijmegen University, usually known as The Nijmegen project. For this reason, this classification is usually referred to as the Nijmegen taxonomy.

We need to bear in mind that, since, as we have already seen, these scholars limited their definition of CSs to the subset of CpSs, their taxonomical proposal is restricted to only this particular type of strategies.

This taxonomy consists of two archistrategies that are based on Levelt’s (1989) psychological model of speech production, more specifically on two of the components of this model, i.e. the conceptualizer and the formulator, which are supposed to draw on two different sources of knowledge. The conceptualizer draws on conceptual knowledge, which constitutes the encyclopedia and contains information about the properties of the concept and its relation to other concepts. The formulator draws on linguistic knowledge, i.e. on the knowledge of the morpho-phonological features of the items of the first, the second or any other possible language; and the syntactic, morphological and phonological rules of all these languages.

These two sources of information constitute the basis for the distinction between the two archistrategies. Depending on whether the speaker predominantly exploits the conceptual knowledge source, i.e. manipulates the concept, or the linguistic knowledge source, i.e. manipulates their linguistic knowledge, they will be making use of a conceptual or a linguistic strategy. Table 1.3 illustrates the specific nature of each of
these two main categories and how they need to be subdivided into only two more strategies types to explain all the possible realizations of strategic behavior.

TABLE 1.3. POULISSE, BONGAERTS AND KELLERMAN’S TAXONOMY OF CSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conceptual strategies</td>
<td>The speaker refers to the intended concept by listing (some of) its properties or by substituting the word for a related concept which shares some of the criterial properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Analytic strategies</td>
<td>The speaker refers to the intended concept by listing (some of) its properties assuming that the listener will be able to infer the intended concept from the properties which have been mentioned (e.g. ‘this you use for a baby so uh, that it can’t uh, make uh, his clothes erm uh dirty’ for ‘bib’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Holistic strategies</td>
<td>The speaker refers to a concept by using the word for a related concept (e.g. ‘vegetables’ for ‘peas’ or ‘table’ for ‘desk’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Linguistic strategies</td>
<td>The speaker manipulates their linguistic knowledge. This will be knowledge of the syntactic, morphological and phonological rules that apply in the L1, some knowledge of these rules in the L2 (and possible in a L3), and knowledge of similarities and dissimilarities between the L1 and the L2 (and L3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transfer strategies</td>
<td>The speaker exploits the similarities between languages. Words or phrases may be transferred from one language to the other. Sometimes, the utterances resulting are phonologically and/or morphologically adapted to the L2 (e.g. ‘paprika’, Dutch word for ‘green pepper’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Morphological creativity</td>
<td>The speaker uses L2 rules of morphological derivation to create (what they assume to be) comprehensible L2 lexis (e.g. ‘representator’ for ‘representative’ or ‘ironize’ for ‘to iron’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Poulisse et al., 1990: 60-62)

Despite its limited scope, i.e. restricted to CpSs, the proposal made by Poulisse et al. (1990) has been widely accepted as a valuable theoretical contribution to the field. It has as well been frequently used for the analysis of empirical data by those researchers who have adopted a psycholinguistic approach to the study of strategic

---

6 In a previous approach to the taxonomic description of CS use Kellerman et al. (1987) had distinguished three different types of conceptual strategies: holistic strategies, when the concept is seen as a whole rather than in terms of its parts; partitive strategies, when an object or figure is seen as consisting of two or more parts; and linear strategies, when the figure is divided into its ultimate one-dimensional components, such as lines, angles or spatial relations, and described in terms of these as if giving instructions on how to draw it. The partitive and linear strategies correspond now to the analytic strategy category.

7 The third language (L3) involves any language known by the learner other than the L1 or the L2.

8 Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) suggest that a more appropriate term for morphological creativity should be grammatical derivation.
communication. However, we also need to point out that this taxonomy does not even cover all the range of CpSs identified by previous researchers. Nonverbal devices are being here ignored, although, in 1991, Kellerman renamed linguistic strategies as *code strategies* in order to include under their scope nonverbal mechanisms. Appeals for assistance could not, however, be incorporated into the system. They are not considered compensatory because they are not learners’ autonomous solutions to their own lexical problems.

The strongest criticism to this system has come from Poulisse herself who, in 1993, argues that it fails to meet the psychological plausibility criterion when Levelt’s (1989) cognitive model is adapted to account for L1 and L2 use. Poulisse (1993) reviews Levelt’s paradigm in order to propose a bilingual speech production model involving a bilingual lexicon. Research on the notion of the bilingual lexicon suggests that conceptual and transfer strategies are largely similar. In both cases the learner substitutes the intended and unavailable lexical item with an alternative word retrieved from their lexicon, which contains words from the L1, the L2 and the L3.  

This scholar also considers that the two subtypes of conceptual strategies, i.e. holistic and analytic, differ substantially from a cognitive point of view. Whereas holistic devices rely on a substitution process, analytic ones require the reconceptualization of the entire preverbal message. These two strategies should therefore be treated as two different categories. On this basis, Poulisse (1993: 163) argues that “although different knowledge sources do affect the choice between a conceptual and a linguistic strategy, they cannot be considered criterial in the distinction of strategy types” and reviews the initial Nijmegen taxonomy to propose a new classification system for CpSs.

In Poulisse’s (1993) model when a speaker cannot access an intended lexical item from their mental lexicon they have three options: (1) to stop the speech production process and give up their message, i.e. to make use of a message abandonment strategy; (2) to implicitly or explicitly appeal for help from their interlocutor; or (3) to use a CpS to compensate for their lexical problem. In this respect Poulisse (1993) agrees with Poulisse *et al.* (1990) —cf. present chapter, p. 30. However, as the following table

---

9 The bilingual lexicon stores lexical items and their features or specifications. For instance, for the word ‘boy’, the specifications are [+ human], [+ male], [+ child], [+noun] and [+ English]. The English language specification is therefore treated as just one more of the word features (Poulisse, 1993: 176).
illustrates, within CpSs Poulisse (1993) distinguishes three instead of two different types of strategies.

### TABLE 1.4. POULISSE’S TAXONOMY OF CSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Substitution strategies</td>
<td>The speaker replaces the intended lexical item with another one. This can be either a related item (e.g. ‘animal’ for ‘rabbit’) or the corresponding L1 item (e.g. Dutch ‘voorwoord’ for ‘preface’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Substitution plus strategies</td>
<td>The speaker applies a L1 or L2 morphological and/or phonological encoding procedure to a L1 or L2 lexical item (e.g. the creation of the verb ‘ironize’ on the basis of the noun ‘iron’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reconceptualization strategies</td>
<td>The speaker may choose to encode the conceptual features of the intended lexical item one by one, for instance by listing them (e.g. ‘it’s green, you eat it with potatoes and Popeye eats it’ for ‘spinach’); or may decide to select two lexical items from the lexicon which can be combined into one new word (e.g. ‘cooking apparatus’ for ‘cooker’). A speaker may also decide to add further background information to their message, so that the listener will be able to exploit the context in interpreting this message (e.g. saying that three quarters of a swimming pool is for people who want to dive and play, and one quarter is for people who want to swim in this way, in order to compensate for ‘lengths’ as in ‘to swim lengths’). Finally, the speaker may opt for gestures rather than speech or a combination of speech and gestures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kellerman and Bialsytok (1997) consider this new approach and the expansion of the original two basic types of CpSs into three different categories unnecessary. They therefore prefer to keep the original binary division. However, Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) take advantage of this new model to propose a new CS taxonomy that, as we have already pointed out, is not only the most updated classification system available but also the most comprehensive one.

On the basis of an empirical analysis of data collected from 44 Hungarian learners of English, Dörnyei and Kormos developed in 1998 a framework of analysis that aimed to provide a comprehensive and systematic description of the different ways in which learners manage problems and difficulties in FL communication. These scholars were thus trying to bring together phenomena that had been traditionally
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treated in an independent way in different areas of SLA research. The system developed distinguishes four main sources of problems –resource deficits, processing time pressure, perceived deficiencies in one’s own language output and perceived deficiencies in the interlocutor’s performance– and four types of devices associated with them –CSs, stalling mechanisms, self-repairs and self-rephrasing, and negotiation of meaning strategies. Here we focus on their analysis of CSs and, within this group, on those strategies used to solve lexical problems, although their model also accounts for CSs used to manage grammatical and phonological deficits.

In 1997 Dörnyei and Scott had carried out a review of previous theoretical and empirical approaches to the classification of CSs that revealed that most of the taxonomies proposed in this field of research, either from an interactional or a psycholinguistic perspective, differ mainly in terms of terminology and organizing principles, but display the same set of categories. Drawing on this previous work, Dörnyei and Kormos elaborated in 1998 a taxonomy of CSs –or lexical problem-solving mechanisms as they called them, that intends to combine previous approaches. This taxonomy involves all the CSs types generally identified and accounted for in previous classification systems and makes it possible to establish a relationship between interactional and psycholinguistic categories.

In 1997 Yule and Tarone had already illustrated the relationships existing between the psycholinguistic classification of CSs proposed by Poulisse et al. (1990) and previous CS taxonomies developed by interactionist resarchers.

As above explained, Dörnyei and Kormos’ (1998) typology also accounts for CSs used to solve grammatical as well as phonological and articulatory problems. However, since most of the previous taxonomies have been devised for lexical CSs and the purpose of our research is the study this specific kind of CSs, we present here only those categories related to lexical problem-solving mechanisms.

TABLE 1.5. DÖRNYEI AND KORMOS’ TAXONOMY OF CSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION AND EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Content reduction strategies | Leaving a message unfinished because of some language difficulty (e.g. using ‘that is a flat … in a house…’ to avoid ‘housing state’)
| a) Message abandonment | Reducing the message by avoiding certain language structures or topics considered problematic languagewise or by leaving out some intended elements for a lack of linguistic resources (e.g. ‘he is responsible… for the…for the cleanliness of the house and er … he locks the door … at night and opens it … in the morning’ for ‘he was responsible for the running of the house’)
| b) Message reduction | |

10 In 1997 Yule and Tarone had already illustrated the relationships existing between the psycholinguistic classification of CSs proposed by Poulisse et al. (1990) and previous CS taxonomies developed by interactionist researchers.

11 As above explained, Dörnyei and Kormos’ (1998) typology also accounts for CSs used to solve grammatical as well as phonological and articulatory problems. However, since most of the previous taxonomies have been devised for lexical CSs and the purpose of our research is the study this specific kind of CSs, we present here only those categories related to lexical problem-solving mechanisms.
c) Message replacement
Substituting the original message with a new one because of not feeling capable of executing it (e.g. ‘you can … stay here until … midnight or … how do you want’ for ‘until dawn’ or ‘until morning’)

2. Substitution
a) Code switching
Including L1 or L3 words with L1 or L3 pronunciation in L2 speech; this may involve stretches of discourse ranging from single words to whole chunks and even complete turns (e.g. ‘ferrum’ for ‘iron’)
b) Approximation
Using a single alternative lexical item, such as a superordinate or a related term, that shares semantic features with the target word or structure (e.g. ‘and er … takes the apple in its mouth’ for ‘beak’)
c) Use of all-purpose words
Extending a general, “empty” lexical item to contexts where specific words are lacking (e.g. the overuse of ‘thing’ ‘stuff’, ‘make’ or ‘do’)
d) Complete omission
Leaving a gap when not knowing a word and carrying on as if it had been said (e.g. ‘then … er … the sun is is … hm sun is … and the Mickey Mouse’ for ‘shine’)

3. Substitution plus
a) Foreignizing
Using a L1 or L3 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology, i.e. with a L2 pronunciation or morphology (e.g. ‘my guest from the … ministerium’ [with an English pronunciation])
b) Grammatical word coinage
Creating a non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing L2 word (e.g. ‘dejunktion’ and ‘unjunktion’, created from ‘junk’ and the prefixes ‘de-’ and ‘un-’, for ‘clear the junk’ and ‘street clearing’)
c) Literal translation
Translating literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word, or a structure from L1 or L3 to L2 (e.g. ‘snowman’ as a literal translation of a Hungarian word)

4. Macro-reconceptualization
a) Restructuring
Abandoning the execution of a verbal plan because of language difficulties, leaving the utterance unfinished and communicating the intended message according to an alternative plan (e.g. ‘she has to care about the house, to care about the garbage, and to care about the … or to clean the house’ for ‘cleanness’)

5. Micro-reconceptualization
a) Circumlocution
Exemplifying, illustrating, or describing the properties of the target object or action (e.g. ‘it becomes water’ for ‘it melts’)
b) Semantic word coinage
Creating a non-existing L2 word by compounding words (e.g. ‘snowsculpture’ for ‘snowman’)

6. Appeals for help
a) Direct appeal for help
Turning to the interlocutor for assistance by asking an explicit question concerning a gap in one’s L2 knowledge (e.g. ‘it’s a kind of old clock so when it strucks er … I don’t know, one, two, or three o’clock then a bird is coming out. What’s the name?’)
b) Indirect appeal for help
Trying to elicit help from the interlocutor indirectly by expressing lack of a needed L2 item either verbally or nonverbally (e.g. ‘I don’t know the name …’ [rising intonation, pause, eye contact])

(Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 359-361)
Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) adopt a psycholinguistic perspective based, like Poulisse’s (1993), on Levelt’s speech production model –Levelt (1989, 1993, 1995). The resulting system is organized in three different levels. The first level accounts for the already mentioned binary distinction between reduction or avoidance strategies and achievement or compensatory ones. Following Poulisse (1993) these authors argue that learners experiencing difficulties in verbal retrieval can resort to one of two main options: “(a) abandon or change the original speech plan, or (b) keep the macro-plan unchanged and modify the preverbal message only” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 358).

In the second level CpSs are classified into five main categories. Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) extend thus the tripartite model proposed by Poulisse (1993) with the aim of overcoming some of the criticisms raised against this work. In particular, Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) had argued that it is not always easy to classify certain overt manifestations of strategic behavior into Poulisse’s (1993) categories. It is not clear whether phrases like ‘stuff to kill flies’ for ‘fly spray’ should be treated as one single reconceptualization strategy or whether the term ‘stuff’ should be interpreted as a substitution strategy for ‘spray’. The second problem concerns expressions like ‘tables, beds, chairs and cupboards’ for ‘furniture’, which can be seen as a reconceptualization or as substitution strategy (Kellerman and Bialystok, 1997: 42). Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) claim to have compensated for this problem by making a distinction between micro-reconceptualization strategies –strategies which involve reconceptualizing one chunk in the preverbal message, and macro-reconceptualization strategies –strategies which involve reconceptualizing more than one preverbal chunk.

Their model incorporates also appeals for assistance, which are described as “problem-solving devices that utilize the interlocutor’s rather than the speaker’s own speech production system in retrieving a lemma” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 366). They ignore, however, nonverbal strategies because they consider it problematic to include body language and nonverbal gestural codes in a speech production framework.

In the third and final level Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) differentiate a total of fifteen types of problem-solving devices reflecting variation in verbal encoding, i.e. in the verbal properties of strategic utterances. Most of these categories can be directly related to previous attempts to classify CSs from an interactional approach, such as Tarone (1977).
As we can see in table 1.5 and as already pointed out, the result of Dörnyei and Kormos’ (1998) approach to the description and classification of CSs is a taxonomy that, firstly, allows to draw a relationship between interactional and psycholinguistic perspectives; secondly, it integrates within one single framework most of the CS types and categories identified in previous research, being thus the most comprehensive and detailed CS taxonomy existing to date; and, thirdly, it is also the most updated framework of analysis available for the classification of CSs. For these reasons we have decided to use this classification framework for the purposes of our research. In Chapter Four we will provide further justification for this choice and a detailed account of its implementation in the analysis of our data.

1.1.3. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON CSs TO DATE
In this section we intend to give a general overview of empirical research conducted on CSs to date. Since this is a topic that has attracted quite a lot of attention among SLA scholars and it has now more than 30 years of history, a considerable amount of both theoretical and empirical investigations have been accumulated in the area. Here we pay attention to those studies that have contributed in a more significant way to the development of the field, helping us to enhance our understanding of the use that the FL learner makes of CSs, and of their effects on the L2 use and acquisition processes.

As already explained at the beginning of our review, we need to distinguish several different phases in the development of this area of research. Initial studies were mainly concerned with the theoretical issues of CS definition, identification and classification. They were not aiming at explaining learners’ use of CSs, but at establishing the necessary theoretical background for this question to be approached in subsequent investigations. Examples of this line of research are the already discussed contributions made by Váradi (1973), Tarone (1977), Corder (1978), or Færch and Kasper (1983b).

In the late 70s and the early 80s the first empirical investigations trying to provide explanatory accounts of strategic behavior started to appear. Most of these early studies paid attention to the possible influence of learner-related factors on CS use. Scholars such as Tarone (1977) or Corder (1978) had pointed out, from an intuitive approach rather than a systematic analysis of empirical data, the possibility that
learners’ proficiency level, personality or L1 background could determine their use of CSs. These issues were investigated by Palmberg (1979), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Hyde (1982), Bialystok (1983) or Haastrup and Phillipson (1983). Research was also carried out on the effect of extralinguistic factors on CS use, such as task demands – cf. Galván and Campbell (1979), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), or Bialystok (1983); and on the comprehensibility and effectiveness of the different types of CSs available for the FL learner – cf. Ervin (1979), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Palmberg (1982), or Bialystok (1983).

Most of these studies were exploratory in nature and conducted at a small scale, analyzing IL performance obtained from reduced groups of subjects. They did not allow for serious quantitative analyses of the data and their results could not be generalized. They played, however, a major role in the development of a research methodology for the study of CSs and in the opening of new paths for future more systematic investigations. The main findings of these studies were compiled by Færch and Kasper (1983a) in their already mentioned state of the art collection Strategies in Interlanguage Communication, which, as we have also said, served to consolidate this new area within the field of SLA.

This work would be followed by more developed and refined studies that investigated these same issues but relying on larger and more representative samples of data – cf. Paribakht (1982, 1985), Manchón (1989) or Si-Qing (1990). A special mention deserves here the Nijmegen project, a large scale empirical study which, as we have already seen, challenged previous approaches to the theoretical issues of CS definition and classification, and, at the same time, investigated a variety of empirical questions. Relying on a quantitative analysis of an extremely large and comprehensive amount of data, attention was paid to the influence of proficiency level and task-related factors on CS use, the effectiveness of different types of CSs, and the possible relationship between L1 and L2 CSs – cf. Bongaerts, Kellerman and Bentlage (1987), Kellerman, Bongaerts and Poulisse (1987), Poulisse (1987), Poulisse, Bongaerts and Kellerman (1987), Bongaerts and Poulisse (1989), Poulisse and Schils (1989), Kellerman, Ammerlaan, Bongaerts and Poulisse (1990), Poulisse (1990), Poulisse et al. (1990) and Kellerman (1991). This work made of the Netherlands the main centre of CS research in the later 80s and the early 90s. Their definition of CSs, their taxonomy and the
methodological design of their investigation had a strong influence on the work carried out during this period, which, subsequently, was dominated by a psycholinguistic approach to the analysis of the strategic phenomenon.

In 1997 Kasper and Kellerman published a second collection of CS papers that intends to be a continuation of Færch and Kasper’s (1983a). This volume accounts for the main advances made in the field during the previous years, but it also represents a turning point in the sense that claims are now be made for a reconsideration of the interactional perspective to the study of CSs –as previously defended by Tarone and Yule (1989), and Yule and Tarone (1991); and for a broadening of the scope of this area of research. It thus includes studies which analyze CSs as elements of naturally occurring face-to-face interactions –cf. Wagner and Firth (1997) and Williams et al. (1997); and investigations that approach strategic communication from the perspective of sociolinguistics –cf. Rampton (1997), or discourse analysis and pragmatics –cf. Kasper (1997). It also recognizes the work being carried out in other related domains of research, such as L1 referential communication, child bilingualism, language pathology, or mother tongue education –cf. Deutsch, Bruhn, Masche and Behrens (1997), Lloyd (1997), Rodino and Snow (1997), and Stemmer and Joanette (1997); and investigations trying to establish comparative analyses between L1 and L2 CSs –cf. Russell (1997).

Since then the field has been enriched by work being carried out from a relatively wide variety of approaches. Still, the concerns of present day research are to a considerable extent the same as those raised up in the early studies. An important part of this work aims to explain CS use by looking at learner- or context-related factors –cf. Abdesslem (1996), Liskin-Gasparro (1996), Luján (1997), Jourdain (2000), Luján-Ortega and Clark-Carter (2000), Baba (2001, 2004), Littlemore (2001), Pons Sanz (2001), Wongsawang (2001) or Herschensohn (2003).

An issue that has always been present in CS research but has received special attention in the last years is the possible teachability of CS use. There has always been a strong debate among scholars opposing those who consider that effectiveness in CS use can and should be enhanced by explicit instruction –cf. Færch and Kasper (1986), Tarone and Yule (1989), or Dörnyei (1995); to those who believe that strategic competence is directly transferred from the L1 into the L2 and therefore needs not to be taught –cf. Poulisse et al. (1990), Bialystok (1990) or Kellerman (1991). Although a
definite agreement on this issue has not yet been achieved, a considerable number of studies have appeared in the last years trying to demonstrate that CS instruction is not only possible but also desirable –cf. Dörnyei (1995), Salomone and Marsal (1997), Russell and Loschky (1998), Scullen and Jourdain (2000), Faucette (2001), Iwai (2002), Jourdain and Scullen (2002), or Konishi and Tarone (2004).

In the present section we give a general account of the main findings of this research, paying special attention to those studies conducted within the field of SLA and with a focus on the FL learner’s use of CSs, either to try to explain this use or the possible role of these strategies in the FL teaching practice. We intend to draw a general panorama of what is known so far about CSs in relation to L2 use and acquisition, to assess the present state of the research on this issue and to set up thus the background of our own empirical study of CSs. With this objective in mind we first review those studies that have analyzed the effect of learner-related factors –such as proficiency level, personality, learning style, linguistic or cultural background; and context- and task-related features on CS use. Taking into account the specific purpose of our research, we discuss with special care the work conducted in this area from a strict interactional approach, i.e. analyzing CSs as elements of interaction and considering the role that both the learner and their interlocutor play in the strategic communication of meaning process. Finally, we review the controversy existing around the possible teachability of CSs and the main empirical attempts made to contribute to this issue, in an attempt to clarify the relationship existing between this field of research and the FL teaching practice.

In sections 1.2 and 1.3 of this same chapter we concentrate on research conducted in other related domains, within and outside the field of SLA, which are also directly related to our investigation. Some of the studies here mentioned, such as for instance those comparing L1 and L2 CSs, are therefore reviewed in these following sections. We also need to point out that, in line with the definitions and taxonomies of CSs above discussed, we will look in our work at CSs as devices used to deal with lexical IL deficits encountered in language production. This means that in our review of CS research we leave out of the scope studies paying attention to CSs as reception rather than production strategies –cf. Rost and Ross (1991), Rost (1994), Ross (1997) or Vandergrift (1997); as well as research carried out on the management of phonological,
1.1.3.1. The effect of learner-related factors on CS use

Trying to understand and explain the use that the FL learner makes of CSs and to account for perceived differences on this use between different individuals, researchers have looked for relationships between learner factors, such as proficiency level, NL or learning style, and patterns of CS use. This has been, without doubt, one of the most fruitful lines of the research in this area, both in terms of findings and amount of work carried out. We will initiate our review paying attention to those studies that have directly addressed the influence of the learner’s proficiency level on their strategic behavior, since this has been one of the first issues to be analyzed in the area and also probably the one that has attracted the most attention.

The possibility of an influence of the proficiency level factor on the FL learner’s use of CSs was already suggested in the initial approaches to the study of the phenomena, even though no empirical data supporting this idea was available at that time – cf. Tarone (1977) and Corder (1978). Subsequent studies attempted to test this hypothesis in a more systematic way. Two main conclusions were reached.

On the one hand, Hyde (1982) found that, in the accomplishment of the same task, lower level students make more frequent use of CSs than more proficient ones. Because of their more limited command of the TL, low level learners encounter more problems in communication and therefore need to resort to CSs more often.

On the other hand, Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), and Bialystok (1983) provided evidence of a relationship between the learner’s proficiency level and their choice of different CS types. On the assumption that L2-based strategies should impose higher linguistic demands than L1-based strategies, these scholars formulated the hypothesis that advanced students would use more L2-based strategies than less proficient ones. The analysis of data obtained from three groups of English students of

---

12 The distinction Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), and Bialystok (1983) make between L1-based and L2-based strategies corresponds to Tarone’s (1977) distinction between conscious transfer and paraphrase strategies – cf. table 1.1 in p. 34.
French belonging to three different proficiency levels reveals that, as expected, low level learners resort to the borrowing of lexical items from their L1 more often than high level learners; whereas these latter use a significantly higher proportion of L2-based strategies, i.e. strategies based on the speaker’s manipulation of their resources in the FL.

Although small scale and fairly exploratory in nature these studies established the main lines of research for following more comprehensive analyses. Paribakht’s (1982, 1985), Corrales and Call’s (1989), Manchón’s (1989), Si-Qing’s (1990) or Liskin-Gasparro’s (1996) studies, conducted in a variety of different settings and also using different methodological designs, obtained similar results and provided further support to the hypothesis that, both in terms of frequency and choice, CS use correlates with proficiency level.

However, contradictory evidence to this assumption has also been found. The researchers involved in the already mentioned Nijmegen project conducted rigorous quantitative and statistical analysis on more than 4,000 instances of CSs. This data was obtained from a total of 45 Dutch learners of English, organized in three different groups according to their proficiency level, who were asked to perform four different types of oral tasks. The analyses carried out reveal a significant inverse relationship between the absolute number of CSs used and the proficiency level of the speaker. However, in terms of choice of particular CS types, the results obtained suggest that the proficiency level factor has quite a limited influence, overruled by that of other features, such as the nature of the communicative task used in the elicitation of the data –cf. Poulisse and Schils (1989) and Poulisse et al. (1990).

When considering these findings we need to bear in mind that, first, these researchers paid attention only to a subset of CSs, i.e. CpSs; secondly, they classified these strategies according to a taxonomy emphasizing parsimony and psychologically plausibility which only considers four different types of strategies –cf. table 1.3 in p. 39; and, thirdly, although the amount of quantitative data is impressive, no qualitative analyses were completed by these researchers on the question of the proficiency level influence.

In recent years research has widened its scope to focus on the influence that proficiency has on CSs not only in terms of number and types of strategies used, but
also in their linguistic realization. Evidence has been found that one’s ability to make use of certain CSs, in particular paraphrase strategies, increases with proficiency level. That is, higher proficient students seem to be more native-like and, consequently, more effective and successful in their strategic behavior (Jourdain, 2000). Research has also been conducted trying to relate specific aspects of language proficiency, such as, for instance, vocabulary size, with the choice between more and less demanding CSs (Baba, 2001, 2004); obtaining also positive results that show the importance of this learner-related factor on strategic communication.

Nowadays, the influence of the learner’s proficiency level on their use of CSs is a widely accepted fact. However, scholars also generally recognize that this is a more complex issue than initially thought and that the effect of proficiency level on CS use always needs to be considered in relation to other personal and contextual variables.

Together with the possibility of a proficiency level influence on the learner’s use of CSs, Tarone (1977) and Corder (1978) hypothesized, also from a theoretical perspective, that different learners may resort to different CS types because of differences in their learning styles and personality profiles.

This issue was first investigated in an empirical way by Haastrup and Phillipson (1983). This preliminary study is based on the analysis of CS use by learners of English as a FL chosen from three different Danish schools. It is assumed that learners attending different types of schools, with different motivations and pursuing different academic goals also possess different learning profiles. Learners’ styles are established on the basis of conversational features, such as fluency or patterns of communication disruptions, and the results obtained reveal that each learner has their own conversational and strategy style. This is taken as evidence of differences in learning style, but no test to confirm this assumption is administered.

More recently, the relationship between personality and strategy use has been investigated in a more systematic way. Thus, Luján-Ortega and Clark-Carter (2000) use a psychometric IQ test (Heim, 1970) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator test of personality/learning style (Myers and McCaulley, 1985) to assess the effects of individual differences on CS use. Littlemore (2001) also uses a standardized test, Riding’s (1991), for the same purpose. The results of both studies reveal a significant

\[13\] This had also been recognized in Paribakht’s (1982, 1985) research on the relationship between CS use and proficiency level.
statistical relationship between cognitive or learning style and preference for different CS types, identified on the basis of Poulisse et al.’s (1990) taxonomy. Furthermore, Luján-Ortega and Clark-Carter’s (2000) analyses suggest that individual characteristics influence CS use, and also that these two factors taken together predict achievement in formal language examinations.

From a psycholinguistic perspective the study of cognitive or learning style differences in relation to CS use has become an important research question. If it can be demonstrated that learners with different cognitive characteristics prefer different types of CSs, this should give light into the psychological processes underlying the use of those CSs – cf. Littlemore (2001). However, more work is still needed, assessing how these individual variables interact with other personal or contextual factors, in order to reach a definite conclusion on this issue.

A third major topic in CS research has been the examination of the possible influence of L1 and cultural background on the learner’s use of CSs. Initial studies, such as Tarone (1977) or Palmberg (1979), found no relationship at all between the subjects’ NL and their patterns of FL CS use. Tarone’s (1977) research on CSs involves learners of English as a FL with three different NLs – Spanish, Turkish and Mandarin. It therefore makes possible to draw some conclusions on the issue, but these need to be taken with care because the study was not specifically designed for the examination of differences in strategic behavior. Palmberg’s (1979) work examines CS use by Finns, Finland-Swedes and Swedes. This study is specifically devoted to the analysis of the L1 influence on L2 strategic communication, but the findings gained are similar to those in Tarone (1977). On this basis Palmberg concludes that “strategy preference is primarily a question of proficiency level and personality, irrespective of learner L1” (Palmberg, 1979: 73).

However, contradictory evidence has also been found in subsequent research. Tarone and Yule (1987) analyzed CS use between learners with different NLs, i.e. learners who only share their knowledge of the TL, finding that this affects CS choice. The results of this study reveal that language switch and appeal for assistance strategies are not used in NNS-NNS interactions as opposed to NNS-NS ones.

Si-Qing (1990) found that the learner’s linguistic background has a certain influence on their use of some types of CSs, more specifically on the use of L1-based
CSs and on the use of CSs to make reference to culture-specific notions. Chinese learners show a strong tendency towards avoidance strategies that this scholar explains as a result of their sociocultural background. They also tend to avoid L1-based strategies and this is accounted for as an effect of the learners’ perceived differences between the two languages, i.e. Chinese and English. Similar results were also obtained by Wongsawang (2001). This scholar analyzed the use of CSs by Thai learners of English as a FL referring to culture-specific notions. Although this particular kind of referents may seem, initially, more susceptible of eliciting L1-based strategies, the subjects involved in the study tended to prefer the use of approximation or circumlocution strategies. Wongsawang explained the lack of foreignizing and literal translation strategies in the data as a result of the learners’ perceived distance between Thai and English.

In general the results of these different studies suggest that, more than the NL itself, it is the relationship perceived by the learner between their NL and the TL what has a direct influence on their use and choice of CSs. That is, the closer the learner perceives the L1 and the L2, the more likely they will resort to the use of transfer strategies –cf. also Paribakht (1985), Tarone and Yule (1987), or Chen (1990). In the analysis of face-to-face interaction we also need to take into account, as pointed out by Tarone and Yule’s (1987) study, that the NL of the interlocutor may as well have a strong influence on the learner’s use of certain CSs.

Other researchers have tried to look at other factors that could directly or indirectly account for some of the individual differences found in CS patterns of use. Thus, Labarca and Khanji (1986) designed a comparative study to examine the use of CSs by students who had been instructed with two different teaching methods –the Strategic Interactive Method (Di Pietro, 1982) and the Total Physical Response Method (Asher, 1969; 1977). The results obtained suggest that the method of instruction has an important bearing on the amount and kind of CSs used and, as a result, also on proficiency attainment. Herschensohn (2003) compared the CSs used by two English speaking learners of French: one studying French as a FL in an academic setting and the other one learning the language in a natural context, i.e. in France. However, the results of the analyses conducted reveal no significant differences between the two learners’ use of CSs, suggesting that the learning setting has not a relevant influence on this issue.
Herschensohn accounted for these results following Bialystok’s (1990) and Kellerman’s (1991) claim that CSs are used in the L1 and do not need to be learnt again in the L2. The scholar concluded, on this basis, that there is no need to teach CSs in academic FL learning settings.

Nowadays, it is widely recognized that individual differences have a significant influence on the way learners manage problems in FL communication. However, the different and sometimes even contradictory results of the research here reviewed seem to suggest that these different factors interrelate in complex ways with each other and probably also with task- and context-related features. More work needs therefore to be carried out in this area before a clear and definite understanding of the use that the FL learner makes of CSs can be attained.

1.1.3.2. The effect of task- and context-related factors on CS use
The possibility that the nature of the task being accomplished could affect CS use has been closely examined from the very beginnings of the research. Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), and Bialystok (1983) paid certain attention to this issue, comparing written versus oral modes of discourse, but they did not find a significant relationship between this task-related feature and CS use. However, in 1979, a different study conducted by Galván and Campbell yielded some evidence suggesting that certain CS types are dependent on the nature of the task in which they are used.

The most comprehensive analysis of this issue is, without doubt, the one conducted by the researchers involved in the Nijmegen project. These scholars compared CS use across three different types of task: a concept identification task, where subjects had to refer to twenty photographed objects; a story-retell task, where they had to retell in English a story previously heard in their L1; and a conversation, where they had to interact for fifteen minutes with an English NS.\textsuperscript{14} We have already pointed out that the results obtained in this study show that task-related factors play a major role in the learner’s use of CSs that even overrules the influence of other factors, such as proficiency level. This study suggests that the choice of specific types of CSs –identified and classified on the basis of the already discussed Nijmegen taxonomy, see

\textsuperscript{14} A fourth task consisting of a description of abstract shapes is also used in this project to compare L1 and L2 CSs. Learners’ performance in this task is not, however, taken into account in the analysis of task-related factors and their influence on FL CS use.
table 1.3 in p. 39; depends on the demands imposed by the task and the situation. This is explained in relation to communicative principles, i.e. Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle and the principle of economy. In the first task, since it is important to get the message across, speakers are eager to expend a considerable deal of effort in their strategies and therefore they make frequent use of time-consuming analytic strategies. In the story-retell task and the conversation the general idea is more important than the details. Furthermore, these two tasks are cognitively more demanding and impose certain time constraints on the speaker. Subsequently, in these two tasks less effort demanding strategies, such as holistic or transfer ones, are more frequently used. Finally, the conversation task gives the speaker an opportunity to check for the comprehensibility of their strategies, which is generally exploited by the learner. Speakers tend to resort first to less demanding strategies, such as the use of transfer, and, only if these fail, they take the effort to elaborate more complex strategies. That is, they try to achieve maximum comprehension with the minimum possible effort.\textsuperscript{15}

Luján (1997) replicated the previous study with English speaking learners of Spanish as a FL, obtaining similar results and also concluding that the various factors that differentiate communicative situations predict differences in CS use.

Other projects conducted on this issue, but from different approaches, are Yarmohammadi and Seif (1992), or Khanji (1993). The former compared, as had been previously done by Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), and Bialystok (1983), CS use in oral and written tasks. These scholars did not find significant differences between the two modes of discourse in the learners’ choice of reduction versus achievement strategies, but they identified a relationship between task type and the use of specific CS types within each of these two main categories. Khanji (1993), building on Labarca and Khanji (1986), compared CS choice in two different types of conversation tasks –Di Pietro’s (1987) Strategic Interaction tasks, based on the notions of \textit{scenario} and \textit{role play}, and learner’s interview tasks. The first form of conversation led to the use of more achievement strategies, suggesting that interview tasks, because of their answer-response pattern, do not provide good, natural-like interaction practice.

The use of CSs in interview tasks but in a Spanish setting has been approached by Pons Sanz (2001). This scholar analyzed the speech of Spanish learners of English as

\textsuperscript{15} For a detailed account and discussion of these results, and the study of the influence of communicative principles on CS use, see also Poulisse and Schils (1989) or Poulisse (1997).
a FL interviewing English NSs. The results of her analyses reveal a significant effect of conversational role in the performance and strategic behavior of the NNS, suggesting that the role adopted by the learner may have a stronger influence on their use of certain CSs than their proficiency level.

This last study also illustrates a relatively recent tendency among researchers towards the use of sociolinguistic perspectives and frameworks of analysis in the examination of FL strategic communication – cf. Kasper and Kellerman (1997) or Safont (2001). CSs have started to be explored in authentic naturally occurring communicative situations and more attention is being paid to the sociocultural factors involved in communication, such as conversational role or linguistic and social identity – cf. Wagner and Firth (1997), Williams et al. (1997) or Rampton (1997). This new line of research shows that an interactional perspective, taking into account the learner’s and the interlocutor’s actions, their relationship, and the social situation created by the interaction itself, can offer new and interesting possibilities for the development of CS research.

### 1.1.3.3. CS use in interactional contexts

In all the studies reviewed so far, conducted either from a psycholinguistic or an interactional perspective, the analysis of CS use has been essentially centered on the FL learner. Depending on the perspective adopted, researchers have concentrated either on the linguistic or on the cognitive features of CSs, but they have all described and explained CSs as products of the learner’s individual use of the language. However, in the last few years, new studies have appeared adopting a more strict interactional approach and trying to account for CS use as a truly interactional phenomenon; i.e. involving the active participation of the learner and their interlocutor in a joint, socially situated meaning creation process. They have thus gone back to Tarone’s (1980, 1981) conceptualization of strategic communication and reassessed the benefits of an interactional perspective to the study of CSs.

The interactional definition of CS use as “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” was first presented by Tarone in 1980 (Tarone, 1980: 419, 1981: 288). In her 1977 study of CSs, however, Tarone had already pointed out the interactional function
of these strategies. This paper includes the analysis of an excerpt of face-to-face oral conversation that clearly illustrates the use of CSs as interactional tools used by the speaker to engage their interlocutor in a joint negotiation of meaning process. Unable to recall the TL item ‘waterpipe’, a learner uses a paraphrase strategy that is not directly understood by the interlocutor. This leads both of them to a relatively long exchange in which several clarification requests, confirmation checks and reformulations of the original CS need to be used before the two interlocutors manage to reach the desired mutual agreement on the meaning ‘waterpipe’. This extract clearly shows that strategic communication of meaning in face-to-face interaction involves the joint action and mutual effort of both the speaker and the listener.

As just mentioned, subsequent investigations tended, nevertheless, to focus exclusively on the FL learner’s actions in strategic communication, ignoring the possible role of the interlocutor in this process. The interactional approach to the study of CSs defined its agenda as an analysis of the linguistic features of CSs, versus the analysis of cognitive processing pursued by psycholinguistic scholars. Fruitful as this line of research may have been in order to clarify the linguistic nature and defining features of CSs, it does not however succeed at meeting the requirements of a true interactional perspective, which can explain the function and role of CSs in interaction.

In 1991 Yule and Tarone made an explicit call for research ‘looking at the two sides of the page’; that is, integrating within one single framework the analysis of speakers’ and interlocutors’ actions in face-to-face strategic interaction. The study of communicative problems in speech production had so far been approached by CS investigations, whereas comprehensibility problems in the reception of messages had been the focus of a different area of SLA research, i.e. negotiation of meaning studies. These two areas had traditionally worked independently, recognizing each other’s work, but not attempting to build on it.

However, as these two scholars clearly illustrate, in interaction, CSs and negotiation of meaning strategies tend to be used in combination. Meaning negotiation moves, such as clarification requests or confirmation checks, used by an interlocutor when unable to comprehend received input, tend to elicit CSs from the speaker. These moves initiate the negotiation of meaning process, but for a mutual agreement on meaning to be reached the initial input needs to be modified through CS use. That is, the
speaker needs to reformulate their initial utterance in order to make it comprehensible for their interlocutor, using for this purpose an alternative means of expression, i.e. a CS.

Yule and Tarone (1991) argue on this basis that to understand how communicative problems are resolved and meaning is achieved, analysts cannot focus exclusively on either negotiation of meaning movements or CSs. They need to consider them together. Furthermore, they defend that a CS framework of analysis allows for an effective description of the key moves made by both the learner and the interlocutor, that is, for an integrated study of CSs and negotiation of meaning strategies taking into account the two sides of the interactional exchange.

Following this approach, Suni (1996) considered how understanding problems are solved in discourse between native and non-native speaking interlocutors. The results of this study, in which CSs and negotiation of meaning moves are analyzed as related interactional phenomena, confirm the postulates of Yule and Tarone (1991). A similar attempt to link CS and negotiation of meaning research was also made by Williams et al. (1997). These two studies are descriptive in nature and pay more attention to comprehensibility than to production problems. Thus, the strategic categories guiding Williams et al.’s (1997) analyses correspond to what have been traditionally considered negotiation of meaning strategies, i.e. confirmation checks, clarification requests, comprehension checks, repetitions and reformulations.

In 1997, Wagner and Firth made a strong claim in favor of the, at that point, still infrequently pursued interactional approach to the study of CSs. Their analysis of natural, spontaneous interactions shows that this perspective can provide light on aspects of strategic communication overlooked or simply ignored in previous research.

Wagner and Firth work on the assumption that communication is an interactive endeavor, “accomplished as a situated, contingent, locally managed achievement” (Wagner and Firth, 1997: 325); and that encoding difficulties encountered in this process are overcome through the joint action of all the interlocutors. CSs are thus seen as elements of an “ongoing and contingent meaning creation process” (Wagner and Firth, 1997: 325), used to engage the two parties of the conversation in a mutual attempt to resolve a communicative problem. They can, therefore, be fully explained only if attention is paid to the two sides of the conversational exchange. This also leads them to
argue that for a non-target-like element to be considered a CS it needs to be flagged as such in speech. Speakers use verbal and nonverbal signals to indicate to their interlocutors how their actions or utterances need to be interpreted and reacted upon. When they make use of a CS, they signal the strategic nature of their utterance and, in this way, they engage their interlocutors in a mutual attempt to resolve the encountered problem.

They study from this perspective authentic, naturally occurring telephone conversations audio-recorded in different business settings. These conversations involve employees of several Danish commercial companies and their foreign partners, speaking in a variety of languages – English, German, French, Swedish and Danish; that sometimes constitute a lingua franca, i.e. the system of communication is a FL for both interlocutors.

Paying attention to the social and contextual aspects of language production, Wagner and Firth’s (1997) analyses suggest that non-target-like elements usually interpreted as CSs in previous research may fulfill in interaction a variety of different functions. Thus, code switching can be employed as a CS to negotiate meaning, but also as a social strategy to negotiate identity. It can also be the result of a change in topic or in situational features. Apparent CSs may be actually part of private working argots. In interactions involving well-acquainted interlocutors talking about routine topics, non-target-like elements become, under certain circumstances, stable and more or less fixed alternative expressions to compensate for lexical gaps shared by the two interlocutors. In order to understand these uses, attention needs to be paid to the relationship between the two interlocutors and to their idiolects or personal biographies. Finally, speakers fill sometimes their lexical gaps with unflagged non-target-like elements that serve as dummy items. When the appropriate TL element is lacking but is not relevant for the purposes of discourse, speakers may resort to alternative expressions that are not necessarily intended for solving the linguistic problem. In these cases the non-target-like element functions as a blind spot, which will be left unattended by both interlocutors. They keep the problem unresolved and they only try to solve it later on in the conversation if this item becomes relevant for the meaning creation process.

In sum, Wagner and Firth’s (1997) examination of naturally occurring conversations shows that CSs are contingent products of interaction. The function of a
non-target-like element is defined by the socially created situation in which it is used. Therefore, CSs, conceived as interactional elements used by speakers and listeners to create meaning when their linguistic or pragmatic competences in the FL are not yet fully mastered, can only be accurately identified and understood if careful attention is paid to the social and contextual aspects of language production.

Anderson (1998) also examined lingua franca conversations from an interactional perspective, comparing them to NS-NS interactions. Assuming that communication is a joint activity and that “it takes at least two people and the strategic use of a language system to build common knowledge” (Anderson, 1998: 5), he explained strategic interactions using the framework of the collaborative theory of communication. Drawing on previous research conducted in this area, as well as on CS and negotiation of meaning studies, he described and analyzed CSs as interactional tools used to negotiate meaning for the purposes of common ground building.

From this perspective Anderson (1998) found that NNS-NNS and NS-NS interactions differ in terms of frequency of CS use and length. To complete the same task, NNSs use more verbal and nonverbal strategies than NSs, and they also engage in longer interactions. However, they adopt similar strategic approaches to the accomplishment of the task. They both resort to what he calls a non-explicitness strategy, that is, whenever possible they avoid problematic items. In the same line, they opt for the brevity of the message, i.e. they limit their speech to the essential information for the successful completion of the task. When a lexical item is not available or is not known by one of the two interlocutors, they tend to avoid it, instead of trying to coin a new term or using terminology that is new for at least one of the two members of the dyad. Finally, in negotiation of meaning sequences they explicitly accept each other’s contributions, making frequent use for this purpose of other-repetitions. In this way they reassure their partner that the message has been correctly understood. All these different kinds of strategic behaviors made it possible the successful accomplishment of the communicative task at hand by both NS-NS and NNS-NNS dyads.

Anderson’s (1998) study, although limited in focus and scope, illustrates the viability and suitability of CS research approached from an interactional perspective, taking into account the actions and movements of all the interlocutors taking part in the conversational exchange. It is also particularly interesting for our own investigation,
since, as already mentioned, we intend, like Anderson, to build on the collaborative theory of communication for the purposes of CS use analysis. In section 1.2 of the present chapter we will give a detailed account of this communicative theory, referring there again to Anderson’s (1998) study.

1.1.3.4. CS effectiveness

The study of the communicative effectiveness of the different types of CSs available for the FL learner has also attracted quite a lot of attention. This issue is particular relevant for those researchers who consider that CSs can and should be taught in the FL classroom. In order to enhance learner’s communicative effectiveness through CS instruction, they need first to identify which forms of strategic behavior are more effective for communicative purposes.

This task was approached in the early years of the research by scholars such as Ervin (1979), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Palmberg (1982) or Bialystok (1983). Ervin (1979) and Palmberg (1982) developed in their studies systematic means to elicit CSs from FL learners and comprehensibility judgments on these strategies from independent judges. They did not, however, attempt in these preliminary studies to make claims about the effectiveness degree of specific CS types.

Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), as well as Bialystok (1983), went one step forward. Assuming that avoidance or reduction strategies are, by definition, less effective than achievement ones, they compared the communicative value of L2- versus L1-based strategies. The results of their analyses reveal that those strategies based on the L2 which take into account the specific features of the intended concept, i.e. description or circumlocution strategies, are the most effective ones. In contrast, strategies based on the L1, in particular language switch strategies, seem to be generally less effective. The results obtained also suggest that the best strategy users are those who stand out by their flexible strategy selection and CS combinations.

In 1990 Poulisse et al. approached this same issue but from a psycholinguistic perspective, thereby comparing the comprehensibility of different types of CSs identified on the basis of differences on cognitive processing rather than on linguistic features. The design of this research draws on the preceding work conducted by Ervin (1979), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), and Bialystok (1983). The results obtained are,
however, not very straightforward. It seems that a combination of holistic and analytic strategies is very likely to be comprehensible, whereas the combination of transfer and holistic strategies is less likely to succeed. Furthermore, these findings cannot be generalized, since the results of the analysis suggest that the comprehensibility of a particular CpS depends to a large extent on the context in which it is used.

Subsequent studies have approached this issue from a more comprehensive approach. Thus, Marrie and Netten (1991) or Jourdain (2000) have related CS effectiveness to the learner’s proficiency level. Marrie and Netten’s (1991) study shows that the ability to make use of more effective CSs develops together with the IL system. The already discussed research conducted by Jourdain (2000) reveals that circumlocutions used by highly proficient learners approximate those of NSs; suggesting that, even when employing the same type of CS, higher proficiency level students are able to make a communicatively more effective use of the strategy than lower level ones.

Nowadays, it is generally agreed that, for an accurate assessment of the communicative potential of CS use, attention cannot be exclusively focused on the type of CS being used, but also on the conceptual and linguistic structures used to encode this strategy. Furthermore, one needs to consider the interrelated influence of individual and contextual factors. A particular strategy, proved effective in a particular situation, may be incomprehensible for a different interlocutor or in a different context. The complexity of this issue explains, in part, the scarcity of research on CS effectiveness in the last few years.

1.1.3.5. The teachability of CSs

During the first years of the research in this field great attention was paid to the empirical analysis of CS use in FL communication, but relatively little to the question of whether this use could be fostered or developed through explicit CS instruction. This was not because of a lack of interest. The ultimate purpose of this area of research is to find out possible implications of CS use for the processes of L2 learning and teaching. However, for a relatively long period of time, it was considered necessary to focus the study of CSs on language use processes, that is, on the descriptive analysis of the use that the learner makes of these strategies for the purposes of FL communication, before
starting to make claims about acquisition –cf. Yule and Tarone (1991). In other words, research on CSs was mainly seen as research on language use, not on language learning or language teaching processes.

Some scholars, however, attempted at this time to approach the issue of the possible teachability of CSs, but usually as a secondary research question and, quite often, basing their claims and arguments on theoretical postulates. The result was the beginning of quite a strong controversy that, as we have already pointed out, is still open nowadays. Some researchers defend that strategic competence develops in the speaker’s NL and is transferred to the L2; therefore, there is no need for students to be instructed on the use of CSs. Other scholars maintain, on the contrary, that L1 CSs are not always directly transferred into the L2 and that, subsequently, strategy training is not only possible but also desirable.

The first opinion is held among others by Bialystok (1990), Poulisse et al. (1990) or Kellerman (1991); that is, by those researchers adopting a psycholinguistic approach to the analysis of strategic communication. These scholars reject the validity and usefulness of CS training on theoretical arguments. We have seen that they share the view that CSs are cognitive processes; teaching these strategies would therefore mean to teach cognitive processing. It is assumed that adult language learners have already developed cognitive abilities in their L1, that they already use CSs in their NL, and that, therefore, they do not need to be taught again on the use of these strategies. All they need to do is to acquire the FL knowledge necessary to implement their L1 strategies in the L2. In sum, as illustrated in the following quotes, these scholars believe that the learner’s use of CSs will develop together with their IL system.

_The more language the learner knows, the more possibilities exist for the system to be flexible and to adjust itself to meet the demands of the learner. What one must teach students of a language is not strategy, but language._

(Bialystok, 1990: 147)

_There is no justification for providing training in compensatory strategies ... Teach the learners more language and let the strategies look after themselves._

(Kellerman, 1991: 402)

The opposite opinion is defended by authors such as Færch and Kasper (1986), Tarone and Yule (1989), or Dörnyei (1995). These scholars base their arguments on empirical evidence suggesting that FL learners do not always use their L1 CSs in FL communicative situations, even though these strategies could help them to enhance their
communicative effectiveness. On this basis, they argue that strategic competence and CS use in particular are not directly transferred from the L1 to the L2, and that, subsequently, it needs to be explicitly taught.

Part of this controversy can be accounted for as a result of the different views that these two groups of scholars have on the CS concept. We have just seen in the previous section that interactionist researchers, focusing on the linguistic features of CSs, have been able to identify more and less effective types of CSs. This data supports the suitability of instructing learners in order to promote their use of effective versus non-effective strategies.

Dörnyei (1995), as well as Yule and Tarone (1997) also argue that this divergence of opinions is due to the fact that different scholars seem to have interpreted the notion of teaching in different ways. If teaching is understood as passing on new information, there is probably no point in the instruction of CSs, because learners are already familiar with them in their NLs. However, instruction can also be interpreted in a broader sense, including procedures such as raising learner’s awareness about CSs, their nature and their communicative potential; encouraging speakers to take certain risks and thus use circumlocutions, approximations or even word coinages; and providing models of CS use. This last approach seems to offer more possibilities for the purposes of strategic competence development.

Although an agreement between the two opposed views on the teachability of CSs has not yet been reached, a considerable amount of empirical research has been accumulated on the issue. This work has been mainly conducted by those researchers in favor of teaching CSs in the FL classroom, whereas psycholinguistic scholars continue to confirm their arguments against teachability on the basis of theoretical postulates. Consequently, this research has been carried out with two main objectives: to obtain empirical data evidencing the benefits of teaching CSs, and to develop pedagogical models, guidelines and materials suitable for CS instruction.

Most of the initial studies were directed at finding empirical data to sustain the theoretical claims made in favor of the teachability of CSs. They typically involved comparisons between groups of students receiving instruction aiming at fostering their use of CSs and control groups of learners with no explicit training on CS use. The results of these practical experiences, such as Færch and Kasper (1986) or Dörnyei
(1995), suggest a positive influence of CS instruction on the learner’s use of CSs as well as on their IL performance levels. In general, learners were found to use more achievement and less avoidance strategies as well as more L2-based and less L1-based CSs after these training sessions —cf. Færch and Kasper (1986), Dörnyei (1995), or Dörnyei, Csomay, and Fischer (1995).

In the last few years new and also more focused studies have been carried out. Salomone and Marsal (1997), for instance, have centered their analyses on the teachability of circumlocution strategies, finding that learners explicitly instructed on this particular type of CS, not only use it more often than learners who have received no training at all, but also in a more efficient way. They learn to focus on the salient features of the lexical items they are trying to compensate for and this enhances the comprehensibility of their strategies. Similar positive results suggesting the suitability of fostering circumlocution use in the FL classroom have also been obtained by Scullen and Jourdain (2000).

Scholars in favor of the teachability of CSs have also tried to provide language teachers with the necessary resources to implement CS instruction in their FL classrooms. Most of this effort has been devoted to the design and testing of activities intending to foster students’ use of what are believed to be the most effective CSs; that is, achievement versus avoidance and L2-based versus L1-based strategies —cf. Tarone (1984), Willems (1987), Tarone and Yule (1989), Dörnyei and Thurrell (1991, 1994) or Berry-Bravo (1993). Researchers have also examined NS discourse trying to identify the core vocabulary and syntactical structures used by these speakers when employing CsPs. The aim of this kind of research is to offer models and patterns of strategic language use that can be employed by the teacher as baseline data for the purposes of CS instruction —cf. Tarone and Yule (1989), Iwai (2002), or Konishi and Tarone (2004).

Taken altogether the results of these different research projects suggest that an explicit instruction on CS use, raising learner’s awareness on the value of these strategies and giving them opportunities to practice their use in different contexts, has a positive effect on the development of the learner’s strategic competence. However, teaching materials as well as resources books offer little help for the accomplishment of this task. Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) complained about the lack of materials specifically designed to promote learners’ use of CSs. In fact, Faucette (2001) reviewed
up to 40 different course and teaching resource books on English as a FL, finding that they offer very few effective practice activities or teaching guidelines that can be used for the development of the learner’s strategic competence. It seems, therefore, that more work and effort are still required from both SLA researchers and FL teachers for a real integration of CS instruction in the FL teaching practice.

1.1.3.6. Concluding remarks

The aim of this literature review is not to present an exhaustive account of all the research carried out on CSs within and outside the field of SLA – there are certainly significant studies that have been left out of our discussion because of their little relevance for the purposes of our investigation. This survey provides us, however, with a clear picture of what is known so far about the use that different FL learners make of different CSs in different communicative situations, and of present day considerations about the role that these strategies may play in the FL teaching practice.

A general assessment of the research conducted in the area shows that SLA scholars have approached the study of strategic communication mainly with descriptive aims. They have tried to describe and explain the use that the FL learner makes of CSs, paying attention for this purpose to both individual and context-related factors. When other issues, such as the effectiveness of different CS types, have been approached, the underlying intention has also been descriptive. The only line of research that has tried to establish some practical implications is the one followed by those scholars interested in the possibility of introducing CS instruction in the FL classroom.

This reveals that, in general, the study of CSs has been regarded as a study of language use, not of language learning. Some scholars have, however, made some initial claims about the possible role that the use of certain CSs may play on the development of the learner’s IL system. As already mentioned in the introduction to our work, it has been argued that CSs can be used to test hypotheses about the TL (Corder, 1978), to elicit feedback on these hypotheses, or to obtain new and comprehensible input (Færch and Kasper, 1980). It has also been suggested that the use of certain CSs can make already existing knowledge more accessible (Færch and Kasper, 1986), help the learner gain control over TL lexical knowledge (Kasper and Kellerman, 1997) and, in general, provide learners with more opportunities for interaction, negotiation of meaning and
comprehensible input (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). All these different claims have, however, been raised from a theoretical perspective. That is, no empirical research specifically devoted to examine these issues in a systematic way has yet been conducted. This explains, in part, why in the last years this field has been unable to attract as much interest as other related areas of research, such as negotiation of meaning or feedback studies, also focused on the learner’s use of the FL, but in relation with the SLA process.

The present work represents an attempt to advance in this direction. Taking into account what we know so far about the use that the FL learner makes of CSs, we will try to establish the possible implications that this use may have for the development of the learner’s IL system. That is, we will analyze learners’ strategic interaction in order to describe and explain what we believe to be a collaborative creation of meaning process, but also in order to identify whether this process may have an effect not only on the learner’s use of the language but also on their IL system.

1.2. COMMUNICATION MODELS: THE COLLABORATIVE MODEL
The study of CSs originated in the field of SLA research. It has been, therefore, mostly focused on the use that language learners make of these strategies to compensate for their IL deficiencies when trying to communicate in a L2. However, from the very beginnings it has been pointed out that CSs are not a L2 specific phenomenon (Tarone, 1977, 1981; Færch and Kasper, 1983b; Poulisse et al., 1990; Yule and Tarone, 1990; Kellerman, 1991). NSs face a range of different communicative situations which pose similar problems to those encountered by the FL learner. Children acquiring their L1 have also a limited command of vocabulary which results in the same communicative problems L2 learners face, aphasic patients need often to compensate for their lexical gaps in a similar way as L2 learners, and unimpaired speakers are sometimes temporarily unable to retrieve a word in their own L1 –the tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon– and occasionally face the lack in their lexicon of certain words or expressions which belong to discourse domains too specialized or just unfamiliar to them. In other contexts the NS may know the desired word to communicate their intended message, but they cannot use it because it is unknown for their interlocutors. This happens to experts trying to explain technical terms to laymen, teachers
introducing new vocabulary to their students, writers of monolingual dictionaries or simplified reading texts, and adults trying to communicate to learners or children who have not yet acquired a full command of the language – foreigner talk and motherese speech.\footnote{For a more detailed analysis of these and other similar L1 communicative problems and their relationship with L2 strategic communication see Poulisse \textit{et al.} (1990: 9), and Kasper and Kellerman (1997: 8-9).}

The source of the problems encountered by NSs in these communicative situations may be different from that of the lexical difficulties the L2 learner usually faces, but the nature of the problem is certainly the same. In all these contexts, as in L2 strategic communication, the word or expression desired to communicate an intended message is unavailable and speakers manage to compensate for it by developing an alternative means of expression, i.e. by making use of a CS.

NSs may not resort to CSs as often as L2 learners do, but they clearly make use of these strategies in their everyday oral interactions. CSs are thus not exclusive of L2 speech but an aspect of overall communication. It seems therefore reasonable to assume that, first, research carried out in certain fields of L1 communication could and should inform the study of L2 strategic behavior; and, secondly, a fair and comprehensive account of CS use should be able to provide a common explanation for both L1 and L2 strategies.

The need to cross disciplinary boundaries in order to remove the study of CSs from its relatively isolated position within the field of SLA has been frequently pointed out. We have already seen that SLA scholars have made some attempts to adopt psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic frameworks of analysis for the purpose of L2 CS explanation – cf. present chapter, p. 47. Attention has particularly been called to the similarities existing between L2 strategic behavior and child and adult L1 referential communication, and to the possibility for CS research to benefit form the work being done on referential communication (Bialystok, 1990; Poulisse \textit{et al.}, 1990). Claims have also been made to the potential value of research on topics such as child bilingualism (Deutsch \textit{et al.}, 1997; Rodino and Snow, 1997), mother tongue education (Lloyd, 1997) or language pathology (Stemmer and Joanette, 1997). As already mentioned, these studies were included in the latest state of the art collection of literature on CSs, i.e.
Kasper and Kellerman’s (1997) work; on the grounds that, although not directly focused on CSs, they should be interesting and relevant to SLA research on this issue.

The recognition of the work carried out in these related domains has influenced the study of CSs in two different but closely related ways. On the one hand, it has made possible the establishment of comparative analyses between L1 and L2 strategic communication and to find evidence of the assumed similarities existing between L1 and L2 CSs. On the other hand, L1 communication research has provided SLA studies with theoretical models of communication able to account for CS use both in the L1 and in the L2, and thus to explain CSs as part of both NSs’ and NNSs’ use of the language.

In the previous section of the present chapter, we mentioned the work of a group of researchers who, drawing on the existing literature on L1 referential communication, compared the use that speakers make of referential CSs when communicating in their L1 and in a L2 (Bongaerts et al., 1987; Bongaerts and Poulisse, 1989; Kellerman et al., 1990; Poulisse et al., 1990; Russell, 1997) –cf. pp. 46-47. The starting point for these studies is the assumption that, since research on L2 strategic communication has been mainly focused on learners’ use of lexical CSs to compensate for vocabulary gaps when trying to establish reference, the analysis of L2 CSs could benefit from the work done on L1 referential communication. These scholars point out that, in fact, the tasks developed for the study of referential communication create a communicative situation that shares significant features with the kind of communicative context in which L2 CS uses are likely to occur. These tasks –the abstract figure description task designed by Krauss and Weinheimer (1964) and its multiple adapted versions– require from the speaker to refer to a previously non-existent abstract figure, specifically designed for this purpose and that therefore has not been lexicalized in their language. The referential problem the NS faces in this situation is assumed to be the same kind of problem the L2 speaker faces when lacking the appropriate TL word to name an intended referent. On this basis these authors conclude that the results of a study using this kind of task can shed light on both L1 and L2 strategic and non-strategic referential communication (Poulisse et al., 1990: 52).

Using a modified version of Krauss and Weinheimer’s (1964) referential communication task, these researchers were able to elicit L1 and L2 strategic performance data from the same group of speakers and to find evidence of significant
similarities between their L1 and L2 referential strategies. Participants described the figures from the same perspectives, followed a similar pattern of choice between holistic and segmental perspectives, and reduced the complexity of their referential expressions in a similar way when repeated references were made to the same figure. Although differences were also detected in the amount of speech and the structural complexity of the referential expressions used to perform both versions of the tasks, the results obtained suggest that there are no intrinsic differences in the nature of the L1 and L2 strategies used. A similar conclusion was also reached by Bialystok (1990), who compared data obtained on L2 CS use with the results of previous L1 research on children and adult NSs’ referential communication skills.

From an interactional approach to the concept of CS, attempts have also been made to compare L1 and L2 strategy use –cf. Tarone and Yule (1989). For the purposes of this kind of research the object of interest was the comparison of L2 learners’ strategic behavior and that of the NS of the TL. In order to elicit this kind of data, Tarone and Yule (1989) designed a communicative task in which reference had to be made to a set of real but unfamiliar objects expected to pose lexical difficulties to both L1 and L2 speakers. In line with their theoretical approach to the study of CSs, Tarone and Yule’s analyses are focused on the form and structure of the referential means of expression used to perform the task, rather than on the cognitive processes underlying them. Yet, they also reveal striking similarities between L1 and L2 strategies.

The results obtained by all these different studies show that CSs not only constitute part of speakers’ L1 and L2 competence, they are also used alike in L1 and L2 communication (Poulisse et al., 1990: 2). In other words, speakers resort to the same set of strategies when communicating in their L1 and in a L2. This kind of evidence supports the claims made in favor of an explanation of CS use able to account for L1 as well as L2 strategic behavior.

With this objective in mind SLA researchers have related the study of L2 CSs to the general study of L1 communication and tried to embed these strategies into theoretical models of communication originally developed to explain non-strategic NL use. The final aim of this line of research is to develop an all-encompassing theory of CS use able to account for these strategies as an aspect of overall communication and, in this way, definitely remove the study of CSs from its restricted L2 position.
In section 1.1.1 of this chapter, when discussing the controversy existing around the issue of the definition of CSs, we saw how Færch and Kasper (1983b) describe strategic behavior in terms of Clark and Clark’s (1977) model of speech production, whereas Poulisse et al. (1990) adopt Levelt’s (1989) model with a similar purpose. In Færch and Kasper’s approach CSs are analyzed as plans. Strategies are considered to be a subtype of plans developed by the speaker to reach those communicative goals which present some kind of linguistic difficulty. They argue that these strategic plans work in a similar way as non-strategic ones; i.e. those developed for non-strategic or non-problematic communicative goals. On this basis they conclude that “there is no compelling reason imposed by reality why a distinction should be observed between plans and strategies” (Færch and Kasper, 1983b: 30).

Poulisse et al. (1990) and Poulisse (1993, 1997) talk about processes, rather than plans. But they similarly believe that the processes involved in CS use are the same as those leading to what is generally assumed to be non-strategic communication. They recognize that the procedure for encoding a message gets more complicated when lexical difficulties arise. They argue however that the nature of the process in itself is not altered and that therefore CSs should be seen as just another way of encoding messages (Poulisse et al., 1990: 66).

These arguments are also in line with Bialystok’s (1990) claim in favor of a more general approach to the study of CSs –cf. present chapter, p. 28. This author believes that no distinction should be made between strategic and non-strategic language use since any attempt to reach a communicative goal, whether it involves some kind of linguistic difficulty or not, is strategic. For this purpose she proposes to integrate the study of CSs into a cognitive theory of language acquisition and use based on a distinction between analysis of knowledge and cognitive control processes –cf. also Kellerman and Bialystok (1997).

Tarone and Yule (1989), approaching the study of CSs from a more interactional perspective, adopt a different theoretical orientation to explain the strategic phenomena. Focusing their attention on strategic linguistic resources rather than cognitive processing, they treat CSs as referential expressions and try to explain them within the general framework of referential communication. These authors see strategic competence as the speaker’s ability to select the most effective referential expression
available to perform their communicative goals. Depending on the speakers’ linguistic resources, their assessment of the interlocutor’s knowledge of the language and the context of the interaction, the linguistic expression chosen will result in a native or a non-native-like utterance. Both kinds of utterances, however, can be similarly seen as the outcome of the speaker’s strategic attempt to communicate their message with the most effective possible means. Language use, as a type of goal-related behavior, is therefore always strategic, whether it faces the speaker with a lexical gap and a CS use to compensate for it or not.

CSs have also been analyzed within the framework of the pattern theory (Wagner, 1983), conversation analysis (Wagner and Firth, 1997) or critical sociolinguistics (Rampton, 1997). The results obtained by all these different studies suggest that CS uses can and should be considered as special cases of general language use which, on the other hand, can be seen as a fundamental strategic activity (Kasper and Kellerman, 1997: 15). Therefore, not only can CSs be successfully embedded within models originally developed to explain L1 non-strategic communication. In fact, it seems that this is the way research should take if an overall comprehensive understanding of strategic communication is aimed at.

The communicative models reviewed so far are mostly concerned with the speaker and the speech production phase of the communicative process; therefore, they pay little or no attention at all to the role of the interlocutor. In this chapter we present a theoretical model of conversation analysis that explains communication as the result of the speaker and the interlocutor’s collaborative effort to achieve a joint communicative goal. This model was originally devised by Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) in order to explain reference making as a jointly achieved activity, i.e. to investigate how speakers and listeners coordinate their beliefs and behaviors in order to reach an agreement on reference. But it has proved to be suitable for the general analysis of conversational interaction which, in these authors’ view, is always a collaboratively co-constructed activity (Clark and Schaefer, 1987, 1989; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1995, 1997).

In 1997 Kasper and Kellerman included in their already mentioned state of the art collection of research on CSs a review of communication studies carried out within the collaborative theory framework (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997). They were thus suggesting
the possibility for SLA research on CSs to benefit from the insights offered by the collaborative analysis of L1 communication.

One year afterwards, Anderson (1998) made a first attempt to apply the collaborative theory model, previously restricted to the study of NS conversation, to the analysis of NNS interaction –cf. current chapter, pp. 60-61. This model made it possible to look at the role of both the speaker and the listener in the solution of those communicative problems that arise in FL interaction due to interlocutors’ linguistic shortcomings. By looking at ‘both sides of the page’, i.e. speaker and listener, Anderson managed to integrate in one single framework of analysis two previously separate areas of inquiry: strategic communication and negotiation of meaning. He was thus responding to Yule and Tarone’s (1991) claim in favor of a bilateral approach to the study of communicative difficulties in FL communication.

The observations made by Anderson (1998) about interaction and strategic language use, although relatively limited in scope, suggest the suitability and feasibility of further research looking at CS use from a collaborative perspective, paying attention to both speaker and interlocutor as co-constructors of meaning. As explained in the introduction, the collaborative theory model will also be adopted in our study for the purposes of CS use analysis. In following chapters we will argue for an explanation of strategic communication in interactional contexts as the result of the joint collaboration between the learner and their native or non-native interlocutor. Here we introduce the model and review the relevant literature that will constitute the background of our future analyses.

1.2.1. THE COLLABORATIVE THEORY
As we have just mentioned, the collaborative theory sees communication as a collaborative activity, involving actions by speakers and interlocutors and their mutual responsibility in the understanding of each utterance. On this basis, the collaborative model was designed to account for how speakers and interlocutors coordinate their beliefs, and the content and timing of their actions for the purpose of the co-construction of meaning. As Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 2) clearly point out, it is relatively evident to assume that communication is a collaborative process, but it is something different to understand why and how it works. The description and clarification of this
process is the final aim of the work carried out within the framework of the collaborative theory of communication—most notably Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), and Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989).\footnote{In 1986 Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs designed a first version of the collaborative model able to account for how reference is made in face-to-face conversation. This model was revised in 1987 and 1989 by Clark and Schaefer, who extended its applicability to overall face-to-face oral communication.}

The collaborative model appears as a reaction to previous unilateral models of conversation originated within a variety of different approaches to the study of communication: Linguistics (Heim, 1983), Philosophy (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1957; Schiffer, 1972; Searle, 1969; Kamp, 1981; Lewis, 1979; Stalnaker, 1978), or Psychology (Clark and Haviland, 1977; Johnson-Laird, 1983; van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983)\footnote{See Clark (2004) for a detailed comparative account of unilateral and bilateral models of communication.}—cf. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 1-3), and Clark and Schaefer (1989: 260-262). All these implicitly or explicitly unilateral accounts of discourse explain speaking and understanding in conversation as autonomous activities. In these models speakers are seen as senders, whose main responsibility is to issue comprehensible utterances, i.e. to produce the right utterance at the right moment; and addressees as receivers, who have to listen and understand what is said. This view implies that speakers assume that addressees understand their utterances, and that addressees assume they have correctly understood as intended by the speaker. However, as Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs’s (1986) analyses reveal, this is an idealization that does not always work. Addressees do not always understand as intended, and speakers do not just utter words and sentences, they also react to what their interlocutors say or do, changing the course of their utterances and inviting them to collaborate in the meaning creation process by providing repairs or completions of what they are saying.\footnote{In 1986 Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs designed a first version of the collaborative model able to account for how reference is made in face-to-face conversation. This model was revised in 1987 and 1989 by Clark and Schaefer, who extended its applicability to overall face-to-face oral communication.}

In the collaborative approach both speaking and understanding are seen as the mutual responsibility of all the interlocutors. Speakers and addressees need to coordinate on what is meant and what is understood so that successful communication is achieved. In this view conversation, as any other collective act, can only succeed if all the participants work together, performing and coordinating their individual actions to achieve a common goal. The aim of the collaborative model is to identify and describe these actions, as well as the procedures followed in order to coordinate them in face-to-face interaction.
The starting point of the collaborative theory is the generally agreed assumption that communication is a *common ground* building activity. When two or more people take part in a conversation they presuppose they share a certain amount of knowledge, beliefs and assumptions; either because these are universally held in the community to which the participants belong or because of their prior joint personal experiences – communal versus personal common ground (Clark and Marshall, 1981; Clark, 1993, 1994). These presuppositions, the sum of the participants’ presupposed mutual knowledge, beliefs and assumptions, constitute their common ground (Stalnaker, 1978: 320). In the course of interaction participants work to add to this initial common ground, i.e. they use language to try to build new mutual knowledge, beliefs and assumptions out of their individual ones. Each conversational move or contribution is produced and interpreted in relation to the assumed current common ground and results in the creation of new presuppositions and the destruction of old ones. Common ground is thus being constantly accumulated and updated as the conversation proceeds (Clark and Schaefer, 1989; Clark, 1994, 2004).

These assumptions are general to most models of communication. But whereas unilateral approaches suggest that the main means to add to common ground is the speaker’s utterance of a comprehensible sentence, the collaborative theory considers this to be insufficient. As just mentioned, Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) argue that speakers cannot just assume that their utterances are always correctly understood by the addressee and their content automatically added to their common ground; neither can addressees believe they have correctly inferred all the speakers’ communicative intentions. For common ground to be built and conversation to go on, interlocutors need evidence of their mutual understanding. That is, speaker and addressee need to establish the mutual belief that what was meant by the speaker has in fact been correctly understood by the addressee. This requires the joint action of all the participants in the conversation and is accomplished by means of what Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), and Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989) have called the *grounding process*.19

Let us say speaker A wants to make reference to x. This means A intends the identity of this referent x to become part of A and B’s common ground – B being the addressee. For this purpose A needs to present to B a referring expression that, on the

---

19 Clark and Schaefer (1989) initially named it the ‘content grounding process’; but for convenience it is usually referred to as the ‘grounding process’.
basis of their common ground, can lead B to the correct identification of the intended referent. For communication to succeed, B needs to be able to interpret this expression. But this is not enough, A needs to know too that B has in fact correctly identified the referent. A and B need some kind of procedure to establish the mutual belief that B has understood A’s reference, i.e. a grounding procedure. Only then can we say that A’s intended referent has been added to A and B’s common ground, i.e. to their shared knowledge, beliefs and assumptions.

In this view, successful communication involves always the utterance and understanding of a new content, and its grounding. We can thus say that communication proceeds at two levels. At one of level, the speaker specifies the content of the message and the addressee registers it. At the other, the level of grounding, speaker and addressee work together to establish the mutual belief that this content has in fact been correctly understood and added to their common ground (Clark and Schaefer, 1987: 20, 1989: 262).

In order to describe and explain how grounding is accomplished in everyday conversation, the collaborative model designed by Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), and Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989), distinguishes two main phases in the process of contributing to discourse: the presentation and the acceptance phase.

The presentation phase initiates the grounding process. Any action by which one of the interlocutors intends to mean something to the other one is considered a presentation (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 266). This action may be verbal or nonverbal; although, most frequently, it will be a sentential constituent, a full sentence or a series of sentences uttered as a single conversational turn. With this presentation the speaker\(^{20}\) intends to specify the content of their contribution to discourse, i.e. the content they want to add to the participants’ common ground. In order to achieve this purpose with the highest possible degree of efficiency, the speaker needs, first, some kind of evidence that the addressee is paying attention to what is said and can hear and identify it; and, secondly, to utter a presentation that contains what, on the basis of their shared common ground, is assumed to be the necessary information for the addressee to correctly understand the speaker’s intended meaning.

\(^{20}\) In conversation, participation roles, i.e. speaker and addressee, can change with each new action.
The grounding process enters then the acceptance phase in which the main goal is to ground the content introduced in the presentation. In the acceptance phase participants are expected to work together in order to establish the mutual belief that the content presented has been correctly understood and interpreted as intended by the contributor. For mutual acceptance to be reached, the addressee needs to accept the initial presentation providing some kind of evidence of understanding, but the speaker needs to accept this understanding too.

The first move of the acceptance phase is ordinarily made by the addressee. On the basis of the presupposed common ground with the speaker, the addressee tries to interpret the initial presentation. If they believe they have in fact correctly understood this presentation they will indicate it to the sender.

But the addressee cannot always understand the speaker’s presentation or be sure of having correctly interpreted it as intended. Therefore, they cannot always accept the presentation straightforwardly. Clark and Schaefer (1987: 22) identify the potential obstacles the listener may face and, on this basis, establish four different states or levels of acceptance:

State 0. The addressee did not notice that the speaker uttered any expression.
State 1. The addressee noticed that the speaker uttered some expression, but is not in state 2 because all or part of it was not heard.
State 2. The addressee correctly heard the expression, but is not in state 3, because all or part of it was not understood.
State 3. The addressee understood what the speaker meant by the expression.

If the addressee is not in state 3, i.e. if they believe the presentation has not been fully or correctly heard and understood, they are expected to indicate it to the speaker. The initial presentation will then be revised until a new version is achieved that can be satisfactorily understood and accepted by all the participants.

As already pointed out, once the addressee has accepted the speaker’s presentation, this will have to implicitly or explicitly accept their interlocutor’s acceptance. If the speaker believes the presentation may have been somehow misunderstood, they are again expected to revise it. The process will not end until all the interlocutors mutually believe they have understood each other well enough for their current purposes.
Previous models of communication account for repairs when comprehension problems arise. What is significant of the collaborative model is that it accounts not only for negative evidence, but also for positive evidence when successful understanding is achieved (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 265).

The presentation and the acceptance phase together constitute a unit of conversation Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs have named the *contribution* (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 35), defined by Clark and Schaefer (1987: 20) as “a stretch of talk in which the participants specify and ground the content of a coherent piece of information”. In this view conversations do not proceed utterance by utterance, as in most previous models, but contribution by contribution.

Contributions are different from traditional units of analysis in several ways. First, they do not correspond to standard units of syntax, such as the phrase or the sentence. Secondly, they can never be seen as autonomous actions. Since they depend on the coordinated action of all the participants involved in the conversation, they cannot be devised as preformulated plans, they rather emerge as the contributor and their partners act collectively (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 292; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997: 240).

In the creation of each contribution, conversational participants share a common goal, i.e. the building of common ground. They all know this goal can be only achieved through the collective action and commitment of all the participants in the conversation. Clark and Schaefer (1989: 263) explain that speakers and addressees perform individual acts, but these are always done as part of a collective act. All interlocutors work and expect their partners to work in a collaborative way. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 33) suggest that they take for granted a principle of mutual responsibility: “the participants in a conversation try to establish, roughly by the initiation of each new contribution, the mutual belief that the listeners have understood what the speaker meant in the last utterance to a criterion sufficient for current purposes”.

Participants are therefore mutually responsible for grounding each contribution before moving on to the next one.\(^{21}\) The amount of evidence and the level of

\(^{21}\) Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 35-36) argue that, even in those contexts in which participants have not full access to one another—such as written speech or radio and TV broadcasts—they adopt a weakened and modified version of the mutual responsibility principle which they call the ‘principle of distant responsibility’.
understanding required for the contribution to be considered as grounded depend on the purpose of the conversation and the participants’ goals. Empirical research on this issue has provided evidence that, whereas some goals require a high level of understanding, others can be satisfied with a much lower level (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997). Consequently, participants are not always aiming at a full understanding of each utterance, they just try to establish the mutual belief that they have understood each other’s utterances well enough for their current purposes.

This principle works in combination with the principle of least collaborative effort. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) also maintain that participants try, from the very beginning of each contribution to its completion, to minimize the work they do in the presentation and grounding of their contributions. On this basis they say that the preferred procedure is for the speaker to present the new content in the most efficient possible way so that addressees can directly accept it. With this objective in mind, speakers select those utterances which they think can best specify the content they want to contribute with the least possible effort –in terms of time, resources and errors (Clark and Brennan, 1991; Clark, 2004). Addressees, on the other hand, are expected to accept this presentation without taking an extra turn and without initiating a refashioning process unless this is strictly necessary. On behalf of efficiency, both speaker and addressee will tolerate some degree of uncertainty about their mutual acceptance of understanding, as long as this understanding is enough to satisfy their joint purpose in conversation.

Most traditional theories see the principle of least effort in relation to the speaker’s role in the conversation –cf. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 26). In Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs’ (1986), and Clark and Schaefer’s (1987, 1989) view, however, effort is collaborative. It is evenly distributed between speaker and addressee, and the two of them work together to minimize it. It is their joint goals that determine the grounding criterion they establish and the amount of collaborative effort required.

The collaborative model presumes, like most previous models, a principle of cooperation between interlocutors –the cooperative principle (Grice, 1975, 1978). But it goes beyond the limits of this concept. Speakers and addressees do not cooperate to satisfy each other’s goals and minimize each other’s efforts; they collaborate to fulfill a common joint goal with the least possible collaborative effort. Meaning is thus seen and
explained as mutually and interactively co-constructed by all the participants in the conversation.

1.2.2. THE COLLABORATIVE MODEL AT WORK

In order to clarify how the collaborative model works and the specific procedures and techniques interlocutors use to coordinate their actions and beliefs for the purpose of common ground building, we analyze in the following pages a variety of different patterns of contributions. For this purpose we draw on the work carried out by Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), and Clark and Schaefer (1989). The first study analyzes referential communication in an experimental task in which pairs of interlocutors have to make reference to twelve figures of varying abstraction and similarity, and arrange them in a pre-established order. The second study focuses on spontaneous conversations involving different kinds of illocutionary acts. The data is taken from a corpus of everyday conversation called the London-Lund corpus (Svartvik and Quirk, 1980). The extracts we will discuss here are intended to exemplify different uses of language and different features of conversation, and to provide thus a comprehensive view of how contributions get initiated, carried through and completed in everyday face-to-face interaction.

1.2.2.1. The elementary exchange

The simplest pattern of contribution is the basic or elementary exchange – cf. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), and Clark and Schaefer (1989). In one single and complete conversational turn the speaker specifies the content they want to contribute to discourse by means of a stretch of speech which, they believe, will be understood by their addressee without need of refashioning. The addressee accepts the presentation providing evidence of their understanding and the speaker accepts this evidence. Mutual acceptance is thus established and common ground is satisfactorily built.

In example 1.1, taken from Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 16), understanding is asserted by means of the expression ‘okay’. The speaker is expected to accept it by moving on to the next contribution.

EXAMPLE 1.1:
A: Number 4’s the guy leaning against the tree.
B: Okay.
In the second example (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 270), the relevance of B’s answer to A’s question constitutes the necessary evidence for the speaker (A) and the addressee (B) to build the mutual belief that the content has been correctly interpreted. At the same time, it constitutes itself a new presentation to be considered by A, who becomes now the addressee of this second contribution.

EXAMPLE 1.2:
A: How far is it from Huddersfield to Coventry.
B: Um, about um a hundred miles.
A: So, in fact, if you were living in London during that period, you would be closer.

The elementary exchange assures the most efficient grounding. It is simple and short, and therefore requires a minimum collaborative effort from conversational participants. For these reasons it is expected to be the most preferred one (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 33). However, we will see that it is not always the most common model of contribution.

As we have already pointed out, addressees may encounter problems at different levels and may not be able to directly accept the speaker’s presentation. If they believe they have not fully heard, identified or understood the presentation, and therefore cannot respond to it as intended by the speaker, they are expected to indicate it. A side sequence will be then initiated in order to revise and refashion the initial presentation. This means that the contribution process will get extended through several turns before mutual acceptance can be finally established.

Speakers monitor not only their interlocutors’ reactions, but also what they are doing. They may also find problems in their presentations and set about to repair them even before interlocutors can get to identify or indicate any trouble. Furthermore, speakers may mishear or misunderstand addressees’ acceptance moves, they may consider that addressees’ evidence of understanding is not enough for the current purposes, or realize that they have been misunderstood, i.e. that although the addressee believes they have correctly understood the presentation they are in fact in an error. Speakers are then expected to reject the addressee’s acceptance and to initiate a sequence of repairing turns. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 24) have called this a follow-up.

Presentations can also take many different forms and sizes. When the speaker initiates a contribution they need to decide not only what they want to contribute to
discourse but also how they are going to do it. In most cases they will try to specify the content they want to ground in one single and complete turn, as we have seen in the previous examples. But one single turn can also contain several different contributions and one single contribution may be presented in several different turns.

On this basis Clark and Schaefer (1989) have identified three main patterns of contributions to discourse: contributions by turns, contributions within turns and contributions via sentence parts. Here we will illustrate how the collaborative model accounts for these different patterns of behavior and for the refashioning processes that are carried out within each of these contribution types every time a problem or difficulty is encountered.

### 1.2.2.2. Contributions by turns

Contributions by turns occur, according to Clark and Schaefer (1989: 270), every time there is “a relevant orderly change in turns”. This means that the contribution is initiated by a speaker’s turn in which they present the content they want to ground –usually by means of a full or elliptical sentence; and this is followed by an addressee’s turn in which they indicate their state of understanding of the speaker’s presentation. If they believe they have heard, noticed and understood what the speaker meant to add to their common ground well enough for their current purposes, they will accept it. If, on the contrary, they have trouble in understanding it, they will use their turn to reject the presentation and initiate a side sequence that will lead the acceptance phase into a series of consecutive turns.

In order to express acceptance, the addressee needs to provide some kind of positive evidence of their understanding. They may use several different kinds of procedures for this purpose. They may assert their acceptance by means of acknowledgments such as ‘yes’, ‘right’, ‘okay’, ‘I see’ or ‘mh hm’ –cf. example 1.1 above, p. 80; and, in face-to-face interaction, nonverbal signals such as head nods, smiles or raised eyebrows.\(^{22}\) They can demonstrate, i.e. with a paraphrase, or display, i.e. with a verbatim repetition, what they have understood. But they may also presuppose acceptance. They do this by allowing the conversation to continue or by initiating themselves a relevant next contribution. In the first case, their continued

---

\(^{22}\) See Clark (2004) for a study of the different effects that verbal and nonverbal forms of evidence have on the way the grounding process is carried out.
attention and the passing up of the opportunity to indicate trouble or to initiate a repair of a possible misunderstanding is considered as an acceptance of the last presentation. In the second case, the relevance of their utterance suggests their correct understanding of the previous one—cf. example 1.2 in p. 81.

Clark and Schaefer (1989: 272) argue that every utterance that initiates a turn belongs to the presentation phase of some contribution. This means that an addressee’s answer to a speaker presentation, whether an acknowledgment or a relevant next turn, constitutes not only an acceptance but also a new presentation that needs itself to be accepted. The acceptance phase becomes thus inherently recursive. This recursion stops when the weakest form of evidence is reached, i.e. when acceptance is presupposed by means of continued attention and/or the speaker’s initiation of a next contribution (Clark and Schaefer, 1987: 36; 1989: 268).\(^{23}\)

Non-acceptance can also be expressed through a variety of different procedures. Addressees may directly assert their non-understanding of the whole or part of the previous presentation. They may imply their lack of understanding by requesting a repeat or asking for more information, i.e. asking for clarification. They may repeat the presentation or part of it with rising intonation, asking thus for confirmation that they have in fact correctly understood the message as intended. They may finally imply their non-acceptance by means of quizzical looks or silences.

These different forms of non-understanding evidence also need to be considered by the speaker. In general, when addressees reject a presentation a side sequence is opened and a refashioning process gets initiated. Refashioning occurs also when speakers, as pointed out above, notice a problem in their own presentation or in their interlocutor’s understanding. According to Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), refashioning may be accomplished in three different ways: by means of a repair, an expansion or a replacement.

\(^{23}\) Clark and Schaefer (1989) explain this process on the basis of what they have called the strength of evidence principle: “the participants expect that, if evidence e_0 is needed for accepting presentation u_0, and e_1 for accepting the presentation of e_0, then e_1 will be weaker than e_0” (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 268). This means that evidence gets weaker and weaker until the weakest form of evidence, continued attention or initiation of the next turn, is reached. In this way the acceptance process will never spin out indefinitely.
1.2.2.2.1. Repairs

Repairs, as understood by Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 21), are always carried out by the speaker. They occur whenever contributors, detecting an error or an inadequacy in the presentation they are uttering, decide to change it midcourse.

In ongoing conversation, time pressure leads relatively often to the use of mischosen or erroneous words and expressions which need to be corrected as soon as possible in order to prevent grounding problems. This is what is happening in the following example, where ‘his legs are’ is repaired into ‘his one leg is’ (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 21).

**EXAMPLE 1.3:**

A: Um, next one is the guy, the person with his head to the right but his legs are, his one leg is kicked up to the left

The revised version of the presentation is what the addressee is expected to consider and accept. Therefore repairs need to be made, not only as soon as the problem is identified, but also in an unambiguous way, making clear what part of the presentation is being revised and how.

1.2.2.2.2. Expansions

Once a presentation has been uttered, the speaker or the addressee may find it correct but not clear enough for current purposes. They are then expected to expand it by adding new information.

Expansions are directly added by speakers, without need of prompting from the addressee, whenever the presentation process is initiated with a provisional expression, i.e. an expression used under time pressure that the speaker knows cannot accurately specify the content they want to ground. This explains why, in the following example, the speaker has decided to expand their presentation by adding ‘the left side looks like a square’ (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 21).

**EXAMPLE 1.4:**

A: Okay, number 1 is the just kind of block-like figure with the jagged right-hand side. The left side looks like a square.

Expansions can also be requested by the addressee when they find they cannot accurately understand the speaker’s presentation as just uttered. A silence where a reply is expected, a tentatively voice ‘um’, ‘uh huh’ or ‘yes?’, a quizzical look, or a repetition
with rising intonation of some part of the presentation are generally considered to be an addressee’s request for an expansion. As can be seen in the following example (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 21-22), each movement in the side sequence constitutes itself a new presentation to be grounded. The addressee’s signal of trouble needs to be recognized by the speaker, and both the initial presentation and its expansion need to be finally understood by the addressee and thus indicated to the speaker so that mutual acceptance can be reached and the conversation can go on.

EXAMPLE 1.5:
A: Okay, the next one is the rabbit.
B: Uh-
A: That’s asleep, you know, it looks like it’s got ears and he’s pointing down?
B: Okay.

A third type of expansion occurs when the addressees themselves expand the speaker’s presentation. Usually this is accomplished in the form of a request for confirmation or confirmation check uttered with rising intonation. In the following example (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 22), the addressee does not consider the speaker’s presentation clear enough for common ground building purposes and decides to suggest a possible expansion. In turns 3 and 4 speaker and addressee give evidence of a mutual acceptance of the initial presentation plus its expansion.

EXAMPLE 1.6:
A: Um, third one is the guy reading with, holding his book to the left.
B: Okay, kind of standing up?
A: Yeah.
B: Okay.

1.2.2.2.3. Replacements
Finally, unacceptable presentations can also be refashioned by means of a replacement. Once the speaker’s presentation has finished, the addressee may reject it and propose a substituting version to replace the original one. The addressee will normally utter this replacement with rising intonation, indicating they are not fully sure they have correctly understood the speaker’s initial presentation —cf. example 1.7 taken from Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 23).
EXAMPLE 1.7:
A: Okay, and the next one is the person that looks like they’re carrying something and it’s sticking out to the left. It looks like a hat that’s upside down.
B: The guy that’s pointing to the left again?
A: Yeah, pointing to the left, that’s it! (laughs)
B: Okay.

In the last two patterns of refashion, interlocutors actively collaborate not only in the acceptance of the contribution but also in its presentation. This is actually co-constructed by the joint action of the two interlocutors. Collaboration at this level accounts also for the communicative success of what Clark and Schaefer (1989) have called contributions via sentence parts and will be analyzed in more detail in the following pages of the present chapter.

1.2.2.3. Contributions within turns

In everyday conversation, speakers do not always give the floor to their interlocutors every time they finish the presentation of a new contribution. Sometimes they take extended turns in which contributions follow one another. Clark and Schaefer (1989) argue that, although there is no exchange in turns, there is, however, an acceptance process for each contribution, i.e. for each separate portion of the turn. On this basis they have called this pattern of behavior contributions within turns.

The speaker’s speech can always be interrupted by the addressee whenever they believe they may have not correctly heard or understood what is meant. If they pass up this opportunity to initiate a repair, their continued attention can be considered enough evidence for the interlocutors to establish the mutual belief that the content contributed to discourse has been satisfactorily grounded.

Quite often addressees use also continuers or assessments inserted during the speaker’s turn to confirm they are following and understanding what is being said. Continuers include gestures such as head nods or smiles, and expressions such as ‘mm’, ‘mhm’ or ‘yes’ –cf. example 1.8, taken from Clark and Schaefer (1989: 280). Assessments are signals such as ‘gosh’, ‘really?’ or ‘oh’, that offer a brief judgment of what has just been said. As we have already seen these two types of acknowledgments can also constitute an addressee’s turn, but in contributions within turns they are spoken in the background, usually overlapping with speaker’s talk. The addressee utters them without taking the floor from the speaker (Schegloff, 1982).
EXAMPLE 1.8:

B: But you daren’t set synthesis again you see, . you set analysis, and you can put the answers down, and your assistant *examiners will work them,* but if you given them a give n them
A: *yes quite, yes, yes*
B: a free hand on synthesis, and they’d be marking all sorts of stuff, because they can’t do the stuff *themselves,* I must watch [continues]
A: *quite m*

Clark and Schaefer’s (1989) analyses evidence that addressees usually utter acknowledgments when speakers come to an end of a certain thought. They indicate the addressee’s acceptance up to that point and their recognition that the speaker is in the middle of an extended unit of speech. On the other hand, the speaker’s continuation with their turn indicates they are accepting the addressees’ acknowledgments as sufficient evidence of their understanding for the current purposes.

As Clark and Schaefer (1989) also point out acknowledgments are used when interlocutors are quite confident of their mutual understanding and are not expecting strong evidence. This explains that, despite their brevity, they can succeed in creating contributions from extended turns.

1.2.2.4. Contributions via sentence parts

All the instances of contributions analyzed so far are initiated by a presentation which includes, at least, one full or elliptical sentence uttered by the speaker with the aim of specifying the content they want to contribute to discourse. They perform illocutionary acts, such as asking questions, making assertions, requests, apologies, etc. –cf. Clark and Schaefer (1989: 282). But sometimes, initial presentations are uttered as sentence constituents which can only perform parts of the intended illocutionary act and which, the speaker knows, cannot directly lead to the addressee’s understanding and acceptance of their communicative intentions.

Quite often, speakers do so because they think the content they want to add to common ground is too complex and is therefore better presented in several separate turns –installment contributions; because they are unsure of some piece of information and need the addressee’s confirmation –trial constituents; or because they need the addressee’s help to complete the presentation they have just initiated –collaborative completions.
1.2.2.4.1. **Installment contributions**

Installment contributions are uttered in several episodes. The speakers divide the information they want to present into portions and present each of these portions as a separate installment followed by a pause. This pause indicates they need confirmation of understanding from their addressees. That is, each installment of the contribution needs to be grounded, and only once the speaker and the addressee have established the mutual belief that each episode has been correctly understood and accepted can the contribution go on. When the last installment is uttered, the whole presentation also needs to be considered and mutually accepted as an all-encompassing unit.

Each non-final installment is uttered with rising intonation, indicating that, although there is a pause and the floor is given to the addressee, the presentation has not yet finished. The final installment is uttered with falling intonation to signal the end. In this way, although the presentation is divided into episodes and uttered in different turns, it carries the intonation of a single utterance.

As Clark and Schaefer (1987) point out, installment presentations can be both considered as one or several presentations. In the following example (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 284-5), the speaker divides the description of a wedding into four different installments. Acceptance is established for each of the four different parts of the description, which constitute themselves four different contributions with a presentation and an acceptance phase. But the final assertion made by the addressee ‘it does sound, very nice indeed’ grounds not only the last installment, but also the whole description, i.e. a complex presentation made up of four embedded contributions.

**EXAMPLE 1.9:**

B:  How how was the wedding –
A:  Oh it was it was really good, it was uh it was a lovely day
B:  Yes
A:  And . it was a super place, . to have it . of course
B:  Yes –
A:  And we went and sat on sat in an orchard, at Grantchester, and had a huge tea afterwards (laughs .)
B:  (laughs - -)
A:  Uh
B:  It does sound, very nice indeed

1.2.2.4.2. **Trial constituents**

When speakers are not sure whether their presentation is correct or comprehensible for their interlocutors, they may utter it with a *try marker*, i.e. rising intonation followed by
a pause (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979). By adding a try marker, they indicate their lack of confidence in what they have just said and recognize the possibility for a non-acceptance.

According to Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 19), a sentence uttered with falling intonation tends to project an explicit acceptance, i.e. the speaker expects the addressee to accept it. But when it is modified by a try marker, it projects a verdict: accept or not accept.

In the following example (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 18), the speaker is making an assertion, not a question. The final rising intonation simply indicates that the speaker is not sure whether the presentation can be accepted as just uttered and is asking the addressee to explicitly assert whether they have or not understood what they mean. The contribution will not be finished until the addressee confirms their understanding.

EXAMPLE 1.10:
A: Um, the next one’s the person ice skating that has two arms?

Sometimes speakers are unsure about just some piece of the information they want to contribute to discourse. In this case they need to modify only some part of their presentation with a try marker. The marked constituent, i.e. the trial constituent, needs to be accepted by the addressee before the presentation can be completed.

In the next example (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 286), the speaker is trying to assert that ‘A man called Annegra replied, and…’, but is, however, unsure about this name. The speaker presents it with rising intonation, i.e. as a trial constituent, and pauses, waiting for the addressee to either accept it or reject it. The addressee replaces ‘Annegra’ with the correct name ‘Allegra’, indicating they believe they have correctly inferred who the speaker was referring to despite the erroneous name. The speaker accepts the correction by repeating it and goes on to complete the presentation, which is thus accomplished in three different moves and co-constructed by the two participants in the conversation.

EXAMPLE 1.11:
A: So I wrote off to . Bill, . uh who ((had)) presumably disappeared by this time, certainly, a man called Annegra? -
B: Yeah, Allegra
A: Allegra, uh replied, . uh and I . put . two other people, who’d been in for . the BBST job . with me [continues]
1.2.2.4.3. **Completions**

In the standard pattern of contributions speakers are assumed to be the ones who present the content to be grounded. They are therefore expected to utter an utterance that specifies this content. But sometimes this utterance is only initiated by the speaker and it is the addressee who actually completes it.

In example 1.12 from Clark and Schaefer (1989: 286), the speaker initiates the contribution and pauses. The intonation and the pause indicate there is something else to come but the speaker is having trouble to utter it. The addressee, feeling they may know what the speaker is about to say, utters in the second turn what they believe to be an appropriate final part for the presentation, i.e. completes the presentation.

**EXAMPLE 1.12:**
A: Um the problem is a that you('ve) got to get planning consent -
B: Before you start -
A: Before you start on that part, yes

Each completion acts as evidence of the addressee’s acceptance of what has been so far uttered and constitutes itself a new presentation that also needs to be grounded. On this basis, Clark and Schaefer (1989) argue that in completions there are two contributions. The addressee’s completion constitutes one contribution embedded within the presentation phase of an overall contribution that includes the completion and the speaker’s fragment.

Completions are particularly significant because they constitute one of the clearest examples of how meaning in conversation is achieved by the joint action of more than one participant. We see in speech how speaker and addressee collaborate to achieve one single collective goal, i.e. to ground their beliefs about a meaning they are actively co-constructing.

We finally need to point out that grounding problems can also occur at any point during a contribution via sentence parts: an installment or a trial constituent may not be correctly heard, noticed or understood by the interlocutor; or a completion may not be considered acceptable by the initial speaker. In any of these cases a refashioning side sequence needs to be initiated. The non-acceptable part of the contribution will be then repaired, expanded or replaced until a mutually acceptable version is reached.
1.2.2.5. Failures in the grounding process

In all the examples analyzed so far both the speaker and the addressee act and collaborate as expected at both the presentation and the acceptance phases. It is precisely this collaboration what makes possible that, despite the difficulties encountered in presenting and accepting, interlocutors can safely build new common ground; that is, communication of the intended content can be successfully achieved.

If, however, at any point during the contribution one of the participants does not collaborate as expected, grounding failures may occur that can prevent the satisfactory communication of the speaker’s message. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) have identified at least three different types of non-collaborative behavior that may lead to failed or unsuccessful communication: ignoring, feigning understanding and misunderstanding.

1.2.2.5.1. Ignoring

Sometimes addressees simply ignore their conversational partners’ presentations. The speaker utters a presentation, but the addressee does not pay attention to it and goes on uttering a next turn that is not related to the previous one. There is no grounding process and therefore no common ground is built.

In the following example (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 276), B asks a question: ‘what what’s his name then Charlie’. An answer is then expected from the interlocutor. Instead, C utters a new presentation that is not relevant to the just uttered question. There is no evidence of C’s understanding and no grounding. The question has just been ignored.

EXAMPLE 1.13:
C: Well . I’ve got um . a boy ex Gordonstoun - .
B: I say
C: Who sticks out like a sore thumb
B: What what’s his name then Charlie - -
C: And I’ve got . several flower people
B: Ooh uh tha- that’s nice.

Not only do addressees ignore speakers’ presentations, these may also ignore addressees’ acceptance moves. They may ignore indications of troubling in understanding in order to avoid a refashioning process. In either case, the content of the
presentation gets never grounded and communication fails because one of the conversational participants does not collaborate as expected.

However, it is also necessary to point out that sometimes interlocutors do not directly respond to each other’s moves because they prefer to postpone their acceptance, not because they are ignoring them. In these cases, they intend to go back to the postponed presentation and try to ground it during the ongoing conversation.

1.2.2.5.2. *Feigning understanding*

Under certain circumstances addressees may decide to feign their understanding. They may encounter problems to understand the speaker’s presentation and instead of pointing them and initiating a side sequence, as usually expected from them, they may decide to accept the presentation as just uttered.

Addressees deceive speakers relatively often in order to minimize their joint collaborative effort. If they consider the understanding of the contribution is not important for the current purposes of the conversation they prefer to save the effort of carrying out a refashioning process. The speaker, in this case, has no clue to identify the communicative trouble and goes on assuming their message has been correctly grounded.

Addressees may also use this procedure in order to postpone the final acceptance of a problematic presentation. As just explained in the previous section, if this is the case, they will go back to it.

1.2.2.5.3. *Misunderstanding*

A different and more difficult to detect kind of problem occurs when conversational participants misunderstand each other. Addressees may believe they have correctly understood the speaker’s presentation, but they have in fact misunderstood it. If the speaker is not able to recognize this error, the conversation will continue without participants becoming aware of the communicative failure.

1.2.3. **SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The extracts of interaction here analyzed illustrate the main patterns of contribution to be found in everyday oral conversation. They cannot, however, cover all the possible
features of language use. We have seen how conversational participants adapt their actions to each other and to the specific purposes and demands of each situation, which vary from one contribution to another. Utterances can be presented and accepted in an unlimited number of ways and contributions can take an unlimited variety of forms. As Wilkes-Gibbs (1997: 274) explains it, “the collaborative process is flexible, and shrinks or expands in response to the coordination problems of a specific discourse, at a specific point”.

There are, however, certain general patterns of behavior which can be always identified for any collaboratively constructed contribution. These always involve the joint action of all the interlocutors along two identifiable phases: presentation and acceptance. Depending on how these two phases are carried out, contributions will proceed in conversation either sequentially or hierarchically. That is, they may follow each other or get initiated within other contributions. The examples here analyzed illustrate also what, according to Clark and Schaefer (1989), are the three different possible types of embedding: acceptance moves may constitute themselves a presentation of a new contribution that gets thus initiated before the first one is actually completed; presentations can consist of two or more contributions if they involve installments, trial constituents or completions; and refashioning side sequences with their own presentation and acceptance moves may be carried out within the acceptance phase of an all-inclusive contribution.

Any of these embedded contributions may also be judged unacceptable and in need of a refashion. The acceptance cycle applies thus iteratively until mutual acceptance is reached, which means that contributions can be of any length and complexity. Clark and Schaefer (1989: 280) point out, however, that they are normally of a practical extension. They tend to be long enough for the contributor to be able to perform a complete illocutionary act and short enough to lie within the interlocutors’ memory limitations (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 280).24

The collaborative principle, as explained above, accounts in part for the size and complexity of contributions. Conversational participants are expected to choose, among all the possibilities available to present and ground their ideas, the simplest and least effort demanding ones.

---

24 In order to illustrate and clarify this complexity, Clark and Schaefer propose a representation of contributions as contribution trees (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 272).
In this line, Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 19) argue that when a speaker selects a presentation they prefer to utter it themselves and they prefer it to be elementary, adequate, free of errors and uttered fluently; so that it does not need to be refashioned. However, speakers are not always able to utter an elementary presentation, because of time pressure, the complexity of the content or their ignorance, i.e. because they “do not know enough to decide what addressees would accept” (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 27). They need then to resort to more effort demanding forms that require also their addressees’ collaboration, such as installments, marked utterances or provisional presentations.

Addressees are also expected to prefer a positive acceptance rather than a refashioning side sequence. We have already mentioned that repairs, expansions and replacements are only initiated when understanding is considered not enough for current purposes. Therefore, there may be problems in understanding that can just be ignored. Furthermore, speakers prefer to repair or expand their own utterances and to initiate these refashioning processes rather than to wait for interlocutors to prompt them. Addressees, on the other hand, prefer to offer their own expansions or replacements rather than to ask speakers to refashion. In this way, they both work to minimize their collaborative effort (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 27).

At the same time a presupposed acceptance is expected to be preferred to an asserted one. Nevertheless, most presentations carry an indication of the strength of evidence that the speaker expects from the addressee (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267) and, as Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) explain, different types of presentations project different types of acceptance moves. An elementary presentation may be just accepted by an implicit indication of understanding, such as continued attention. However, an elementary presentation with a try marker projects a verdict; therefore, it needs to be explicitly accepted by the addressee. The same applies to installments or trial constituents. Provisional presentations, in contrast, project a completion, requiring thus even more collaborative effort from addressees.

---

25 Clark and Schaefer (1987: 23) suggest that addressees follow what they have called the strongest initiator rule: “choose the strongest initiator that is consistent with understanding to a criterion sufficient for current purposes”.

26 See Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 20) and Clark and Schaefer (1989: 290) for a complete account of projections.
In general, the least collaborative effort principle predicts a trade-off between the amount of work devoted to the initial presentation and that of the refashioning. The more effort put into the initial presentation, the least it is expected to be needed for the acceptance. Conversational participants try to distribute this effort efficiently in order to satisfy their collective goals (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997: 242).

But as Wilkes-Gibbs (1997) clearly explains, the extent and complexity of presentation and acceptance moves depend also to a considerable extent on the effect that different conversational factors have on collaboration. People’s goals and the criteria they set for what is considered to be enough understanding for current purposes play an important role. But contextual variables, such as the medium of communication, the resources it provides and the demands and constraints it places, have also a major influence.

Empirical research within the collaborative theory framework has focused on the study of the effect that all these different factors have on the collaborative process. Attention has been paid to the issue of how individuals with different goals in conversation coordinate their actions for the joint purpose of common ground building (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986). Analyses have been also made of conversations between individuals with different amount of knowledge on the topic they are discussing, i.e. experts and novices, (Isaacs and Clark, 1987); or with different conceptual and/or spatial perspectives on the referents they are describing (Schober, 1993).

Another line of research has focused on the study of how collaboration works when there are more than two interlocutors taking part in the conversation and how the number of participants affects this process (Thornton, 1990). The role that different interlocutors take in the conversation, in particular the differences between active participants and non-participants or overhearers has also been examined in Clark and Schaefer (1987), Schober and Clark (1989), and Wilkes-Gibbs and Clark (1992).

Particularly interesting is the work carried out on the influence that the communicative medium and the constraints it places on the kind of evidence available has on the grounding process. Brennan (1990) has studied the effects of having continuous versus discontinuous evidence of partner’s understanding; and Clark (2004) verbal versus nonverbal evidence. An important line of research has applied the collaborative framework to the analysis of interaction when computers are used as a
medium to communicate through and also as a partner to communicate with (Brennan, 1998). The final aim of these studies is not only to understand but also to improve human-computer interaction.

Considerable amount of research has also been devoted to the study of the effect that accumulating common ground has on the grounding process. That is, how the grounding process gets affected when reference is made to the same content a second, third, fourth or fifth time in the same conversation. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), and Wilkes-Gibbs and Clark (1992), analyzing referential communication, found that the type, length and efficiency of the reference change as repeated references are made to the same object, i.e. as the participants’ common ground gets accumulated.

The results of these studies suggest that there is always a need for collaboration in any conversational act, but this collaboration is not invariant. The processes and products of collaboration are affected by participants’ needs and desires—their goals, knowledge and roles at any point in discourse— and the context of the conversation—its limitations, demands and resources.

Furthermore, these studies have extended the domain of applicability of the collaborative theory model. We have already explained that the model was originally designed for the purpose of referential communication analysis (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986). However, subsequent research had developed it and made it suitable to the analysis of other communicative situations. The research projects conducted since the model first appeared show that collaboration is general to many situations of language use. A discourse activity involving interaction among at least two different participants is always a collective activity. On this basis, the collaborative model will be applied in our study to the analysis of L2 face-to-face oral interaction.

1.3. INTERACTIONIST APPROACHES TO SLA: COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE
The role of interaction in L2 learning is, without doubt, one of the major focuses of study in the field of SLA. For years researchers adopting an interactionist perspective have examined the value of interaction for the development of the learner’s IL system and claimed the major importance of conversation for L2 learning. A rich line of both
theoretical and empirical research has developed from this approach, giving rise to a wide variety of theories on the issue and much subsequent debate among researchers.

Attention will be here concentrated on the study of interaction and SLA from a sociocultural approach, i.e. on the analysis of interaction and its role in L2 learning taking as basis the postulates of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of mind (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987). More specifically, we will discuss the concept of collaborative dialogue, presented in Swain (1997, 2000), and Swain and Lapkin (1998) as evidence of L2 learning occurring in face-to-face oral interaction. In subsequent chapters we will argue that strategic communication may develop, under certain circumstances, in collaborative dialogue and be thus an occasion for L2 lexical knowledge acquisition. Here we will first try to locate collaborative dialogue in current views on the role of interaction in SLA; secondly, we will focus on this unit of analysis; and, finally, we will review empirical research from a sociocultural perspective supporting Swain’s theoretical claims on the role of collaborative dialogue in L2 learning.

1.3.1. INTERACTIONIST APPROACHES TO SLA

Until the 70s conversational interaction was seen in the SLA research and the FL teaching practice as a field for practice and reinforcement. Learners were assumed to learn grammatical rules and structures first and then put them into practice in order to carry on conversation. The importance of interaction was certainly acknowledged, but its role in the process of language learning was considered, at most, secondary. This view changed with Hatch’s publication of two critical papers that served to reverse previous assumptions on the nature of the learning process and the role of conversational interaction: Hatch (1978a, 1978b). This scholar claimed that “one learns how to do conversation, one learns how to interact verbally, and out of this interaction syntactic structures are developed” (Hatch, 1978b: 404). Hatch was thus suggesting that, instead of looking at how acquired rules and structures lead to the communicative use of language in conversation, SLA research should rather look at conversation as a source of L2 knowledge.

Since the publication of Hatch’s seminal papers, the major importance of interaction for language learning has become an unquestionable fact. However, much discussion has arisen about how or in what ways learners’ participation in conversation
can assist their L2 learning, and on what aspects and types of interaction researchers should focus their attention in order to enhance our understanding of the language learning process.

Most of the theoretical and empirical work carried out so far has emphasized the role of interaction as a provider of input, arguing not only that in interaction learners obtain the input they need for their IL system to develop, but also that this input works better for acquisition than other forms of linguistic evidence. This research approach derived originally from Krashen’s *comprehensible input* hypothesis. Krashen claimed that acquisition would unconsciously occur through exposure to comprehensible input, i.e. input that is understood by the learner (Krashen, 1980, 1982, 1985, 1994). Although most scholars now agree that positive evidence is necessary though insufficient for SLA, Krashen’s hypothesis opened a rich line of research trying to find out how new input can be rendered comprehensible and in what ways interaction may be a source of comprehensible input.

In the early 80s Long proposed that, although input may be made comprehensible in a variety of different ways –e.g. *modified input* in foreigner talk, the most optimal condition for comprehensible input to be obtained is *modified interaction* (Long, 1980, 1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1985). Modified interaction, understood as a modification of the structure of the conversation versus the modification of input occurring in foreigner talk, occurs through *negotiation of meaning*. In negotiation of meaning learners and their interlocutors work to solve anticipated, perceived or experienced difficulties in message comprehensibility. Through the use of negotiation strategies, such as comprehension checks, topic shifts or clarification requests, and repeating or rephrasing the original message, interlocutors achieve comprehensibility (Pica, 1994). It was thus hypothesized that negotiation of meaning leads to L2 learning because it provides learners with comprehensible input.

Following this assumption, negotiation of meaning became one of the most active areas of research in the field of SLA during the 80s and most of the 90s. Evidence was found that negotiation leads to greater comprehensibility of input and also of how negotiation works and which interactional contexts or factors foster more negotiation of meaning –cf. Pica (1994) for a detailed review of negotiation of meaning research carried out during the 80s and the early 90s. However, as Swain (2000) argues, it is not
yet clear to what extent this greater comprehensibility of input achieved through negotiation may lead to L2 learning\textsuperscript{27} or in which way this may occur, i.e. what are the mechanisms or procedures that may account for the transformation of comprehensible input into L2 knowledge and use.

In 1985 Swain first called for a broadening in the focus of research to pay attention not only to input but also to output. She argued that both input and output have a role to play in L2 learning and that, therefore, interaction and negotiation of meaning should be examined not only as a source of input but also as an opportunity to use the TL, i.e. an opportunity for output.

Swain’s arguments stemmed from research carried out with French immersion students revealing that, after years of comprehensible input exposure, these learners’ productive use of language deviates noticeably from that of the NS. Observation of immersion classes revealed that these students have little opportunities to engage in extended discourse and they are generally not pushed by their teachers to produce accurate as well as fluent TL. These insights challenged Krashen’s hypothesis, suggesting that grammatical accuracy cannot always develop from input alone. Swain suggested then the need of \textit{pushed output} for the learner’s IL system to develop towards the TL norm. Pushed output occurs when the learner is “pushed toward the delivery of a message that is not only conveyed, but that is conveyed precisely, coherently, and appropriately” (Swain, 1985: 249).

The basis of what is now known as the \textit{comprehensible output} hypothesis lies in the belief that output production requires deeper processing than input comprehension: “output may stimulate learners to move from the semantic, open-ended processing prevalent in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production” (Swain, 2000: 99). In other words, while a message can be comprehended with little syntactic analysis, i.e. drawing mostly on semantic knowledge, producing comprehensible output engages learners in morpho-syntactic processing, and this is assumed to foster acquisition.

\textsuperscript{27} Very few studies have been able to establish a direct causal link between negotiation and acquisition, some noticeable although limited in scope exceptions are Ellis, Tanaka and Yamazaki (1994), and Mackey (1995).
The comprehensible output hypothesis was revised in 1995 by Swain herself, who suggested then that output may play three main functions in L2 learning: a noticing or consciousness raising, a hypothesis testing and a metalinguistic function.

Noticing as a result of output occurs when, in an attempt to produce TL, learners find out that they do not know how to express their message in a coherent and accurate way. Learners notice a hole in their IL system, i.e. become aware of what they need to know but do not know yet about the TL – for evidence of this function of output see Swain and Lapkin (1995), Kowal and Swain (1997) and, in general, CS research.

Conscious of this problem learners try to solve it, engaging in cognitive processes, such as extending L1 knowledge to L2 contexts, extending L2 knowledge to new L2 contexts, or formulating and testing hypotheses. One way to test a hypothesis is to produce language. Evidence has been found that learners use output as a way to try out new language forms and structures, i.e. to see what works and what does not. The feedback obtained serves them to confirm or disconfirm their hypotheses, leading, whenever necessary, to a modification of their initial output – empirical research, such as for instance Pica, Holliday, Lewis and Morgenthaler (1989), has demonstrated that in negotiation of meaning learners modify their output in response to their interlocutors’ feedback.

Finally, output may serve a metalinguistic function, when learners consciously reflect on the form of their own TL use. Swain argues that this reflection plays a major role in the process of control and internalization of linguistic knowledge (Swain, 1997: 119).

In the last decade, recognizing that linguistic accuracy could not be expected to develop only from comprehensible input exposure, researchers have broadened considerably the focus of their approach to interaction. Phenomena such as noticing, attention to form and feedback have thus become a major object of study in the field of SLA.

It is now generally agreed that for input, particularly grammatical input, to become intake some noticing or conscious attention to form must occur – cf. Schmidt and Frota (1986), Schmidt (1990, 1994, 1995), Gass (1990), or Gass and Varonis (1994). Learners need to notice TL forms in the input they receive (Ellis, 1994), gaps or differences between their TL use and that of the NS (Schmidt and Frota, 1986), and, as
mentioned above, holes in their IL system. Researchers acknowledge in this way that some kind of intervention or guidance may be necessary for grammatical accuracy to develop out of interaction; that is, to draw learners’ attention to form while communicating meaning. In this line negative evidence, i.e. corrective feedback offered by the interlocutor in response to a learner’s error, has been and continues to be the object of much empirical research. Feedback obtained through interaction draws the learner’s attention to form, while providing them with TL models of their erroneous IL utterances. It facilitates modified output, i.e. the learner’s modification of their initial output towards the TL norm, and subsequent L2 development.

Long’s input hypothesis was revised to acknowledge the functions not only of input, but also of output and feedback in L2 learning – cf. Long (1996). Focus on form models have been devised and tested – cf. Lightbown and Spada (1990), Lyster and Ranta (1997), Doughty and Williams (1998), Long and Robinson (1998), and Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998); and, as just mentioned, much research has accumulated on feedback – cf. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), Long et al. (1998), Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000), and Morris (2002).

Still, in all these theories and models interaction is primarily seen as a source of input and an opportunity for output. Focus on form and feedback are relevant for L2 acquisition in so far as they serve to draw learners’ attention to the nature of interactional input and/or output.

This widespread approach to the study of L2 interaction reflects a theoretical orientation based on the message model of communication (Donato, 1994: 34; Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 320). From this perspective, communication is seen as message transmission and reception, as the successful sending and receiving of linguistic tokens. Input and output are thus conceived as images of messages that are “transmitted as output from one source and received as input elsewhere” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 18). As Donato (1994), following Savignon (1991), points out, in this view meaning is seen as a fixed and immutable construct, to be sent and received. There is therefore no place for the collaborative nature of the meaning creation process we argued for in the previous section of the present chapter.

Tarone (2003) argues also that in input-output models of L2 interaction and learning (Van Patten, 1996; Gass, 1997), as well as in focus on form (Doughty and
Williams, 1998; Long and Robinson, 1998; Long et al., 1998) or connectionist models (Ellis, 2002), the learner is seen as an automatic and logical language processor. Like a computer, the learner’s brain receives data, i.e. comprehensible input or input as feedback, analyzes it, incorporates it to existing knowledge, and uses it to generate output. In this view, learners are assumed to be rather passive and the social context is believed to play no significant role in the language learning process. However, Tarone has provided evidence that in interaction learners manipulate the input they receive and stretch their IL knowledge, i.e. they are active and creative; and the social context and the social relationships existing between the learner and their interlocutors affect L2 processing and learning in significant ways –cf. Tarone (2003). On this basis she argues that an “adequate theory of SLA must include the elements of social context, sociopsychological process, and creative choice on the part of the learner” (Tarone, 2003: 110).

Some more recent approaches to the study of interaction have tried to account for the social factors influencing language acquisition and to take into consideration the learner as both social and active in this learning process. In this alternative approach to interaction Tarone (2003) locates those theories that try to explain SLA providing sociolinguistic models (Preston, 2000, 2002; Tarone, 2000), conversation analysis models (Markee, 2000, 2004; Buckwalter, 2001) and Vygotskyan models (Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 2000).

The concept of collaborative dialogue (Swain, 1997, 2000) appears thus as an alternative to the traditional study of interaction focused almost exclusively on negotiation of meaning exchanges and feedback responses. Swain, in line with Kramsch (1995) and van Lier (2000) among others, attempts to go beyond the analysis of input and output in order “to broaden the perspective to one in which all social activity forms a part of the learning environment” (Swain, 2000: 99).

In Swain’s (1997, 2000) approach to interaction, language use is seen not only as communication but also as cognitive activity, socially constructed through interaction. That is, output has both a communicative and a cognitive function. Swain suggests that learners and their interlocutors use language as a psychological tool to solve problems, co-construct knowledge and thus aid L2 learning. This means that language development does not only occur as an internal mental process hidden in the
heads of individuals as they process received input or feedback, it occurs also through social interaction and is available in the social and cognitive activity the learner engages in when interacting with other learners or with native speaking interlocutors –cf. Donato (1994: 35). That is, instead of analyzing interaction only as communication, i.e. as input reception and output production, Swain proposes to look at it also as cognitive and social activity.

Certainly, not all interaction can be considered cognitive activity aiding L2 development. Swain distinguishes between the conversational dialogue typical of negotiation of meaning tasks, where language is used for communicative purposes, and collaborative dialogue, where the communicative and cognitive functions of language co-occur (Swain, 2000: 107). Without denying the value of negotiation of meaning studies, Swain claims that attention should also be paid to a different form of interaction, i.e. collaborative dialogue, so that a more comprehensive understanding of how L2 learning occurs can be achieved.

In the following section we will describe in detail the concept of collaborative dialogue, illustrating it with examples that will help to clarify Donato’s (1994) arguments and Swain’s (1997, 2000) theoretical proposal.

1.3.2. COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE
Swain’s proposed change in the approach to interaction and SLA has its origin, as already pointed out, in Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of mind. The claim that dialogue can be seen as social cognitive activity leading to L2 development, i.e. that language and language knowledge are socially co-constructed through interaction, is supported by the work of Vygotsky (1978, 1987) and those scholars who have collaborated to articulate the sociocultural theory –cf. among others Leont’ev (1981), Wertsch (1985, 1991), Newman, Griffin and Cole (1989), and Cole (1996). To understand the concept of collaborative dialogue and its role in L2 development we need therefore to consider first those Vygotskian premises that underlie Swain’s theoretical framework.

From a sociocultural perspective, the origin of cognitive processes is situated in social activity. Sociocultural theorists argue that cognitive mental functions such as reasoning, attention or voluntary memory arise from the dialogical activities in which individuals participate when engaged in social interaction. Cognitive processes are first
socially co-constructed and then transformed into mental activity through a gradual process of internalization. Cognitive development arises thus as interpsychological activity, and becomes intrapsychological through this internalization or appropriation process. This means that the origin of individual knowledge is dialogue, i.e. socially situated interaction occurring between speakers. In other words, “higher psychological processes unique to humans can be acquired only through interaction with others, that is, through interpsychological processes that only later will begin to be carried out independently by the individual. When this happens, some of these processes lose their initial, external form and are converted into intrapsychological processes” (Leont’ev, 1981: 56).

In this view language plays a major role in learning, acting as the mediating tool that makes possible the social co-construction of knowledge through dialogue and the transformation of social cognitive activity into mental one. For Vygotsky (1978, 1981), language constitutes a powerful semiotic tool. Just like a physical tool, such as for instance a hammer, allows us to carry out physical activities we would not be able to perform without it, language makes it possible to accomplish mental activities we would not be able to accomplish otherwise –cf. Swain (2000: 103-104). Language mediates our interaction with the social environment and our physical and mental activities. Language is the means through which interpsychological activity is carried out and transformed into intrapsychological functioning.

In sum, Swain’s approach to the nature of the language learning process is framed on the sociocultural theory belief that (1) cognitive processes originate as social activity, (2) social cognitive activity is transformed into mental one through internalization, and (3) language is the semiotic tool that mediates the construction of social cognitive processes and the internalization of these processes and the knowledge they build.\(^{28}\)

Collaborative dialogue, as described in Swain (1997, 2000) and Swain and Lapkin (1998), arises in face-to-face FL interaction as collaborative problem-solving activity. It occurs when learners and their interlocutors identify a problem and work to solve it in a joint and collaborative way. For instance, in trying to produce output the learner may notice a hole in their IL system, i.e. that they lack the necessary TL

\(^{28}\) For a full account of the sociocultural theory of mind and how it has been applied to the analysis of SLA, see Lantolf and Appel (1994), and Lantolf (2000).
knowledge to express the meaning they had in mind in an accurate and appropriate way, and try to seek for a solution to this problem with the collaborative help of their interlocutor.

With this objective in mind learner and interlocutor engage in cognitive processes such as formulating and testing hypotheses, extending L1 knowledge to L2 contexts or L2 knowledge to new L2 contexts, offering and assessing alternatives, etc. These cognitive processes are carried out through language use. We have already explained how, for instance, learners produce language to see what works and what does not, i.e. to test their current hypotheses about TL structure – cf. current chapter, p. 100. Language is thus used as a psychological tool to perform cognitive activity. That is, language mediates cognitive processing.

These cognitive activities are also social action. They are not carried out by one individual alone. They are the joint activity of all the interlocutors collaborating in the problem-solving task, i.e. the learner and their native or non-native speaking interlocutor or interlocutors. They are dialogically constituted in socially situated interaction. This means that the cognitive activity leading to the final solution of the problem is interpsychological activity, socially co-constructed through dialogue, i.e. through language use.

In this activity there is always a process of conscious reflection on language. In collaborative dialogue, versus negotiation of meaning interaction, attention is focused on both meaning and form. Learners and their interlocutors work to convey meaning and to do so with an accurate and appropriate TL form. Language is here the vehicle and the object of reflection.

Interlocutors collaborate to co-construct language, i.e. the language they need to solve the linguistic problem encountered. The cognitive processes they are engaged in result in new TL and the modification of the learner’s original output. With the help of the interlocutor the learner becomes able to use previously unavailable TL grammatical and/or lexical structures. In collaborative dialogue we can thus see how performance outstrips competence.

Following Donato (1994), Swain (1997: 123) argues that the linguistic change that occurs in collaborative dialogue, as learners’ modify their initial output, represents new TL knowledge. Through the process of appropriation hypothesized in the
sociocultural theory of mind, the learner is expected to internalize this new language and to become able to use it in the future in an individual and independent way. That is, what is originally socially co-constructed language and language knowledge becomes individual knowledge, i.e. the learner becomes “able to use the language of others (and the mental processes that interaction has constructed)” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 321). On this basis Swain and Lapkin support Donato’s (1994: 39) claim that “the focus [in SLA] should be … on observing the construction of co-knowledge and how this co-construction process results in linguistic change among and within individuals during joint activity” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 321).


Since the cognitive processes leading to knowledge building are mediated by language and socially constituted through dialogue, they are directly observable in interaction –cf. Donato and Lantolf (1990: 85) for a discussion of this claim. Dialogue is an enactment of cognitive activity and in dialogue we can follow the cognitive steps which form the basis of language development. What normally remains hidden in individually internalized thought, in joint problem-solving activity manifests itself in dialogue (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 321). That is, collaborative dialogue is language learning and is also evidence of language learning. Whereas in negotiation of meaning research we see input reception and output production as possible sources for L2 learning, in collaborative dialogue we perceive actual L2 learning taking place.

In sum, collaborative dialogue is “knowledge-building dialogue. In the case of our interests in second language learning, it is dialogue that constructs linguistic knowledge. It is what allows performance to outstrip competence. It is where language use and language learning can co-occur. It is language use mediating language learning. It is cognitive activity and it is social activity” (Swain, 2000: 97).

29 In the following section we will see how this assumption has been confirmed by the results of empirical research demonstrating that the language structures co-constructed in social interaction are later recognized and used by the learner in individual activity (Donato, 1994; LaPierre, 1994; Swain and Lapkin, 1998).
We will now examine some examples of collaborative dialogue that illustrate what we have just explained about the nature of this kind of interaction and its role in the SLA process.

1.3.2.1. Collaborative dialogue and L2 grammatical development

The first excerpt of interaction we are going to discuss here comes from Kowal and Swain (1997), and has also been included in Swain (2000). Trying to identify how syntactic processing could be promoted in content-based immersion classes, Kowal and Swain engaged students in a variety of tasks specifically designed to encourage focus on form while creating meaning. In this first example we see how two French language learners, identified by the pseudonyms Rachel and Sophie, collaborate to reconstruct in writing a text they have just heard.

**EXAMPLE 1.14:**

   (Look up new [as in] new threats.)
2. Sophie: Good one!
3. Rachel: Yeah, nouveaux, des nouveaux, de nouveaux. Is it des nouveaux or de nouveaux?
4. Sophie: Des nouveaux or des nouvelles?
5. Rachel: Nou[veaux], des nou[veaux], de nou[veaux].
6. Sophie: It’s menace, un menace, une menace, un menace, menace ay ay ay!
   [exasperated].
7. Rachel: Je vais le pauser.
   (I’m going to put it on pause [ie the tape-recorder].)
   [They look up ‘menace’ in the dictionary.]
8. Sophie: C’est des nouvelles! [triumphantly].

The phrase included in the original text that Rachel and Sophie are trying to recreate is ‘de nouveaux problèmes’ – in English ‘new problems’. Instead of producing a verbatim repetition, these two students decide to reformulate the initial sentence and to produce a phrase that is new for them. Rachel substitutes the original ‘problèmes’ with the synonym ‘menaces’ – i.e. ‘threats’; and in turn 2 Sophie congratulates her on doing so: ‘Good one!’. According to Swain (2000: 101), they are trying to stretch their IL and thus make the task more challenging for them. Notice also that this is not a requirement of the task. In Donato’s terms, it is a *sub-goal* spontaneously generated by the learners themselves – about sub-goals see Donato (1994: 43).

In producing this new phrase, they come to recognize a hole in their IL system. Rachel is not sure whether the correct partitive is ‘de’ or ‘des’, and Sophie realizes that
'menaces’ may be feminine and subsequently the correct adjective may be ‘nouvelles’ and not ‘nouveaux’. In fact, ‘menaces’ is actually feminine and the accurate form of the partitive is ‘de’, because it precedes an adjective. That is, the correct form of the utterance presented in 1 is ‘de nouvelles menaces’.

By producing a phrase that she knows may be not well-formed, Rachel creates for herself and her interlocutor an object to reflect on. Note that they have understood each other without problem. They do not engage in the subsequent negotiation sequence because of a message comprehensibility difficulty. They do so because they have identified a problem in the form of their utterance and want to solve it, i.e. to produce an utterance that not only conveys their message but does it in a syntactically accurate and appropriate way. They are focusing on both meaning and form.

In this initial phrase we see what Swain, following Wells (2000), calls “the two faces of an utterance”: the cognitive activity of “saying” and the product of it, i.e. “what is said”. Rachel “says” in order to create meaning, but “what is said” is an utterance that can be reflected on and responded to (Swain, 2000: 102). In this line, this utterance constitutes also a hypothesis that will be tested out in the following turns. It represents Rachel’s current state of TL knowledge.

We will here focus on the solution of the second problem, i.e. Rachel and Sophie’s collaborative effort to produce the correct form of the adjective. Sophie recognizes the possible incorrectness of Rachel’s utterance and a hole in her IL system, i.e. she does not know whether ‘menaces’ is feminine or masculine. In turn 4 she verbalizes the problem formulating an explicit question: ‘des nouveaux or des nouvelles?’ In 6 she puts into words the different possibilities available: ‘it’s menace, un menace, une menace, un menace, menace ay ay ay!’ This is a common strategy among FL learners. They test different alternatives hoping that, by saying them out loud, they will be able to identify which one sounds best and thus choose the correct form. They use language, i.e. output production, as a means to build TL knowledge (Swain, 2000: 101-102).

This strategy, however, fails and neither Sophie nor Rachel are able to solve the problem. They decide then to resort to an available tool, their dictionary. They find in this way the information they need to build the TL form that will allow them to convey

---

30 The trouble with the partitive is left aside when the adjective problem is identified. Later on in their interaction Rachel and Sophie will return to it and correctly change ‘des’ to ‘de’.
their message with grammatical accuracy. In turn 8 Sophie uses the information found in the dictionary to provide the correct form of the adjective: ‘C’est des nouvelles!’ In turn 9 Rachel confirms the correctness of Sophie’s utterance and provides a metalinguistic explanation for their final choice: ‘C’est féminin’.

At the end, their collaborative effort makes possible the modification of their initial output and the co-construction of a correct TL utterance: ‘des nouvelles menaces’. They have arrived at this solution through joint collaboration. They have used language to formulate hypotheses and assess the different alternatives available. Unable to solve the problem by themselves they have together decided to turn to the tool that would provide them with the desired solution. In the two final turns they co-construct new TL. This means that their final performance outstrips their initial competence.

This linguistic change in their output represents new TL knowledge. In Swain’s words “together what Sophie and Rachel have accomplished is the construction of linguistic knowledge; they have engaged in knowledge building” (Swain, 2000: 102).

The cognitive processes leading to this knowledge building have been mediated by language and socially co-constructed through dialogue. Their interaction is not only communicative activity, but also cognitive one. In their dialogue we can see the processes that lead them from their original state of TL knowledge, ‘des nouveaux menaces’, to the final one, ‘des nouvelles menaces’. We can thus follow L2 development. We see in this excerpt of interaction language learning co-occurring with language use.

In sum, Rachel and Sophie engage in collaborative dialogue as they jointly use language for both communicative and cognitive purposes. Through collaborative dialogue they co-construct TL knowledge, providing us with a window to observe what, in an individual activity, would have remained hidden.

In the next example three different speakers, American students of French as a FL, collaborate on the planning of a presentation they are going to perform one week later in front of their classmates. They help each other to prepare the language structures they anticipate will be needed to carry out their oral presentation.

This excerpt of interaction belongs to the data collected by Donato (1994) in a study that attempts to “answer the question of whether learners can exert a developmental influence on each other’s interlanguage system in observable ways”
With this objective in mind, Donato (1994) examines learners’ oral interaction in collaborative planning tasks looking for evidence of scaffolding. The concept of scaffolding, original of cognitive psychology and L1 research (Wood et al., 1976; Greenfield, 1984), is defined by Donato as a situation where “in social interaction a knowledgeable participant can create, by means of speech, supportive conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend, current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence” (Donato, 1994: 40). From a sociocultural approach, Donato, following Wertsch (1979a), argues that scaffolding can be seen as “a dialogically constituted interpsychological mechanism that promotes the novice’s internalization of knowledge co-constructed in shared activity” (Donato, 1994: 41). Swain (1997) includes this excerpt as evidence of collaborative dialogue occurring in learners’ classroom interaction.

EXAMPLE 1.15:

1 Speaker 1: …and then I’ll say… tu as souvenu notre anniversaire de marriage… or should I say mon anniversaire?
2 Speaker 2: Tu as…
3 Speaker 3: Tu as…
4 Speaker 1: Tu as souvenu...“you remembered?”
5 Speaker 3: Yea, but isn’t that reflexive? Tu t’as…
6 Speaker 1: Ah, tu t’as souvenu.
7 Speaker 2: Oh, it’s tu es
8 Speaker 1: Tu es
9 Speaker 3: Tu es, tu es, tu…
10 Speaker 1: T’es, tu t’es
11 Speaker 3: Tu t’es
12 Speaker 1: Tu t’es souvenu.

In turn 1 Speaker 1 attempts to render into French the message ‘you remembered our wedding anniversary’. For this purpose the compound past form of the French verb ‘(se) souvenir’ –in English ‘to remember’, needs to be used. Donato (1994: 44) points out that the formation of this verbal form requires a rather complex cognitive process. The learner needs first to identify that ‘souvenir’ is a reflexive verb, i.e. ‘se souvenir’; to choose the auxiliary ‘être’ instead of ‘avoir’, because of the reflexive nature of the verb; to select the correct reflexive pronoun for the subject, here ‘te’ or ‘t’ if followed by a vowel; to form the past participle of the irregular verb ‘se souvenir’, i.e. ‘souvenu’; and finally to decide whether this past participle needs to agree with the subject and, if so, how it should be marked. Here no agreement is needed and therefore the correct form of Speaker 1’s initial utterance should be ‘tu t’es souvenu’.

In this interactional excerpt we can see how this cognitive process is carried out by the three different speakers working in collaboration. Each of them possesses part of the linguistic knowledge necessary for the correct rendering of the message, but none of them seems to be able to do it alone. Working together, however, they are able to create the correct TL expression they would not have been able to produce if they prepared the task independently.

In turn 1 Speaker 1 makes a first attempt to construct the compound past form of the verb ‘souvenir’. Although their two interlocutors recognize its meaning, they question the grammatical accuracy of the resulting expression, and the three of them decide to work together to achieve a correct version of this original utterance. In turn 5 Speaker 3 points out that ‘souvenir’ is a reflexive verb and that therefore it needs a reflexive pronoun: ‘tu t’as’. This is acknowledged by the first speaker that modifies the original output to incorporate the reflexive pronoun: ‘tu t’as souvenu’ – cf. turn 6. Speaker 2 recognizes then the error in the choice of the auxiliary. In turn 7 Speaker 2 proposes to use the verb ‘être’ instead of ‘avoir’: ‘it’s tu es’. In turn 8 Speaker 1 acknowledges the verb ‘être’ as the correct auxiliary, ‘tu es’; in turn 10 uses the correct auxiliary with the correct reflexive pronoun, ‘t’es, tu t’es’; and in turn 12 becomes able to produce the correct TL form ‘tu t’es souvenu’.

This final expression has been co-constructed by the three speakers. Speaker 1’s initial utterance offers an object to reflect on. Identifying the problems existing in this utterance, all the speakers decide to collaborate in their solution. Through language use they co-construct the cognitive processing required to achieve a final accurate expression. This social cognitive activity is enacted in their dialogue and therefore directly observable for the researcher. We see in this interactional excerpt the cognitive steps followed to reach the final utterance and how the three interlocutors have helped each other; in Donato’s words, how they have been “able to construct collectively a scaffold for each other’s performance” (Donato, 1994: 45).

The final utterance is correct TL, performance that outstrips the three learners’ individual competencies. But it represents also new TL knowledge built through
dialogue, that is, through a social cognitive process enacted in dialogue. Language, both
the L1 and the L2, have been used to co-construct new TL and aid L2 development. 31

Previous research yielded evidence of how experts provide linguistic help to
novices in interaction, for instance, teachers to students (Wong-Fillmore, 1985) or NSs
to NNSs (Hatch, 1978b). But Donato’s (1994) study shows that learners can also be
considered as a source of knowledge. In the previous dialogue the three learners are
novices as individuals, but experts together. Donato concludes that “learners are capable
of providing guided support to their peers during collaborative L2 interactions in ways
analogous to expert scaffolding documented in the development psychological
literature” (Donato, 1994: 51).

1.3.2.2. Collaborative dialogue and L2 lexical knowledge acquisition
Collaboration has been more frequently considered in relation to grammatical
development, but Swain and Lapkin (1998) have also found evidence of collaborative
dialogue promoting lexical knowledge acquisition. Arguing for an approach to
interaction where dialogue is viewed as both a means of communication and a cognitive
tool aiding L2 learning, Swain and Lapkin (1998) analyzed learners’ dialogue focusing
on what, in 1995, they had called language-related episodes – cf. Swain and Lapkin
(1995). These are defined as “any part of a dialogue where the students talk about the
language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or
others” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 326). These researchers distinguish between form-
based language-related episodes, when students’ attention is focused on spelling,
morphology, syntax or discourse; and lexis-based language-related episodes, which
involve learners seeking TL vocabulary or choosing among competitive vocabulary
items.

The data collected for the purposes of this study reflects student dyads’
interaction as they collaborate in the performance of a jigsaw task. Learners received a
set of pictures, and were asked to work out the story depicted in them and to write it out.
The class was focused on French reflexive verbs, but, as they carried out the task,

31 In the next section of the current chapter we will see that Donato (1994) has also found evidence that
the social cognitive processes evident in scaffolded performance and the TL they aid to co-construct are
internalized by learners and result in future independent correct TL production.
learners engaged also in lexis-based language-related episodes as the one presented in example 1.16.

In this excerpt of interaction we can see how, in producing output, Rick comes to realize that he lacks in his IL system the appropriate French word to make reference to a ‘pillow’. In order to solve this problem, he explicitly asks Kim for help: ‘how do you say “pillow”?’. Although Swain and Lapkin’s study is not focused on strategic communication, what we see here is an example of what CS research considers to be an appeal for assistance strategy.

EXAMPLE 1.16:
1 Rick:  *Et elle est encore au... au... uh... à l’autre bout du lit avec, avec ses pieds sur le... sur la... how do you say “pillow”?> (And she is already at the other end of the bed with, with her feet on the... on the... how do you say “pillow”?)
2 Kim:  *Oreiller.*
   (Pillow.)
3 Rick:  *Avec ses pieds sur l’oreiller.*
   (With her feet on the pillow.)

Kim offers the French word ‘oreiller’ as the correct TL lexical item to express the meaning ‘pillow’. This is accepted by Rick and incorporated to his initial utterance in turn 3. Rick has identified a hole in his IL knowledge, but has also worked to solve this problem, i.e. to convey his intended meaning despite the IL gap by using a CS and to fill the gap by asking for the appropriate TL word. Meaning is satisfactorily communicated in the initial turn, but the two learners go beyond trying to co-construct correct TL to express this meaning. The result, in turn 3, is Rick’s modification of his initial output and the production of a lexically accurate and appropriate TL utterance. This performance outstrips Rick’s original competence. With Kim’s help Rick has become able to build correct TL and new lexical knowledge.

In Donato’s (1994) example we saw learners helping each other, here we see one learner, Kim, helping another one, Rick. But this, too, is knowledge building dialogue. As Swain points out, collaborative dialogue occurs whenever “through their joint effort, one or both participants move beyond their current cognitive or linguistic state” (Swain, 1997: 127). These two participants may be two learners, two NSs or a learner and a NS.

Learning, however, is not a one-time shift from ignorance to knowledge and, quite often, it requires reinforcement. As Swain and Lapkin explain it, “learning is cumulative, emergent, and ongoing, sometimes occurring in leaps, while at other times
it is imperceptible” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 321). In the following extract of interaction Rick and Kim’s attention focuses again on the TL word ‘oreiller’. Rick is thus given an additional opportunity to check his correct comprehension of the meaning of this word, to reflect on it and to add it to his IL system. In a post-test carried out two weeks afterwards Rick picks up the item ‘oreiller’ as the correct word for ‘pillow’ among four different choices. That is, Rick shows to have learned the L2 lexical item ‘oreiller’ through collaborative dialogue.

EXAMPLE 1.17:
1 Kim: Quelque chose uh … est sur l’… quelque chose est sur l’oreiller.
   (Something… is on the… something is on the pillow.)
2 Rick: Is that l’oreiller? (Pointing to something in the picture.)
   (Is that the pillow?)
3 Kim: No, this is l’oreiller.
   (No, this is the pillow.)
4 Rick: Pillow?
5 Kim: Yeah, pillow’s oreiller.

The final excerpt of interaction we are going to discuss comes also from the data collected in Swain and Lapkin’s (1998) study. Here the same two previous learners, Rick and Kim, engage in a language-related episode as they choose between two competing French vocabulary items: ‘s’en aller’ and ‘marcher’.

In order to express the notion of walking to school Rick proposes to use the French verb ‘s’en aller’, but Kim suggests substituting it for ‘marcher’. The two learners agree on the second option, ‘marcher’, and they use this form in their collaborative writing of the story. However, the second alternative is a direct transfer from the English verb ‘to walk’ and is not the correct French form. A French NS would have used in this context the verb ‘s’en aller’.

EXAMPLE 1.18:
1 Kim: [Elle voit un] gars
   (She sees a guy)
2 Rick: … gars, qui s’en va à l’école
   (guy, who is going to school)
3 Kim: qui marche vers l’ école… marche
   (who is walking towards school, walking)

Rick’s initial utterance poses a problem, i.e. the need to choose between ‘s’en aller’ and ‘marcher’. Rick and Kim collaborate to solve this problem agreeing to select the second form, ‘marcher’, as the accurate means of expression to convey their intended message. The initial utterance is modified and a new TL expression is co-
constructed with the collaborative effort of the two learners. This modified output represents the two learners’ current state of IL development. But in this process Rick and Kim reach a wrong solution. They co-construct wrong TL knowledge.

This kind of interaction gives rise to an important pedagogical issue. As Swain and Lapkin (1998: 333) indicate, in collaborative tasks some kind of teacher feedback is needed. Without it students may learn the wrong grammatical structure or lexical item. This means that, although collaborative dialogue seems to have an important learning potential to be profited from in the FL classroom, the teacher has also a significant role to play in the process of L2 development through learner-learner interaction.

1.3.3. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON SLA FROM A SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE: RESEARCH AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The value of collaborative dialogue for both the research and the teaching practice is based on two major claims: firstly, the social construction of language and language knowledge is mediated by language, enacted in learner’s dialogue and thus directly observable for the researcher; and, secondly, collective cognitive processes and the linguistic knowledge these processes build are internalized by the learner and transformed into individual mental resources for future independent TL use. Empirical research on SLA carried out from the perspective of the sociocultural theory of mind has provided evidence that supports these two claims and Swain’s (1997, 2000) theoretical perspective on interaction and SLA.

The examples of collaborative dialogue so far discussed show that learners use language as a mediating tool to perform problem-solving cognitive processes and that, when these processes are socially co-constructed through interaction, learners’ dialogue constitutes an enactment of cognitive activity. These examples, as already mentioned, come from Donato (1994), Kowal and Swain (1997) and Swain and Lapkin (1998) –some of them have also been included in Swain’s (1997, 2000) theoretical approaches to the concept of collaborative dialogue. However, there are other research projects carried out from a sociocultural perspective that also demonstrate that when language learners solve problems “through dialogic interaction with another person”, this interaction offers “a window into intramental processing” (Goss, Ying-Hua and Lantolf, 1994: 267).
Goss et al. (1994) examined learners’ grammatical judgments in an aim to identify what kind of cognitive processes they represent. Instead of relying on introspective data or think aloud protocols, as had been done in most previous similar research, these scholars asked learners’ dyads to decide jointly on the grammaticality of a set of sentences. The dialogue they engaged in proved to be an enactment of their cognitive processing, which involved language mediated activities, such as making translations or making explicit their metaknowledge through language use. That is, analyzing the dialogic interaction of learners in this kind of collaborative problem-solving task, Goss et al. (1994) were able to observe the cognitive processes that led these learners to decide on the grammaticality of the sentences proposed. Furthermore, they also found similar response patterns when the task was accomplished by dyads and by individuals working alone. These results suggest that the mental processes observable in joint activity are similar to those at work in individual cognitive activity.

Goss et al.’s (1994) study does not only provide additional evidence on collaborative dialogue as an enactment of cognitive processes, it also directly suggests that this kind of dialogue could and should be used as a research tool. It seems to offer a more direct source of mental data than introspective techniques.\footnote{The problems and limitations of introspective techniques have been widely discussed in the field of SLA research. This issue will also be treated in more detail in Chapter Three of the present study. For a discussion of the problems existing for observing mental processes related to SLA the reader can also see Donato and Lantolf (1990).} In Swain and Lapkin’s own words collaborative dialogue offers “a window into intramental processing … more transparent than the window provided through introspective techniques” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 322). A similar claim is also made in Donato and Lantolf (1990), Donato (1994) and Swain (1997, 2000).

These scholars do not deny the value of introspective techniques. In fact, Swain and Lapkin explicitly ask for research combining the analysis of collaborative dialogue with retrospective data obtained through follow-up interviews, arguing that this may provide “a more fine-grained understanding of … mental processes” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 333). Collaborative dialogue is rather posited as an additional and complementary tool for the study of mental processes.

The second claim concerns the issue of whether the dialogically constituted cognitive processes evident in learners’ interaction aid or favor L2 learning, i.e. whether...
collaborative dialogue constitutes an occasion for L2 learning leading to future independent L2 performance. Evidence directly supporting this claim was found in at least four different empirical research projects previous to Swain’s (2000) theoretical account of collaborative dialogue and its role in SLA: Holunga (1994), LaPierre (1994), and the already mentioned Donato (1994) and Swain and Lapkin (1998).

As Swain (2000: 110) explains, the role of language mediating learning is generally accepted in other educational domains such as mathematics, science or history— for some empirical research on this issue see Talyzina (1981) or Newman et al. (1989). However, the role of language mediating language learning seems to be less well understood. She argues that maybe this is so because in L2 development language is both the vehicle and the product of learning. Its function as a mediating tool is subsequently more difficult to conceptualize and also less clear to observe.

In this line, Holunga (1994) designed a study on the relationship between metacognitive strategy instruction and oral accuracy of verb forms that explicitly tested the role of language mediating strategy use and its effects on grammatical development. Holunga compared the performance of three different groups of students as they carried out a communicative task in pairs: a group who had not been instructed in strategy use; a second group who had received instruction on metacognitive strategies, such as predicting, planning, monitoring, and evaluating; and a third group who had received the same instruction and was also asked to verbalize their strategy use as they performed the communicative task at hand.

Analyzing learners’ interactions during this task Holunga (1994) found that the dialogue of the second group of students was typical of negotiation of meaning tasks, i.e. it was focused on meaning rather than on form. However, the talk of the third group displayed attention to both content and form. These learners externalized hypotheses, tested them and reached reasoned solutions. They pointed out each others’ errors, provided explanations for their inaccuracies and modified their output whenever necessary. They did not only verbalize the verb form they needed, but also why they needed this form and not other. In general, their dialogue reveals that they predicted, planned, monitored and evaluated their use of verb forms. These strategic processes were co-constructed in interaction and mediated by language. Language was the focus of their attention and the means by which they performed the task.
Holunga also asked her students to carry out a pre- and a post-test on verb forms. The results of these tests reveal that students who had received instruction on metacognitive strategies made significant gains on the accuracy of verb forms when compared to those who had no strategic instruction. But Holunga also found out that dyads who verbalized their strategy use performed considerably better and improved more than those who had not. On this basis she concluded that verbalization, i.e. external speech, mediated not only task performance but also language learning. Learners’ verbalization of strategy use, i.e. the act of talking about what they were doing, aided them to co-construct correct grammatical verb forms and to internalize this co-constructed knowledge. Their dialogue was language learning mediated by language use.

We have already explained the main goal of Donato’s (1994) study and the methodology employed to achieve it –cf. current chapter, p. 109-110. This methodology allowed him to test actual learning occurring in scaffolded performance where both the L1 and the L2 are used as a cognitive tool to co-construct language and linguistic knowledge. Donato related learners’ individual performance in an oral presentation task to the scaffolding situations occurring in a previous collaborative preparation of this presentation. He identified 32 cases of scaffolding in the planning session. 75% of the language structures co-constructed in these scaffolds were used correctly and independently in the presentation that took place one week afterwards. This allowed him to conclude that, as suggested in the sociocultural theory of mind theory, “L2 development is brought about on the social plane”. That is, “social interactions in the classroom result in the appropriation of linguistic knowledge by the individual” and therefore we can assert that “learners can exert a developmental influence on each other’s interlanguage system in observable ways” (Donato, 1994: 39).

In LaPierre’s (1994) study, learners were engaged in a dictogloss or story reconstruction task similar to the one used by Kowal and Swain (1997) –cf. present chapter, p. 107. This researcher examined language-related episodes that occurred as dyads of learners tried to solve the problems encountered in the writing of a previously heard story. LaPierre’s (1994) final aim was to test the hypothesis that when L2 learners need to talk about the language they are producing in order to perform a task, their metatalk may be a source of L2 learning. With this objective in mind, the researcher
designed a dyad-specific post-test that included those language items that had been the object of previous language-related episodes. The results of the post-test, administered one week after the performance of the first task, reveal that, for the 140 episodes where a correct solution to a linguistic problem had been attained through collaborative dialogue, 80% of the related post-test items were correct. Similarly, when students had co-constructed an incorrect solution to their difficulties, their performance in the post-test matched this incorrect solution in approximately 70% of the items. That is, the co-constructed knowledge, whether correct or incorrect, tended to be retained by the learners. In sum, conscious reflection on language through collaborative dialogue proved to be an occasion for L2 learning.

Swain and Lapkin’s (1998) study is similar to LaPierre’s (1994), although these two scholars used both pre- and post-tests. As already explained, they focused their attention on both form-based and lexis-based language-related episodes occurring as dyads of learners performed a jigsaw task where they had to reconstruct in writing the story depicted in a set of pictures—for a more detailed account of the design of this study, conducted in a classroom context, see current chapter, p. 112.

They found, first, striking differences between dyads in their performance of the task. Whereas some students engaged relatively often in language-related episodes, others seemed to focus almost exclusively on meaning and not to care about grammatical or lexical accuracy. That is, different pairs of students interpreted the same task in different ways. This is not surprising, since Coughlan and Duff (1994) had already shown that the “same task” is not the “same task” for different students.

Swain and Lapkin selected the performance of one pair of learners, Rick and Kim, to carry out their analyses. These yielded evidence of dialogue as an enactment of mental processes and occasions for L2 learning. Rick and Kim used language as a means of communication and as a cognitive tool. When in face of a problem, language was used to solve it, i.e. to co-construct the language required to express their intended meaning with grammatical and lexical accuracy. Through language use, both L2 and L1, they consciously singled out the L2 as an object of reflection and manipulation, generated alternatives and hypotheses, assessed or tested them, and applied the resulting knowledge to the solution of the problems encountered. These socially co-constructed cognitive processes, mediated by language, were manifest in their dialogue. Their
outcome was co-constructed language and co-constructed language knowledge evident in their modifications of initially erroneous output, i.e. in linguistic change. In the post-test these learners showed to have retained the correct and the incorrect knowledge they had co-constructed in language-related episodes. Their collaborative dialogue, i.e. their use of language as communication and cognitive activity, served both as a tool to aid L2 learning and as a window for the researchers to observe actual learning taking place.

Taken all together, the results of these different research projects confirm that “language learning occurs in collaborative dialogue, and that this external speech facilitates the appropriation of both strategic processes and linguistic knowledge” (Swain, 2000: 113). This conclusion bears important research and pedagogical implications.

In order to achieve a full understanding of collaborative dialogue and its role in SLA it seems that, as claimed by Donato (1994) and Swain and Lapkin (1998), “the focus [in SLA] should be … on observing the construction of co-knowledge and how this co-construction process results in linguistic change among and within individuals during joint activity” (Donato, 1994: 39). This means that interactionist research needs tasks that encourage these types of processes. That is, since in communicative tasks “attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (Nunan, 1989: 10), more attention needs to be paid to collaborative tasks that, while still oriented to meaning communication, encourage learners to pay also conscious attention to language form in social interaction (Swain, 1997: 119).

Collaborative tasks, as the ones used for the study of language-related episodes and collaborative dialogue –cf. Kowal and Swain (1997), or Swain and Lapkin (1998)– can be considered communicative tasks too, in the sense that they engage two interlocutors in meaning communication activities. These tasks, however, require also a joint final product: a written text or an oral presentation. The need to produce a final written or oral text in the TL, with the highest possible degree of appropriateness and accuracy, is what encourages learners to focus not only on meaning but also on form, and to collaborate to create both meaning and TL structures.

From a pedagogical perspective, it seems that the use of collaborative tasks in the FL classroom can encourage learners to engage in a collaborative dialogue that has proved to be particularly helpful for their learning of strategic processes, and
grammatical and lexical aspects of the TL. In fact, the need to focus learners’ attention on both meaning and form, and the value of collaborative tasks to push learners’ conscious reflection on the language they use to communicate meaning are now widely recognized among researchers interested in pedagogical tasks –cf. Bygate, Skehan and Swain (2001).

In recent years, following Swain’s (2000) theoretical claims and proposals, a considerable amount of empirical studies have been conducted on collaborative dialogue –cf. among others Swain (2001), Swain and Lapkin (2001), Lapkin, Swain and Smith (2002), Lee (2004) or Leeser (2004). New insights are still required in order to clarify why, in the performance of the same task, some students engage more often in collaborative dialogue than others, why they do so in certain situations but not in others, or why this dialogue results often, but not always, in individual knowledge. The literature here reviewed suggests the need of further work to give answer to these still open issues, but also the suitability of more research carried out within this theoretical framework.
EMPIRICAL STUDY
CHAPTER 2

THE OBJECT OF STUDY:
CSs AND STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION
IN FACE-TO-FACE FL INTERACTION
The present study is prompted by an interest in understanding CSs and strategic communication in relation to L2 use and acquisition. This research project was introduced with a presentation of its context and main aims. It intends, firstly, to describe and explain how language learners and their interlocutors manage to communicate their messages in FL interaction despite their IL shortcomings i.e. when the desired TL items or structures to convey these messages are unavailable and a CS needs to be used. More particularly, the first objective of this project is to account for this strategic communication of meaning in face-to-face FL interaction as a collaborative activity, involving the joint action and mutual effort of both the learner and their native or non-native speaking interlocutor. In addition and as a second main objective, it will try to show that CS use and strategic communication may have an effect on the learner’s SLA process. We will try to find evidence that may show that, in strategic interaction, interlocutors collaborate not only to create meaning, but also to produce accurate TL forms to express this meaning and new TL knowledge for the FL learner.

In the preceding chapter, Chapter One, the theoretical background of this investigation was established. To achieve these two different but closely related aims, this study draws on three primary areas of knowledge: CS research, L1 communication studies and interactionist perspectives on SLA. Theoretical and empirical studies conducted in these three different fields of research have been reviewed, paying special attention to those theoretical models that, we believe, can contribute to the understanding of strategic interaction.

Here the empirical study is introduced. This chapter intends to clarify the objectives of the research by delimiting the object of study and the perspective from which it is going to be approached. It will thus define what it is that we are going to study and how: what we consider to be a CS, what aspects of CS use and strategic communication we are going to examine, and which units and frameworks of analysis will be used for the purpose of characterizing and explaining strategic communication of meaning in FL interaction.

A detailed survey of research on CSs revealed that the study of this phenomenon has been undertaken from two different and sometimes even opposed perspectives: the interactional and the psycholinguistic. The divergence between these two approaches
permeates both theoretical and empirical accounts of CSs. There is no agreement among researchers on the definition of the concept of CS, the criteria to be used in order to identify and classify these strategies, and the methodological framework to be adopted for their study. It seems thus that, for a rigorous analysis of CSs to be conducted, the researcher needs first to clarify their position on two interrelated issues: the theoretical position taken for the study of CSs and their understanding of the CS concept. This explains why we have considered it necessary to devote one single, although brief, chapter to the issue of the definition and description of our object of study: CSs and strategic communication.

Since the main interest of this investigation is in the communicative function of CSs in face-to-face FL interaction, we will here concentrate on the interactional nature of these strategies. This means that, within the controversy existing between interactionist and psycholinguistic researchers, we place ourselves on the interactional side. In this study, the conceptualization and the analysis of CSs are going to be surveyed from a clear interactional perspective.

Psycholinguistic research has provided enlightening insights on the individual and mental processes learners engage in when facing a linguistic deficit in their IL system. It has thus been able to explain how learners overcome linguistic problems in the speech production phase of communication, the resources they draw on and the factors that affect their strategic language use. However, it has not successfully explained how communication of meaning is achieved in face-to-face oral interaction, where at least two different interlocutors are involved in an ongoing, socially situated and collective meaning creation process. In other words, communication of meaning involves more than a speech production process and psycholinguistic research, by focusing exclusively on the FL learner’s mental actions fails, inevitably, to capture the whole complexity of strategic communication.

Interactional researchers, examining the study of CSs as elements of the interaction taking place between the learner and their interlocutor, have conceived communicative problems as mutually shared problems and their solution as the joint responsibility of all the interactional participants. They have thus attempted to integrate the interlocutor in their definitions and accounts of strategic communication and to offer, in this way, a more comprehensive framework for the analysis of CSs.
For the specific purposes of the present study we will build on Tarone’s (1981) definition and description of CSs –cf. Chapter One, pp. 24-26. We believe that strategic communication involves “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981: 288) and that CSs need to be seen as interactional tools that language learners and their interlocutors use for the purpose of building this mutual agreement on meaning.

In Chapter One, section 1.1.1, we have also seen that Tarone settled a set of conditions in order to distinguish CSs from other related phenomena, such as learning or production strategies. According to this scholar, CSs are characterized by the following criteria:

1. a speaker desires to communicate meaning x to a listener;
2. the speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning x is unavailable, or is not shared with the listener; thus
3. the speaker chooses to
   a) avoid – not attempt to communicate meaning x –or
   b) attempt alternate means to communicate meaning x. The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning

(Tarone, 1981: 288)

Although Tarone says that CSs are related to a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning, her description of CSs is clearly centered on the speaker. This view has thus been criticized on the grounds that it fails to account for the role of the interlocutor in the use of CSs –cf. Cook (1993).

We believe that these criticisms arise, in part, from the confusion existing in this field of research between the concepts of CS and strategic communication. In our view, strategic communication is understood as the overall process of communicating meaning in the lack of the desired TL item or structure, and CSs as tools or instruments used in this process. In other words, CSs are a necessary part of strategic communication, but this involves much more than the use of a CS. Strategic communication involves the utterance of a CS, the understanding of this CS, the establishment of a mutual agreement on its meaning and, if comprehensibility problems occur within this process, the joint negotiation for meaning.

CSs can thus be identified and even described by looking only at the speaker’s strategic use of the language. But in order to understand the interactional function of CSs and how communication of meaning is achieved through CS use, attention needs to
be paid to the joint actions of speaker and addressee, i.e. to strategic communication understood as a mutual effort of two interlocutors to agree on meaning.

This explains that most previous research, focused on the FL learner’s utterances and mental processes, has provided many insights on the cognitive and linguistic nature of CSs. Nevertheless, as also argued in the introduction, it has not been able to account for the role of CSs in the strategic communication process and how communication of meaning is actually achieved.

We consider, however, that an interactional definition of CSs should certainly acknowledge a more active role in the interlocutor’s part. On this basis and building on Tarone’s (1981) description, we have elaborated our own working definition of CSs. This theoretical account of the concept of CS intends to clarify the object of study of the present investigation and also to serve as a guide for the identification of CS uses in FL interaction, as a first step in the analysis and description of strategic communication.

We consider that a CS is used in face-to-face FL interaction when:

1. The learner desires to communicate an intended meaning to the interlocutor.
2. The learner (and his/her interlocutor) believes the lexical item desired to communicate this meaning is unavailable or is not shared with his/her interlocutor.
3. The learner (and his/her interlocutor) chooses to
   (a) avoid, that is, the learner does not attempt to communicate the intended meaning, or
   (b) try out an alternative means of expression to communicate the intended meaning.

The first two conditions establish CSs as problem-solving techniques. CSs are used as tools in order to overcome the problem that arises when, in an attempt to communicate meaning in face-to-face oral interaction, the TL lexical item originally desired to convey this meaning cannot be used.

Notice that, as explained in the introduction chapter, in FL interaction learners may face a wide variety of communicative difficulties directly resulting from their inadequate command of the TL. They generally need more time than a NS in order to produce an utterance and they also encounter relatively frequent comprehensibility difficulties. To overcome these problems they use production or conversational
strategies, such as fillers or repetitions, that allow them to gain time; and negotiation of meaning strategies, such as confirmation checks or clarification requests. These different phenomena occur, relatively often, in combination with CSs, but they cannot be considered as CSs in themselves. They have thus been left out of the definition of CSs; although, in the analysis of strategic interaction, we will see that, quite often, they are part of the overall strategic communication of meaning process.

The second condition makes it explicit, in line with Tarone (1981), that lexical difficulties may be the result of a learner's or an interlocutor's deficit in their IL system. Sometimes a learner is unable to make use of a desired word or expression because it has not yet been acquired. That is, the desired TL item is not ready for use because of a learner's IL gap. On other occasions, this item is part of the learner's IL system but, because of the time pressure of ongoing interaction, it cannot be retrieved at a specific moment, i.e. it is unavailable because of a recall difficulty. In face-to-face interaction, it may also happen that this TL item is accessible in the speaker's IL system, but it cannot be used in order to establish an agreement on meaning with their interlocutor because it is not yet part of the latter's knowledge of the TL, i.e. because it is not shared with the interlocutor. We believe that these three different sources of difficulty pose the same kind of problem and, subsequently, elicit the same kind of strategic behavior.

In her description of CSs Tarone makes reference to linguistic and sociolinguistic difficulties, but in the definition here proposed the scope of CSs has been limited to lexical problems. This does not mean, however, that we consider that CSs need to be necessarily related to lexical difficulties. Like most previous researchers in the field we defend that CSs can also be used to deal with communicative problems resulting from phonological, syntactical or pragmatic deficits in the FL learner's IL system. However, the present investigation is going to be restricted to the study of lexical difficulties and, subsequently, the working definition of CSs has been devised to meet this lexical restriction.

The scope of the investigation needs to be somehow narrowed down. It is not possible to deal, within the limits of this kind of research project, with every sort of linguistic and sociolinguistic difficulty a learner may face in FL interaction. We have
decided to limit the scope of our research by focusing on lexical CSs, in part, because lexis seems to play a central role in communication. As Poulisse et al. pointed out “without knowledge of (at least a few of) the words of a language it is impossible to communicate in it, however large one’s knowledge of the grammar of that language may be” (Poulisse et al., 1990: 12). Other researchers have also argued that, in general, lexical CSs are used more often than other kinds of CSs, not only in FL interactions but also in L1 communication –cf. Kellerman (1991), Kasper and Kellerman (1997) or Dörnyei and Kormos (1998). We postulate, on these grounds, that their study can offer more relevant insights for our understanding of FL communication.

On the other hand, Chapter One, section 1.1, has clearly shown that most previous research adopted a similar focus. Lexical CSs have received much more attention in the field of SLA research that any other form of CSs and, consequently, their study is highly developed. This project intends to build on these previous investigations. We plan to study strategic communication analyzing FL learners’ interactions as well as their retrospective comments on these interactions. Such a methodological framework seems to benefit from a focus on lexis. Some researchers have found that learners are able to provide more extensive comments on the lexical problems they encounter and the strategies they use to solve them than on grammatical or phonological difficulties (Glahn, 1980; Poulisse et al., 1990). These latter forms of communicative difficulties certainly deserve attention in the field of SLA, but taking into account the current state of the research we consider that a particular emphasis on lexical problems is more advantageous for the specific purposes of the present study.

In this working definition CSs are described as problem-solving devices, but they are also conceptualized as conscious strategies. In this sense we disagree with Tarone (1981) who rejected the consciousness criterion –cf. Chapter One, p. 25. We believe that for a CS to be used, the learner, and possibly the interlocutor as well, need to “believe”, that is, to be somehow aware, that a lexical problem has been encountered. In other words, we think, like Færch and Kasper (1983b), that problematicity always implies a certain degree of consciousness –cf. Chapter One, p. 27. A communicative problem is experienced when one or both of the interlocutors become more or less

Note that the expression ‘lexical CSs’ is used to make reference to CSs used to solve lexical difficulties, not to the nature of the CS itself.
conscious—understanding consciousness as a gradual phenomenon—that a difficulty has arisen in their attempt to reach a communicative goal.

In fact, as seen in Chapter One, section 1.1.1, problematicality and consciousness have been the two most commonly used criteria in previous definitions of CSs. Consciousness has played a major role in CS research. It implies that learners are aware of problems and can, therefore, report on them and on the strategies they use to solve them. Retrospective comments elicited from the learner on their FL performance have made it possible to distinguish CS uses from other related IL phenomena that may have a similar surface realization in interaction. Non-target-like utterances can reveal an automatic application of an erroneous IL rule or the use of a CS. Code switching, for instance, occurs relatively often in FL learners’ speech. Sometimes it is used subconsciously. It can also be employed as a conscious social strategy, for instance to assert identity or to establish a closer rapport with the interlocutor. It may be finally used as a CS to compensate for what the learner believes to be the unavailability of a TL lexical item or structure. In order to distinguish these three different kinds of phenomena the researcher needs, relatively often, to rely on introspective data provided by the speakers themselves.

As explained above, from an interactional approach problems arising in FL communication are mutually shared problems. In interaction speaker and interlocutor share a common goal, i.e. the successful communication of meaning. Any lexical difficulty encountered in the attempt to achieve this goal is, subsequently, mutually shared. This does not mean, however, that both the speaker and the interlocutor need to be aware of the problem and of the use of a CS to solve it. The speaker is always the one originally experiencing the problem and they may raise their interlocutor’s awareness on this problem or not. That is, the interlocutor may collaborate to establish a mutual agreement on meaning without being conscious that the TL structures used to convey this meaning are not the speaker’s originally intended ones.

In Chapter One, section 1.2., when reviewing the different types of CSs available, we could observe that most of them result in erroneous or non-target-like uses of the FL. The use, for instance, of a word coinage, a transfer or a wordy extended description instead of the appropriate and accurate TL term generally reveal that the learner is experiencing some kind of lexical difficulty and is making use of an
alternative means of expression. Explicit statements, such as ‘I don’t know how to say this’; direct appeals for assistance, such as ‘how do you say this?’; or problem indicators, such as an overuse of pauses, fillers, repetitions, lengthening devices or hedges, like ‘a kind of’, also act as a signal for the interlocutor suggesting that the speaker is confronting a linguistic problem – cf. Wagner and Firth (1997). Some interactionist scholars, such as Wagner and Firth (1997), argue that only when the learner signals to their interlocutor that a lexical difficulty has been encountered by means of one of these flagging devices and the interlocutor responds to it, can the researcher consider that a CS is being used: “an interactional approach defines instances of talk as CS if, and only if, the participants themselves make it public in the talk itself an encoding-related problem and by so doing engage – individually or conjointly – in attempts to resolve the problem” (Wagner and Firth, 1997: 325-326).

However, other researchers have provided data suggesting that, under certain conditions, speakers may try to conceal their lexical deficits, and that some learners, in particular advanced level students, are sometimes able to hide the strategic nature of their utterances from their interlocutors – cf. Færch and Kasper (1984). On this basis we believe, as mentioned above, that CSs can in certain situations be used without the interlocutor’s awareness. This explains the inclusion of the interlocutor within parentheses in our working definition of CSs: “the learner (and his/her interlocutor) believes the lexical item desired to communicate this meaning is unavailable or is not shared with his/her interlocutor”.

The third criterion or condition in this description of CSs draws a clear distinction between two main types of strategies: avoidance and achievement. Following Tarone (1981) we consider that, when a lexical problem occurs in FL communication, speakers and interlocutors have two main options: to circumvent the lexical deficit that caused this problem by avoiding the meaning they originally intended to communicate, or to compensate for the unavailable TL lexical item using an alternative means of expression.

Furthermore, we believe that, in face-to-face FL interaction, this can be accomplished by the speaker alone, or by the speaker working with the interlocutor; thus again the use of parentheses: “the learner (and his/her interlocutor) chooses to avoid, that is to say, the learner does not attempt to communicate the intended meaning,
or try out an alternative means of expression to communicate the intended meaning”. In most previous research it has been assumed that the speaker originally experiencing the problem is the one who develops and presents a CS to solve it. We maintain, however, that in interaction the interlocutor can also have an active participation in this process. The interlocutor may infer, from the linguistic and social context of the communicative exchange, the meaning the learner is trying to convey and offer a CS to express it. It is also possible that an alternative means of expression, such as a description, becomes co-constructed by the learner and the interlocutor; or that each of the two interactants offers different but complementary CSs to convey one single meaning.

Finally, we have omitted from Tarone’s original description of CSs her claim that “the speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning”. This condition seems to imply that all achievement CSs result in the successful communication of the originally intended message. Previous research has, however, revealed that some CSs are more effective than others and that an agreement on meaning is not always reached when the lexical structures desired to convey this meaning are not available or not shared –cf. Chapter One, pp. 61-62.

The criteria established in this working definition of CSs delimit our object of study and will guide our investigation: the kind of data we are going to examine, the analyses we are going to conduct and the conclusions we will draw. In Chapter Four, we will analyze the samples of face-to-face FL interaction elicited for the purposes of the research with the aim of identifying CS instances. An element of the interaction will be considered a CS and under the scope of our study if, and only if, it fulfills the three conditions of our working definition. In the following chapters of the data analysis, Chapter Five and Chapter Six, attention will be paid not only to the CS but also to the interlocutor’s response to this strategy. This means that attention will be focused on the whole strategic communication process and on the use of the previously identified CSs as part of a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on meaning. In this way we expect to be able to account for strategic communication of meaning in face-to-face FL interaction as a collaborative activity involving the joint actions and efforts of all the interactional participants.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD
The current chapter is devoted to the methodology employed for the collection of the data that will be analyzed in the present investigation. We describe here the experiment set up for the elicitation of the data and the procedures followed.

In the first section we talk about the participants who collaborated in our project. We explain the method applied to select our final sample of subjects from all the students who volunteered to take part in our experiments.

In the next section we discuss the data collection instruments. The first involves a spot-the-difference task specifically designed to elicit interactional information that could be considered as representative as possible of naturally occurring interactions, and at the same time suitable for analytical purposes, i.e. with a certain degree of researcher’s control. Following most previous research on CSs, we intend to support the study of learners’ language with retrospective data, more specifically, with learners’ retrospective comments on the particular uses of language being analyzed. For this purpose we developed a post-interview activity.

The final design of these two data collection tasks, as described in section 3.2, is the result of an initial pilot experience. In the next part of the chapter we explain the procedures followed to carry out both this piloting and the main experiment. We discuss the problems encountered during the first trial experience, and how certain modifications incorporated into the original design of the experiment allowed us to compensate for them in the actual data collection process. We conclude this account with a general assessment of the experiment and of the nature of the data obtained.

In the final section of this chapter we describe the system and procedures followed for the transcription of the samples of interaction elicited. We also explain how we decided to present the language data collected in this work.

### 3.1. SUBJECTS

In the introduction to the present study we pointed out our intention to analyze FL interactions involving English language learners with two different proficiency levels, working in dyads with other learners of the same level or with NSs. We also explained that this work was to be conducted in the context of the University of Santiago de Compostela. Therefore, our non-native speaking participants were, at the moment of the data collection, undergraduate and graduate students of the English language and
literature courses offered by this university. The undergraduate courses were part of the English Philology B.A. degree and the graduate ones of the English Philology Ph.D. program. The English NSs were international students who were taking Spanish language courses at the Modern Languages Center of this university.

For the purposes of our research, it was necessary to obtain language data from a representative amount of participants that could guarantee the generalizability of our results. Moreover, in order to carry out the qualitative analyses required to accomplish the specific objectives of this study, our sample of participants could not be too large. On this basis we decided to analyze interactional data obtained from a total of thirty-two participants: twenty-four learners of English as a FL and eight NSs.

Students from different undergraduate and graduate level courses volunteering to take part in this project were asked to take a placement test. For this end we administered to these students the *Oxford Placement Test* designed by Allen (1992). This quiz, included in Appendix A.1, has a multiple-choice format. It is a well-established and standardized instrument for proficiency level assessment and can be easily conducted with a considerable number of students. Like most tests of this nature, it is, however, mainly focused on written and listening skills, which do not always constitute a direct evidence of the learner’s oral production ability. It was not possible, within the limits of the present study, to carry out oral interviews with all the students who volunteered to participate in the test. We did, however, ask our participants to fill in a questionnaire in order to control certain variables that could have an influence on this issue, such as the university year they were in, stays in English speaking countries or contacts with NSs of the language.

We made a shortlist in which we included all those students who had obtained either a mid-intermediate or a mid-advanced level score in the Oxford Placement Test. In order to ensure as much homogeneity within our groups as possible, we tried to choose a final sample of twelve intermediate and twelve advanced level students who had achieved a similar test score, and who were taking courses at the same level and had had similar experiences with the English language. This was, however, not always feasible. A considerable percentage of the students who took the test obtained high-intermediate or low-advanced scores. These students had to be disregarded in order to
guarantee clear differences between our intermediate and advanced level groups and, as a result, this left us with a reduced number of volunteers.

Most of the intermediate subjects finally selected to participate in the project were taking first or second year courses and had had relatively little contact with the English language outside the academic context. But we had to include in this group five fourth year students. Advanced level learners were either last year undergraduate students, or graduate ones. Again, we had to resort to graduate students because we had not enough last year undergraduate volunteers with an advanced proficiency level. Most of them had spent relatively long stays in English speaking countries.

Because of the specific context in which our study was conducted, all our non-native speaking participants come from the same bilingual background. Some of them have Galician as their mother tongue and the others Spanish, but all of them share a native-like command of these two languages. Previous research compared Spanish L1 and Galician L1 learners of English as a FL without finding significant differences in terms of CS use –cf. Fernández Dobao (2001). The results of this previous investigation suggest that the shared native-like command of both the Spanish and the Galician language ensures the linguistic homogeneity of our students, at least for the purposes of strategic communication analysis.

The ages of these students range from 19 to 35 years old, although most of them are under 25. All these learners but one are female. Ideally, we would have selected an equal number of men and women. However, since most of the English language students at this university are females, not that many males volunteered to participate in our project. Our two groups of learners are therefore relatively homogeneous in terms of proficiency level and linguistic background, but not in terms of age or sex. We need, however, to say that none of these two variables has been found to have a significant influence on CS use in previous research. Therefore, these differences should not affect the data and the results of our research in a significant way.

The following table illustrates the personal profile of each of the English language learners selected to take part in the study. Each of these participants is here identified by a pseudonym in order to safeguard their personal identity.
TABLE 3.1. ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FIRST LANGUAGE</th>
<th>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY LEVEL ACCORDING TO THE OXFORD PLACEMENT TEST SCORE</th>
<th>YEAR AT UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>STAYS IN ENGLISH SPEAKING COUNTRIES AND CONTACTS WITH NATIVE SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amparo</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2nd year undergraduate student</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antía</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>Erasmus student for 1 year in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bárbara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1st year graduate student</td>
<td>2 months in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year graduate student</td>
<td>Erasmus student for 1 year in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1st year undergraduate student</td>
<td>1 month in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concha</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1st year undergraduate student</td>
<td>1 month in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>3 months in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>3 months in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>Erasmus student for 1 year in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2nd year undergraduate student</td>
<td>1 month in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>2 months in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
<td>2 weeks in U.S.A. Regular contact with English NSs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 When the L1 of the learner is Galician their L2 is Spanish, and vice versa, when the L1 is Spanish the L2 is Galician.
As already explained, the English NSs who took part in our project were international students at the University of Santiago de Compostela. They were enrolled in undergraduate programs and, following university programs, they were taking Spanish courses at the Modern Languages Center of this institution.

Given the context in which our work was conducted, all our English NSs had some knowledge of Spanish, i.e. of the learners’ L1 or L2. This may have encouraged our learners to make a more frequent use of L1-based strategies than they would have normally made if talking to interlocutors with no knowledge at all of Spanish. However, since the aim of our research is not to compare L1-based and L2-based CS use, we consider that this should not have a significant bearing on our data.

These participants were selected on a totally random basis among those who freely volunteered to collaborate in our research. They were all taking beginner or intermediate level Spanish courses and had been in Spain for less than a year, but they

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maruja</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1st year undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mónica</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student Erasmus student for 1 year in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovidio</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student 1 year in U.S.A. Regular contact with English NSs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1st year undergraduate student 3 months in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student 1 month in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student 1 month in England 5 months in U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofía</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student 4 months in U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toñi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student 4 years in U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>1st year undergraduate student 1 month in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verónica</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4th year undergraduate student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
come from different sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds, and differ in age and sex. The following table summarizes their personal profiles. Again our participants are here identified by a pseudonym.

**TABLE 3.2. ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FIRST LANGUAGE</th>
<th>SPANISH PROFICIENCY LEVEL</th>
<th>STAYS IN A SPANISH SPEAKING COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>American English</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>In Spain for 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Malaysian English</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>In Spain for 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>British English</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>In Spain for 3 months. Also in Spain for 6 months in 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>British English</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>In Spain for 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>British English</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>In Spain for 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>British English</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>In Spain for 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>British English</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>In Spain for 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>British English</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>In Spain for 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the sample of both native and non-native speaking students had been selected, they had to be paired in four different dyad conditions: intermediate-intermediate level learner, advanced-advanced level learner, intermediate learner-NS and advanced level learner-NS.

None of the participants was acquainted with the research study and we also tried to pair students who were not familiar with each other, since we believe this may have affected collaborative work and thus biased the data. Taking also into account the classroom schedule and time availability of each of our subjects, we established the dyads of participants as illustrated below.

---

35 The Spanish proficiency level is based on the course the participant is taking at the Modern Languages Center, i.e. either beginner or intermediate Spanish.


### TABLE 3.3. DYADS OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANCED LEVEL LEARNER &amp; ADVANCED LEVEL LEARNER</th>
<th>ADVANCED LEVEL LEARNER &amp; NATIVE SPEAKER</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE LEVEL LEARNER &amp; INTERMEDIATE LEVEL LEARNER</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE LEVEL LEARNER &amp; NATIVE SPEAKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antía &amp; Verónica</td>
<td>Bárbara &amp; Sean</td>
<td>Carla &amp; Lola</td>
<td>Amparo &amp; Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa &amp; Toñi</td>
<td>Carmen &amp; Stuart</td>
<td>Fernando &amp; Cristina</td>
<td>Carolina &amp; Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María &amp; Mónica</td>
<td>Isabel &amp; Mary</td>
<td>Sofía &amp; Concha</td>
<td>Paula &amp; Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia &amp; Ovidio</td>
<td>Raquel &amp; Anne</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Manuja</td>
<td>Sara &amp; Larry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these dyads was asked to perform the two data collection tasks. The samples of interaction obtained will be analyzed in subsequent chapters. It will therefore be necessary to make constant references to these dyads in order to identify the excerpts of interaction we are discussing. For this purpose we will allude to the TL command of each of the two participants and to the first letter of their names: ADV-ADV AV – advanced level learner Antía and advanced level learner Verónica, ADV-ADV LT, ADV-ADV MM, ADV-ADV SO, ADV-NS BS, ADV-NS CS, ADV-NS IM, ADV-NS RA, INT-INT CL, INT-INT FC, INT-INT SC, INT-INT VM, INT-NS AE, INT-NS CS, INT-NS PM and INT-NS SL. In this way the reader will be able to identify at every moment who is taking part in the interaction we are analyzing and which of the four different dyad conditions it represents.

### 3.2. MATERIALS

#### 3.2.1. LANGUAGE DATA COLLECTION TASK

In order to obtain valid language data for the purposes of CS analysis, SLA research has generally resorted to a task-based methodology. Empirical studies on CSs rely almost invariably on the use of pedagogical tasks specifically designed to pose frequent
linguistic difficulties to the FL learner and thus elicit the particular kind of strategic language use the researcher is interested in.

Following Færch, we can, however, distinguish in this previous research two different methodological approaches: “the empirical trap” and “straying around in the forest” (Færch, 1984: 49-50). Studies within the first approach have developed highly controlled elicitation instruments that force learners to make a constant use of CSs. These include concept identification tasks in which subjects have to name or describe a series of referents, usually presented as pictures, for which they are known to lack the appropriate TL item –cf. Paribakht (1982, 1985), Si-Qing (1990), Salomone and Marsal (1997), or Jourdain (2000). Psycholinguistic researchers have also asked learners to describe previously non-existent abstract shapes that have not been lexicalized in the TL –cf. Bongaerts et al. (1987), Bongaerts and Poulisse (1989), or Kellerman et al. (1990). These instruments provide the researcher with a considerable amount of objective and easily quantifiable data. They create, however, quite an unnatural communicative situation, and encourage the use of certain CSs, such as circumlocutions, allowing little or no opportunities at all for avoidance CSs.

Other researchers, aiming at studying CS use in a more natural linguistic context, have preferred to draw on photograph description or picture-story narration tasks36 –cf. Váradi (1973), Tarone (1977), Ervin (1979), Hyde (1982), Dechert (1983), Palmberg (1984), Ellis (1984), Marrie and Netten (1991), Anderson (1998), Gullberg (1998) or Wongsawang (2001). These instruments make it possible to elicit extended samples of unplanned IL discourse, while at the same time keeping a certain degree of control on the content. The researcher pre-selects the photographs or pictures taking into account the proficiency level of the learner. In this way they guarantee that linguistic problems are going to be encountered. They cannot, however, predict on what specific aspects of these images the learner is going to focus their attention and when or how they are going to try to communicate them, i.e. when a CS is going to be used. The data thus collected needs therefore to be always screened by the researcher in search for possible CS instances.

36 Typically, researchers have asked learners to describe a photograph or to narrate a story depicted in a series of pictures, but they have also used complex drawings to elicit descriptions and video materials to elicit narratives.
Some attempts have also been made to analyze CS use in unstructured conversations or interviews, where topics are introduced in a spontaneous way –cf. Haasrup and Phillipson (1983), Labarca and Khanji (1986), Khanji (1993), Liskin-Gasparro (1996), Pons Sanz (2001) or Herschensohn (2003). The samples of IL data obtained with these conversational tasks can be considered closer to naturally occurring interactions. However, since there is no control at all over what the learner will say, the researcher has usually no clue to know if the learner is in fact communicating their originally intended message with the originally intended TL form or if they are making use of an avoidance or achievement CS. For CS identification purposes, it is therefore often necessary to rely exclusively on the subjects’ retrospective comments, which may threaten the reliability of the procedure. Furthermore, the data thus elicited does not allow for the analysis of different learners’ strategic behavior in the communication of the same content, which can also be considered a hinder of these investigations.

Finally, some researchers have combined in their projects a variety of data collection instruments –cf. Tarone and Yule (1987), Manchón (1989), Yarmohammadi and Seif (1992), Dörnyei (1995), or Luján-Ortega and Clark-Carter (2000). As seen in Chapter One, pp. 54-56, in some of these studies attempts have also been made to analyze the effect of task-related factors on CS use –cf. Galván and Campbell (1979), Bialystok and Fröhlich (1980), Bialystok (1983), Poulisse and Schils (1989), Poulisse et al. (1990) or Luján (1997). The results of this kind of research suggest that the nature of the task at hand has a strong influence on the FL learner’s strategic behavior and, therefore, most of the conclusions drawn from the analysis of certain types of data cannot be directly generalized to other communicative situations.

In the present investigation we intend to analyze samples of language that can be considered as representative as possible of everyday naturally occurring FL communication, but also suitable for CS research, i.e. involving identifiable and comparable CS uses. We needed, therefore, to design a data collection instrument that

---

37 The interest of the present work does not concern CS use variation across different task conditions and in this project language data is going to be collected using one single instrument. For a study on the influence that task-related factors have on the use that Galician and Spanish speaking learners of English as a FL make of CSs, conducted in the same context as the current investigation, see Fernández Dobao (1999, 2001).

38 The tasks here discussed have been the most widely used data collection instruments in CS research. Other instruments also employed for this purpose, although to a considerable lesser extent, include: sentence completion tasks, oral and written translations, instruction giving tasks or role plays.
made it possible to keep a certain degree of control on the content of the data, but not in
the way this content was communicated. Furthermore, it was necessary that it could
guarantee that the different types of interactions we were going to examine were carried
out under the same conditions.

On this basis we decided, for the purposes of research design, to draw on those
previous studies that had employed picture-story narration tasks for the collection of
their data. In this kind of work a series of drawings or photographs is presented to the
FL learner, who is asked to describe them in as much detail as possible and to narrate
the story they illustrate. In this way both descriptive and narrative discourse is elicited.
The images provide a well-defined and stable content, as already explained, specifically
selected to pose linguistic problems to the learner. The design of the task prompts the
subject to communicate about this pre-selected content but allows a considerable degree
of freedom on the TL items or structures to be used to communicate it. Furthermore, the
learner is generally free to decide on which specific aspects of the content they want to
focus their attention or to leave unmentioned those features of the pictures that they may
consider not too relevant for the successful accomplishment of the task. As above
mentioned, the constant content across subjects facilitates the study of the data by
making it possible to draw comparative analyses on the performance of different
subjects. But it also allows the researcher to elicit from each learner a second NL
version of the task. This NL baseline data can be used for CS identification and analysis
purposes. These features have made of the picture-story narration task the most
frequently used data collection instrument in CS research, particularly in those studies
adopting an interactional perspective on CSs.

The design of this task facilitates the elicitation of samples of extended IL
discourse, but not real interactional data. In most of these studies the learner is not
working with an interlocutor. When there is another learner acting as interlocutor, this is
generally asked to refrain from giving verbal feedback to the speaker, on the grounds
that this might contaminate the results of the investigation. This methodological design
illustrates the learner-centered approach that most previous research has adopted in the
study of CSs. Since the interest of the previous research lay on the linguistic and/or
cognitive features of the FL learner’s strategic behavior, the role of the interlocutor in
the communicative process was considered to be irrelevant and therefore minimized by
the very design of the data collection procedure.

In the present study we were, however, interested in CS use in face-to-face
interaction, involving a real exchange of information between two different
interlocutors. In order to elicit valid language data for the specific purposes of our
research we needed, therefore, to review the traditional design of the picture-story
narration activity. With this objective in mind we decided to transform it into a spot-the-
difference task. In this type of task two versions of the same picture are presented to two
different learners. The latter are asked to identify the differences existing between their
pair of images without looking at each other’s pictures. We decided to follow this
procedure, but using a series of pictures depicting a story rather than a single
photograph or drawing.

In the communicative situation created by a spot-the-difference activity there is
always a speaker who has some pre-selected information to convey, a listener or
interlocutor who requires this information to complete a task, and an awareness that an
information gap exists. These three conditions are considered essential for an elicitation
task aiming at providing spontaneous and at the same time controlled and therefore
comparable data (Tarone and Yule, 1989; Yule, 1997). They provide a purpose for the
communicative act to fulfill, thus simulating a real communicative exchange. At the
same time they allow for the control of the content while leaving freedom to the form.
This specific and constant content, known by the researcher, simplifies the analysis of
the data.

Taking into account these principles, we proceeded first to the selection of the
particular picture-story to be used in our investigation. For this aim we relied on a
previous study we had conducted on CS use also involving Galician and Spanish
speaking learners of English as a FL (Fernández Dobao, 1999). In this earlier work we
had asked our learners to tell, with as much precision as possible, the story depicted in a
series of six pictures. This story, included in Appendix A.2, involved four different male
characters, two boys and two men, performing a series of related but different actions.
These actions constituted the plot of the story illustrating a series of concatenated
events, and changes in place and time. Learners had thus to describe the characters, their
physical appearance and changing mood states, to locate them in space and time, and to explain their acts, as well as the relationships and consequences of these acts.

This task proved to be suitable in order to elicit extended samples of IL discourse from our learners. They did not have problems to interpret the pictures and to give a general account of the story. Some learners gave more details and engaged in more extensive descriptions than others, but all of them, independently of their TL command, were able to perform the task without major problems. More significant for the purposes of our research, this story posed linguistic difficulties to beginner, intermediate and advanced proficiency level students, making thus it possible to elicit a frequent use of CSs and a considerable amount of strategic language data from all the participants involved in our research. Since we were going to use the same story with all our learners, it was important that it was designed so that it created some constant difficulties to all of them, but that at the same time did not prevent lower level students from being able to communicative meaningfully and with relative success. This particular story required reference to certain concepts and actions, such as ‘black eye’, ‘suspenders’ or ‘to roll up’, for which most of the intermediate as well as the advanced level learners did not know the accurate TL item.

For the goals of the current study the original story was expanded. New objects and actions were incorporated to the original version. The result was a cartoon strip that tells the same story but is conformed by twelve rather than six pictures, thus allowing us to elicit larger and more representative samples of IL data.

In order to create the desired spot-the-difference task we designed a second version of the story. It consisted of exactly the same pictures but some of the items included in the original drawings were deleted or changed. These items represented the differences between the two stories that the participants would have to identify. They involved a set of referents that had to be carefully selected –they will be called from now on target referents. They did not only provide a rationale for the communicative task at hand, i.e. a purpose for the communicative exchange of information, they would also constitute the basis of our analyses. In subsequent chapters we will focus on the strategic means of expressions that learners may use to communicate these non-shared target referents, that is, to agree on meaning when no visual support is available and the speaker and the interlocutor have to rely exclusively on language use.
For the selection of these items, we drew again on our earlier investigation. Following Tarone and Yule (1989), we analyzed the IL performance of our learners in order to establish the *essential structure* of the task, i.e. “those actions and objects which were mentioned by all (or almost all) the subjects in performing the task” (Tarone and Yule, 1989: 117). We identified in this way a list of items that appeared repeatedly in all the narratives and that could, on this basis, be considered to epitomize the core of the information required to complete the task successfully. We also singled out from this essential structure those referents that had posed linguistic difficulties for most intermediate and advanced level students and had, therefore, elicited more CS uses.

We employed this data as a guide to select the target referents. These referents belonged to the essential structure of the task and, for this reason, they were expected to be mentioned in all or most of the accounts of the story. Most of them had triggered CS uses in the first investigation and were, therefore, likely to elicit the same kind of strategic behavior in the current study. Others had been relatively easy to communicate for both intermediate and advanced level students. They were included in order to simplify the task, make sure that all our participants were going to be able to identify at least some differences without much trouble and, in this way, prevent some possible frustration, especially from our lower level learners. Finally, in order to incorporate a balanced number of differences in all the pictures, we also had to select some items that belonged to the expanded version of the story, i.e. they were not part of the pictures used in our first investigation.

The piloting of the experimental design gave us an opportunity to confirm that all these different target referents belonged to the essential structure of the task. We also verified that they would elicit the kind of strategic language use we were interested in. Taking into account the results of this piloting experience, which are described in more detail in the next section of the present chapter, some slight changes had to be made to the original drawings. These affected the quality and clarity of the pictures used as prompts, rather than the structure of the task itself.

The target references finally selected are presented in the following table. Here, and in subsequent chapters, they will be identified by means of the TL words or expressions that the English NSs collaborating in the piloting phase of the experiment used to make reference to them. The differences between the two stories concern
physical objects, emotions and actions. Subsequently, they elicited from NSs the use of concrete and abstract nouns, adjectives and verbs. The target referents guaranteed thus that we would be able to collect and analyze CSs used to compensate for a variety of different types of lexical difficulties.\textsuperscript{39}

**TABLE 3.4. TARGET REFERENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PICTURE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>to punch / fist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>badge / school badge / emblem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>black eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>painful face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>striped tie / stripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>moustache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waistcoat / vest / sleeveless jumper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pointing to the school / pointing outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>points to his black eye / boy pointing to the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surprise / father’s surprised / father’s surprised face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father drops newspaper / drops the newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>holding hands / father takes the boy by the hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry / father looks very angry / father is frowning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>knocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>letterbox / mailbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>father knocks at the door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>touching the chin / little boy is rubbing his chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>wallpaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>checkered / checked floor / tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>braces / suspenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sleeves rolled up / rolled up sleeves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>father pointing to the house / pointing inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father starts shouting / shouting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>father turns round / calls his son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father clenches his fist / clenched fist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>father rolls up his sleeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father is scared / surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>little boy looks dejected / boy’s head is bent / turned cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freckles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>striped tie / stripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>badge / school badge / emblem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next two pages we have included the two cartoon strips finally designed for our task: story A and story B. The pictures in the first strip, story A, incorporate all the target referents identified in the previous table, but these items are different or simply lacking in the second strip, story B.

\textsuperscript{39} About the importance of using a variety of referents for the purposes of CS elicitation, see Færch and Kasper (1986: 185-186).
PICTURE STORY A
CHAPTER 3: Method

PICTURE STORY B
We can see in these images that some differences are constant through several pictures. The first character, for instance, is wearing a blazer with a school badge in story A, but not in story B, and this is so in all the pictures in which he appears. In the last scene a new school boy is present, wearing the same clothes and, therefore, the same school badge difference is repeated. In picture three of story A we see the little boy pointing outside. In the next picture he is pointing again, but now to his eye. These two pointing actions are not included in story B. All these different kinds of repetitions were created intentionally as they would allow us to analyze repeated references to the same concept. We expected thus to be able to identify to what extent learners and interlocutors relied on the context of their interaction and their previous references to the same concept for the purposes of strategic communication.

Since all of the target referents were part of story A but were not included in story B, the second version was much simpler in details. One of the members of the dyad, the one receiving the first set of pictures, would always have more information to convey. On this basis this interlocutor would be identified as the sender and their partner as the receiver. 40

We opted for this particular design because the interest of our research lay on the analysis of CSs used in face-to-face interaction when a FL learner needs to convey a message but the TL lexical item desired is not available in their IL system or not shared with their interlocutor. With this design we guaranteed that in interactions involving native and non-native speaking interlocutors, the learner, acting as sender, would always be in possession of the information that the NS, acting as receiver, would require for the successful accomplishment of the task. In the communication of the target referents the information flow would therefore go from the learner to the NS. In this way, if linguistic difficulties would arise, the learner would be the participant expected to develop the CS that would initiate the strategic communication of meaning process. In other words, our spot-the-difference task was designed so that all the CSs we were going to analyze were used to convey the originally intended messages of the same participant, i.e. the one adopting the sender role, and that this participant was always a learner.

40 The sender would be given story A and would therefore be also identified as participant A. The receiver would have story B and would be also identified as participant B. The sender would always be the first member of the dyad and the receiver the second; thus, for instance, in ADV-ADV AV, Antía would take the sender role and Verónica the receiver role.
The receiver would be given a paper sheet with a grid and asked to fill it with the differences that they and their partners managed to identify. This grid would be collected by the researcher at the end of the task. The data thus obtained would help us to establish, in an objective way, which of the differences included in the pictures were actually identified by our participants and, in a next stage of the analysis, which strategic exchanges resulted in the successful communication of the learner’s originally intended message.

For the analysis of the interactional data we would rely on audio- and videotaped material. In the pilot experiment the performance of our participants was tape-recorded and the researcher took notes on their gestures, face expressions and paralinguistic activities. The problems encountered in the transcription of the data revealed that, for a systematic study of nonverbal CSs, the experiment needed to be video-recorded.41

A set of written instructions was elaborated in order to ensure that all the participants would interpret the task in as much a similar way as possible. With these instructions we also tried to focus our learners’ attention on the successful communication of their messages, rather than on the forms they used to convey these messages. The instructions made clear that the point of the task was to identify the differences existing between the two pictures and that the participants should try to accomplish this goal even if the means of expression needed to do this in a linguistic accurate and appropriate way were not available.

In the instructions we also explained that the sender’s pictures were more elaborated and with more details than the receiver’s. The sender had more information to convey and the receiver was the one who had to write down the differences identified. This could, initially, lead some receivers to adopt too a passive role in the communicative exchange and to try to identify the differences by simply listening to what the sender had to say. In order to prevent this kind of behavior, we made explicit in the instructions that the identification of the differences was the responsibility of both the sender and the receiver. We asked them to reach an agreement on the differences.

41 The quality of our video-recording equipment was not as good as the quality of the audio-tape-recorder. In order to prevent possible problems in the interpretation of the video-recorded data we decided to support it with audio-taped material. Furthermore, we will soon see that this audio-recording was also necessary for the retrospective interview.
and warned them that, to accomplish this joint common goal, the two of them would need to know how each other’s pictures looked like. We also encouraged the receiver to ask the sender as many questions as necessary in order to be sure that they had correctly identified the differences.

A spot-the-difference task should be relatively familiar to all the individuals taking part in our study and, consequently, relatively easy to interpret. We designed, however, a practice task to be performed by all the participants at the beginning of the experiment. This task, included in Appendix A.2, followed the design of the actual data collection instrument but was considerably simpler, involving only four pictures and eight differences to be identified. During this rehearsing experience the researcher would be able to check that the two participants had interpreted the task as originally intended and understood the mechanics of a spot-the-difference activity. In this way, if doubts or problems would arise during the performance of this trial task, the participants as well as the researcher would have an opportunity to discuss them before the actual data collection procedure started.

The main task would be performed twice, first in English and then in the learner’s L1. In dyads involving two learners the L1 version of the task would be carried out in pairs, following exactly the same procedure used for the English version. If the dyad was composed by a learner and a NS, the learner would be asked to provide an individual account in their L1 of the story depicted in their pictures.

This L1 repetition of the task would be conducted in order to obtain NL baseline data that would serve for analytical purposes. Although generally affected by some restructuring and usually more elaborated than the FL account, the L1 description of the story was assumed to reflect the intended meaning, i.e. what the speaker would have said if they had not been constrained by an imperfect command of the TL (Hyde, 1982: 18-20). Previous research had shown that a comparison of the two versions of the task could give a preliminary idea of some of the problems encountered in FL communication –cf. Hyde (1982), or Yule and Tarone (1990). Items mentioned in the NL but not in the FL version, or less detailed accounts of certain topics in the L1 description could point at linguistic difficulties and subsequent CS uses. What would be relevant of this L1 performance would be the particular items the learner mentioned and with what degree of detail or precision. The change from an interactional to a
monologue condition would certainly affect the L1 version in significant ways; in
general, however, the data thus obtained should be suitable for the specific function we
wanted it to fulfill.

In Appendix A.2 we have included all the materials designed in relation to the
picture-story spot-the-difference task, that is the sender’s and receiver’s cartoon strips
depicting the main story, the rehearsal or practice story, and the instructions for the
participants. In this appendix the reader can also find the picture-story narration task
used for the purposes of our 1999 investigation, that constituted, as already explained,
the basis of the spot-the-difference task designed for the current study.

3.2.2. RETROSPECTIVE DATA COLLECTION TASK

As explained in the introduction to the current chapter, for the specific purposes of our
investigation we intended to combine the analysis of IL and retrospective data. We
decided thus to use a post-interview in order to elicit comments from both learners and
NSs on their performance of the spot-the-difference task, the linguistic problems
encountered in this activity and how they tried to solve them. The data thus obtained
would help the researcher to interpret and analyze what was going on in strategic
interaction, providing evidence of certain processes and behaviors that we knew could
not always be identified or fully understood through an examination of language data
alone.

In the performance of the highly controlled tasks discussed at the beginning of
the previous section, p. 146, it is not too difficult to know when a CS is being used,
since the problems and their occurrence are predetermined by the researcher. However,
when data is collected with more open activities, such as the one designed for our study,
learner’s language always needs to be screened in search for possible CS uses. The
researcher relies for this purpose on IL performance features. Strategic behavior results,
relatively often, in non-native-like utterances, and is accompanied by problem
indicators, such as pauses, fillers, drawls or repetitions that serve to indicate that a CS is
being used. Previous research has, however, shown that these features do not always
suffice for a reliable identification and analysis of CS use.

Certain CSs are not observable in learners’ speech. As also discussed in the
preceding chapter, learners are sometimes able to conceal their linguistic deficits and
strategic behavior – cf. Chapter Two, p. 134. They avoid the occurrence of the above mentioned problem indicators, in such a way that in their speech there is no evidence at all that the message they are communicating is not the originally intended one, or that the structures they are using to convey this message are not the ones they initially desired to use. In other contexts the researcher is able to identify that a CS is being employed, but not the communicative intention of the speaker, i.e. the lexical item they are trying to compensate for, or whether the interlocutor has been able to infer the meaning of the CS as intended by the speaker. From the analysis of IL performance features the researcher can sometimes think that the learner is making use of a CS when in fact the utterance they are presenting is the result of an unconscious error, or can interpret that part of the task content is left unmentioned because of an avoidance strategy, when it is simply ignored or forgotten by the speaker. All these different problems suggest that a study of strategic communication based on the exclusive analysis of IL data can overlook or misinterpret significant aspects of strategic communication – cf. Poulisse et al. (1987), Tarone and Yule (1989), or Poulisse et al. (1990).

In order to try to compensate for these shortcomings, previous research on CSs has relatively often supported the analysis of the learner’s speech with retrospective data. Psycholinguistic researchers, such as Poulisse et al. (1987, 1990), concerned with the cognitive processes underlying strategic CS use, have strongly argued in favor of verbal reports. Most interactional researchers, such as Tarone and Yule (1989), have also widely acknowledged the value of retrospective information for the study of strategic language. In fact, since Tarone first used introspective data for the analysis of CSs in 1977, retrospective techniques have been incorporated into a considerable number of CS studies: Tarone (1977), Glahn (1980), Hyde (1982), Palmberg (1984), Manchón (1989), Poulisse et al. (1990), Suni (1996) or Wongsawang (2001) among others.

Retrospective procedures have, however, been also criticized. No retrospective technique is free of problems. Lapses of memory on the part of the speaker, low degree of consciousness in the use of certain strategies or possible biases introduced by the intervention of the researcher may easily affect the data obtained. It is necessary to rely on the learner, i.e. trust their statements about how they process and organize their
language use, and this may not always be considered objective enough for a neutral and unbiased analysis of language. These limitations have certainly to be taken into account.

However, we also need to say that the use of introspective and retrospective techniques is now a widely extended and systematic practice in many different areas of SLA research. Much work has been carried out on the design of these techniques. This has helped to improve their objectivity and reliability, and to demonstrate that learners can provide insightful and helpful information on many aspects of their FL use and FL learning processes. In the present study we drew on this previous work to devise a retrospective data collection instrument that could fit our methodological approach and at the same time offer the highest possible degree of accuracy and reliability. For this purpose we took into account those design principles that previous scholars, such as Ericsson and Simon (1984, 1987), Færch and Kasper (1987a), Cohen (1994) or Gass and Mackey (2000), had argued any retrospective method needs to fulfill.

Following most preceding research in the area of CSs, retrospective data was here elicited using a post-interview activity. After the performance of the spot-the-difference task all the participants involved in our study would hold a meeting with the researcher in which their language use in the previous task would be discussed. This interview would be carried out in the participants’ L1. In this way we facilitated the task, especially for our intermediate level learners. The students’ attention could be focused on what they were saying rather than on the language they were using. We contributed thus to guarantee that even our lower level students would be able to provide the appropriate amount of information, and with the necessary degree of accuracy and precision (Cohen, 1994: 680). This means, however, that the members of learners’ dyads would be able to conduct the interview together, either in Galician or in Spanish, but in the case of dyads involving English NSs and NNSs two different meetings would be required. The NS would be first interviewed in English and, in a second interview, the learner would chat with the researcher in their L1.

The retrospective data we were looking for concerns, as already mentioned, speakers and interlocutors’ comments on the linguistic problems encountered in their interactions and the strategies they had used to overcome them. Automatic processes are not usually accessible for introspection, because they generally occur in an unconscious way, but processes used to solve problems are conscious and attended to, and, therefore,
they are available for retrospection (Færch and Kasper, 1987b: 12). We have already explained in Chapter Two that we considered CSs to be problem-solving devices used with the speaker’s awareness – cf. Chapter Two, pp. 132-133. This means that the information we were looking for was conscious, had been heeded during IL performance and should therefore be relatively easy to retrieve.

However, learners could forget about their problems and CS uses. As above mentioned, one of the arguments raised against retrospective techniques is that subjects’ losses of memory may affect the data obtained. Memory decreases as the temporal distance between the action and its verbalization increases, it is therefore decisive for the validity of the data to carry out the retrospective task as soon as possible, i.e. while the desired information is still in the learner’s short-term memory (Cohen, 1987: 87; Færch and Kasper, 1987b: 15).

In our pilot experiment the interview took place one day after the performance of the spot-the-difference task and we found out that some learners had problems to remember some relevant aspects of the information we were looking for. For this reason we decided that, in the main experiment, the interview would be hold immediately after the completion of the language data collection task. The immediacy of the event would help our participants to remember the specific kind of information we were looking for.

This, however, did not allow much opportunity for a pre-analysis of the data. To try to compensate for this shortcoming of immediate versus delayed retrospection, the researcher, while observing the learners’ performance of the picture-story narration task, would take notes on those language uses that could be considered suspicious of involving some kind of strategic behavior. The investigator would then try to make sure that these language uses would be discussed during the interview.

In order to provide the students with contextual information to activate their memories recall support would also be offered – cf. Gass and Mackey (2000). The interviewees, as well as the researcher, would have in front of them the pictures used to elicit the IL data and would listen to the tape-recording of their performance. The idea was to make our learners listen to this recording and to ask them to stop it whenever they had something to comment upon. Previous research has shown that this kind of confrontation with the task situation constitutes an important stimulus, helping the learner to reconstruct what was going on when they were performing the task and to
avoid possible confusions between different events taking place during this act (Færch and Kasper, 1987b: 17).

Before the actual interview would start, participants would need to be instructed on its purposes and procedures. At this point they would know they were collaborating in a linguistic research project, but not on what aspects of language use it was centered or what objectives it intended to accomplish. The interview would therefore be introduced with a general overview of the investigation. It would be necessary to explain what kind of linguistic problems we were interested in and what we considered to be a CS.

Another problem of retrospective techniques is that subjects may repress actual data in order to supply socially acceptable information (Cohen, 1994: 680). This issue is particular relevant in our study, since we are dealing with linguistic shortcomings and problems that not all learners may be eager to disclose. It was therefore important in this phase of the interview to make clear to the learner that we were not testing their proficiency level, that the spot-the-difference task had been specifically designed to pose linguistic difficulties to them and that they were expected to freely comment all the IL gaps they had noticed. In this respect we think that the fact that the researcher conducting the interview was not a professor of the Department and was not related to the students at an academic level should facilitate the task.

It was also necessary to take into account that our participants were not familiarized with retrospective techniques. Therefore, we had to make sure that they understood, not only what to report but also how they were supposed to do so. In order to minimize the effect of the researcher’s bias, participants should ideally comment spontaneously on the difficulties they had encountered and the CSs they had used to overcome them. The researcher should refrain from asking leading questions and aim to collect self-initiated comments (Ericsson and Simon, 1984: 40).

On this basis, we would ask our students to listen to the recording of their performances, to stop the tape-player whenever what they were hearing involved a possible CS use, and to provide as widely as possible comments on the difficulty encountered and the attempt made to solve it. The member of the dyad that had taken the sender role would be specifically asked to talk about the lexical gaps experienced, the alternative means of expression used to compensate for or circumvent them, and
whether they considered that their interlocutor had been able to correctly infer their original message or not. Basically, they would be asked to comment about all those things they intended to say but they finally decided to omit or avoid, and all those words or expressions they used which were not their originally desired ones.

The receiver would be asked to comment whether they had been able to recognize that the speaker was dealing with a lexical difficulty and using a means of expression that was not the originally intended one, whether they had tried to collaborate in the solution of this problem and how, whether they had thought they had been able to accurately understand the sender’s intended message, and whether afterwards, looking at the sender’s pictures, they still considered they had correctly understood this message.

Both of them would be told not to worry about the time and to provide as much information as possible, even if they were not totally sure what they were going to say could be important, or what was actually expected from them. It would be the researcher’s task to decide which items of information were relevant or not for the purposes of the investigation.

We have just said that, ideally, the researcher should refrain from asking leading questions to initiate the learner’s comments. These should be spontaneous and unprompted. However, our previous experiences and the results of the pilot experiment showed us that this did not always work, or at least not with all the participants. Whereas some individuals were very prolific in their comments, others needed to be constantly encouraged by the researcher to keep talking, and the information they provided was not always as detailed and complete as desired, or simply clear enough – cf. Fernández Dobao (1999). We hence decided that in our study the researcher would participate in the interview encouraging reserved learners to talk as much as possible, making questions whenever necessary to clarify what the student had just said, or asking them to comment on aspects of their language use they had left unmentioned but the researcher was interested in. These would always be open-ended questions carefully posed so as not to shape learners’ responses. In sum, the researcher would take the initiative only if the informants remained passive and trying not to influence their answers. Notice that this combination of self- and other-initiated retrospection is
relatively common in the field of CS research and has been recommended among others by Færch and Kasper (1987b), Poulisse et al. (1987) and Poulisse et al. (1990).

All the interviews would be conducted by the same researcher who had considerable experience with this kind of activity since, as already explained, we had conducted a piloting of the methodological design of the current study and previous investigations on CS use in FL communication. The researcher was thus familiar with CS analysis and with retrospective interview procedures, which should facilitate their task.

In the next section we discuss the actual performance of the post-interview. In the light of the data obtained, we also try to assess the validity of this retrospective technique, as here designed, for the specific purposes of CS research.

3.3. PROCEDURES
As repeatedly pointed out all through this chapter, the final design of our experiment is, in part, the result of an initial trial experience. We piloted the spot-the-difference task and the interview in order to test, first, that our participants would be able to carry out these two activities without problems, and, secondly, that they would elicit the specific kind of data we need for the purposes of our research.

We conducted therefore two experiments: the pilot and the main one. Here we describe first the procedures followed in the implementation of the pilot experiment, commenting on the problems encountered in this initial phase. We discuss then the main experiment, paying special attention to those aspects of the procedure which were modified in order to try to overcome the drawbacks of the initial piloting experience.

3.3.1. PILOT EXPERIMENT
The pilot experiment took place in May 2000 at the University of Santiago de Compostela. It was conducted with eight subjects grouped in four pairs: two dyads involving four intermediate level learners and two dyads involving two intermediate level learners working with two NSs. None of these subjects belongs to the final sample of participants selected to collaborate in the main experiment, since their previous experience with the tasks would have biased the data obtained from them. No advanced level students were available at that time. It was, however, assumed that if intermediate
level learners were able to carry out the task without problems, so would be advanced level and, therefore, this should not be a major problem at this stage of the research.

Each of these dyads was asked to perform the experiment in the same room of the English Department but on different days. In this room we had prepared a table with a small cardboard screen in the middle. The two members of the dyad sat down face-to-face across the table but separated by the screen, so that they could see each other’s faces and gestures but not their pictures. We placed the tape-recording equipment in this same table. The researcher, during the spot-the-difference activity, sat down at the end of the room, in order to observe the participants as they performed the task and at the same time trying to interfere as little as possible with her presence.

The students were given the written instructions and the materials for the practice and the main task. The receiver was as well provided with the grid in which they should note down the differences identified. Both of them were told to read their instructions, to ask the researcher any questions they might have about them and to initiate the performance of the practice task whenever they felt ready for it.

During the practicing experience we observed that, although most learners had understood the requirements of the task at hand, others had experienced some problems. They provided general accounts of the story rather than detailed descriptions of the pictures and, as a result, they were not able to identify most of the differences included in them. In some pairs the receiver, rather than the sender, took the initiative in the description of the drawings. Since most of the differences between the two versions concerned items that were available in the sender’s pictures but not in the receiver’s, this approach made more difficult the identification of the differences. In these cases, the researcher had to interrupt the practice session in order to clarify the initial instructions. With some guidance from the researcher all the participants ended up performing the practice task with quite satisfactory results.

This experience served to confirm the advantages of providing an opportunity for practice before the data collection. It also revealed that, although some dyads would need to perform this rehearsal task to the very end in order to get used to the procedure, others would have enough with just a few minutes of rehearsing.
Once the performance of the main task began, all the students appeared to know what they were expected to do. In general, they did not have any difficulties to follow the instructions of the researcher and to carry out the activity as originally designed.

They were usually able to interpret the pictures and the story without serious problems. A few small details in some of the pictures were at times confusing for some of them. As already explained, see p. 151, the source of this confusion was the quality of the drawings rather than their content, and the necessary revisions were made to assure that this problem would not arise again during the performance of the main experiment.

Some dyads provided extensive and highly detailed accounts of the story, whereas others focused on the most relevant information of each of the pictures. However, all of them mentioned the majority of the target referents, thus confirming that they belonged to the essential structure of the task. As expected, some of these items were relatively easy to convey for our students, such as ‘moustache’ or ‘to knock’; whereas others, such as ‘suspenders’ or ‘to roll up’, posed linguistic difficulties and elicited CS uses from most of our intermediate level learners.

For the performance of the task the dyads spent an average of 25 minutes. It was tape-recorded and the researcher took notes on gestures and other kinds of kinesic or paralinguistic activities that could be related to strategic behavior. The grid with the differences was collected by the researcher. This showed that the participants had been able to recognize a considerable percentage of the differences included in their pictures, around 80%.

Once the task had been completed, the learners were asked to repeat it but now in their L1. As originally planned, in dyads involving a learner and a NS, the former was asked to provide an individual account of the picture-story. In dyads involving two learners we followed the same procedure used in the English version. Sometimes the L1 of the sender was not the L1 of the receiver. As already explained, all our students shared a native-like command of Spanish and Galician, but for some of them their L1 was Spanish and Galician their L2, whereas for others it was the other way round. When this happened, we decided to opt for the sender’s L1.

The first phase of the experiment was here closed. Learners were urged not to talk about the task to their classmates and asked to come back the following day to
perform a post-activity. This post-activity was the retrospective interview; however, we did not inform our participants about its nature until the actual moment of its being conducted.

The researcher made a rough transcription of the tape-recorded material and conducted a pre-analysis of CS uses. In these transcripts we tried to incorporate the subjects’ nonverbal behavior. We found out, however, that nonverbal CSs tended to co-occur with oral strategies, and that, on the basis of the notes taken down, it was impossible to establish a reliable and precise relationship between language and gestures. We could not always know, with enough accuracy, whether the oral and the nonverbal strategy had been used in a simultaneous way or one after the other. As mentioned above, we decided, consequently, that tape- and video-recorded data should be collected in the main experiment.

In the pre-analysis we tried to identify those utterances that, because of their non-native-like nature and/or the appearance of problem indicators, such as pauses, fillers, drawls or repetitions, seemed to reveal a CS use. This provided the researcher with a general guideline about some of the issues that should be commented upon during the post-interview.

The following day the researcher met the students again in order to interview them retrospectively. Since, as already explained, this was to be conducted in the participants’ L1, the two members of learners’ dyads came together for the interview, but in the case of dyads involving a NS, a first interview was conducted with this NS in English and a second with the learner in their L1, either Spanish or Galician.

Following the design devised, we explained to them the objective of our research and discussed the concept of CS before the actual interview was initiated. The researcher talked about what we considered to be a CS and the learners commented on their previous experiences with these strategies. Although none of them was familiar with the term CS, all of them recognized to use these problem-solving devices relatively often in their attempts to communicate in the English language. We also gave detailed instructions about the procedure the interview should follow, encouraging them to provide as much information as possible and to initiate their comments rather than to expect the researcher to be constantly asking them. We focused their attention on the
target referents, since the means of expression used to convey them was what we were really interested in.

As recall support the students had in front of them the pictures of the story, a list with the differences existing between them, i.e. the target referents, and the transcripts of their speech. We proceeded to the listening of the tape-recordings while reading through the transcripts. The subjects spontaneously commented most of the fragments that involved some kind of CS use, but they did not talk about other excerpts of interaction previously identified by the researcher as possible CSs. Once we reached the end of the tape, we decided to ask them about these fragments, thus finding out that, although initially overlooked, most of them involved in fact CS uses. We also discovered that some of these strategic segments of interaction had been left unmentioned by our learners simply because they were regarded as too obvious and clear to need any kind of further comment. This kind of behavior had already been documented in previous research, such as Poulisse et al. (1987: 225).

As discussed in the previous section, see p. 161, we had to confront other problems during the interview. Although in general terms our subjects remembered what they had said the previous day and why, sometimes they could not recall certain relevant information. They were usually able to identify when they had used a CS, but they were not always able to say, with enough precision, what lexical item they were trying to compensate for or why they had resorted to that particular kind of alternative means of expression. We have already said that, to compensate for these memory losses, in the main experiment the interview would be conducted immediately after the performance of the spot-the-difference task.

Despite these drawbacks, the piloting experience was quite satisfactory. The picture-story task provided us with a considerable amount of interactional data and frequent CS uses. The interview offered, with some guidance from the researcher, the expected kind of information. A common overview of the FL and L1 transcripts, and the retrospective comments confirmed the suitability of the methodological design, and suggested that, with some slight modifications, it could provide us with the data needed for the specific purposes of our research.
3.3.2. MAIN EXPERIMENT

Broadly speaking, the procedures followed in the main experiment were quite similar to those of the pilot activity. The most relevant difference, as we will see, is that, since the interview was conducted right after the spot-the-difference task, each dyad of participants completed the experiment in one single session.

This phase of the research took place in March and April 2001. The collection of the actual data was done in the same room of the English Department of the University of Compostela where we had conducted the pilot experiment, and under the same conditions. We added a video-camera to the whole setting. This was placed at the end of the room, in a position where it could record the gestures of the two members of the dyad.

The procedure followed exactly the same steps as before. We first gave the instructions and materials to our participants. We discussed these instructions with them and especially clarified those issues that had posed problems to the learners who had participated in the pilot experiment. We then initiated the performance of the practice task. This was stopped before the end whenever the students and the researcher considered that the procedure of the activity had been correctly understood.

The main task was conducted under the same conditions as in the piloting. The learners did not have problems in the interpretation of any of the details of the pictures. Again, some students engaged in more comprehensive accounts of the story than others, but all of them mentioned most of the target referents and made repeated allusions to those items specifically included to elicit this kind of repetitive behavior. Some of the receivers participated more actively than others, but all of them collaborated with the sender to establish a mutual agreement on the target referents and to identify thus as many differences as possible. It was also confirmed that a considerable percentage of those items who had posed linguistic difficulties for the intermediate level learners participating in the piloting phase of the study were problematic as well for advanced learners. This included words and expressions such as ‘vest’, ‘suspenders’, ‘knocker’, ‘holding hands’ or ‘to roll up’.

To compensate for the lack of time necessary to carry out a pre-analysis of the data before the interview, the researcher observed the performance of the task, taking notes on apparent lexical problems encountered by the learners and possible CS uses.
Once the task had been completed, we asked our students to repeat it in their L1. For this purpose, we followed exactly the same process as in the pilot experiment.

After a ten minute break we initiated the retrospective interview. When a NS was participating, they held the interview first and the learner acted as an observer. When the dyad involved two learners, they conducted the interview together, exactly as we had done before in the pilot experiment.

We gave to the learners taking part in the main experiment the same instructions we had given in the piloting but, since there was no time for a transcription, the recall support used was the pictures of the story and the tape-recorded material. We listened to the recording of their performance. Again, our participants commented in an unprompted way on the lexical difficulties they had encountered, the means of expression they had used to overcome them and the perceived effectiveness of these solutions, i.e. to what extent the two of them considered that the sender’s originally intended message had been correctly understood by the receiver.

Taking into account the experience of the pilot experiment, on this occasion the researcher did not refrain from making questions to the learners or replaying the tape whenever she felt they had not commented on a possible strategic language use. Most of the comments were self-initiated. When the researcher prompted these comments, the information provided by the learners was not always the originally expected one. They rejected sometimes the researcher’s original interpretation and provided evidence of CS uses which had not been initially noticed by the investigator.

This suggests, first, that learners are aware of their strategic language uses and able to talk about them; and, secondly, that our participants collaborated in the interview with a high degree of honesty and were not affected in significant or observable ways by a possible researcher’s bias. In general the students taking part in our research were extremely collaborative, being always eager to help the researcher and to provide as much and as accurate information as possible. At the end of the experiment they also said to be quite satisfied with the experience and happy to have participated in it, even though the whole process usually lasted around three hours.

We were also pleased with the results of the experiment that provided us with a considerable amount of data. The spot-the-difference task elicited the kind of interaction desired and also frequent CS instances to be analyzed for the purposes of our research.
We need, however, to take into account in these analyses the specific conditions under which the data was collected. It is representative of an experimental situation and of a referential form of communication. When a task-based methodology needs to be used for the collection of the data, there is always an element of artificiality that affects the data. This problem is inherent to this type of research and it should not undermine the value of our study, as long as we always take into account that the results obtained illustrate CSs in this specific task and under these particular experimental conditions.

The same arguments can be applied to the retrospective interview activity and the data it elicited. The information obtained with this retrospective technique should be extremely helpful for our understanding of what is really going on in our learners’ interactions, but we have to bear in mind that it is also limited in its value. We need to trust our learners and rely on the honesty of their comments. There may be relevant aspects of their strategic language use that they have left unmentioned or that they have altered in order to please the researcher in a conscious or an unconscious way. The conditions in which the retrospective interview was conducted guaranteed its maximum reliability but, as already mentioned, no retrospective technique is free of problems.

In sum, our experiment, like all experiments, suffers from certain limitations inherent to its very nature. We tried, with its design, to minimize these shortcomings and, in light of the results obtained, it seems that we succeeded in our aim. Nevertheless, in the analysis of our data we always have to bear in mind the conditions under which it was collected and which it represents.

### 3.4. DATA TRANSCRIPTION

In order to conclude this chapter and before starting the actual empirical analysis, it is necessary to make a brief mention to the system and procedures employed for the transcription of the data obtained and their presentation in the context of the current work. Our analyses were conducted relying, whenever possible, directly on the audio- and video-taped material, rather than on the actual transcripts. In subsequent chapters we will need, however, to illustrate the segments of interaction we are discussing. For this purpose we had to transcribe them. Furthermore, we considered it necessary to include in the appendices of our work the transcripts of our participants’ performance in the spot-the-difference task, that is, the transcripts of their English language
interactions, as well as a database with the segments of strategic interaction identified in this performance and object of our analyses. The reader can thus get a comprehensive view of the language data obtained and situate the CSs analyzed in our work in the specific linguistic context in which they were used. It is important to point out at this stage that part of this material has been incorporated into SULEC (*Santiago University Learner of English Corpus*), which is being compiled at the moment by a group of researchers under the supervision of Dr. Ignacio M. Palacios. This corpus aims to collect one million words of written and spoken English produced by intermediate and advanced learners of English with the aim of being the starting point for subsequent analyses at various languages levels, from phonology to discourse.\(^{42}\)

We developed with this aim a transcription system that follows the principles of conversational analysis research. Building on Atkinson and Heritage (1984), Edwards (1993) and Lazaraton (2000), we established a set of conventions that makes it possible to represent in a written mode all those aspects of communication that we consider relevant for the analysis of CSs. This notational system, included in Appendix B.1, allows for the representation of linguistic phenomena, such as silent pauses, fillers, drawls, rising intonation, deviant pronunciation or laughs, which relatively often co-occur with CS uses. It also allows for the transcription of gestures and the illustration of eye contact or face expressions. It is, for these reasons, a relatively complex system.

We are using standard conventions and, therefore, it should not be very difficult for the reader to interpret our transcripts. However, we have found that the task of transcribing the whole of our data using this system would be huge in terms of time and effort. Moreover, it is not strictly necessary since, as above pointed out, the researcher will generally rely on the actual audio- and video-taped material, not on the transcripts. We decided thus to develop two different sets of conventions: a simplified notational system to be used for the transcription of full interactions and a more complete system for the written representation of the strategic segments of these interactions. The reader can thus find in Appendix B.1, two different sets of transcription conventions—the extended transcription system is a completed version of the simplified one.

In Appendix B.2 we include the transcripts of the interactional data collected from our dyads’ performance in the spot-the-difference task. This appendix displays the

\(^{42}\) For further information about this learner corpus, see the following web page: http://www.usc.es/ia303/SULEC/SULEC.htm.
whole of the English language data on which this study is based, which has been transcribed, as above mentioned, using the simplified version of our notational system.

Appendix C presents the CS database. This database intends to account for the strategic segments of interaction object of our study and the analyses conducted. It will therefore be created and completed as we carry out our analyses all through this work. For each of the entries entered in the database, we will provide the following information:

1. REFERENT: the target referent, as identified in table 3.4, learner and interlocutor are trying to communicate.

2. INTERLANGUAGE DATA: a detailed transcription, with full account of linguistic, paralinguistic and kinesic phenomena, of the strategic segment or segments of interaction in which CSs are being used to convey the target referent, specifying the lines of the transcript of the whole interaction to which each excerpt belongs. When a target referent is mentioned several times in one single interaction, we include all these mentions, even if some of them do not involve a CS use.

3. NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA: a simplified transcription of the relevant NL baseline data, i.e. learners’ mentions in their L1 of the target referent which elicited a CS in the L2.

4. RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS: a simplified transcription of the relevant retrospective data, i.e. learners’ comments on the strategic segment of interaction we are analyzing.

5. RECEIVER’S DIFFERENCES IDENTIFICATION TASK: the receiver’s identification of the sender’s intended meaning as illustrated by their completion of the differences grid we provided them with.

6. ANALYSIS: a brief analysis of the strategic segment of interaction.
CHAPTER 4

IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF CSs
One of the basic aims of the present research is the study of CSs in as much a natural and spontaneous communicative situation as possible. The oral data obtained for this purpose constitutes a sample of complex unplanned interactional discourse between FL learners and NSs, which needs now to be interpreted and coded by the investigator. This means that the researcher needs, first, to identify in the corpus the communication problems experienced by the interlocutors and the CSs they used in their attempt to solve them; and, secondly, to describe and classify these strategies into a consistent taxonomy of CS types.

In the first part of this chapter we explain the method adopted for the identification of CS instances in our data. We talk about the sources of evidence employed to distinguish strategic from non-strategic communication, how each of these sources contributed to the identification of specific CS instances, the problems encountered in this process and how they were finally solved.

The second part deals with the issue of the description and classification of CSs. We present the taxonomy adopted for this purpose, justifying its selection among all the taxonomies available. The procedure followed for the classification of the strategies previously identified in the data into specific CS categories is also explained.

The analyses carried out at this stage of the research reveal that, however helpful the taxonomic classification of strategic behavior may be for descriptive aims, a study dealing with CS categories as independent units of analysis cannot provide a fair account of how these strategies are actually used. In the final part of the chapter we introduce the concept of *CS episode* as an alternative framework of analysis to the traditional study of CSs as independent clearly delimited categories.

### 4.1. IDENTIFICATION OF CSs

The identification method and the criteria that distinguish strategic from non-strategic behavior depend on what the researcher considers to constitute a CS. In Chapter Two of the present study we explained the approach we take to the concept of CS and discussed the conditions an element of the interaction needs to fulfill in order to be considered a CS. This led us to propose a working definition of CSs directly based on Tarone’s (1981).
In the same chapter we justified the need to restrict our analyses to those strategies used to solve lexical problems; that is, to communicate meaning when the desired TL lexical item or structure is not available in the learner’s IL system or not shared with their interlocutor. We also need to explain here that we are not going to pay attention to all the lexical CSs used by our learners and their native or non-native speaking interlocutors. As explained in Chapter Three, section 3.2.1, for the elicitation of interactional data, each dyad of participants was given two versions of the same picture-story and asked to find out the differences existing between them without looking at each other’s pictures. The version of the story given to the L2 learner contained a number of referents which were not available in the pictures of the other participant, whether another learner or a NS. For the successful accomplishment of the task the learner had to communicate these non-shared referents to the interlocutor. They included a variety of concrete and abstract concepts such as ‘vest’, ‘suspenders’, ‘angry’, ‘surprised’; and also actions such as ‘to drop’ or ‘to roll up’. We called them target referents. In our analyses we are going to focus our attention on these target referents; that is, on the lexical CSs learners and their interlocutors used to communicate the non-shared objects of reference.

Taking into account the final objectives of our study, we can now reformulate the working definition of CSs and propose a set of conditions that will limit the scope of the identification analysis to those strategic uses relevant to our research interests. A segment of the interaction will be identified as a CS and included in our analysis if, and only if

1. The learner desires to communicate one of the target referents to the interlocutor.
2. The learner (and his/her interlocutor) believes the lexical item desired to communicate this referent is unavailable or is not shared with his/her interlocutor.
3. The learner (and his/her interlocutor) chooses to
   (a) avoid, that is, the learner does not attempt to communicate the target referent, or
   (b) try out an alternative means of expression to communicate the target referent

See Chapter Three, p. 152, for a complete account of target referents.
These three conditions taken all together provide us with a clear-cut delimitation of the specific kind of strategic behavior we are interested in. It is now necessary to identify in the data possible instances of these CSs in an objective and reliable way.

As Færch (1984) pointed out, in highly controlled elicitation tasks, where the problem and its occurrence are predetermined by the researcher, the identification of CSs is quite straightforward. The study of more natural-like data, however, poses the added difficulty of having to screen the speech for communicative problems and subsequent CS uses.

Here the lexical problems object of study have been pre-selected, but not their occurrence. The task design allows considerable freedom concerning what elements of the pictures have to be mentioned, at which point of the interaction, and how, either through a strategic or a non-strategic expression. Since the target referents belong to the essential structure of the task, we expect most of them to be mentioned in most of the accounts, but it is impossible to predict when or how. In fact, we know, from previous research, that different learners tend to interpret this kind of communicative task in different ways, which directly affects the amount and type of data provided and the use of CSs –cf. Coughlan and Duff (1994), Fernández Dobao (2002a).

Three different sources of evidence have been recognized and widely used in previous similar studies for the purpose of CS identification: performance features that act as strategy markers –such as errors, hesitation phenomena or direct appeals for assistance; NL baseline data –usually obtained from a second performance of the IL data collection task; and retrospective data –i.e. speakers’ comments on their own IL production.44

It is often difficult to obtain definite unambiguous evidence of strategic behavior from only one of these sources. On account of this most researchers have preferred to use an integrative approach, based on the combination of at least two of them, usually performance features and introspective information and, less commonly, NL data. In this study, in order to be able to establish the presence of CSs with the highest possible degree of certainty, we opted for the triangulation of these three methods. In the

---

44 For a full discussion of the value of each of these different sources of evidence for the purpose of CS identification see Færch and Kasper (1983c), Raupach (1983), Poulisse et al., (1987), and Tarone and Yule (1989).
following pages full account is given of the procedure followed for the identification of CSs and of how each of the three different sources of evidence contributed to this task.

4.1.1. ANALYZING PERFORMANCE FEATURES FOR THE PURPOSES OF CS IDENTIFICATION

The transcripts and video-recordings of the data have been analyzed for verbal and nonverbal performance features that may reveal lexical communication problems and subsequent CS uses.

In general, linguistic difficulties experienced in FL communication are accompanied in speech by hesitation and restructuring phenomena such as pauses, drawls, repeats or false starts. An accumulation of some of these features, usually known in previous research as implicit problem indicators or strategy markers, acts as a signal, for both the interlocutor and the researcher, that the learner is having trouble in conveying the message.

An alternative expression used to communicate meaning in the lack of the most appropriate one quite often reveals itself as a CS because of it is erroneous or non-target-like form. This happens, for instance, with the incorporation of a L1 element in the L2 discourse or the use of an extended circumlocution where a NS would have normally used a single lexical item.

Finally, sometimes speakers explicitly and consciously indicate to their interlocutors that they are making use of a CS by means of explicit problem indicators or signals of uncertainty, such as ‘I don’t know how to say this’ or ‘how do you call this?’ These comments act as direct or indirect appeals for assistance for the interlocutor and as strategy markers for the researcher.

These three different kinds of speech phenomena reveal different attitudes on the part of the speaker towards the problem and its solution. From an interactional point of view they can all be considered to have a double function. On the one hand, they indicate to the interlocutor that what has just been said is not the preferred means of expression to convey the speaker’s intended meaning; i.e. they signal that what has just been heard is a CS and needs to be interpreted as such. On the other hand, they directly or indirectly ask for the interlocutor’s cooperation on the interpretation of the underlying message and/or the development of an alternative, more acceptable, TL
expression to convey it. That is, they ask for the interlocutor’s cooperation on the successful communication of the message. They differ, however, in degree of intentionality, explicitness and obligation of help imposed on the interlocutor.

From the point of view of the researcher they all constitute signals of strategic behavior but, as the following examples will illustrate, some are more noticeable and less ambiguous than others.

4.1.1.1. Overt strategic behavior

Some kinds of CSs can be immediately recognized as such. They result in erroneous, unexpected, inadequate or non-native-like forms that reveal they are not the learners’ initially intended means of expression. This is particularly frequent with strategies based on transfer or on creative processes. In an attempt to overcome their lexical deficits, learners sometimes make up new words or insert L1 or even L3 lexical items into the L2 discourse. The result is usually an erroneous and previously non-existent form that inevitably betrays the use of a CS.

In example 4.1, for instance, performance features suggest that the learner intends to communicate the target referent ‘vest’. The learner believes the lexical items ‘vest’ and/or ‘waistcoat’ desired to communicate this referent are unavailable in their IL system and uses the L1 word ‘chaleco’ instead, i.e. as an alternative means of communication.

EXAMPLE 4.1: INT-NS CS: vest
REFERENT: vest
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (336-338):
1 A: and he has two pockets,
2 (1.2)
3 B: {yeah,}
4 {B nods}
5 (2.2)
6 A: e:h {on the:::} (1.8) chaleco (‘vest’).
7 {A’s HH point to where the pockets would be on her belly,
8 B is not looking}

For each example we include information concerning the proficiency level of the learner acting as sender (A) –in this case an intermediate level learner; the proficiency level of the interlocutor or receiver (B) if he/she is a learner and, if not, indication that he/she is an English NS –NS in this example; the first letter of the participants’ names –here Carolina and Simon; the intended meaning of the CS –here ‘vest’; the target referent learners are trying to communicate as identified in table 3.4 –here ‘vest’; the lines of the transcript of the whole interaction between these two interlocutors to which the extract in the example belongs –from line 336 to line 338. This transcript can be seen in Appendix B.2. Whenever necessary, NL baseline data and retrospective data will also be included.
Quite often, learners, lacking the desired lexical item to name a concept, try to
describe it or use a TL lexical item associated to a related or similar idea. The result is
an unexpected term or a wordy extended linguistic expression, which may be
grammatically correct, but is probably inadequate for the context and immediately
recognizable as non-native speech – cf. example 4.2.

EXAMPLE 4.2: INT-NS AE: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (234-237):
1  A:   there’s e:::h (0.6) something like a:::, {something round?}
2  (A’s RH draws a
3      circle in the air,
4      AB look down)
5  A:   {[e:::h] that you use} {to:: to knock} at the door.=
6      (A makes a fist with her RH, B is not looking)
7      {A’s RH mimics knocking}
8  B:    [mhm ]
9  B:   =oh! okay, it’s a knocker, okay.

The strategic use of gestures is also quite evident. Although nonverbals are more
commonly used as illustrative or supportive to oral strategies, such as in the two
examples above, they can also be used to convey the referential information the speaker
is unable to communicate through an oral expression. In example 4.3 gestures are
essential for the successful communication of the message and a straightforward
evidence of the linguistic difficulty encountered.

EXAMPLE 4.3: ADV-NS BS: to roll up
REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (140-143):
1  A:   a::nd the: the father {is e:::h (1.5) mm:, (1.3) doing this,
2      {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve}
3  A:   (0.7)} {just to:
4      {A’s LH holds the previous gesture, A’s RH mimics
5          punching}
6  B:    uuhuh)
7    (2.2)
8  A:   to hit him, (1.0) e:::h and the boy is again observing

It is, however, necessary to be careful with this kind of analysis. As certain
researchers have already pointed out, non-native-like forms and errors may be the result
of the spontaneous and unconscious application of an erroneous IL rule, rather than of a
In most cases additional evidence is needed in order to ensure that the segment of
interaction being analyzed can be considered a CS. Furthermore, many CSs, specially in
advanced learners’ speech, may result in correct and acceptable TL expressions impossible to be identified through this kind of evidence.

4.1.1.2. Explicit strategy markers
As we said above, learners, in certain situations, may make explicit to their interlocutors that they have encountered a lexical problem and that they are making use of a CS; and even request their interlocutors’ help to develop an alternative means of expression to communicate the intended message. For this purpose they use what Færch and Kasper have called explicit signals of uncertainty (Færch and Kasper, 1983c: 230). These include metalinguistic comments such as ‘I don’t know’, ‘I can’t remember’ or direct appeals for assistance like ‘how do you call this?’.

EXAMPLE 4.4: ADV-NS IM: rolled up
REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE UTTERANCE (381-385):
1 A: (0.8) and his shirt (.):, (.) >i don’t know how to say
2 this< (0.4) (like this?
3 {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve}
4 (1.2)
5 B: rolled up.
6 (0.5)
7 A: ‘rolled.’ (2.8})

EXAMPLE 4.5: ADV-ADV MM: freckles
REFERENT: freckles
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (758-766):
1 A: e:::h (1.2) he {has e::h, (1.2) dots.} ah! how is this?
2 {A’s RI draws dots on her cheek}
3 (1.0)
4 B: the mm nada (‘nothing’).
5 A: {how how do you call e:h?
6 {A’s RI points to her cheek}
7 (1.8)
8 B: i don’t know the name.)
9 (1.5)
10 A: cool heh heh heh=
11 B: =(little brown dots!
12 {B’s LI draws dots on her cheek}
13 (0.5)
14 A: {little brown dots.}
15 {A nods}
16 B: okay)
17 A: heh heh

In example 4.5 we can clearly see how, in order to achieve a final agreement on meaning, both interlocutors get actively involved in the co-construction of an alternative means of expression. Although the learner is the one who originally experiences the
problem, this immediately becomes a shared problem to be interactionally solved by the two participants. Both, the learner and the interlocutor, believe the desired lexical item ‘freckles’ is unavailable in their IL systems, they both attempt alternative means to communicate this referent, and they both signal to each other the strategic nature of their behavior by means of explicit strategy markers.

In certain contexts laughs can also act as explicit signals of strategic behavior. Learners use laughter –represented in the transcript as ‘heh’– to indicate that they are aware of their errors, of being using an incorrect or inadequate TL expression. Stedje has explained this use of laughter as a kind of dissociation behavior –the learner “dissociates himself from his own product” (Stedje, 1983: 208).

EXAMPLE 4.6: ADV-ADV MM: suspenders
REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (523-530):
1   A:  (ah! mm mm (1.0) how are these things called?) {the things
2   (A’s HH outlines the shape of suspenders on her body, A looks
3   down)
4   (A’s HH mimics
5   pulling up her
6   pants, A looks
7   down)
8   A:  you, (1.4) you: pick your trousers} {with?}
9   {A’s HH outlines the shape
10  of suspenders on her
11  body, A looks down)
12  (0.8)
13 B:  ah! (1.5) yeah,
14 A:  heh heh
15 B:  (xxx)=
16 A:  =tights! heh [heh ] hhh heh heh
17 B:  [yeah]
18  (1.5)
19 B:  tirantes (‘suspenders’)?
20 A:  (yeah. heh heh) heh
21 (A nods)

Nonverbal signals, such as rising the eyebrows, shrugging the shoulders or questioning looks, can also appear instead of or accompanying some of the previous problem indicators. That is, learners may consciously use them in order to make evident the strategic nature of their behavior. For the same purpose learners also resort to sighs, swallowing acts and certain vocalization and intonational patterns. In the following extract, for instance, the learner uses rising intonation to draw the interlocutor’s attention to the fact that the lexical expression they are using is not the most appropriate
one. The utterance constitutes thus also a check for the interlocutor’s correct comprehension of the CS.

EXAMPLE 4.7: INT-NS SL: cap
REFERENT: cap
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (302-303):
1 A: he has::, (1.4) eh the::: big boy has a:: (1.9) a hat?
2 (1.6)
3 B: all right

As can be seen in the previous examples, most of these expressions and nonverbal signals constitute a very straightforward and highly reliable evidence of CS uses. However, learners do not always make use of this kind of explicit strategy markers. Sometimes, they do not want to make evident their lexical gaps and the strategic nature of their behavior unless it is strictly necessary.

4.1.1.3. Implicit strategy markers

When learners encounter linguistic difficulties in FL communication, these tend to surface in speech in the form of hesitation phenomena and other implicit signals of uncertainty. Filled and unfilled pauses, lengthening of syllables, repeats, self-corrections or false starts are usually concomitant with strategic behavior. Nervous laughs, sighs or gambits, such as ‘well’ or ‘I mean’, may appear in the same circumstances and all of them can co-occur with an increased use of spontaneous paralinguistic and kinesic phenomena.

These signals are generally less obvious than explicit problem indicators. They are not originally targeted towards the interlocutor. The speaker does not intentionally use them in order to signal a problem and ask for help, or, at least, this is not their main function. They are rather used as time gaining devices, i.e. to help learners gain time to develop an alternative means of expression. Nevertheless, they can also perform the same interactional functions as explicit strategy markers.

Pauses, silent or filled by a non-lexical vocalization like ‘hm’, ‘eh’ or ‘mm’, have been the most widely studied among all these phenomena. We know they are frequent elements, not only of L2 strategic communication, but also of ordinary informal speech. According to Perales and Cenoz (1996), they are regularly used in the L1 and the L2 in a variety of contexts and with many different functions and meanings. It is therefore not easy to identify when their use is related to a CS. For this purpose it is
necessary to take into account their localization, frequency and length (Færch and Kasper, 1983c: 214).

EXAMPLE 4.8: INT-NS CS: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (92-95):
1 A: it has a::: tch (3.8) a::: (2.3) {well, fo:::r knock.} (1.4)
2 (A’s LH mimics knocking)
3 A: it’s=
4 B: =ah! a {a doorknocker?}
5 (B’s RH mimics knocking)
6 A: yeah)
7 B: oh! i see now, heh

In example 4.8 a clear increase in the frequency and length of pauses before the CS can be easily identified. We can also see that pauses appear with other kinds of implicit strategy markers: drawls, repeats, false starts and gambits. As Færch and Kasper (1983c: 224) pointed out, it is the accumulation and co-occurrence of all these phenomena what constitutes a reliable indicator, for both the researcher and the interlocutor, of a lexical difficulty and a possible CS. See also examples 4.9 and 4.10.

EXAMPLE 4.9: INT-NS CS: black eye
REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-8):
1 A: the boy, (0.5) tch e::h (0.5) i i see the boy: (1.4) with a:::
2 (0.8) {with he:rs eye, (1.8) very black.}
3 (A opens her LH and points to her eye)
4 (1.8)
5 B: really? (0.7) {[mm ] heh}
6 (B nods, B is looking down)
7 A: [mhm]

EXAMPLE 4.10: ADV-ADV AV: black eye
REFERENT: black eye
INTERLinguage UTTERANCE (20-23):
1 A: mm:: (0.8) well, you see the same kid, (2.4) but, (0.6) he has
2 already, (0.8) {been given a punch,} (1.2) a:n::d (1.0) and
3 (A nods, B is not looking)
4 A: his right, (0.8) {right eye, (0.8)} {is:: completely black.}
5 (A’s LI points to her eye)
6 (A waves her LH palm down)
7 (4.4)
8 B: in my picture, (1.8) he: (1.2) he’s smiling heh heh heh heh

Most researchers agree, however, that hesitation phenomena cannot be taken as an unambiguous signal of strategic behavior. We have said that pauses may perform many different functions and this is also true for the other implicit strategy markers. This means that they are not always related to communicative problems, and even when
this is the case, the problem does not need to have a lexical nature. We still need more information on the nature and distribution of temporal variables in L1 and L2 non-strategic speech before we can establish which of these features and how many of them are sufficient for the reliable identification of strategic behavior. Another limitation of this identification procedure that we need to bear in mind is that strategies may also occur without the presence of these phenomena in speech. In fact, this problem is also inherent to the use of the other two kinds of performance features for identification purposes; i.e. overt strategic behavior and explicit strategy markers.

Altogether the examples here presented provide evidence of the major importance of performance features in the identification of CSs, particularly when these are considered from an interactional point of view. Psycholinguistic researchers, who view CSs as individual cognitive processes, analyze speech only as an indirect evidence of underlying strategic behavior. The interactional approach to CSs, however, sees them as elements of the interaction, therefore directly evident in IL performance data –cf. Chapter One, pp. 22-23. We assume learners need to make obvious to their interlocutors that they are experiencing a problem and making use of a CS so that interlocutors can share the problem and collaborate to its solution.

As pointed out in Chapter Two, p. 134, some interactionist researchers, such as Wagner and Firth (1997), identify as CSs only those cases of apparent strategic behavior that are explicitly flagged in speech by problem indicators. We may assume that this is the ideal condition for a CS used in interaction to result in the correct and successful communication of the intended message. However, a preliminary look at the data and the results of previous research suggest that this is not always the case.

Firstly, performance features are sometimes ambiguous because learners are not always able to indicate successfully the problem they are experiencing and/or the CS used to solve it. We have seen that not all problem indicators are equally explicit. The surface of a CS in speech is a matter of degree. It may even be possible that the CS is clear from the point of view of the interlocutors but not of the researcher, who is just an external observer of the interaction.

Secondly, sometimes it may be obvious that the learner has encountered a lexical difficulty, but the intended meaning they are trying to convey is not clear at all. We cannot forget that CSs are not always communicatively successful and interlocutors and
researchers are not always able to infer speakers’ intended meanings. Finally, as already recognized in Chapter Two, p. 134, under certain circumstances, learners may try to conceal the fact that they are experiencing a difficulty and using a CS to compensate for it. In fact, most interactional researchers agree that “it is hard for the observer to tell, just by looking at the data ..., whether any given speaker is using a communication strategy or not” (Tarone and Yule, 1989: 109).

In order to compensate for these problems in some previous studies several independent judges were asked to analyze the data. The final decision about the presence of a CS required an agreement between them –cf. for instance Poulisse et al. (1990) or Dörnyei (1995). This increases the reliability of the identification method, but is not a definitive solution since there are still those covert or concealed uses of CSs that cannot be identified by external observation.

We think that performance data is a valuable but not definitive source of evidence for the identification of CSs, no matter how many judges or researchers analyze it. On account of this and following most previous research in the field we will support the analyses carried out so far on IL performance with analyses of NL data and retrospective comments.

4.1.2. ANALYZING NL DATA FOR THE PURPOSES OF CS IDENTIFICATION

In the methodology chapter we explained how, in order to use it as an instrument of CS identification, a second version of the picture-story narration task in the learners’ NL, either Spanish or Galician, was obtained –cf. Chapter Three, pp. 157, 166 and 170. The utility of NL baseline data for identification purposes was first suggested by Váradi in 1973 and soon recognized by other researchers such as Tarone (1977), Hyde (1982), Tarone and Yule (1989), or Yarmohammadi and Seif (1992).

This identification method is based on the assumption that the NL version reflects the learner’s originally intended message; that is, what they would have said if they have not been constrained by an imperfect command of the FL (Hyde, 1982: 19). The comparison of the two versions helps the researcher to identify not only when learners say something different from what they really wanted to say, but also what they originally wanted to say, i.e. the intended meaning of the CS.
In the following example the use of a more specific and precise term of reference in the NL description than the one used in the IL one betrays a lexical gap in the learner’s IL system and the use of a CS to compensate for it. The learner, lacking the desired TL lexical item ‘wallpapered’, decides to use a related one, ‘decorated’, which is correct for the context but does not exactly describe what the learner is seeing in the pictures.

**EXAMPLE 4.11: ADV-NS CS: wallpapered**
**REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (246-249):**
1  A:   e:h well the the::, (0.5) the house with the i can see only:,
2       a part of the house, very funny because the: the walls are
3       (0.8) painted or decorated wi:th e::h flowers?
4  B:   mm:
**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A:   e a casa está ten tch eh as paredes están empapeladas con ou ou
     pintadas vamos con eh flores margaritas parece que son margaritas

Relevant items of the pictures that are mentioned in the NL story but not in the IL one can sometimes be taken as reliable pointers of strategic behavior. Relatively often learners avoid mentioning one of the target referents in the IL version because they lack the TL lexical item desired to do it, but they include this referent in their NL descriptions.

**EXAMPLE 4.12: INT-NS SL: vest**
**REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-87):**
1  B:   and what ab-? his tie? (2.4) and shirt?
2       (1.5)
3  A:   his tie? (4.4) tch e::h his father’s tie is::: white.
4       (1.5)
5  B:   hm=
6  A:   =hm? (0.5) a:n::d (2.5) he has (2.5) a::: (0.5) he has a::
7       newspaper, (1.4) in his:: (0.5) right hand.
8       (0.7)
9  B:   yeah
10      (3.4)
11 A:   a:n::d
12      (0.7)
13 B:   his trousers?
14      (1.4)
15 A:   his trousers, (2.2) okay, (2.4) e::h (0.7) long trousers.
16      (1.0) white trousers. [like] (it all),
17 B:  [yeah]
18 B:   and shoe:s and
19      (0.5)
20 A:   a:n::d shoes::, (1.0) white shoes, also,
21 B:   yeah
**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A:   lleva una corbata blanca un chaleco
The NL version can also provide valuable information to establish the intended meaning of a previously identified CS of ambiguous or obscure communicative intention. We have already said that one of the limitations of the analysis of IL data is that, in certain circumstances, we can be able to tell that a CS is being used but not the intended meaning underlying it –cf. current chapter, pp. 187-188. As can be seen in the following example, NL baseline data may be very useful to complete these limited analyses. In example 4.13, in line 9 of the transcript, performance features suggest that the learner is leaving something unsaid. The communicative intention of this learner cannot be identified until the NL account of the story is analyzed.

**EXAMPLE 4.13: ADV-ADV AV: oblique stripes**
**REFERENT:** stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (34-38):**

1. A: he's wearing::, a:: {a tie?}
   (A’s RH points to her neck, A looks down)
2. (0.7)
3. B: {hm hm=}
4. (B nods)
5. A: =and it’s a::: {striped (/strip/). (1.0)} {black and white}
   (A’s RI draws lines in the air ×n)
6. (A waves her RH ×n)
7. 9 A: stripes (/strips/), {and e::h}
   (B shakes her head, A is not looking)
8. (1.2)
9. 12 B: in my picture, the::, (1.0) the tie is: completely white.
10. (AB nod)
11. NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
12. A: ten unha corbata a raias así oblicuas blancas e negras
13. B: aquí a corbata é toda blanca non non ten debuxo ningún

However helpful all these different uses of NL data may seem, they need to be treated with caution. The previous analyses are based on the assumption that learners intend to convey exactly the same content in their L1 and L2 accounts of the story. Even though the NL version was elicited immediately after the IL one and specific instructions were given to the learners about how they should approach this task, L1 stories tend to be much shorter but also more elaborated and detailed than IL ones. Sometimes it is impossible to know for sure whether the differences between both stories are really due to strategic behavior applying in the FL version, or just to some kind of restructuring in the NL one. Even when it is clear that the learner’s communicative intention in the two versions is the same and a difference is found
between both of them, this may be due to an unintentional error of the learner rather than to a CS.

We agree with Hyde and those researchers who argue that “evidence from this source alone is not enough to establish whether a CS is being used or not” (Hyde, 1982: 19). It is therefore always advisable to use this source of evidence of strategic behavior in combination with some other kind of identification method. In this study further corroboration for those CSs initially identified through this method will be looked for in the analysis of retrospective data.

4.1.3. ANALYZING RETROSPECTIVE DATA FOR THE PURPOSES OF CS IDENTIFICATION

In the retrospective interview carried out immediately after the completion of the picture-story narration task, learners and NSs talked about their performance in the English language, the linguistic difficulties encountered, and how they tried to solve them –cf. Chapter Three, pp. 158-164, 167-168 and 170. The comments they provided were expected to constitute an invaluable source of information for the identification of CSs. In fact, since Tarone (1977) first introduced retrospective data in the study of CSs and Poulisse et al. (1987) showed that certain strategic behaviors can only be identified with the speaker’s help, the usefulness of verbal reports has been systematically recognized in most CS research. We expect the analysis of retrospective data to corroborate previously identified CS instances, to clarify those CS uses that may still remain somehow ambiguous and to disclose new CSs impossible to identify through external observation. The following examples more clearly illustrate in what specific ways this retrospective data contributed to the identification of CSs.

In general, learners’ comments confirmed most of those strategies previously identified through the analysis of IL and/or NL data and, more important, they also provided valuable information for the correct understanding of these CSs. In some situations, such as in example 4.14, it is clear for the researcher and the interlocutor that the learner has encountered a lexical problem, but it is not equally clear what kind of lexical gap originates this problem. In these contexts retrospective data proved to be very helpful, making it possible to establish the learner’s intended meaning with a high degree of reliability.
EXAMPLE 4.14: ADV-ADV LT: vest  
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper  
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-62):
  1  A: he wears a tie, also, and >i
  2  I don’t know, the boy enters, crying,  
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (61-62):
B: and a ahi no sabías o chaleco non?  
A: el chaleco ... yo estaba todo ya antes de la corbata yo le quería decir tiene un chaleco heh pero dije bueno pues vamos por el resto primero heh

On the other hand, the analysis of retrospective data revealed that some segments of the interaction initially considered as potential CSs are in fact erroneous uses of the FL or the result of interpretation problems rather than lexical difficulties. In the following example the learner’s use of the term ‘jacket’ instead of ‘vest’ or ‘waistcoat’ seemed to be due to a gap in the IL lexicon. However, in the interview the learner explained that they had used this term non-strategically, believing that the object they were observing and trying to communicate was really a jacket. Only later did the learner realize it was a vest rather than a jacket.

EXAMPLE 4.15: ADV-NS IM: vest  
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper  
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (95-103):
A: he’s wearing long trousers and a jacket with two buttons and underneath you can see a white shirt and a white tie  
B: he’s wearing a jacket!?  
A: yeah it’s like a jacket  
B: cause mine looks like a shirt with a tie  
B: no he’s wearing a jacket on on the shirt the jacket it’s very similar to the one the kid’s wearing with two pockets on each side  
B: no mine is not  
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (95-103):
A: pensé que era una chaqueta aquí ya me di cuenta pensé que eran las rayas de la chaqueta aquí ya me di cuenta que no era una chaqueta

In example 4.16, as performance features suggest, the learner is experiencing a problem. Retrospective data reveals that the learner does not know what to say because they do not know how to interpret the picture, not because of a lexical or linguistic difficulty. No CS is therefore being used.

EXAMPLE 4.16: ADV-ADV AV:  
REFERENT: painful face/painful expression/curved mouth  
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20-34):
A: in the second mm well you see the same kid but he has already been given a punch and and his right right eye is completely black  
B: in my picture he’s smiling heh heh heh
A: he’s smiling?
B: yeah heh
A: no i think he’s that he is i don’t know about his face his expression but i think that you know? i can see some stars? you know? over his head
B: yeah four stars
A: yeah and he’s not smiling at all heh heh
B: (xxx)in my picture it seems to be smiling
A: smiling
B: he seems to be smiling
A: mhm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (20-34):
B: eu penso que sorrí
... 
A: quizás pe- ainda que non é que nin sequera en español saberría describir esta esta cara entenres? o sea sei que non está rindo pero non sei
I: entonces é que non sabías que decir non que non souberas como dicilo
A: uuhh si

The use of non-native-like or even non-existent TL expressions is not necessarily related to a CS. Certain manifestations of erroneous IL rules may seem to be CSs when they are not. In example 4.17 the analysis of IL and NL data seems to suggest that the learner, in the lack of the desired TL lexical item ‘wallpaper’, has coined the word ‘paperwall’. Retrospective data reveals that the learner has used ‘paperwall’ because they erroneously believe this is a correct TL word. The learner is not using a CS but making an error and the only source of evidence that made it possible to distinguish between both kinds of behaviors were the learner’s retrospective comments.

EXAMPLE 4.17: ADV-ADV IM: wallpaper
REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (371-375):
A: and the paperwall is very flowery
B: the wall- is the wall- is
A: you can see daisies
B: is got wallpaper inside?
A: mhm it’s flowers daisies i think
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (371-375):
A: si paperwall
I: conocías esa palabra?
A: si

Although these forms of TL use are not frequent in our data, they would have been incorrectly identified as CSs, had we not supported our initial IL and NL analyses with retrospective data.

Finally, the analysis of retrospective data revealed new instances of CSs that, so far, had remained unnoticed by the researcher. Learners are able to predict the lexical problems they are going to encounter in the communication of their messages. This
allows them to opt for the avoidance of problematic messages before any sign of uncertainty or difficulty surfaces in their speech. As can be seen in example 4.18, this kind of strategic behavior can only be identified with the help of some introspective technique.

EXAMPLE 4.18: INT-INT VM: badge
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-3):
1 A: there’s a: a little boy who’s dressed in a: (0.8) a: who’s
dressed in shorts, e:::h shoes, an:::d (0.6) a jacket. a:n:::d
(0.5) he’s black his hair is black.
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (1-3):
A: non iso nono comentei ... porque quería rematar pronto non porque
porque ía dicir shield o que pasa é que dixen no sabía nin como
se dicía en español entón dixen shield escudo pero escudo é máis
como como un escudo destes entón ... pensei dixen bah! no vou
dicir shield porque vai pensar que estou que está cun escudo así
e está no e por iso

It is also possible that a learner, who foresees a lexical problem, decides to attempt an alternative means of communication without the awareness of the interlocutor. For this purpose the learner tries to avoid the occurrence of all of the above mentioned problem indicators in their speech. In other words, the learner tries to conceal the CS and to deceive the interlocutor pretending that what has just been said does accurately convey the originally intended message.

EXAMPLE 4.19: ADV-ADV MM: fist
REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/father clenches his fist
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (657-658):
1 A: he is li::ke {threatening:, with his e:::h closed} (0.8) hand
2 {A clenches her RH in a fist to imitate the
3 father}
4 A: (2.2) like if he was going to punch somebody, (0.5)
5 A: {hm!} (2.0) he seems to be very angry now,
6 {A clenches her RH in a fist to imitate the father}
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (657-658):
A: fist es porque no me salía fist dije closed hand porque no me
salía

This kind of behavior becomes even more difficult to identify if the learner happens to hit, in the strategic attempt to find an alternative means of communication, the initially desired TL form. In 4.20 the learner uses the expression ‘black eye’ as a description for the intended referent, without realizing that this is actually the desired TL equivalent of the NL expression ‘ojo morado’.
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EXAMPLE 4.20: ADV-ADV LT: black eye
REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (45-46):
1 A: e::h (2.6) he:: sees (0.5) four stars, (2.0) e::h because of
   the blow, (1.5) and he has a:: black eye. (1.0) e::h his arms
   are open,
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (97-99):
1 A: and his son is: (0.5) pointing at his:: (1.0) i think at his::
   (1.6) black eye?
2 B: okay in mine (1.0) the boy is not pointing at anything,
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (120-122):
1 A: a::nd (2.8) a::nd (0.5) i can:: see only: (1.4) her black eye.
   (2.2) only (0.5) that part of the face.=
3 B: =well, eh in mine he didn’t have a black eye, (1.3) heh so.

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (45-46):
I: lo de black eye eso lo conocías?
A: lo de black eye? lo conocía? no o sea fue
I: cuando dices lo de black eye?
A: el ojo morado no sé si se dice así
I: entonces por qué dijiste black eye?
A: pues también por el dibujo tiene un ojo eso normal y el otro negro
B: lo de black eye sí que lo había oído
I: tú le entendiste que se refería a morado?
B: sí
I: y aparte conocías?
B: si la expresión
...

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (97-99):
I: y ahí vuelves a utilizar lo de black eye otra vez?
A: claro como antes como antes funcionó heh heh

Færch and Kasper (1983c) insist that these deceptive behaviors are relatively quite common, particularly among advanced learners who have large L2 resources, high communicative aspiration levels, and considerable need of face saving, i.e. of disguising embarrassing lexical gaps (Færch and Kasper, 1983c: 235). Examples 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20 show that when speakers are able to conceal their strategies to their interlocutors, it is also impossible for the researcher to identify them, unless the speaker decides to disclose their use in the retrospective interview. However, we need to say that in our data these strategic behaviors are not very frequent.

Despite all the advantages here discussed, the use of retrospective data for CS identification purposes is not free of problems either. In general, any kind of introspective tool is always subject to a number of limitations, reported in the methodology chapter of the present study –cf. Chapter Three, pp. 158-164; and widely documented in previous research –cf. for instance Ericsson and Simon (1984, 1987). According to these authors, two of the main shortcomings of retrospective techniques
are that they are limited to conscious behaviors and subject to memory lapses. The consciousness issue has not been a major problem for us, since, as clearly stated in Chapter Two, we believe CSs to be consciously used by speakers –cf. Chapter Two, p. 132-133. In order to overcome the limits of memory the retrospective interview was carried out as soon as possible and contextual information was used to activate learner’s memories –cf. Chapter Three, p. 161. In general our participants did not complain about retrieval problems and provided the kind of information we were looking for.

Another common argument against the use of retrospective data –also discussed in Chapter Three, pp. 162-164; is that this type of evidence is subject to the effects of researcher bias. As can be seen in the examples above, a considerable percentage of the comments are spontaneous, i.e. not elicited by a researcher’s question; the information provided is more detailed than needed and some of the reports are even contrary to the researcher’s expectations. This seems to suggest that researcher bias has not been a major influence on our data. Furthermore, this also shows that our subjects were in general willing to cooperate and that they tried to be objective in their responses rather than to hide their linguistic shortcomings in order to supply socially acceptable data.

In order to make the identification of CSs as much reliable as possible, all these limitations and potential problems were taken into account, not only in the design of the retrospective interview but also in the interpretation of retrospective data. The information obtained from the participants was, whenever possible, contrasted with the researcher’s analysis of IL and NL data, and those learners’ comments suspicious of being affected by any of the limitations inherent to verbal report techniques were disregarded in our final analysis.

4.1.4. EVALUATION OF THE CS IDENTIFICATION ANALYSIS

None of the three different sources of evidence used in isolation seems to be reliable enough for the definitive identification of CSs in FL interaction. However, the triangulation of the three of them –IL, NL and retrospective data– has proved to be a helpful, effective and reliable identification tool. Each of them can be used to obtain confirmation of those CS identified with the other two, disclose new cases of strategic behavior impossible to be observed with the other procedures, clarify ambiguous uses and even, when necessary, eliminate incorrectly identified CSs. This means that they
compensate for each other’s deficiencies, thus increasing the reliability of the final identification of CSs.

However, it is necessary to recognize that there is not yet any entirely reliable formula for the identification of CSs in spontaneous speech. Even when the three sources of evidence are considered together, doubts may arise as to whether certain elements of the interaction should be identified as strategic or not. Sometimes the information obtained is incomplete or the three different sources of evidence provide contradictory and inconclusive data. We have opted for leaving these ambiguous cases out of our study. This means that actual CS uses might have been omitted from our corpus since we were not able to identify them with enough reliability. In other words, following previous similar studies we have considered it preferably “to err on the side of conservatism” (Poulisse et al., 1990: 107).

We also need to say that these ambiguous cases represent a minimum percentage of the total number of potential strategic uses analyzed and, since the main objective of our research is not the quantitative analysis of CSs, it should not affect the final results of our investigation in any significant way. Furthermore, this problem is not exclusive of our study but common to any CS investigation that attempts to deal with natural-like IL data.

In sum, we believe there is no one hundred per cent effective method to establish the presence of CSs in FL interaction, but the one used in our study, i.e. the triangulation of IL, NL and retrospective data, has proved to be so far the most helpful and reliable one.

In Appendix C the reader can find a database composed by those segments of the interaction in which, according to the evidence provided by the analysis of IL, NL and retrospective data, learners and their interlocutors are making use of CSs to compensate for their lexical difficulties. As also explained in Chapter Three, p.173, we have included a full transcript of the verbal and nonverbal features of the interaction, learners’ NL baseline data and the retrospective comments provided by the participants on their English language performance. In this way readers have the possibility of verifying by themselves not only the results but also the efficiency and reliability of the procedure used in the identification of strategic behavior.
4.2. CLASSIFICATION OF CSs

In order to give an answer to those questions which prompted our research, the strategic segments of interaction identified in the data need now to be analyzed and organized in some kind of descriptive system. That is, a framework of analysis is required which serves to classify these interactional segments into a limited set of CS categories.

As already discussed in Chapter One, p. 32, we agree with those researchers like Tarone who believe that any attempt to reduce spontaneous speech data to fixed measurable categories is somehow arbitrary. Human behavior is unpredictable and unlimited in its variability, and no analytic framework imposed on interactional data can do full justice to this variability (Tarone, 1977: 196; 2002: personal communication). But at the same time the CS researcher needs to organize the amount of data collected into manageable entities in order to find those patterns of strategic behavior that do exist in the data and thus be able to contribute to our understanding of strategic communication.

For this purpose previous researchers have proposed a considerable variety of CS taxonomies. In Chapter One, section 1.1.2, we made a detailed analysis of the most influential ones, discussing the main differences existing between them and how these differences reflect the approach the researcher takes to the concept of CS. Our research has been prompted by an interest in the study of CSs as elements of the interaction. The specific objectives of this investigation require of an analytic framework that allows for the identification and classification of differences in interaction, i.e. in the verbal and nonverbal strategic means of expression used by learners and their native or non-native interlocutors to agree on meaning.

Taking this into account we have decided to make use of Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) classification of what they have called ‘lexical problem-solving mechanisms’. As explained in Chapter One, p. 44, the taxonomic proposal made by these authors is partly based on Poulisse’s (1993) and on Levelt’s (1989, 1993, 1995) cognitive model of speech production. Poulisse (1993) conceives CSs as mental plans to be located into Levelt’s (1989) model and classifies them into a psychologically plausible taxonomy. Dörnyei and Kormos’ classification is therefore initially based on a psycholinguistic approach to the concept of CS. However, we will see that their final distinction of

46 A full description of this taxonomy and the CS categories identified by Dörnyei and Kormos (1998) has also been provided in Chapter One, pp. 41-45.
specific CS types within overall categories reflects interactional principles of analysis in line with our researcher interests.

We have opted for this taxonomy, despite its originally cognitive nature; firstly, because it constitutes the most recent all-encompassing classification of CSs to be proposed. This means that the authors could incorporate knowledge about CSs obtained from the most influential and widely used taxonomies to that date. In fact, its design is based on a careful study of previous CS classification systems, both interactional and psycholinguistic –cf. Dörnyei and Scott (1997). Secondly, as we have just said, it is oriented to the classification of underlying psychological processes, but surface differences of strategic utterances are also taken into account. These authors have been able to identify the common features and relationships of previous psycholinguistic and interactional classifications and, in this way, integrate psycholinguistic and interactional research interests into a single taxonomy –similar attempts are Yule (1997), and Yule and Tarone (1997). This aspect increases the generalizability of the taxonomy and the comparability of the results obtained. Thirdly, it is one of the most extensive and detailed taxonomies available, containing an inventory of strategy types that encompasses virtually all the strategic devices identified in previous interactional approaches to the classification of CSs. As a starting point for the analysis of our data, it is preferable to have in mind as wide a range of CS types as possible, so that potential significant differences among strategies may not be overlooked.

We have seen in Chapter One, p. 44, that Dörnyei and Kormos have organized their taxonomy in three different levels. At the first level of description they make a distinction between two major types of strategic behaviors which they call reduction and achievement strategies. Following Poulisse (1993), they consider that the learner who encounters a lexical difficulty can resort only to two main options: “(a) abandon or change the original speech plan, or (b) keep the macro-plan unchanged and modify the preverbal message only” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 358). The two resulting categories have been explained in psychological terms, but this binary division may be directly related to similar interactional proposals –cf. Váradi (1973) or Corder (1978). It is therefore also coherent with Tarone’s (1981) definition of CSs as two different alternatives and with the working definition of CSs here adopted, which considers that the learner (and his/her interlocutor) may choose to (a) avoid –not attempt to
communicate the intended meaning, or (b) try out an alternative means to communicate this meaning—cf. Chapter Two, p. 130.

The second option, achievement strategies, is broken down into five different categories, which expand the three strategy types originally proposed by Poulisse (1993): substitution, substitution plus, macro-reconceptualization, micro-reconceptualization and appeals for help. These five options reflect differences in the mental processes that underlie strategic utterances and are therefore of little interest for the purposes of our research.

The third level of the taxonomy, the more detailed one, contains a total of fifteen CS types organized within the above mentioned overall categories. It is the result of Dörnyei and Kormos’ attempt “to establish straightforward correspondences between verbalized problem-solving devices and underlying psycholinguistic processes” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 363). Therefore the categories thus established reflect differences in verbal encoding, i.e. in the verbal properties of the strategic utterances observable in interaction. Their labels and description directly relate them to the categories previously proposed in interactional approaches to the classification of CSs.

If we ignore differences in structure and terminology this level contemplates all the CS types identified in previous interactional classifications of CSs. It includes all the strategic types identified by Tarone (1977) in her taxonomy, which, as discussed in Chapter One, p. 35, constitutes the basis of most following taxonomies. Some of the original types have been subdivided—a distinction is made, for instance, between grammatical and semantic word coinage or foreignizing and literal translation—and new kinds of strategic behavior identified in more recent studies have been added—for example, complete omission. But in general, the resulting fifteen categories reflect the same kind of differences that underlie traditional interactional taxonomies: i.e. avoidance versus achievement behavior and the choice between L1, L2 or nonverbal resources.

This inventory of categories, which we believe constitutes the most comprehensive and detailed account of CS types available, will be used as the starting point for the descriptive analysis of the strategies just identified. It will be adapted whenever necessary and organized taking into account the specific purposes of our investigation.
In the following pages we give a full description of each of these CS categories. We explain the analyses carried out in the data in order to classify each of the strategic segments of interaction into one of these categories. The problems the researcher found in this process are also discussed, as well as the decisions taken to solve them and the final results obtained.

4.2.1. AVOIDANCE CSs
As just mentioned, following Tarone (1981), the definition proposed for the concept of CS comprehends two major kinds of behavior. In interaction, the speaker or speakers who desire to communicate a meaning and believe the desired lexical item to do it is unavailable or not shared by the interlocutors choose between two options: (a) avoid – not attempt to communicate the meaning, or (b) attempt an alternative means to communicate the meaning. If they choose not to communicate the meaning they will be making use of an avoidance CS. If, on the contrary, they choose to attempt to convey this meaning using an alternative means of expression, they will be employing an achievement or compensatory CS.

Avoidance strategies are therefore never used to communicate the intended message. They are rather used to avoid it, to leave it unmentioned, which makes of their status as CSs an arguable issue. Dörnyei and Kormos see them “as problem-solving only in a limited sense” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 362), and other authors prefer to consider them as production rather than communication strategies (Suni, 1996: 240). In fact, they have generally received less attention than achievement strategies. They are, however, taken into account in most CS taxonomies on the basis that, by helping the learner to ignore the lexical gap encountered, they solve what otherwise would result in a communicative breakdown. They may be not an effective way to communicate, but they are certainly an effective way to keep communication going on and in this way solve the communicative problem that arises when a desired lexical item is not available.

The category of avoidance strategies as proposed by Tarone (1981) and presented here is roughly equivalent to what other authors have called message adjustment (Váradi, 1973; Corder, 1978), risk avoidance (Corder, 1978) or reduction strategies (Færch and Kasper, 1980, 1983b, 1984; Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998). Dörnyei
and Kormos, however, consider three different types of avoidance or reduction behaviors – *message abandonment, message reduction* and *message replacement*—where Tarone’s interactional approach distinguishes only two – *topic avoidance* and *message abandonment*. In 1997 Dörnyei and Scott related the first two categories – message abandonment and message reduction— to Tarone’s message abandonment and topic avoidance strategies; and the third category – message replacement— to Færch and Kasper’s (1980, 1983b) *meaning replacement* strategy (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997: 188).

The category of message replacement, defined as “substituting the original message with a new one because of not feeling capable of executing it” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 359), is, however, problematic. This definition places the strategy in between avoidance and achievement behavior, blurring the limits between both. In fact, we have found that, when dealing with real data, the distinction between message replacement and a specific type of achievement strategy, *approximation*, becomes difficult to sustain and even arbitrary. In the analysis of interactional data it is impossible to establish in an objective and reliable way whether the intention of the learner is to substitute the message with a similar one, i.e. message replacement, or to substitute the desired lexical item to convey the message with a related approximate term, i.e. approximation. Not even retrospective data can help since we have found that learners are rarely aware of this distinction. This problem was also noticed for Færch and Kasper’s (1980, 1983b) meaning replacement strategy and discussed in previous studies (Poulisse, Bongaerts and Kellerman, 1984: 79-80; Poulisse *et al.* 1990: 27). On account of this we have decided to ignore this category, and to follow the more traditional description of avoidance strategies as topic avoidance and message abandonment.

### 4.2.1.1. Topic avoidance

The learner may decide to avoid reference to an object, action or idea when the desired lexical item to communicate it is not available in their IL system. This kind of strategic behavior is usually known as topic avoidance and it invariably results in a reduction of the original message.
EXAMPLE 4.21: ADV-NS RA: rolled up
REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (262):
A: he’s wearing suspenders, and a:: shirt. (0.7) he’s wearing a:: shirt,
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva la camisa remangada
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (262):
I: el señor lleva las mangas remangadas
A: ah! aquí es que no no sabía cómo decirlo eh
I: pero te fijaste entonces?
A: sí sí
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (262):
I: here the man had the sleeves rolled up but she didn’t mention it
B: okay

As explained in the identification section –cf. current chapter, pp. 194-195, and as can be seen in examples 4.18 and 4.21, learners do not always indicate to their interlocutors that they are making use of a topic avoidance strategy. These are therefore difficult to identify. Differences between the IL and the NL versions of the picture-story may be helpful, but not definitive indicators. In the analysis of interactional data we have found that speakers leave referents unmentioned because of lexical difficulties, but also because they do not consider them a salient or relevant feature to mention or, simply, because they do not notice them. Only if the learner recognizes in the retrospective interview that the referent has been avoided because of a linguistic shortcoming can we identify a topic avoidance CS with the necessary degree of objectivity and reliability.

Retrospective comments will be seen, all through this chapter, to play a major role for the accurate and reliable classification of CSs. The classification process, like the identification procedure, has been carried out by the researcher alone. However, some of the most difficult or problematic examples have been contrasted with other specialists. Broadly speaking, the combination of IL, NL and retrospective data allowed for an easy, clear and objective description and classification of strategic interaction. Again, we believe the triangulation of these three different sources of evidence guarantees the reliability of the procedure.

4.2.1.2. Message abandonment
Tarone makes a distinction, also observed in most following taxonomies, between the previous kind of behavior and those cases in which the speaker initiates the
communication of the message and, when he or she realizes the desired lexical item is unavailable, stops in mid-utterance and gives up any kind of communicative attempt (Tarone, 1977: 198).

EXAMPLE 4.22: INT-INT VM: knocker and mailbox
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker and
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-69):
1 A: there (0.5) there are the::, (0.8) here are the (0.4) the::
2 A: (0.4) sorry, hhh e:h they’re in front of a door,
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (68-69):
A: esto non sabía ... isto non non sabía como dicilo ía dicir como un ring pero non non sabía ía dicir a ring e sabes esto con pero non ... e despois isto pois iso ía explicar e dixen non! paso e pasei de todo
I: e aí incluso cando ela che pregunta
A: se hai un número si aí é cando pensei en dicirlle eu isto pero dixen non sei como se di nono digo

From a communicative point of view the result of both avoidance strategies is the same, i.e. the target referent is omitted. But in interaction the message abandonment strategy takes the form of an unfinished utterance that may act as a signal for the interlocutor that a lexical gap has been encountered and an avoidance strategy is being used. As pointed out by Tarone, this gives the interlocutor the possibility of trying “to fill in and suggest an alternative means of expressing what the speaker wants to say”, which would mean an interactional joint effort to agree on meaning (Tarone, 1981: 290).

Also common among learners is the use of topic avoidance or message abandonment strategies with the intention of postponing a message rather than actually abandoning or avoiding it. In example 4.23 the learner initially uses the message abandonment strategy as a temporal solution. They are talking about the father’s clothes and realize the desired lexical item ‘vest’ is unavailable in their IL system. The learner temporarily ignores this referent and continues with the description of the clothes of the father –cf. lines 1-9. Once this description is finished, the speaker goes back to this item and only now, when the context allows for all the attention to be focused on the lexical problem, attempts an alternative means of expression to communicate the originally intended meaning ‘vest’ –cf. lines 15-57.
EXAMPLE 4.23: INT-INT CL: vest
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-262):

1 A: he has a::: (2.7) shirt? (1.4) [and] then he has {a::,} ah! >i
2 B: [hm ]
   (A’s HH point to her chest)
3 A: don’t remember the name,< {a::} okay, (1.2) like a::: (3.4) mm
4   (A’s HH point to her chest)
5 A: mm mm tch (heh (0.8) (yes)) tch e::h, he has (2.2) long
6   (A’s HH point to her chest, A looks down)
7 A: trousers?
8      (1.2)
9 B: {yes,}  
10      (B nods)
11 A: (1.4)
12 A: e::h normal shoes, {i think,} (1.7) a::n:d the::: (2.6) he has
13   (B nods)
14 A: (0.5) e::h a::: (2.3) >i don’t remember the name,< sorry, e:h
15   your your father has only the::?:
16 B: the:::
17   ((1.5})
18 A: {wi[thout  ]}
19 B: [(you mean)] the the shirt?
20      (0.6)
21 A: yeah=  
22 B: =yes he has, and there is a pocket in the shirt,
23      (1.2)
24 A: {(no.}) } (1.5) be[cause (0.5) no ]
25   (A shakes her head)
26 B: [so (0.5) (heh)there] (heh)is
27   (heh)something, hhh who is (. ) difference, (0.5) okay.=
28 A: =no i i i’m going to explain, e:h he has like a:::
29   (2.6)
30 B: jumper?=  
31 A: ={like a sweater,} {or jumper,} yes, {but without?=  
32   (A’s RH points to her chest)
33   (B nods)
34 (A’s RI draws an armhole around her LA shoulder ×2)
35 B: =okay)
36 A: {sleeves, (0.5)} i [think,] (1.3) >i don’t remember the
37   (A’s RH grabs her LA sleeve)
38 B: [uhuh ]
39 A: name,< {(1.5}) and in: {he has, two pockets?}
40   (B nods)
41   (A’s HH point to where the pockets would be on her belly)
42      (1.4)
43 B: yes  
44 A: but okay i think that is just the difference [the:::]
45 B: {[ yes,]} i think,  
46   (B nods)
47 B: (heh) (. ) okay,  
48   (B nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y tiene un chaleco tch
B: ahí está el chaleco
A: era el chaleco el que no me acordaba cómo se decía
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: no tenía el chaleco
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: eh en el tuyo llevaba el chaleco y todo esto
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (238-262):
I: tú te diste cuenta de que era un chaleco
B: sí cuando dijo es un jersey sin mangas
...
I: hasta ahí no sabías lo que era?
B: no podía ser yo que sé una chaqueta no sé no tenía ni idea de lo que podía ser

This behavior shows that in order to know the real intention of the speaker and whether the target referent is actually avoided or abandoned in discourse, the interaction needs to be considered as a whole. Attention needs to be paid to the full exchange between interlocutors rather than to isolated utterances.

4.2.2. ACHIEVEMENT CSs

Any attempt made by the learner and/or his/her interlocutor to develop an alternative means of expression for the communication of the intended meaning in the lack of the desired TL lexical item is considered an achievement CS. To compensate for their IL shortcomings learners and their interlocutors manipulate their knowledge of the TL, the NL or any other language they may happen to know. They mix languages, make up new items, extend the application of the already known ones and create roundabout expressions to overcome their problems. In face-to-face interaction they often combine these creative uses of language with the use of gestures and all sorts of kinesic and paralinguistic devices. That is, they exploit all the linguistic and non-linguistic resources available for the purposes of strategic communication.

Achievement strategies involve, therefore, a considerable range of different strategic behaviors. In the present study these will be classified as: code switching, approximation, use of all-purpose words, complete omission, foreignizing, grammatical word coinage, literal translation, circumlocution, semantic word coinage, appeals for assistance and nonverbal strategies.

4.2.2.1. Code switching

Code switching, also known in the literature as language switch or borrowing, is defined by Dörnyei and Kormos as “including L1 or L3 words with L1 or L3
pronunciation in L2 speech” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 359). The learner, lacking the appropriate TL lexical item to make reference to a given object, action or idea, uses a term from a different language without making any attempt to translate or adapt it to the TL.

**EXAMPLE 4.24: ADV-ADV SO: rhombs**
**REFERENT:** checkered floor/ (tiles)
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (193-197):**

1. A: a:n:::d there a::re e:::h (2.0) diamonds? (on the floor, (1.5)
2. ) (A waves her RH palm down ×n)
3. )
4. A: so:me black and some white,
5. ) (0.8)
6. B: diamonds?
7. ) (0.4)
8. A: yeah, (0.7) e:::h (0.4) {°rombos ('rhombuses').° heh=}
9. ) (A’s RI draws a rhombus shape in the air)
10. )
11. B: =oh! (2.2) diamonds, sí ('yes').

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A: el suelo pues tiene rombos unos blancos y otros negros

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (193-197):**
B: eu aí entendín que había diamantes e dixen onde están os diamantes porque nonos vía hai diamantes de verdade? e despois claro fixeime dinme de conta da forma...
I: mhm y diamond lo dices?
A: como rombo pude decir cuadrados pero me salió eso heh
I: cuando ella no te entiende lo de diamonds
A: pude haberle dicho otra cosa lo dije en español porque no porque no lo pensé no sé

**EXAMPLE 4.25: INT-INT FC: suspenders**
**REFERENT:** suspenders
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (570-574):**
1. A: he {we- e:::h he wears e:::h (1.5) tirantes ('suspenders'),
2. } (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
3. )
4. A: como:: esto: ('like this') (0.8) tirantes ('suspenders').
5. ) (0.8))
6. B: a::h! tirantes ('suspenders'),=
7. ) (sí ('yes').)
8. ) (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
9. ) (1.5)
10. )
11. B: sí, no sé cómo se dicen tirantes, ('yes i don’t know how to say suspenders')
12. )
13. A: (ni idea (no idea))
14. )

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (570-574):**
I: bueno y lo de los tirantes que dijisteis
B: ah! es verdad dónde está?
A: sí los los tirantes del este
B: como se dice tirantes
I: braces o suspenders
A: yo no sabía no sabía cómo se decía
Our data reveals that learners tend to resort to the use of L1 or L3 terms in their L2 discourse only when everything else fails; that is, when they feel unable to make use of any other kind of CS. We have found that code switching often follows previous failed attempts to communicate through a different kind of strategy – as in example 4.24 where it follows an approximation and a nonverbal strategy. It may also be used by learners who explicitly indicate they have been unable to produce a meaningful TL expression – as in example 4.25. The successful use of this strategy is to a great extent based on the interlocutor’s knowledge of the speaker’s L1. But even when the listener is not familiar with this language, interlocutors may exploit the communicative value of the context of the interaction and their awareness of the relationships and similarities existing between the L1 and the L2 to reach a final agreement on meaning.

In our study we have found that learners and their interlocutors resort relatively often to other languages, most frequently the learner’s L1, to overcome their lexical difficulties in the English language. This process of conscious transfer, which involves code switching as well as foreignizing and literal translation strategies, constitutes the basis of what most previous taxonomies consider a broad CS category known as L1-based or conscious transfer strategies (Corder, 1978; Tarone, 1977, 1981; Bialystok and Frölich, 1980; Færch and Kasper, 1983b).

4.2.2.2. Approximation

Dörnyei and Kormos define approximation as “using a single alternative lexical item, such as a superordinate or a related term, that shares semantic features with the target word or structure” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 359). Under this or different labels the strategy of approximation has been identified in all previous CS taxonomies and defined in quite similar terms (Váradi, 1973; Tarone, 1977; Færch and Kasper, 1983b; Poulisse et al., 1990).

In examples 4.26 and 4.27 learners intend to communicate the meanings ‘to roll up’ and ‘cap’, but realize the desired lexical items to convey these messages are

---

47 Our research was carried out in a very specific linguistic context. As we have already explained our learners are Galician and Spanish speaking bilinguals – cf. Chapter Three, p. 141. Transfer from either the Spanish or the Galician language is therefore always considered as L1 transfer. It is also important to notice that when our learners were interacting with other learners they knew they shared their NL. When they were communicating with English NSs they could expect them to have some knowledge of the Spanish language, since they were, at that time, temporarily living in Spain. These specific conditions seem to have fostered the use of L1 transfer minimizing any kind of L3 transfer.
unavailable in their IL systems. They decide to use the alternative TL lexical items ‘to fold’ and ‘hat’, believing these items share enough semantic features with the intended ones to lead them and their interlocutors to a mutual agreement on the originally intended meanings.

EXAMPLE 4.26: ADV-ADV LT: to roll up
REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (298-302):
1 A: and (0.7) now i can see both (. ) arms of the father.
2 B: eh no, i can only see one.
3 A: is folding his sleeve like (2.6) (2.3)
4 (A’s LH grabs RA sleeve, B is not looking)
5 A: as if he were going to hit someone.)
6 (5.4)
7 B: mine he’s not, he doesn’t intend to hit.
8 (B shakes her head)
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh después en el siguiente eh ya se está remangando la manga de la camiseta
B: no el mío aparte que sólo se le ve está en la misma actitud que en la en la vez anterior y sólo se le ve ese brazo
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (298-302):
A: y ahí claro remangando pues no sabía
I: ... y tú qué entiendes ahí?
B: holding his sleeve eh así como no le voy a pegar no le voy a pegar porque sí no
I: ah! entonces no entendiste lo de que se estaba remangando?
B: no
I: como que estaba agarrando su brazo?
B: sí es que
I: y tú te diste cuenta de que ella no te entendió o te pareció que sí que te estaba entendiendo?
A: no no sé porque luego creo que también te digo que tenía la manga como subida entonces no sé
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (298-302):
A: ahí ella no sé si me entendió o no
B: sí le entendí que tenía la manga subida
I: mhm remangada?
B: sí
I: sin embargo no lo apuntaste aquí
B: no pero sí ... es que hay cosas por ejemplo the badge que me preguntaste al principio si me acordaba o no y no me dijiste la palabra pero después ahora ahora me acordé y claro es badge

EXAMPLE 4.27: INT-NS AE: cap
REFERENT: cap
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (590-593):
1 A: a kind of hat, he’s wearing?
2 B: mhm=
3 A: =he has the same picture, e: h that he had, (1.0) that (0.6)
4 e: h the: small child has, on his jackt. jacket.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una gorra de béisbol y una insignia en la gorra de béisbol
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (515-518):
A: yo sabía que se decía algo de que a las viseras se les llamaba
Speakers typically approximate by using a superordinate term, i.e. a term that refers to the concept but at a relatively high level of generality –example 4.27; or by means of a hierarchically same level related term, i.e. naming an object, action or idea which is not the intended one, but is similar to or reminiscent of it –example 4.26. Sometimes they even make use of a synonym, i.e. a term that does make reference to the concept being conveyed but is not the originally intended one. They establish analogies and/or comparisons between two different but related items, or use antonyms and draw contrasts or oppositions between two opposed items. Some authors have also found evidence of the use of subordinate terms –for instance, the use of ‘pines’ for ‘conifers’, ‘pine’ being considered as a subtype of ‘conifer’, documented in Poulisse (1993: 180); but these uses are quite rare and no examples have been found in our data.

As can be seen in the examples above, the speaker usually warns the interlocutor that the uttered TL item is not the originally intended one. Quite often approximate terms are accompanied by hedging expressions such as ‘it’s a kind of’ or ‘it’s like a’, which indicate that the word used does not fully express the speaker’s intended meaning and that therefore the listener needs to infer what is actually intended. That is, for an approximation strategy to work effectively, first, both interactants need to know that the approximate term used is not the desired and most appropriate one and, secondly, they should be able to establish a semantic link between this TL lexical item and the originally intended one.

Quite often approximation strategies appear in interaction in combination with other CSs. In example 4.28 an approximation and a nonverbal strategy are used simultaneously to make reference to a single concept. They work together to convey the intended meaning in such a way that one cannot be understood without the other.
Also frequent is the use of approximation as part of a descriptive circumlocution. In example 4.29 a relationship is first established between the referent ‘vest’ and a related one ‘jersey’. Those features which distinguish a vest from a jersey are also mentioned in order to describe the intended referent and thus guarantee the effective communication of the message. This kind of strategic behavior is extremely frequent. Poulisse et al. (1990) tried to distinguish it as a separate CS type but found this distinction problematic. When dealing with actual data, the limits between the three types of strategies turned out to be less clear than initially expected. Other researchers have identified this kind of behavior as a circumlocution CS ignoring the fact that an approximate term is involved in the strategy. However, we believe that in order to understand what is actually happening in the interaction and how the two interlocutors are able to agree on meaning, attention needs to be paid to the two different but related kinds of strategic behavior. Again, they work simultaneously, so that one cannot be understood without the other.
dous botóns e digo que é un xersei sen mangas porque solo ten
dous botóns

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (86-88):
B: waistcoat! waistcoat! ah!
I: what did you think it was?
B: because i thought mm a shirt but with no sleeves manga corta
because i thought like this you know? like in summer

In example 4.30, below, we can see how interlocutors resort first to a combination of approximation, ‘pullover’, and description, ‘without sleeves’—quite similar to the combination of CSs seen in example 4.29. Once agreement on meaning is established, the approximate term alone is used to make further references to the same concept. The use of the approximation CS in lines 304–322 cannot be correctly understood without taking into account the strategic exchange in lines 196–205. Learners and their interlocutors co-construct the conditions of their interaction and build on them in order to communicate their messages. This means that, to achieve a comprehensive understanding of how CSs work, they need to be considered in the context of the whole interaction and in relation to other possible CS uses.

EXAMPLE 4.30: INT-NS PM: vest
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-205):
1 A: he’s wearing a shirt, but {as well a::: (0.8) like a
2 (A’s HH point to her chest)
3 A: pullover,) {but without e::h the arm:::=
4 {A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her
5 left arm}
6 B: =sleeveless?}
7 (1.2)
8 A: mhm
9 B: uhuh!=
10 A: =with {two pockets} {and two:: buttons.
11 {A holds up two fingers}
12 (A’s HH point to where the buttons would
13 be on her chest)
14 (1.7))
15 B: right. (0.5) so one difference (he’s) got (0.5) a sleeveless
16 (3.0) jumper,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (308-322):
1 B: where?
2 A: whe- (3.6) where?
3 B: yeah. ah! on the? [on the shirt?]
4 A: [in the: ] yeah, no not on the shirt
5 because i i cannot see:
6 B: {he’s still wearing} {the jumper?}
7 {B’s HH outline the shape of a jumper on her body}
8 {A nods}
9 A: yeah,
10 B: right. (1.5) but where? where is this pocket?
11 (1.5)
In this excerpt we can also see how the learner, in an attempt to describe the intended object of referent, runs into a second linguistic difficulty and needs to solve it by means of a new CS. The learner tries to describe the intended referent ‘vest’ as a ‘pullover without sleeves’ and realizes the lacks in the IL system of the lexical item ‘sleeve’. To compensate for this gap the learner uses an approximate term: ‘arms’. The approximation strategy for ‘sleeves’ is therefore embedded in the circumlocution strategy for ‘vest’. The two CSs appear in the same utterance, but each of them is used to convey a different meaning. Embeddedness of one CS within the framework of another CS is a relatively common phenomenon widely discussed in previous research (Bialystok, 1990: 69-70; Poulisse et al., 1990: 65-66).

As in code switching, in approximation learners substitute a desired unavailable TL lexical item with an alternative related one. But whereas in code switching they make use of their L1 or L3 resources for this purpose, in approximation they exploit exclusively their knowledge of the FL. On this basis, most researchers classify this
strategy within a different broader category called L2-based or paraphrase strategies (Tarone, 1977, 1981; Bialsytok and Frölich, 1980; Færch and Kasper, 1983b). This category also includes the use of all-purpose words, complete omission, grammatical word coinage, circumlocution and semantic word coinage.

4.2.2.3. Use of all-purpose words

Dörnyei and Kormos posit an additional separate category which they call use of all-purpose words to describe the use of empty words as an alternative to the unknown or unavailable TL lexical item (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 360). They talk about the use of words such as ‘thing’, ‘stuff’, ‘make’ or ‘do’, and even ‘thingie’ or ‘what-do-you-call-it’. These share only very common features with the desired lexical item and are related to the intended object of reference at a very general level.

The use of all-purpose words has not been recognized as a CS in most previous taxonomies. Dörnyei and Thurrell (1994) consider it a special type of approximation strategies and some authors include the use of general expressions in the group of avoidance strategies (Corder, 1978; Færch and Kasper, 1983b). The analysis of spontaneous ongoing interaction reveals, however, that all-purpose words are frequently used and, definitely, with an achievement rather than an avoidance intention.

In real communication interlocutors can resort to the context of the interaction to make sense of apparently empty or meaningless expressions. Once agreement on meaning has been achieved by means of a more elaborated CS, subsequent references to the same meaning in the same conversation are often easily and quickly accomplished by means of one of these all-purpose words. In example 4.31, for instance, it is the fourth time these two interlocutors are making reference to the concept badge in their interaction, the interlocutor can therefore rely on their shared common ground to interpret the use of the all-purpose word ‘thing’ in ‘the thing that the little boy:, (1.3) had.’. Again, this kind of strategic behavior can only be understood if it is related to what has been said before in the course of the interaction.

EXAMPLE 4.31: INT-INT CL: badge
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (828-832):
1 A:   and again (the:: the thing that the little boy:, (1.3) had.
   {A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her
2   chest}
3 A:   (2.8) the:: ]
5 B: [the] same or well more or less)} [yeah] {the same
6 A: {[yeah]}
7  {A nods}
8  {B nods}
9 B: thing) okay, (2.4) in on:: his jacket?
10  (1.8)
11 A: ye:ah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: que en la mia no tenía la las rayas la insignia la misma?
A: hm

In other circumstances all-purpose words are used together with illustrative gestures that make possible the successful communication of the message. In example 4.32 the all-purpose expression ‘doing this’ creates a speech context that contributes to the correct understanding of the strategic gesture. This kind of behavior is extremely frequent in our data and it clearly proves the need to pay closer attention to strategic combinations of what have been considered different and independent CSs up to now.

EXAMPLE 4.32: INT-INT CL: to roll up
REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (781-786):
1 A: the::: the::: the father of the: of the little boy, (1.2) is
2  e:::h (0.8) {i don’t know how do you say} {with, with one,
3  {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve
4       (A’s LH grabs her
5       RA}
6 A: with his hand,) {is like doing this.
7       {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve
8  (2.2)
9 B: oh my god! heh heh heh okay)
10 A: you know? {like, [i’m going (heh)to: ]}
11  {A’s LH mimics punching}
12 B: [(heh)hm (heh)hm heh heh] heh {to:} (. ) hit
13  (B nods)
14 B: you, okay
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: se está remangando? el padre ya para
A: si
B: para pelearse con el otro
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (781-786):
A: lo que ya dijimos antes de la camisa remangada ah no aquí se lo
digo no sé como se lo explico
B: que se está remangando he’s doing he’s doing

4.2.2.4. Complete omission

Another strategy which has not been always recognized in traditional CS taxonomies is complete omission, defined as “leaving a gap when not knowing a word and carrying on as if it had been said” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 360). Again, interlocutors need to rely on the verbal and nonverbal context of the interaction for the satisfactory
interpretation of the strategy. This explains, in part, that the use of omission has not been often documented in previous CS studies, mostly based on the analysis of non-interactional speech.

In our data we can see that when speakers omit unavailable lexical items they do it in a context which, they believe, provides enough information for the interlocutor to understand the intended message correctly. Either because of a previous reference to the same object –as in example 4.33 where omission follows a previous code switching strategy used for a first mention to the same object in the context of this conversation; or because of the simultaneous use of illustrative gestures –as in example 4.34.

EXAMPLE 4.33: ADV-ADV SO: vest
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (71-74):

1  B:   does he have a::? (2.2) {a little pocket} in the::?
2                               {B’s RI points to where the pocket
3 would be on her chest, A is not
4 looking)
5       (1.4)
6  A:   two. (0.6) [two ] little, pockets, and the: boy too.
7  B:              [two?] 

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   mm un chaleco con dos botones
B:   hm
A:   eh tiene dos bolsillos también en el chaleco

EXAMPLE 4.34: INT-NS CS: chin
REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-384):

1  A:   he is:: {(2.4) touching hi- the::
2       {A’s LH touches her chin}
3   (2.0)
4  B:   {{his chin?}
5       {{
6       (2.5)
7  A:   {{ºsí ('yes'º)}} } 
8       {{[A nods]}}
9       (2.5)
10 B:   {{[okay]}}} )
11   {{[B nods]}}

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-384):
A:   ah! si a barbilla non sabía dicilo
I:   e cando el te di chin? entendiches que se refería á barbilla
A:   si pero porque me soa pero así saber pois non

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-384):
I:   did you understand because of the mime?
B:   yeah

In the first example, 4.33, the complete omission strategy is clear. In the second, 4.34, it could be argued that the speaker is not really omitting a word, but using a
gesture instead of a word – Tarone (2003) personal comment. This gesture, however, cannot be correctly interpreted by the interlocutor or explained by the researcher without taking into account the linguistic context created by the learner. On this basis we will consider, for descriptive purposes, this kind of behavior as a simultaneous combination of an oral complete omission and a nonverbal strategy. We need though to acknowledge that, as we will also see in the next example, the complete omission category may be sometimes fuzzy, at least from the researcher’s perspective.

In example 4.35 we see how, quite often, learners consciously create a linguistic context that describes or illustrates the target concept. In line 9 of the transcript we can observe how the learner leaves a speech gap in substitution for the lacking TL item, but after having illustrated what the intended referent is not. In this kind of expressions the limits between omission and circumlocution become blurred. It is difficult to know where the description ends and the omission begins or whether it is possible or makes any sense to establish limits between both kinds of strategic behavior.

EXAMPLE 4.35: INT-NS PM: stripes
REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (91-97):

1. A: and he’s having a tie. (xxx) but (heh)i
2. {A shakes her head}
3. A: (heh) don’t {remember, hhh the::: (2.6) with:) (2.0)
4. {A’s RI draws lines in the air \times n}
5. A: {i don’t (0.5) i don’t know,} {with e:::h hhh} (1.6) well ties
6. {A shakes her head}
7. {A’s RI draws lines in the air \times n}
8. 
9. A: (. ) can see (. ) {with only one color,} {or what} [with]
10. {A holds up one finger}
11. {A’s RI draws lines in the air \times n }
12. 
13. B: \[ah! \] with
14. stripes!
15. A: with stripes. [okay. ]
16. B: \[ah! he\]’s got he’s got a tie with stripes?
17. A: yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: leva unha corbata que antes non se vía leva unha corbata de raias

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (91-97):
A: acordábamme que que aprendera o de raias i i non me acordaba como se dicía
I: mhm
A: expliqueino dixen en vez de ser toda dunha cor dixen as corbatas poden ser todas dunha cor ou doutra maneira algo así dixen

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (91-97):
I: how did you know the tie was a striped tie? because of the mime? because you could imagine it?
B: yeah because well
I: she told you the tie had two colors
B: yeah yeah and i could imagine

These examples also show that interlocutors collaborate actively in the successful communication of the message. They do not only make an effort to interpret the speaker’s communicative intention, they also attempt to complete the speaker’s unfinished contribution proposing alternative means of expression to solve the lexical problem encountered. These alternative forms may be the learner’s desired but unavailable TL lexical item, as in examples 4.34 and 4.35, or an additional CS if this item is not available in the interlocutor’s IL system either. In example 4.36 B uses ‘arms’ as an approximate term for ‘sleeves’ that in A’s preceding turn was omitted. Notice also that the omission and approximation CSs for ‘sleeves’ are embedded within a description or circumlocution strategy to convey the meaning ‘vest’.

EXAMPLE 4.36: ADV-ADV LT: sleeves
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-95):
1 A: but (1.0) he:: (3.6) but no, i think mine (2.0) wears a::: heh
2 heh (3.4) pullover (without::t (2.8) e::h
3 {A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her arm}
4 (1.2)
5
6 B: without arms?
7 A: {{arms}}
8 {{A nods}}
9 (2.0)
10 B: oh! {{[mine] is just a shirt,}} (2.4) no pullover, (5.7) okay,
11 {{B shakes her head}}
12 A: [mm ]
13 B: i think that’s it.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: tiene un chaleco en el tuyo sólo una camisa no?
B: si tiene una camisa

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (90-95):
A: ahi pues bueno ya dije veía los botones pero ya dije pues debe haber algo
I: si porque dice in the bottom of the tie tú no ves el bottom realmente
A: claro claro ahi ya dije
B: es que claro yo ahi no sabia ni imaginé que podía llevar chaleco o sea yo es que yo sabia que algo tenia que tener porque vamos
A: ahi (xxx) si ... y ella cuando me di- o sea porque dijo bueno seguro que no tiene chaleco ya lo estaba pensando ya desde el principio pero cuando me dijo lo del bolsillo de la camisa pues ya ...
A: y ahi tambien no me salia mangas en ese momento y despues si ...
B: el chaleco yo es que sabia a lo que se referia pero en ese momento no es que son cosas que no ... cómo se dice chaleco?
Paying no attention to the context of the interaction and to nonverbal communication, the use of omission would be erroneously interpreted as a message abandonment strategy. The examples provided reveal, however, that omission can be successfully used in interaction with an achievement intention. It may also foster the interlocutor’s collaboration with the learner to create the appropriate TL means of expression to convey the originally intended message.

4.2.2.5. Foreignizing

Dörnyei and Kormos define foreignizing as “using a L1 or L3 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology (i.e. with a L2 pronunciation) or morphology” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 360). This strategic behavior has been documented in most CS taxonomies, either in relation with literal translation (Tarone, 1977, 1980; Corder, 1978) or as an independent CS category (Bialsytok and Frölich, 1980; Fierch and Kasper, 1983b; Poulisse et al., 1990).

In the following examples a L1 word is used for the purposes of FL communication, as we saw for code switching, but here the learner makes an attempt to adapt it to the features of the TL. In example 4.37, the learner recognized in the retrospective interview that they had used the L1 word ‘diagonal’, but had tried to pronounce it according to the phonological rules of the English language. The learner in the following example, 4.38, said to have foreignized the L1 word ‘cuadrangular’. This learner added to the L1 form the ending –gle, which is common to TL words related to the intended one, such as rectangle or triangle.48

EXAMPLE 4.37: ADV-NS RA: diagonal
REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (27-33):

1 A: a::nd he’s wearing also {a:: tie, (0.5)} {{with } diago- (1.0)
   {A’s RH points to her neck}
2                                          
3   (A’s RI draws
4   diagonal stripes on
5   her chest)
6 B:                                          
7   {{{hm hm}]
8 A:   diagonal (/’diagonl/) mm:: stripes!) black and white stripes.
9 B:   that
10 A:   tch e:[h]
11 B:   {{[tha]t’s} the difference

48 A phonetic transcription of learner’s speech is included whenever there is a deviation from the standard form that may be relevant for the purposes of our analysis.
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12  {B nods}
13 A: okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una corbata de rayas blancas y negras en diagonal

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (27-33):
I: esa palabra la conoces en inglés?
A: no diagonal por heh no sé por el español
I: dices diagonal pero con acento ingles?
A: sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (27-33):
I: when she said that the stripes are diagonal did you understand?
B: uhuh yes

EXAMPLE 4.38: ADV-ADV AV: square
REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (205-210):
1 A: and the:: (2.1) you see the floor? of of the::, (1.4) of the
2 house.
3 B: yeah
4 A: inside the house. (2.2) mine is like {with e::h,} (7.4) tch is
5 (A’s II draw a square
6 in the air, A looks
down)
7
8 A: black and white.
9 (2.4)
10 B: mine is {only black,} (2.6) {only white,} heh heh [heh ]
11 (B shakes her head)
12 (B shakes her head)
13 A: [mine]
14 (is black and white,) again with: (2.0) quadrangles
15 (A nods, A looks down)
16 A: (/kwa’drangls/), >°or something like that°<

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o chao da que se ve na porta pois ten rombos blancos e negros
B: aquí nada é blanco todo

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (205-210):
A: quería dicir a cadros ... non nin se me pasou o sea quería dicir
A cadros e logo como más fácil branco e negro e o dela como era
dun color seguido pois heh
...
I: entón ti aí que entendes?
B: pois nin
A: de calquera forma
B: que era branco e negro pero non sabía de que forma nin
...
I: ai non entendín moi ben o que dixeches quadrangles ou?
A: si porque o sea igual que ... mm en forma de cadrados ... si
seguro que da palabra cuadrangular saquei quadrangle inventei a
palabra xa literalmente
I: porque nese momento non
A: non
I: non sabías dicir cadrados?
A: si
...
I: pero sabes como se di cadrado
A: mm
B: squares
A: squares e que tiña na mente o a forma sabes? cando describes
alguna forma cuad- cuadrada
These examples show that learners make use of foreignizing strategies in their interactions with other learners of the English language who share their NL – cf. example 4.37; but also with NSs of the TL who do not necessarily have any knowledge of the original L1 form – cf. example 4.38. Learners make, however, a creative and sensible use of this strategy, taking into account the similarities and relationships existing between languages. This explains that foreignized terms may result in correct and contextually acceptable TL lexis, difficult to identify as strategic behavior without the speaker’s retrospective comments – cf. example 4.37.

4.2.2.6. Grammatical word coinage

Traditionally word coinage has been defined as the learner’s use of their L2 knowledge for the creation of a new word (Tarone, 1977; Bialystok and Frölich, 1980; Færch and Kasper, 1983b). More recent approaches to the study of CSs tend to distinguish two different kinds of strategic coinage: grammatical and semantic. In grammatical word coinage the learner creates “a non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing L2 word” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 360); whereas in semantic word coinage creates “a non-existing L2 word by compounding words” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 361).

The use of grammatical word coinage is relatively rare in our data. Example 4.39 illustrates one of the few attempts made by our learners to create what they assume to be a new, previously non-existent, TL form.

Here, according to the comments provided in the retrospective interview, the learner believes they lack in their IL system the desired lexical item to make reference to a ‘knocker’. To compensate for this problem they use a related TL word, ‘to knock’, applying to it a TL rule of derivation, i.e. the addition of the derivative suffix ‘-er’ – cf. line 12 of the transcript.

EXAMPLE 4.39: INT-INT FC: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (390-399):

1 A: it has a:: (0.5) a sp- a:: kind of (1.7) circle,} (2.5) in
2 (A’s RI draws a circle on the table, B is not looking)

49 Semantic word coinage will be dealt with in pp. 230-231.
CHAPTER 4: Identification and classification of CSs

3 A: the:: (2.0) in the:: e::h (1.4) bueno (‘well’), (1.4) tch
4 (2.0) {a:: circle,} {in::}
5 {A’s RI draws a circle in the air}
6 {A’s RI point upwards}
7 (1.8)
8 B: (xxx)?
9 A: no! in the: in the door.
10 (2.0)
11 B: ah! a circle in the door. ah! mirilla (‘door peephole’).
12 A: (=a kind of a:: a kind of (0.8) knocker.
13 {A’s RH mimics knocking}
14 B: a:::h!} {yes yes} yes [yes yes] (1.4) {to knock?
15 {B nods}
16 A:                         [a::nd ]
17 {B’s RH mimics knocking}
18 A:   yeah.)
SENDERS AND RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (390-399):
B:   y tampoco sabíamos decir esto
I:   el knocker
B:   ah! se dice knocker!
I:   si
A:   knocker
I:   que tú en un momento llegaste a decir knocker
B:   si!
A:   si pero no no sabía
I:   tu dijiste knocker pero como no
B:   si sí
A:   dije knocker
B:   sí lo dijiste
I:   pero como como ya no tal pues entonces volvisteis a entonces no sé tú cuando le oíste decir knocker
B:   yo decía sí
I:   o sea lo de knocker tú lo reconociste?
B:   sí supe que estaba diciendo pero digo yo no sé si será yo sí
I:   o sea no sabías si era la palabra o sí
B:   claro no sabía si se lo había inventado o si cuadraba realmente
A:   uuhh! es que me lo había inventado knocker knocking knocker heh heh
B:   heh heh heh
A:   está bien

From the interlocutor’s point of view the product of a grammatical word coinage strategy is most often a previously non-existent L2 word, therefore easily identifiable as the result of strategic performance. However, as can be seen in example 4.39, it is also possible that in the attempt to create comprehensible L2 lexis the learner actually hits a L2 word which was not yet part of their IL system. Again this kind of strategic behavior has been identified with the retrospective information provided by the speaker.

4.2.2.7. Literal translation

Literal translation is defined in Dörnyei and Kormos’ framework as “translating literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word, or a structure from L1 or L3 to L2”
That is, in order to compensate for a lexical deficit in the TL the learner translates word by word a L1 or L3 expression into the L2. In interaction this generally results in unexpected and non-target-like collocations, compounds or even longer expressions such as, in example 4.40, ‘going by hand’, literal translation of the Spanish structure ‘ir de la mano’.

EXAMPLE 4.40: ADV-NS RA: holding hands
REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (138-143):
1 A: both: (1.5) both men (1.5) are {(3.2) e:::h tch are (2.4) with
2 {A’s RH holds LH}
3 A: her hands ti-, a:re (1.5) are going} (by hand.
4 {A closes RH and mimics
5 grabbing a hand}
6 B: they’re holding hands?)
7 A: (holding hands=)
8 {A nods}
9 B: =okay
10 A: yes.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre coge al niño de la mano
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (138-143):
A: eso es que no me salía ... lo de ir de la mano sí
I: cuando dices by hand?
A: de la mano quería eso de la mano
I: pero lo dices ya ... lo dices para salir del paso o convencida de
que se dice así
A: no no pa salir del paso
I: y piensas que ella te entendió
A: pienso que ella me entendió
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (138-143):
B: they were holding hands ... i understood her

When literal translation is applied to a single lexical item the result is usually a L2 item used in an inappropriate context, as it is also the case with approximation strategies. In fact, some authors describe this kind of strategic behavior as approximation encoded in the L1 (Poulisse et al., 1990). In example 4.41 the use of ‘shield’ as an alternative for ‘badge’ has a L1 origin. These two items are usually named with the same label, ‘escudo’, in the learners’ NL. That is, in the lack of the TL term ‘badge’, the learner has translated ‘escudo’ literally as ‘shield’.

EXAMPLE 4.41: ADV-ADV MM: badge
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (750-757):
1 A: and well he’s wearing a (1.2) {a: cap? like a baseball cap?}
2 {A’s RH points to where the cap
3 would be on her head}
4 A: (1.8) {with the::; (2.0) tch the the shield i told you,} (1.5)
5 {A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest
and draws circles). 

A: {the::, (1.0) the shield,} he the [bo- ] the small man (0.5) 

(A’s RH point to where the badge would be on her chest and 
draw circles)

B: [yeah] 

A: well he has the, (0.5) the shield on the:, {on the cap}

(A’s RH points to 
where the cap
visor would be on
her forehead)

A: {and on the jacket. (1.5) you know a c d c!? (1.5) the
(A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest)

A: [band?]} {eh heh [heh heh]} heh heh 

B: [yeah ]

A: [A nods]

A: heh eh lo del escudo
B: sin bolsillo ni bueno era un escudo? era no?
A: es un escudo si y

SEND AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (128-137):

B: aí shield eu sóubeno porque me fixo así que eu non sabía que 
shield era escudo
I: ah pola mímica? no por?
A: es que yo ...
B: como cando onde levas dixo cando levas a espada ou algo así 
dixeches?
A: si si heh not a sword the thing you go with a sword ... lo 
primero que me salía era espada y entonces era como la cosa que 
llenas con la espada es
I: el escudo y por ejemplo cuando utilizas shield ahí para la para 
el escudo ese para la insignia? quiero decir
A: no tengo ni idea de cómo se dice escudo de insignia en inglés ...
I: pero entón ti entéraste non polo shield senón?
B: non fixome así e o saber que era un uniforme pois supuxen que 
sería o

Whereas in approximation the relationship between the desired lexical item and 
the alternative one is semantic, in literal translation this relationship needs to be 
interpreted on the basis of the learner’s L1. That is, learners use their L1 resources for 
the purposes of L2 communication. More specifically, they combine L1 and L2 
elements. For this reason we prefer to consider this kind of strategic behavior as literal 
translation and therefore as a conscious transfer strategy, like foreignizing and code 
switching.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{50} A more detailed account of the use that Spanish and Galician speaking learners of English as a FL make 
of conscious transfer processes for strategic purposes, in their interactions either with other learners or 
with NSs, can be seen in Fernández Dobao (2002b).
4.2.2.8. Restructuring

The category of restructuring is defined as “abandoning the execution of a verbal plan because of language difficulties, leaving the utterance unfinished and communicating the intended message according to an alternative plan” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 360). In example 4.42 the learner intends to say ‘he has a black eye’, but the TL expression ‘black eye’ is not yet part of their IL system. The learner leaves this attempt unfinished and communicates the intended meaning with an alternative form of expression ‘her right eye is black’.

EXAMPLE 4.42: INT-INT FC: black eye
REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (82-97):
1  B:  he seems to be:: flowing,
2  A:  yeah
3  B:  in the earth.
4  (1.3)
5  A:  he has [a:: ]
6  B:  [in the] air.
7  (1.5)
8  A:  her right eye is (0.8) black.
9  B:  mm!? (1.3) what?
10  (1.0)
11 A:  her her his (3.2) his right eh eye (1.5) is black.
12  (3.5)
13 B:  his right?
14  (1.4)
15 A:  eye.
16  (1.0)
17 B:  eye is black?
18 A:  yeah
19  (1.5)
20 B:  {mine no,} (2.0) mine not.
21  {B shakes her head}
22 A:  full black.
23  (1.0)
24 B:  {no,} (1.2) mine is normal, (0.8) e::h a black eye? (1.4)
25  {B shakes her head}
26 B:  [no?  }
27 A:  {[yeah.]} (2.5) black eye.
28  {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  parece como un ojo todo morado
B:  con un ojo morado hm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (82-97):
I:  y luego cuando habláis del ojo morado sabíais que ojo morado se
dice black eye?
A:  sí es que no me salía pero luego ya me lo dijo ella
B:  sí

The learner compensates for the desired but unavailable TL lexical item ‘black eye’ with a description of the intended referent ‘the eye is black’. That is, the alternative
means of expression that allows the learner and the interlocutor to achieve an agreement on meaning is the use of a description, usually known as circumlocution strategy. The restructuring or reformulation of the utterance is a consequence of speech of the use of this achievement strategy, not a CS in itself. It will be inconsistent with our definition of CSs to consider this kind of behavior a strategy, since the restructuring does not convey any kind of meaning or referential information. We rather see the circumlocution as the CS used to communicate the message and the restructuring phenomenon as a relevant element of the strategic interaction and a helpful pointer to strategic behavior, but not a CS in itself.

4.2.2.9. Circumlocution

The term circumlocution has been used in most CS taxonomies to make reference to learners’ use of wordy descriptive periphrasis to convey their meanings in the lack of the desired TL lexical item. Dörnyei and Kormos more specifically define it as “exemplifying, illustrating, or describing the properties of the target object or action” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 361).

The kind of information included in the circumlocution and the form it adopts depend on the nature of the intended referent, the context of the interaction and the interlocutors’ resources in the TL. In the following examples we can see how learners circumlocute by describing the intended referent, i.e. mentioning its most relevant attributes such as shape, size, color, location or, as in example 4.43, function. They can also make reference to an action by describing its result, in the lack of the desired lexical item to describe the actual action –cf. example 4.44 where the result ‘to be on the floor’ of the intended action ‘to drop’ is mentioned. They may also resort to examples of people, occasions or events related to the object or quality they desire to communicate –cf. example 4.45 where the learner conveys the meaning ‘suspenders’ making reference to a well-known television character who uses this item.

EXAMPLE 4.43: ADV-ADV SO: letterbox
REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-149):
1  A:   and a:::, {i don’t know::,} how to say it, (1.2) e::h the
2                 {place where you: introduce the:: (1.2) the: letters,}
3       {A opens her RH and mimics dropping mail in the mailbox ×4}
4       (1.8)
6 B: oh! the letters! {(the letterbox)}
7 (A opens her AA, B is not looking)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: están delante de una puerta con un buzón

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (146-149):
A: the letterbox porque no me salía
B: eu puxen mailbox

EXAMPLE 4.44: ADV-ADV LT: to fall down, to drop
REFERENT: father drops newspaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (101-105):
1 A: e::h (4.0) the newspaper of (3.7) the newspaper, (0.5) that
2 the father (0.8) the father has, (1.8) is on the floor now.
3 (1.5)
4 B: okay, mine has it in his hands.
5 (2.2)
6 A: a::nd {his hand (.) is open.}
7 (A opens RH, B is not looking)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y abre la mano y se le cae el periódico al suelo
B: en la mía tiene el periódico agarrao

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (101-105):
A: ahi quise decir que el periódico que se le cayó de las manos
I: mhm como drop the newspaper o algo así?
A: si al abrir la mano que se le cayó
I: y tú ahi qué entendiste?
B: que estaba tirado

EXAMPLE 4.45: ADV-ADV LT: suspenders
REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (232-239):
1 A: e::h (3.8) and he has e::h=
2 B: =he’s stan- he’s standing on the step? right?
3 A: {yeah=}
4 (A nods)
5 B: =or i- he’s inside the house? on the step.
6 (1.5)
7 A: and instead (0.5) of wearing:: a belt, {he has:: (1.5) ºi
8 (A’s LH outlines the
9 shape of a suspender
10 on her body)
11 A: don’t knowº
12 B: ah!} mine has no belt, {and no::
13 (B’s HH outlines the shape of the
14 suspenders on her body)
15 A: heh heh
16 B: like steve urkel, (1.0) heh) heh heh
17 (0.7)
18 A: e::h in the: (0.5) in the next picture,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: y el padre del niño grande no lleva lo los tirantes

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el de los tirantes

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh después el padre eh bueno eso el de los tirantes

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (232-239):
I: ahi ya ibas a decir a lo mejor lo de los tirantes?
A: sí sí ahi ya lo estaba pensando cómo digo los tirantes?
...
In general, speakers can make reference to any of the components or features of the objects, actions or ideas they intend to communicate. They select those aspects they consider to be the most representative and likely to lead to the correct identification of their communicative intentions by the interlocutor, and combine them into what they assume to be an acceptable TL expression. The result is most frequently a wordy extended expression where a NS or learner, had he not been constrained by a limited command of the TL, would have used a single lexical item instead. This construction may be grammatically correct, but is not the appropriate means of expression in this context. It is non-native-like and therefore easily identifiable for the interlocutor as a CS.

The analysis of interactional data reveals that circumlocutions may be formulated in a single turn –example 4.43, or in several turns –example 4.46. Most often, only a couple of the characteristics of the intended referent are mentioned –example 4.43, but more features may be referred to if necessary –example 4.46. An initially uttered and apparently finished circumlocution may be extended if there is an indication that it has failed to achieve its communicative goal –example 4.46. It is difficult to know, in this kind of contribution, where to establish the limits of the CS and whether to identify one single circumlocution or a sequence of different but closely related circumlocuting strategies –most researchers tend to adopt the first option. Furthermore, in the analysis it is also necessary to take into account that the interlocutor plays a major role in the communicative success of the strategy. Interlocutors interrupt the speaker’s circumlocution if they believe they may have already understood their intention –example 4.46, lines 9 and 16; they rephrase ambiguous descriptions –example 4.46, line 24; and, relatively often, they add new information to make sure an agreement on meaning is successfully achieved –example 4.46, line 30. The circumlocutive description becomes then co-constructed by the learner and the native or non-native speaking interlocutor.
EXAMPLE 4.46: ADV-NS IM: vest
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-318):

1. A: e:h you can see:: (1.2) like a semicircle? at the back of
2. his:: neck? (2.0) it’s it’s it’s a line of the: jacket,
3. (3.3)
4. B: i have the thing is that i haven’t got a jacket, so=
5. A: =a:::h! it’s not a jacket, (0.4) heh heh heh (. it’s not a
6. jacket, it’s one of these things (’/zig/) things you wear in
7. (A’s II point to her chest)
8. A: in:=
9. B: =braces?)
10. (0.7)
11. A: (it’s like ja- jacket without the:, the arms?) {(.)
12. (A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her LA ×2)
13. (A’s II point
14. to her chest)
15. A: y[ou over, ]} (0.5) no. (. you wear it in:
16. B: [it’s a waistcoat?]
17. (A’s HH outline the
18. shape of a vest on
19. her body)
20. A: under:: a shirt. (. like that.) (1.3) you bri-, >i don’t
21. (A mimics putting on a
22. vest)
23. A: know how you call it?<
24. B: a waistcoat.)
27. (B’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her
28. LA)
29. (0.4)
31. (0.5)
32. B: {like} a waiter might wear?= 33. (A nods)
34. A: {=yeah! {(like a waiter.}) } (. that’s what he’s wearing!
35. (A nods and waves her RH to indicate confirmation)
36. {{B nods})
37. A: (0.6) “now i can see it.”
38. (0.8)
39. B: “so he’s wea[ring]”
40. A: {[that’s] (. that’s why: it has that semicircle at
41. (A’s HH draw a semicircle at the back of her neck)
42. A: the back, because
43. (0.5)
44. B: he’s wearing) {a waist{{co[at.]
45. (A nods)
46. }{B nods})
47. A: [ye:]ah.)
48. (0.8)
49. B: so {[(xxx)]}
50. A: [it’s ] a waistcoat. (0.6) mm)
51. (1.5)
52. B: “wearing a waistcoat.”
53. (0.6)
54. A: hhh e:::h (his eyebrows are still the same, (5.0)) {you can
55. (A’s II draw a vi on her forehead, B is not looking)
56. (A’s RI
draws a line in the air.  

A: see two lines} {at on his back,  

\[ \text{A’s HH touch her back} \]  

(2.2)  

B: two lines on his back?  

A: \{=well a line. (1.5) vertical line,\} it’s made by his  

\[ \text{A’s RH draws a vertical line in the air} \]  

(1.8)  

B: a::h! (2.5) on the father?  

A: yeah is it’s like a bit also a wrinkle ºon the waistcoat,º  

(1.5) you can see two buttons and a pocket,  

(2.3)  

B: eh w- well that’s the waist-  

A: mm  

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:  

A: lleva unos pantalones una camisa una corbata y un chaleco  

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (291):  

I: ahí por ejemplo cuando te dice braces preguntándote tú no?  

A: no sabía lo que me decía eso qué es  

I: braces son los tirantes  

A: ah  

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (292):  

A: si en vez de sleeves ... sé que es sleeves pero ... creo que es la primera palabra que me salió inconscientemente  

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (293):  

I: y luego también cuando estás describiendo el chaleco dices  

A: ella me dijo la palabra chaleco? waistcoat?  

I: sí  

A: me sonaba a raincoat o algo así y dije no no  

I: si sí y luego te la vuelve a decir creo  

A: y luego le dije ya vi que había entendido lo que decía y dije ya vale  

This extract shows, once more, that in order to understand how CSs function in spontaneous, ongoing and natural-like interaction, it is necessary to look at the strategic interactional exchange as a whole, rather than to single utterances or to the contribution of only one of the interactants.  

4.2.2.10. Semantic word coinage  

We have already explained that semantic word coinage is defined by Dörnyei and Kormos as “creating a non-existing L2 word by compounding words” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 361). In the lack of the desired TL term the speaker selects two IL lexical items, which usually refer to two distinguishing properties of the object of
reference, and combines them to create what is assumed to be a previously non-existent TL compound.

EXAMPLE 4.47: ADV-NS IM: letterbox
REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (254-259):
1 A: there’s just {a:: letter:: hole?} (0.9) in the center, (.)
2 (A’s RI draw a rectangle in the air, B is not looking)
4 A: (it’s like a rectangle, (0.8) with a line,
5 (A’s RI draws a rectangle with a line in the middle in the air, A holds the gesture)
7 (1.5)
8 B: hhh let- (. ) a letterbox? (0.5) i haven’t got a
9 ((letterbox.))
10 ((A nods, B is not looking))
11 (1.3)
12 A: tch okay.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: bueno y un como un agujero para echar las cartas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (254-259):
A: es que yo conozco la palabra letterbox y me imaginaba que era el que hay fuera no no sólo si no si es sólo un agujero
I: mhm o sea pensabas eso que letterbox era más para lo que es
A: dije letterhole
I: y lo de letterhole? hiciste tú esa palabra o?
A: si heh me la inventé heh

Like in grammatical word coinage, the product of this strategy is most often a new and creatively constructed lexical item, at least from the speaker’s point of view. Its strategic nature and intended communicative value are therefore easily identifiable. This does not mean, however, that this strategy, as the previous ones, does not frequently appear in interaction in combination with other kinds of strategic means of communication –cf. example 4.47 above where a nonverbal strategy and a circumlocution are used together with the semantic word coinage ‘letterhole’.

4.2.2.11. Appeal for assistance
The concept of appeal for assistance or appeal for help is used in most taxonomies to describe the CS used by the speaker who asks the interlocutor for help in the lack of a TL lexical item (Tarone, 1977; Corder, 1978; Færch and Kasper, 1983b). Dörnyei and Kormos distinguish two different types of appeal for assistance strategies: direct appeal for help, i.e. “turning to the interlocutor for assistance by asking an explicit question concerning a gap in one’s L2 knowledge”; and indirect appeal for help, i.e. “trying to
elicit help from the interlocutor indirectly by expressing lack of a needed L2 item either verbally or nonverbally” (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 361).

Under the first category these authors include strategies like the one illustrated in example 4.48, where the speaker explicitly asks the interlocutor to provide the unknown or unavailable TL lexical item: ‘how do you say?’ . Indirect appeals include explicit statements of uncertainty, such as ‘I don’t know the name’, NL terms used with rising intonation or puzzled expressions indicating a problem –cf. example 4.49.

**EXAMPLE 4.48: INT-INT CL: to knock**
**REFERENT: father knocks at the door**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (498-502):**

1. A:  now {the father is::, e:::h (4.8)} {how do you say? {mm}}
2. {A raises her RH clenched in a fist, B is not looking}
3. {A’s RH knocks on the table}
4.  5. A:  [heh ]
6. B:  [knocking?] (1.0) {uhuh}
7. {B nods}
8.  6. (0.5)
7. A:  mm yes, sorry, {he’s knocking} on the:, on the door.
8. {A’s RH knocks on the table}
**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A:  mm el padre está de espaldas esperando para llamar a la puerta
B:  en el otro es que está llamando a la puerta
**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (498-502):**
A:  ahí es que me sabía la palabra pero no me salía cuando me dice knocking digo sí sí knocking

**EXAMPLE 4.49: INT-INT CL: freckles**
**REFERENT: freckles**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (865-866):**

1. A:  {and he has li:ke? (2.4) you know? i don’t know,
2. {A’s RI points to her cheek ×n}
3. (1.0)
4. B:  {(yes! (0.5) mm: (0.5) hm hm)}
5. {(B nods)}
**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
B:  eh con pecas
A:  tch sí
B:  el mío no tiene pecas
**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (865-866):**
A:  lo de las pecas que no me acordaba cómo se decía
B:  pero tú te diste cuenta
A:  sí cuando me dijo así tí ti tí ti sí pecas

Appeals indicate that the learner expects the interlocutor to provide the correct TL item. The interlocutor may infer this item from the context of the interaction, but we have found that, much more often, an additional CS is used to provide the necessary
information for the interlocutor to know what lexical item the learner is appealing for. In other words, appeals for help tend to work in combination with some other kind of oral or nonverbal CS. In examples 4.48 and 4.49, for instance, the learner uses a nonverbal strategy that acts as an alternative means of expression to convey the intended meaning.

This means that, to understand how appeal for assistance strategies actually work and how agreement on meaning between the two interlocutors is finally achieved, these strategies cannot be considered in isolation. They need to be analyzed in the context of ongoing interaction, that is, in relation to other kinds of possible complementary strategic means of expression.

Some researchers have argued that appeals for assistance are CSs used by the learner “to signal his problem to his interlocutor and attempt to get the problem solved on a cooperative basis” and use this definition to distinguish between cooperative strategies, i.e. appeals for help, and non-cooperative strategies (Færch and Kasper, 1983b: 51). When talking about the identification of CSs we have seen that appeals are only one of the multiple devices used by speakers to indicate to their interlocutors that they are experiencing a communicative problem –cf. examples 4.4 and 4.5. Furthermore, most of the examples cited so far reveal that for interactants to engage in a cooperative solution of a lexical problem no appeal for assistance is needed. All the CS types discussed are potentially cooperative. This means that all of them can be used to initiate meaning negotiation processes leading to a final joint solution of the problem, and to elicit the learner’s desired and initially unavailable TL lexical item from the interlocutor.

From an interactional point of view the distinction between cooperative and non-cooperative strategies as proposed by Færch and Kasper (1983b) is therefore unsustainable. It is inconsistent with an interactional definition of CSs which presupposes that strategic behavior in interaction is always, at least potentially, cooperative, and it is not supported by the empirical analysis of interactional data.

**4.2.2.12. Nonverbal CSs**

The use of mime and/or other nonverbal means of communication for strategic purposes is recognized in almost all CS taxonomies (Tarone, 1977, 1980; Corder, 1978; Færch and Kasper, 1983b; Paribakht, 1985; Poulisse *et al.*, 1990; or Dörnyei and Scott, 1997).
In 1997 Dörnyei defined this strategy as “describing whole concepts nonverbally, or accompanying a verbal strategy with a visual illustration” (Dörnyei and Scott, 1997: 190). But in 1998 Dörnyei and Kormos decided to leave it out of their taxonomy on the grounds that the use of body language or gestural code cannot be discussed within a speech production framework (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998: 382-3).

The analysis of interactional data reveals, however, that nonverbals – most frequently hand performed gestures but also other kinesic activities such as facial expressions or eye behavior, and paralinguistic phenomena such as sound imitation or onomatopoeias – play a major role in strategic communication and cannot be ignored in any comprehensive account of CSs.

Although widely recognized, this particular type of strategy has not received much attention in theoretical and empirical studies of CSs and, therefore, little is known about their nature and how they actually work in interaction – a noticeable exception is Gullberg (1998). This explains why, for the purposes of our study, we have decided to design our own framework of analysis drawing, partly, on the research tradition of nonverbal communication studies – cf. Efrón (1972), Ekman and Friesen (1969), Poyatos (1983, 1993), Kendon (1988) and McNeill (1992). This framework makes it possible to distinguish three different types or patterns of nonverbal behavior: enacting strategies, which allow the speaker to act or mimic an action related to the intended meaning – cf. examples 4.50, 4.51 and 4.52; outlining strategies, that make possible the pictographical representation of target referents – cf. example 4.53; and pointing strategies, used to point to or touch the referent, its location or a related object – example 4.54.51

### Enacting nonverbal strategies

**EXAMPLE 4.50: ADV-ADV MM: knocker**

**REFERENT:** knocker/doorknocker  
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (377-380):**

1 B: {no handle?}
2 {B’s RH mimics grabbing a door handle and opening a door}
3 (0.6)
4 A: {no there’s,} (0.5) the (0.3) [kind] of thing you use to
5 {A’s RH mimics grabbing a knocker and knocking}
6 B: [okay]

---

51 A more detailed account of this descriptive framework and of the use that Spanish learners of English as a FL make of nonverbal strategies can be seen in Fernández Dobao (2003).
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7  A: knock? (0.6) a::n:d the::

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: la manilla
A: es redonda y eso y
B: aquí nada

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (377-380):
A: no sé cómo se dice llamador
I: mhm vale y primero utilizas handle o algo así no?
B: no eso díxenllo eu se tiña a manilla porque se non ten nada
...
A: la cosa con la que se usa para llamar
B: para chamar
A: es que ni siquiera cómo se dice en español?

EXAMPLE 4.51: ADV-NS IM: to roll up
REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (469-472):
1  A: e:::h (1.0) now the fa- the the old the: father, heh (0.5)
2       (is: doing that thing. (.) now.
3       {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve, A holds the gesture}
4       (0.6)
5  B: the father’s rolling his:: [sleeves up?]
6  A:                             {[rolling    ]} his shirt.
7                                 {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   el el padre se está remangando la camisa el la manga derecha de
la camisa

EXAMPLE 4.52: ADV-NS BS: sobbing and rubbing the eye
REFERENT: boy pointing to his black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (55-57):
1  A:   e:::h the boy is crying an:d he’s e:::h, hhh well the tears
2       again an:::d his: mouth is: (.hhh) open, heh (0.7) a::n:d
3       {A opens her HH and AA, B is not looking}
4       (A’s RI scratches her eye to imitate the child}
5  A:   the::, (1.0) {he’s with his finger like ((sobbing)),} (1.2)
6                    {A’s RI scratches her eye to imitate the child}
7  A:   a:n:::d the the:: the man,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   vemos al niño que está señalando a su ojo morado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (55-57):
A:   ahí es que yo no veía el ojo negro no me acordaba que esto era un
ojo negro si hubiese sido estado más grande sabría que estaba
señalando el ojo pero pensé que estaba llorando como haciendo el
típico gesto de llorar que no se como se dice por eso dije gesto
de
I:   vale como que se estaba frotando el ojo
A:   sí como cuando lloras y luego te frotas
I:   y eso no sabías decírla
A:   no sabía decirlo

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (55-57):
B:   yeah the yeah

Outlining nonverbal strategies

EXAMPLE 4.53: INT-NS CS: stripes
REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (15-27):
1  B:  is he wearing {a tie as [well?]}} (0.8) all right=
2   {B’s RH outlines the shape of a tie on her
3   chest}
4  A:  [yeah]
5  A:  (=e::h (1.5) tch with:: (1.7) s- strings? (1.5) black and
6   {A’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest ×n)
7  A:  white.}
8  B:  mm:: ah {all right!} {like a a belt? (1.2) is he wearing a
9   {B waves her HH around her waist
10   outlining the shape of a belt}
11  B:  belt?] (1.0) or?:
12  (2.4)
13  A:  no. tch {in [the: in] the tie? (0.7) he ha::s
14   {A’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest ×n}
15  B:   {[no belt])}
16  B:   {{[no belt]}}
17  B:   {(oh! [the tie]}
18  B:   {(B’s RH outlines the shape of a tie on her chest ×2, B nods})
19  A:   [ black,] white, black, white,}
20  A:   (1.2)
21  B:   black and white stripes?}
22  (23)
23  A:  yeah. (0.5) [heh]
24  B:   {oh!] {all right,} i see,
25   {B nods, AB look down}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  e unha corbata a raias branca e negra
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (15-27):
I:   aí exactamente que dixeches?
A:   strings con raias
I:   mhm entón dis strings por raias
...  
I:   e cando el te di o de black and white stripes? entendes o que che
quere dicir?
A:   si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (15-27):
I:   did you understand her?
B:   not really heh to be honest heh but eventually i think that i
grasped what you meant
B:   because when she said string i thought it might be a belt but
when she said black and white black and white i understood
stripes

Pointing nonverbal strategies

EXAMPLE 4.54: ADV-NS IM: chin
REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (322-325):
1  A:  mm::, (6.2) the little boy’s: (.:) touching his:: {e:::h (0.5)
2   {A’s RH
3   touches
4   her chin}
5  A:  how do you call this?=
6  B:  =chin.
7  A:   {(chin? yeah.)} with his right hand. (1.4)} {like if he was
8   {(A nods)
Examples such as 4.52 and 4.54 show that nonverbal strategies can be effective alternative means of communication in the lack of the necessary linguistic item or expression. However, we have seen all through this chapter that nonverbal strategies are more frequently used in combination with some other kind of verbal CS. Sometimes the gesture illustrates the oral CS. In example 4.50 we can see how the learner describes orally the intended object ‘knocker’ making reference to its function, i.e. ‘to knock’. Simultaneously this learner mimics the action of knocking. This gesture supports the description but does not add new referential information. However, in example 4.51, the use of the all-purpose expression ‘doing that thing’ and the strategic gesture of rolling up the sleeve cannot be understood separately. The verbal and nonverbal strategies function together by completing each other.

In our data the co-occurrence of verbal and nonverbal strategies is extremely frequent, evidencing the need to take always into account both modes of communication in the study of CSs. We strongly believe that a comprehensive understanding of what is actually happening in strategic face-to-face interaction can only be reached through the combined analysis of verbal and nonverbal communication.

4.3. THE CONCEPT OF CS EPISODE

The taxonomy described here has made possible the description and classification of our subjects’ strategic behavior into a limited set of CS categories and, in this way, organize an otherwise too heterogeneous and unmanageable sample of data. The criteria that delimit each of the categories proposed have proved to be clear and coherent with the data obtained. Furthermore, the use of three different sources of evidence for the purpose of CS classification minimized ambiguity or arbitrariness problems and they allowed the researcher to classify the strategies used by learners and their interlocutors with the necessary degree of objectivity and reliability.
But our analyses also suggest that, however helpful the taxonomic classification of strategic behavior may be for descriptive and organizing purposes, it inevitably fails to capture the whole complexity of strategic interaction and CS use. CS taxonomies present CS types as unique and independent entities to be used by the learner, but neither learners nor their interlocutors treat them in this way. In spontaneous ongoing interaction, where the main objective is meaning agreement for the purpose of common ground building, speakers and interlocutors co-construct the form of their strategies, exploiting their combinatory possibilities and the dynamic conditions of the context.

We have seen how in face-to-face interaction CSs, as traditionally identified in CS taxonomies, are rarely used in isolation. Most often they follow, substitute and complete each other. Two different CSs –examples 4.41 and 4.47– or repeated variations of one single CS –the circumlocution in example 4.46– may be sequentially used to fulfill one single communicative function. A failed CS tends to lead to the use of a following substituting strategy, which needs to be interpreted in relation to the initial one –cf. examples 4.24 and 4.46. Certain strategies, appeals for assistance, seem to work always in combination with some other kind of oral or nonverbal strategy –examples 4.48 and 4.49. Oral CSs are quite frequently accompanied by co-occurring nonverbal strategies and sometimes they even complement each other in such a way that one cannot be understood without the other –examples 4.28, 4.32 and from 4.50 to 4.54. Even two oral CSs such as approximation and circumlocution may be used simultaneously –example 4.29. In other contexts, however, two different strategies are used in one single turn to make reference to two different but related meanings. That is, one CS is embedded in the framework of another CS –examples 4.30 and 4.36.

In spontaneous naturalistic interaction the communicative value of a CS always depends, to a certain extent, on the linguistic and extralinguistic context in which it is used. In ongoing interaction, this context is always in progress since it is being co-constructed by the interlocutors. Each contribution is built on the previous one and acquires its meaning in relation to it. CSs, seen as elements of the interaction, need therefore to be understood with respect to everything that has been said before. This becomes particularly evident when learners make a second reference in the same conversation to a meaning already communicated by means of a CS. The second CS is built on the first one and tends to be simpler and more straightforward, but it can only
be understood if considered in relation to the first one –cf. examples 4.30, 4.31 and 4.33. In general, any strategic attempt made by learners and their interlocutors to convey meaning in the lack of the desired TL lexical item needs to be considered in relation to the context in which it appears. Only in this way can we make sense of what otherwise would seem incomprehensible or meaningless expressions and get to understand how communication is actually achieved.

Interaction also allows for the possibility of immediate feedback and for the interlocutor's active participation in the co-construction of the message. Learners rephrase, complete and substitute their strategies if they receive any direct or indirect indication from their interlocutors that their communicative intention may have not been correctly understood –cf. again examples 4.24 and 4.46. Furthermore, interlocutors interrupt speakers’ strategic attempts to convey their messages if they believe they may have already understood the intended meaning –example 4.46 lines 9 and 16. They complete these messages with the desired but unavailable TL lexical item –examples 4.34, 4.35 and 4.46 lines 22 and 42. They rephrase ambiguous strategic expressions –example 4.46 line 24; elaborate on learner’s initiated strategies –example 4.46 line 30; and propose additional alternative means of expression to convey the learner’s originally intended meanings –example 4.36. That is, as argued in Chapter Two, pp. 134-135, in face-to-face strategic interaction, quite often both meaning and form are actively co-constructed by all the participants. A fair analysis of how CSs are used and how successful communication of meaning is finally achieved cannot therefore overlook the active role of the interlocutor in this process.

The conventional taxonomic classification of strategic behavior into specific CS categories ignores all these aspects. It is helpful for descriptive purposes at an initial level of analysis, but we believe it cannot constitute the basis for further comprehensive explanatory research.

The CSs discussed in this chapter have not been presented as isolated utterances but as part of a higher order and more encompassing unit of analysis which we are going to call CS episode.\footnote{The label ‘episode’ has been selected on the basis of the similarities we believe exist between Swain and Lapkin’s (1995, 1998) concept of language-related episode, as described in Chapter One, p. 112, and our concept of CS episode. In Chapter Six, CS episodes will be analyzed from a sociocultural approach, and the relationship between language-related episodes and CS episodes will thus be clarified.} A CS episode may be defined as any segment of the
interaction in which learners and their interlocutors engage in the strategic communication of a message, i.e. work together to reach a mutual agreement on a meaning when the desired TL means of expression to convey this meaning is not available or shared. It begins with the learners’ intention to communicate the message that will prompt the use of a CS and ends when both interlocutors decide to move on to the next topic; either because agreement on meaning has been successfully established or because they have chosen to avoid this particular message and continue with their interaction.

CS episodes may consist of less than a turn or of several turns, and they may comprehend both verbal and nonverbal behavior. They may involve one single CS instance or an unlimited number of them. Any type of CS here discussed and any possible combination of these may be part of one single CS episode. This episode may even contain other CS episodes inside, as when a CS occurs embedded within the framework of a different CS. Within one CS episode strategic reference to the intended meaning may be interrupted. The learner may initiate the communication of the intended referent and the same learner or the interlocutor may interrupt this reference to talk about something else before finishing their strategic reference to the initial intended meaning. This also means that different CS episodes can get mixed or even merge.

Most previous research has dealt with the phenomenon of strategic communication at the sentence level; in other words, CSs have been studied as independent learners’ utterances. In these studies the classification of CS utterances into specific CS categories played a major role.

The main objective of our research is, however, the study of strategic communication as interaction, that is, as collaboration between two different interlocutors. This means that the classification of CS instances will help us in the task of describing learners and interlocutors’ strategic behavior. Explanatory analyses of the data, however, having as main aim the understanding of how communication is actually achieved when linguistic problems arise in face-to-face interaction, will always be based on the framework of analysis that the concept of CS episode just defined provides.
CHAPTER 5

THE COLLABORATIVE CREATION OF MEANING:
ANALYZING CS USE IN FL INTERACTION AS A COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITY
In this chapter strategic interaction between learners and their native or non-native speaking interlocutors will be analyzed with the aim of finding an answer to the first major question which prompted our research: how is communication achieved through CS use in face-to-face FL interaction? The final objective of the present chapter is thus to describe and understand how language learners and their interlocutors manage to reach successful communication of their messages despite their IL shortcomings, i.e. when the desired TL item or structure to communicate an intended meaning is either unavailable or not shared by all the interlocutors.

In the approach we take to the study of strategic communication, CSs are considered to belong to the interaction taking place between the learner and their interlocutor, and defined as elements of this interactional exchange. In face-to-face oral conversation, speakers and addressees share a common goal, the successful communication of their messages. Communication of meaning, as we understand it, is always a jointly achieved collaborative activity. For communication to succeed speaker and addressees need to agree on meaning. The speaker has to present a message and the addressee to understand it, but the two of them also need to establish the mutual belief that what has been said has been understood as intended. This requires the collaborative effort of all the participants, the coordination of their individual actions and beliefs in the pursuit of one common goal (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986; Clark and Schaefer, 1987, 1989; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997).

Problems encountered along the communicative process are also commonly shared problems and their solution the mutual responsibility of speakers and addressees. Strategic communication will thus be seen as “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981: 288), and communication of meaning through CS use will be explained as a collaboratively co-constructed activity. Our objective is therefore to describe and understand how interlocutors collaborate in face-to-face oral interaction to solve what we believe to be a shared problem. That is, we intend to identify what actions are taken by both the speaker and the addressee when the desired TL item to communicate an intended meaning is unavailable, how the two of them coordinate their individual actions and beliefs in order to reach a final agreement on meaning, and to
what extent the communicative outcome of the strategic exchange results from the collaborative effort of all the interactional participants.

In the previous stage of the research, we analyzed the samples of L2 spontaneous conversational data elicited for the purposes of our study and identified the occurrence of linguistic difficulties and subsequent CS uses. The results of these analyses provided some initial evidence that strategic communication cannot be fully understood if attention is focused only on the FL learner’s actions, as has been done in most previous research. We have found that learners monitor their interlocutors’ reactions when they use a CS and, if they detect any indication that the content of their message is not being correctly understood, they repair or substitute the initial CS – cf. examples 4.24 and 4.46 in Chapter Four, pp. 207 and 229-230. Interlocutors collaborate with learners in the development of alternative means of expression when communicative problems arise: they repair speakers’ utterances proposing less ambiguous – cf. example 4.46 line 24, in pp. 229-230; more elaborated – cf. example 4.46 line 30, in pp. 229-230; or additional CSs – cf. example 4.36, in p. 218. Sometimes they even provide the desired but unavailable TL lexical item in order to facilitate the successful communication of the message – cf. examples 4.34, 4.35 and 4.46 lines 22 and 42, in pp. 216, 217-218 and 229-230. Evidence was also found that, all through this process, speakers and addressees exploit the combinatory possibilities of different CS types and the contextual conditions of the co-constructed ongoing interaction. On this basis we argued that, in order to understand how communication of meaning is achieved, attention needs to be paid not only to the CS used by the FL learner, but to the whole strategic interactional exchange taking place between the learner and the interlocutor.

With this objective in mind we have proposed the concept of CS episode as an alternative framework of analysis to the traditional study of CSs as learners’ independent and isolated strategic utterances. CS episodes have been defined as segments of interaction in which learners and their interlocutors work to reach an agreement on meaning when the TL item or structure desired to express this meaning is not readily available. They may involve one CS or a combination of different verbal and/or nonverbal CSs to fulfill one single communicative function. These are uttered by the learner, the interlocutor or both of them working together along a non-predetermined
and unpredictable number of conversational turns. CS episodes are thus always interactionally and collaboratively constructed by the learner and their interlocutor—cf. Chapter Four, pp. 239-240.

In order to accomplish the objectives proposed in the introduction and thus give answer to those questions which prompted our research, the basic unit of our analyses will not be the CS, but the CS episode. CSs, as described in Chapter Two, will be considered as elements of the strategic exchange taking place within the limits of the CS episode, understood as a higher order and more encompassing unit of analysis, able to capture the interacational nature of strategic communication.

In line with the approach we have taken to the study and conceptualization of strategic communication, in the present chapter CS episodes will be analyzed within the theoretical framework of the collaborative theory of communication; as described in Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989), and Wilkes-Gibbs (1997).

The collaborative theory explains communication as a common ground building activity. People use language in order to add new content to the common ground they share with their interlocutors, i.e. to create new mutual knowledge, beliefs and assumptions out of their individual ones. Whereas most traditional accounts of communication explain this process as the result of the speaker issuing the right utterance at the right moment and the listener understanding it, the collaborative theory sees it as a collaborative process. The understanding of each utterance is the shared responsibility of the speaker and the addressee and it can be successfully achieved only if both of them work together to reach this common goal.

As already explained in section 1.2 of Chapter One, speakers contribute to this process by presenting an utterance which, they believe, specifies the content they want to add to common ground. But neither speakers nor addressees can just assume this utterance is always understood as intended. For common ground to be safely built, they need to establish the mutual belief that what is meant by the speaker is actually understood by the addressee well enough for their current purposes. This mutual agreement on meaning is achieved through a grounding process in which the addressee accepts the speaker’s presentation providing some kind of evidence of their
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53 For a detailed review of the collaborative theory of communication and the research carried out within this framework, see section 1.2 in Chapter One.
understanding, and the speaker recognizes and accepts this evidence. If addressees believe they have not been able to understand the speaker’s presentation, they are expected to indicate their trouble and initiate a side sequence. The initial presentation is then refashioned until a new version is achieved that can be correctly understood and accepted by the all the interlocutors. In this view any communicative act involves the specification and understanding of content, plus its grounding, i.e. the speaker and addressee’s building of the mutual belief that the content has been correctly understood and satisfactorily added to their common ground (Clark and Schaefer, 1987: 20, 1989: 262).

The collaborative model describes how this process is carried out along a conversational unit called the contribution (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 35), and explains conversation as a combination of sequential and hierarchical arrangements of contributions. These have been defined as “a stretch of talk in which the participants specify and ground the content of a coherent piece of information” (Clark and Schaefer, 1987: 20). The extent of the unit thus defined matches the one delimited by the concept of CS episode, understood as “any segment of the interaction in which learners and their interlocutors engage in the strategic communication of a message, i.e. work together to reach a mutual agreement on a meaning when the desired TL means of expression to convey this meaning is not available or shared” –cf. Chapter Four, pp. 239-240. CS episodes will thus be here seen and examined as a particular form of conversational contributions, i.e. as a stretch of FL talk in which learners and their interlocutors specify and ground a content or meaning for which the desired TL means of expression is not available.

A contribution, as described by the collaborative model of communication, involves always two identifiable phases: presentation and acceptance. In the presentation phase the speaker specifies the content of the message and in the acceptance phase speaker and interlocutor work to ground it.

Any act, verbal or nonverbal, by which a conversational participant intends to mean something to an addressee is considered a presentation (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 266). A CS, an utterance by which the FL learner intends to convey a meaning to their interlocutor, is therefore a presentation. That is, we believe that learners use CSs in
order to present the content they want to be added to their and their interlocutors’ shared common ground.

In Chapter One, section 1.2, we also illustrated how in L1 non-strategic contributions speakers are expected to utter the presentation that can best specify their message, so that their interlocutors can directly understand it. In CS episodes, however, the presentation cannot be uttered as initially intended by the speaker, because the desired TL item or structure is unavailable. This needs to develop an alternative means of expression in order to compensate for the lack of what they believe to be the most adequate or efficient TL form. Strategic presentations, therefore, involve always an extra amount of effort in terms of both production and comprehension.

In the previous chapter we analyzed these alternative means of expression. That is, we paid attention to the strategic techniques language learners use for the presentation of their messages when lexical difficulties arise in FL communication. In this way we identified the different types of CSs available as well as their combinatory possibilities within the context of ongoing oral interaction. In the present chapter attention will be focused on the grounding of the content presented by means of these CSs. We will analyze CS episodes in order to identify and categorize the procedures used in FL interaction to assure that the CS uttered by the speaker is understood as intended by the addressee. As already pointed out, the aim is to understand how agreement on meaning is collaboratively reached, paying attention to the joint actions and effort of speaker and addressee all through the CS episode.

Work done within the framework of the collaborative theory of communication has identified the procedures available in face-to-face oral interaction for mutual agreement on meaning and subsequent successful communication of the message to be established. These grounding procedures are used by the addressee in order to provide evidence of their state of understanding of the preceding presentation and by the speaker in order to accept this evidence. Techniques are also available for the collaborative solution of the understanding problems that may arise during the communicative process. Following the research carried out on L1 communication, we intend to identify how these different procedures work in FL strategic interaction.

We will first pay attention to the devices addressees use in order to provide evidence of their satisfactory understanding of the speaker’s communicative intentions.
That is, how addressees and speakers establish agreement on meaning when the content presented through a CS is successfully interpreted by the interlocutor.

In the second section of the chapter those CS episodes in which understanding difficulties have been encountered will be analyzed. The communicative model predicts a joint collaboration between speaker and addressee in the refashioning of those presentations that cannot be directly understood as initially uttered. When a CS is not understood by the addressee, this and the learner are expected to reformulate it until a version is achieved that can be mutually accepted. The aim of our study is to identify how this process is carried out within the limits of the CS episode.

In the final section we will analyze those CS episodes that have resulted in unsuccessful communication. That is, those strategic interactions in which, because of the learner’s use of an avoidance CS or despite their use of an achievement strategy, final agreement on meaning has not been reached. We will try to identify the causes of these failures in communication and to determine to what extent they are due to the nature of the CSs employed or to unsolved problems occurring during the grounding process.

5.1. PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF CS UNDERSTANDING FOR GROUNDING PURPOSES IN CS EPISODES

In Chapter One, section 1.2, we saw that speakers and addressees adapt their utterances and actions to each other and to the contextual circumstances of their ongoing interaction. Content can thus be presented and grounded in an unpredictable and unlimited number of ways. In Chapter Four we also saw that CSs can not only be of different types, they can also be uttered alone or in combination with other CSs, in one single turn or in several subsequent turns, by the learner or their interlocutor, or even co-constructed by the joint action of both of them. We should therefore expect grounding devices to vary depending on the nature of the strategic presentation and the purposes and demands of the specific interactional context to which it belongs.

A detailed qualitative analysis of CS episodes reveals that, whenever the interlocutors believe they have correctly heard and understood what the FL learner is trying to mean with a just uttered CS, they can use a variety of difference procedures in order to provide evidence of this understanding. They may assert their understanding
and acceptance of the speaker’s previous presentation providing an affirmative response such as ‘yeah’, ‘okay’ or ‘uh huh’. These kinds of confirmatory devices are known in the collaborative theory of communication as acknowledgments, continuers or backchannel responses (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 8; Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 280-283; Clark, 1994: 994 and 997). They may also show what it is that they have understood. For this purpose they sometimes use verbatim repetitions of all or part of the previous strategic presentation. In other circumstances they paraphrase what the speaker has just said, providing an alternative CS or what they believed to be the learner’s intended but unavailable TL item. Repetitions are usually referred to as displays and paraphrases as demonstrations in the collaborative theory research (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267). We have finally found that addressees may also presuppose their acceptance of the speaker’s strategic presentation, initiating a relevant next contribution or allowing the speaker to proceed with the conversation by showing continued attention (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 7 and 9; Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267 and 271-272; Clark, 1994: 993-994; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1995: 246).

All these different kinds of grounding procedures have been widely documented in L1 communication studies. In fact, Clark and Schaefer identified these five different categories of grounding devices as the most common procedures used by addressees in order to provide evidence of understanding of a previous speaker’s utterance (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267). Here we will analyze and describe how these strategies work in FL CS episodes. That is, how speakers and addressees use this evidence of understanding to build the mutual belief that a just uttered CS has been interpreted by the addressee as intended by the speaker and thus reach an agreement on the meaning they are trying to communicate.

5.1.1. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AS A GROUNDING PROCEDURE IN CS EPISODES

Taking into account the approach adopted to the conceptualization and study of CSs, and the specific purposes of our research project, we specified in Chapter Four the criteria that an element of interaction needs to fulfill in order to be considered a CS and within the scope of our analyses –cf. Chapter Four, p. 178. Following the working definition thus proposed, we consider that in the next extract of interaction a
combination of two different CSs is used when the learner, A, desires to communicate
the meaning ‘rolled up’ to his interlocutor, B, and finds that the lexical item desired to
achieve this goal is unavailable. That is, the learner intends to add the meaning ‘rolled
up’ to the common ground he shares with his interlocutor. For this purpose he needs to
present an utterance that can specify this content, but the lexical expression that he
desires to use in this presentation, i.e. ‘rolled up’, is not yet part of his IL system.

The learner decides to attempt an alternate means to communicate this meaning
and presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy. Instead of the
intended but unavailable TL expression ‘rolled up’ he uses the IL item ‘up’, which he
believes to share enough semantic features with the originally intended one to be here
correctly understood by his interlocutor. He illustrates the meaning of this oral strategic
expression with an enacting nonverbal CS: mimicking the action of rolling up a sleeve.

EXAMPLE 5.1. ADV-NS RA: rolled up
REFERENT: to roll up/father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (406-408):
1 A: he remains with the:: tch (with the:: (0.5) sleeve (0.5) of
2 (A’s LH mimics rolling up her right
3 sleeve)
4 A: the tshirt (1.8) up?
5 B: {{uhuh}} }
6 ({{B nods}})
7 A: a::nd an:d now the man with glasses, (0.5) seems to be very:
8 happy
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre empieza a a remangarse en plan como si no sale pues que
le va a pegar o que le quiere pegar
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: la manga remangada tambien el pa- el padre el de bigote
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (406-408):
I: aquí?
A: remangada si es que no no sabia como decirlo
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
raising up the sleeves of his shirt

54 The interlocutor identified as A in the transcript is always the learner taking the sender role in the
picture-story spot-the-difference task. The receiver in this task, whether another learner or a native
speaking interlocutor, will be identified as B. For the purposes of our analysis, the interlocutor initiating
the strategic presentation of the message and the CS episode will be referred to as ‘the speaker’ and their
partner as ‘the addressee’. In order to facilitate reference we will also treat the speaker as a male and the
addressee as a female, independently of their actual sex as specified in tables 3.1 and 3.2 –cf. Chapter
Three, pp. 142-144, and in Appendix B.2 and Appendix C.
55 Like in Chapter Four, we include for each example information on the proficiency level of the learner,
A, and the interlocutor, B, if he/she is also a learner and, if not, indication that he/she is an English NS.
We also specify the intended meaning of the CS, the target referent that elicited the CS as presented in
table 3.4 –cf. Chapter Three, p. 152, and the lines of the transcript of the whole interaction to which the
excerpt in the example belongs. Finally we include, whenever relevant, NL baseline data, retrospective
data and the results of the difference identification task.
The repetitions, drawls, pauses and pause fillers act as a signal for the addressee evidencing that the learner is experiencing some kind of linguistic problem in the utterance of his presentation. This is also modified by what Sacks and Schegloff (1979) have called a *try marker*, i.e. it is uttered with final rising intonation. With this try marker the speaker indicates that he is not sure about the understandability of his presentation and that, for mutual agreement on meaning to be reached, he needs an explicit confirmation of understanding from his interlocutor (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 18-19).

The use of the approximation and nonverbal strategies has allowed the speaker to present the meaning he wants to contribute to discourse, but this presentation alone cannot account for the successful communication of the message. For communication to be achieved agreement on meaning between the learner and his interlocutor needs to be established, i.e. the content here presented also needs to be grounded.

The CS episode enters thus the acceptance phase, in which the addressee is expected to provide some kind of evidence of her state of understanding and her subsequent acceptance or non-acceptance of the CSs presented by the speaker. Here, the addressee believes she has been able to identify the meaning the learner intends to contribute to their shared common ground. She indicates her understanding of the approximation and nonverbal strategies offering an asserting ‘uhuh’ and a head nod. Within the collaborative theory framework these are considered to be acknowledgments (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267), i.e. affirmative verbal or nonverbal signals offered by the addressee in order to assert their acceptance of the speaker’s previous presentation.

For agreement on meaning to be reached the learner also needs to accept these acknowledgments as enough evidence of the addressee’s satisfactory understanding of his intended message. In lines 7 and 8 of the transcript we can see how he initiates a new contribution: ‘a::nd an:d now the man with glasses, seems to be very: happy’. By allowing the conversation to proceed to the next topic the speaker is accepting the evidence of understanding offered by the addressee, i.e. the speaker is accepting the addressee’s acceptance. Mutual acceptance is thus established. The joint and coordinated actions of speaker and addressee have allowed them to establish the mutual belief that what the speaker meant with his initial presentation —with the approximation
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56 The use of try markers and their role in the grounding process have been analyzed in detail in Chapter One, pp. 88-89.
and nonverbal strategies– has been understood by the addressee well enough for their current purposes and satisfactorily added to their shared common ground.

The communicative process was initiated by the learner’s utterance of a strategic presentation, but was not accomplished until mutual acceptance of this presentation was established. An analysis of the CSs alone could not have explained how mutual agreement on meaning has been reached, since this has been collaboratively achieved with the joint effort of both the learner and the interlocutor all through the interactionally co-constructed CS episode.

Notice that, as explained in Chapter One, p. 83, ultimately all contributions will end when either the speaker or the addressee presuppose acceptance by moving on to the next topic in the conversation. Every unit a speaker utters constitutes a presentation. As Clark and Schaefer explain it “every mutually accepted alternation in speakers … initiates a new contribution at some level” (Clark and Schaefer, 1987: 36). This means that acceptance moves, such as acknowledgments, belong always to the acceptance phase of a contribution and the presentation phase of a second contribution hierarchically subordinated to the first one. Therefore they also need to be mutually accepted by speaker and addressee. Contributions are thus inherently recursive, which does not however mean they can spin off into infinity. As also explained in Chapter One, p. 83, Clark and Schaefer argue that participants follow a strength of evidence principle, i.e. they “expect that, if evidence e0 is needed for accepting presentation u0, and e1 for accepting the presentation of e0, then e1 will be weaker than e0” (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 268). In each new move evidence gets weaker, until the weakest type of acceptance evidence is reached. This is considered to be continued attention or allowing the conversation to proceed to the next topic. When a new idea is presented the contribution is therefore finished. Speaker and addressee believe that the grounding process has been completed.

When a speaker initiates a presentation they need to decide, among other things, how much information they want to get grounded in a single contribution. Clark and Schaefer (1989) have pointed out that participants cannot stop to ground every word that is uttered, but at the same time they need to stop often enough to prevent understanding problems from remaining unnoticed. In general, the length and composition of the

57 The final turn in this transcript, lines 7-8, does not therefore belong to the CS episode. It has been included here only for illustrative purposes.
presentation will be determined by its anticipated difficulty. Following the *least collaborative effort principle*, speakers try to anticipate how much effort it will take for them and their addressees to ground the content they want to contribute, and they design their presentations in order to minimize this work. The more difficulty it is expected for a unit of information to be understood, the more contributions it will be divided into (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 291).\(^{58}\)

Clark and Schaefer (1989) also argue that most contributions are associated with sentences and they are used for performing illocutionary acts, such as asking questions, making assertions or requesting something (Austin, 1962). Propositional acts, such as referring, naming, denoting or predicating are normally parts of illocutionary acts and therefore also parts of larger contributions. But when the speaker is uncertain about some piece of information or the content they want to present is too complex, a propositional act, such as referring, may also constitute an independent contribution, i.e. the speaker may present just a reference (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 283).

The CSs here analyzed are used for referential purposes and in the analysis of our data we have found that quite often they constitute part of illocutionary acts, such as making a question or an assertion. But, because of their strategic nature, their content tends to be grounded as soon as they are uttered. CSs do not only place a harder burden on the learner, who needs to develop an alternative means of expression to compensate for the unavailable originally intended one, they also require an extra effort from the interlocutor. This usually needs to recognize that the speaker is experiencing a communicative difficulty, that the utterance presented is not the originally intended one and that it cannot be interpreted in its literal sense. They need to infer what the learner is actually trying to say in order to be able to understand the message well enough for current purposes. Strategic presentations therefore involve a higher risk of understanding problems, which explains that, generally, they are presented in short utterances and carry most of the content that is going to be grounded in one single contribution.

We have found, however, some examples in which the CS constitutes part of a large more inclusive presentation and the content presented in the CS is grounded together with the rest of the information.

\(^{58}\) The least collaborative effort principle has been explained in detail in Chapter One, pp. 79-80.
In the CS episode illustrated in example 5.2, the learner presents an utterance which involves reference, among other objects, to a ‘badge’. The TL lexical item ‘badge’ is not yet part of the learner’s IL system and in order to compensate for this problem he uses an approximation strategy. He presents the approximate term ‘symbol’ as a means for his interlocutor to identify the intended meaning ‘badge’.

EXAMPLE 5.2: ADV-NS CS: badge
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (356-359):

1 A: and i see, i can see the: symbol of the: (0.7) of the: the
2 school, {in the one one (0.5) e:h side of the:;} (0.7) of the
3 {A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her
4 chest, AB look down}
5 A: jacket,
6 B: mm::
7 A: =a::nd he has a: a cap, with the symbol as well,
8 B: mm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: deben ir na mesma escola porque teñen os dous o o uniforme

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (356-359):
A: aquí volvín a dicir symbol porque el entendeme e dache confianza
    non sabes? non necesito buscar outra alternativa

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
sign on big boy’s blazer

Since the learner does not wait for evidence of the interlocutor’s correct interpretation of this CS right after uttering it, we assume he is quite confident of its understandability. In fact, an analysis of the whole interactional exchange taking place between this learner and his interlocutor reveals that this same approximate term had already been used in this conversation to communicate this same meaning –cf. Appendix B.2, lines 9-12 and 51-53 in the transcript of the interaction between these two speakers. Speaker and addressee rely on the common ground they have been building all along their ongoing interaction in order to be able to establish a mutual agreement on the meaning of this CS with a relatively low level of effort.

Even though the learner continues with his presentation after uttering the approximation strategy, the communication of the meaning ‘badge’ cannot be considered completed until this content has been satisfactorily grounded. In line 6 of the transcript we see how the addressee asserts her acceptance of the learner’s presentation providing the acknowledgment: ‘mm::’. In this way she lets him know that she believes she has heard and understood everything just said. That is, she has been able to interpret
the CS as intended by the speaker, to recognize the intended meaning ‘badge’ and to add it to the common ground she shares with the speaker.

Acknowledgments constitute also invitations for the speaker to continue talking and to proceed to the next contribution. The learner offers a new presentation in line 7: ‘and he has a cap, with the symbol as well.’ By continuing with the conversation he is also recognizing the addressee’s acceptance. A and B’s mutual belief that the content presented in 1-5 has been correctly understood and satisfactorily added to their common ground is thus established.

Furthermore, in the new presentation a second reference needs to be made to the concept ‘badge’, and the previous approximation strategy is now repeated for this purpose. This also indicates that the speaker is satisfied with the communicative effectiveness of his CS. He believes that the approximate term ‘symbol’ has been satisfactorily grounded as an alternative term of reference for ‘badge’. The acknowledgment ‘mm’ provided by the addressee in 8 confirms the understanding of this second use of the approximation strategy. The CS episode ends here, i.e. the conversation moves to a new topic, which indicates that this second presentation of the meaning ‘badge’ has been mutually accepted by both speaker and addressee. The two of them consider that the concept ‘badge’ has been successfully added to their shared common ground.

To sum up we can say that, in the segment of interaction here presented, we have observed two different CS episodes. In both of them successful communication of the message was collaboratively co-constructed by the learner and his interlocutor. Communication of meaning was not achieved by the learner’s utterance of a CS alone, but by the learner and the interlocutor’s coordination of their individual actions and beliefs to reach an agreement on meaning.

Clark and Schaefer (1987) explain that acknowledgments or continuers, as they have also been called, can be used in different ways and occur at various levels of prominence. They may be invited by the contributor at the end of their turn, as seen in example 5.1, or offered by the addressee without an explicit prompting from the speaker, as in example 5.2. But they can also be presented in the middle of an utterance. The addressee may utter an acknowledgment within a pause of the speaker, as we will see in example 5.4, or as overlapping speech, see example 5.3. These overlapping
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acknowledgments are less prominent and they are for this reason usually called reduced continuers or backchannel responses (Clark and Schaefer, 1987: 38).

In the next excerpt of interaction, example 5.3, the speaker presents a message which includes a reference to the meaning ‘to drop’. Lacking this TL item in his IL system, he makes use of a combination of different CSs. In line 1 the lexical item ‘to throw’ is used as an alternative approximate term for ‘to drop’. An enacting nonverbal strategy is also used to illustrate this oral CS. The speaker mimics an action related to the message he is trying to communicate, i.e. opening the hand to drop the newspaper. The approximation CS is then expanded with a circumlocution uttered in line 4 of the transcript. Here the speaker makes reference to the action ‘to drop’ describing its result, i.e. ‘the newspaper has fallen’, and repeating the previous illustrative nonverbal enacting strategy. After these CSs the learner continues with his utterance and his turn.

EXAMPLE 5.3: INT-INT VM: to drop
REFERENT: father drops newspaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (285-288):
1 A:  ah! and the father has e::h (0.7) {throwing} the newspaper,
2                                          {A opens her RH, B looks
3 down}
4 A:  (1.2) or the newspaper {has fallen,} (1.5) [cause] it it’s not
5                                          {A opens her RH}
6 B:                                              [mm:: ]
7 A:   (xx)
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   o periódico xa caeu
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (285-288):
I:   a primeira vez non comentaches que o rapaz está sinalando o ollo?
A:   non
I:   nin que o pai se sorprende? nin que se lle cae o periódico
A:   non
I:   iso dilo logo cando volves
B:   si despois
I:   por que nono dixeches?
A:   mm pois no sei o do ollo eh no me fixei o do periódico tampouco
    despois dinme conta que caera o periódico e dixen oh! caeuselle o
    periódico
    ...
A:   si pero aí eu non sei si é thrown si si é non é tirou
I:   era esa a palabra que querías dicir?
A:   bueno thrown é é máis arroxar pero máis ben caeuselle ...
I:   cando utilizas throw e fall ... non era esa a palabra que querías
    utilizar?
A:   non pensei por non dicir saber dicer caeuselle
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
el padre ya arrojó el periódico

Even though the speaker has not given the floor to his interlocutor and has provided no signal that the presentation of his message has been completed, the
addressee offers, after the CSs, an acknowledgment: ‘mm:’. With this action, uttered as an overlap at the end of the CSs but not of the speaker’s turn, the addressee is asserting her understanding of what has been presented up to this point. According to Schegloff (1982), she is indicating that she is paying attention to what the speaker is saying and that she realizes he is in the middle of a more extend turn. She is thus encouraging the speaker to continue talking and, by passing up the opportunity to initiate a repair, indicating that she believes she has understood him so far.

Clark and Schaefer (1989: 281) argue that, by proceeding with his turn, the speaker is also indicating that he accepts the backchannel response as evidence of his partner’s understanding of the CSs just uttered. The learner has not yet finished his turn, but the content he has presented by means of a combination of oral and nonverbal CSs has already been grounded. A contribution has thus been completed within a speaker’s turn.

Although contributions co-occur most often with changes in turns, we had already seen in Chapter One, pp. 86-87, that sometimes they can be created within turns. This kind of collaborative behavior clearly illustrates how the length and the structure of the contribution is co-constructed and determined by the collective action of the contributor and their partner. Agreement on meaning and successful communication of the speaker’s intended message is not achieved through an act predetermined and executed by this speaker alone. It has been reached with the speaker and the addressee’s active participation along a unit of conversation, the contribution, here a CS episode, that emerges and gets structured through the collective actions of speaker and addressee.

Backchannel responses or reduced continuers are certainly less prominent than acknowledgments uttered at the end of turns, but they almost always succeed at dividing extended turns into smaller units of contribution. They are generally used when no strong evidence of acceptance is considered necessary because both the speaker and the addressee are quite confident of their mutual understanding of the content just uttered (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 281).

In the analysis of our data we have also found that, in order to ground a CS presented within an extended and more inclusive contribution, interlocutors sometimes make use of what in the collaborative model of communication is known as a trial constituent (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 285-286). As explained in Chapter One,
PP. 88-89, trial constituents are elements of a presentation that are modified with a try marker, i.e. with rising intonation followed by a pause. Sometimes speakers are unsure about the understandability of just some part of the presentation they are uttering. To prevent final misunderstanding problems of the whole presentation they utter this portion with rising intonation. With this try marker they are asking their addressees for an explicit acceptance of the trial constituent. Only after the addressee has provided this acceptance does the speaker continue with his turn and complete his presentation.

On this basis we can argue that when a CS is uttered as a trial constituent the speaker is indicating that they are not as certain of the understandability of this portion of their presentation as they are of the rest, and that they consider necessary to ground the content of the CS before their overall encompassing presentation can be completed.

In the CS episode presented in example 5.4 learner A uses an approximation strategy to present the meaning ‘rolled up’, illustrated by an enacting nonverbal strategy: rolling the sleeves of his shirt. Notice that the approximation CS has resulted in actual correct TL lexis: ‘ro::lled up?’ But neither the speaker nor the addressee are aware of this fact. They use an IL expression that they believe can convey a similar meaning to the originally intended one but cannot be accurately used in this context. This IL expression is uttered with rising intonation and followed by a short pause, i.e. is uttered as a trial constituent.

EXAMPLE 5.4: ADV-ADV MM: rolled up
REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (701-703):
1  A:  well (0.3) you know at the: the {the sleeves were ro::lled up?
            (A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve}
2
3   (0.5)
4  B:  yeah.
5   (0.5)
6  A:  for the small man)
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:  las mangas de la camisa
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (553-561):
59
A:  no sé como se dice remangarse rolled up?
I:  sí to roll up o sí e ti entendiches non?
B:  sí
I:  polo que te dicía? ou pola mimica? polas dúas cosas?
A:  yo creo que fue una combinación heh
B:  eu pen- si
I:  e ti sabes dicir que as mangas remangadas

59 A first reference to the meaning ‘rolled up’, previous to the one here analyzed, was made in lines 553-561 of the transcript of the whole interaction, see Appendix B.2.
The addressee provides an acknowledgment, ‘yeah’, in order to indicate that she believes she has correctly understood the content the learner is trying to add to their shared common ground. After the acknowledgment the speaker continues with his presentation: ‘for the small man’. The meaning ‘rolled up’ has thus been grounded. Speaker and addressee have successfully reached a mutual agreement on this meaning through their collaborative joint actions.

In this excerpt of interaction we can thus distinguish two different contributions. There is an all-encompassing contribution that includes the whole presentation uttered by the speaker, ‘well (0.3) you know at the: the the sleeves were ro::lled up? for the small man’, and its acceptance in subsequent turns. There is also an embedded contribution, the CS episode. This is initiated with the speaker’s presentation of the approximation and nonverbal CSs. It is accomplished with the agreement on the meaning ‘rolled up’ that is reached when the addressee and the speaker establish their mutual acceptance of the trial constituent.

The analysis of our data reveals that the use of verbal and nonverbal acknowledgments in order to provide evidence of understanding of a previously uttered CS is an extremely frequent grounding procedure in FL strategic interaction. In Appendix C the reader can find multiple examples of CS episodes where acknowledgments are used for grounding purposes in both NNS-NS and NNS-NNS interactions, involving either advanced or intermediate proficiency level learners. That is, this grounding procedure is frequently used in CS episodes by both native and non-native speaking interlocutors independently of the learners’ level of proficiency in the TL.

All these different examples support the analyses here carried out and the conclusions drawn. Uttered at the end or in the middle of turns, acknowledgments are offered by the addressee in order to indicate that they believe they have correctly interpreted the meaning of the CS presented by the speaker. Once recognized and accepted by the speaker, they allow this and their interlocutor to reach an agreement on the meaning they are trying to communicate through CS use. Successful communication
of the message is thus collaboratively achieved through the joint action of the learner and their native or non-native speaking interlocutor.

5.1.2. REPETITION AS A GROUNDING PROCEDURE IN CS EPISODES

Another common procedure for addressees to indicate that they believe they have noticed, heard and understood what has just been said is the verbatim repetition of all or part of the speaker’s previous presentation. This kind of repetitive behavior is usually known as display in the collaborative theory of communication literature (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267). In the following extract of interaction, example 5.5, we can see how the addressee repeats the CS uttered by the speaker as a means to collaborate in the grounding of the content just presented.

In line 1 of the following transcript the speaker, here B, desires to make reference to a ‘knocker’. The TL lexical item desired to present this meaning is unavailable in his IL system and he chooses to make use of a circumlocution strategy: ‘something to knock?’. This circumlocution also involves an all-purpose word: ‘something’. The presentation is at the same time modified by a try marker, i.e. uttered with rising intonation and a following pause.

EXAMPLE 5.5: INT-INT FC: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (417-418):
1  B: tch a:::nd (0.5) something to knock?
2       (1.4)
3  A: yeah something:: to kn- to knock.
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (390-399):
B: y tampoco sabíamos decir esto
I: el knocker
B: ah! se dice knocker!
I: si
A: knocker
I: que tú en un momento llegaste a decir knocker
B: si!
A: sí pero no no sabía
I: tu dijiste knocker pero como no
B: sí sí
A: dije knocker

Because of the design of the data collection instrument –cf. Chapter Three, p. 155, in the excerpts of interaction we are analyzing the sender in the picture-story spot-the-difference task is usually the participant who presents the first CS and initiates the CS episode. That is, A is generally the speaker. However, under certain circumstances, the receiver, B, may be the one who presents the CS and takes the role of speaker in the CS episode. The sender, A, acts then as the addressee of the CS. This change in roles needs to be taken into account in the analysis of this CS episode, as well as in the CS episodes presented in examples 6.6, 6.10 and 6.19.
In line 3 the addressee asserts her understanding and acceptance of the speaker’s strategic presentation with an acknowledgment, ‘yeah’, and the repetition of the CS: ‘something:: to kn- to knock.’. After this evidence of understanding the conversation continues. Speaker and addressee allow the conversation to proceed to the next topic, which, as already pointed out, indicates that they consider the CS episode completed and its content satisfactorily grounded.

The addressee has combined here two different kinds of procedures for the purpose of common ground building: the use of an acknowledgment and the verbatim repetition of the CS initially uttered by the speaker. This action and the subsequent continuation of the conversation have allowed speaker and addressee to establish the mutual belief that the meaning ‘knocker’ has been understood to a criterion sufficient for their current purposes. By repeating the speaker’s words the addressee has participated as expected in the grounding process and in the collaborative co-construction of meaning.

This use of repetition in FL strategic interactions had already been documented in Anderson (1998) –cf. Chapter One, p. 60. Within the field of SLA research, repetition responses or echoing what someone has just said had been often studied as time gaining strategies –cf. Dörnyei and Scott (1997); or confirmation checks –cf. Long (1980). But Anderson showed in his work that other-repetition can also be used for grounding purposes, i.e. to indicate to the speaker that the content just presented has been correctly understood and grounded (Anderson, 1998: 35-37).

The results of our analyses confirm Anderson’s conclusions about the use of repetition. Although in CS episodes this grounding procedure is not as common as acknowledgments, we have found that both native and non-native speaking interlocutors
resort to other-repetition in order to provide evidence of what they believe to be their correct understanding of a learner’s previous CS. Again, the reader can find in Appendix C more examples of CS episodes evidencing this kind of behavior. The one here analyzed illustrates the use of repetition for grounding purposes in an interactional exchange between two intermediate level language learners. A representative example of this strategy in interaction involving advanced level students may be found in ADV-ADV SO: 146-149. Native speaking interlocutors resorted also to this strategy in their conversations with advanced level learners, see, for instance, ADV-NS IM: 259-264, and with intermediate level speakers, see INT-NS AE: 68-70.\(^{61}\)

### 5.1.3. INITIATING A RELEVANT NEXT CONTRIBUTION AS A GROUNDING PROCEDURE IN CS EPISODES

By offering acknowledgments and repetitions addressees assert their understanding and acceptance of the speaker’s previous presentation but, as explained above, acceptance can also be presupposed. In the analysis of our data we have found that addressees sometimes respond to speakers’ strategic presentations initiating a relevant next contribution. That is, they offer an utterance which constitutes the presentation of a new content and the initiation of the next contribution, but that is built on the speaker’s previous presentation. A relevant next utterance indicates through its structure and/or its content the understanding of what has been previously said, and is considered and treated for grounding purposes as an implicit indication of acceptance.

Following Schegloff and Sacks (1973), Clark and Schaefer suggest that many contributions follow this pattern of acceptance because they are organized in *adjacency pairs* (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 270-271). They are constituted of two ordered utterances or pair parts and, on the basis of what is known as the *conditional relevance property*, the first one projects the structure and content of the second one. Thus, if the speaker presents a question, it is conditionally relevant for the addressee to respond with an answer. A request is expected to be followed by a compliance or refusal, a proposal by an acceptance or rejection, a greeting by a greeting and so on.

\(^{61}\) As explained in Chapter Three, p. 145, for identification purposes, we include, for each given example, information concerning the interlocutors taking part in the exchange—proficiency level in the TL and the initials of their names. We also indicate the lines of the transcript of the whole interaction to which each CS episode belongs. The reader can thus easily identify in Appendix B.2 and Appendix C the transcription and analysis of each of the CS episodes here mentioned.
The CS episode in example 5.6 is initiated by B presenting a question for A to be answered. Within this question the speaker intends to make reference to a ‘knocker’, but this TL item is unavailable in his IL system. In order to present this meaning and thus compensate for his ignorance of the word ‘knocker’, he decides to develop an alternative means of expression. In lines 1-4 of the transcript B presents an all-purpose word, ‘thing’, as part of a wordy extended description of the intended object of reference: ‘the:: thing to knock’. This circumlocution CS is accompanied by an enacting nonverbal strategy that illustrates the oral description: mimicking knocking on a door.

EXAMPLE 5.6: INT-INT CL: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (628-629):
1  B:   you: you still watching the:: thing to knock.
    (1.2) {the:: thing to knock.
2                                           {
3                                           {B’s RH mimics knocking on
4  B:   (1.0) on the door?=}
5  A:   {=no!} because the door is completely open,
6       {A shakes her head}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   está simplemente para llamar a la puerta el bueno no sé el el
    éste pa llamar a la puerta heh
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   bueno y el chisme este para llamar que sigo sin saber como se
    llama heh el llamador vamos el que cuando no hay timbre
A:   sí el
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
llamador (toc toc)

The utterance by the addressee, here A, of a relevant and expectable answer to the first part of the adjacency pair indicates that she has understood what the speaker meant: ‘no! because the door is completely open’. Following Clark and Schaefer (1989: 271), we can say that A is providing here evidence of her understanding at three different levels. She is passing up the opportunity to ask for a repair which, as we have already seen, is considered as an implicit acceptance of the presentation. By initiating an answer she is recognizing that a question has been asked and, through the content of this answer, displaying her correct understanding of this question.

In order for the two interlocutors to be able to establish their mutual belief on the correct interpretation of the CS and the question, this answer also needs to be accepted by the speaker. Furthermore, with this response the addressee is also presenting new content, i.e. initiating a relevant next contribution. The utterance in 5-6 is part of the acceptance phase of the CS episode, but also of the presentation phase of a second
embedded contribution. Its content needs therefore to be grounded. Here speaker and addressee move on to the next topic. Allowing the conversation to continue they accept each other’s presentations and establish the mutual belief that the question in 1-4 has been satisfactorily asked and answered, and the content contributed to discourse thus added to their shared common ground. The communication of the meaning ‘knocker’ has been collaboratively achieved through the speaker and the addressee’s coordination of their individual actions and beliefs.

In the next CS episode the addressee’s acceptance utterance is related to the speaker’s strategic presentation in a different way, but it can also be considered as the initiation of a relevant next contribution. The speaker, A, desires to communicate the meanings ‘painted’ and ‘wallpapered’ to the addressee, B. But in uttering his presentation he finds that the TL items desired for this purpose are unavailable in his IL system. He presents an alternative term of reference, ‘decorated’, which is believed to share enough semantic features with the intended ones to be correctly interpreted by his addressee. He is thus making use of an approximation CS.

EXAMPLE 5.7: ADV-ADV LT: painted, wallpapered
REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (201-202):
1 A: a::n:d behi::n:d him, (1.8) there’s a:: wall, (1.4) e::h
   decorated with (. ) flowers, or
3 B: (mine is plain.)
4 (B shakes her head)
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh hay se ve como una pared eso con
B: sí
A: estampada de flores
B: en la mía no tiene ni flores ni tiene el suelo con
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (201-202):
I: ahí por ejemplo en lo de a wall decorated with flowers? ... no pensaste que fuera empapelada?
A: quise decir un no sabía otra forma de decirlo
I: entonces cuando dices lo de decorada te referies a
A: eso
I: empapelado?
A: o con flores pintadas
I: y tú qué entiendes? simplemente?
B: eh con flores pues empapelada o sea pero sí con
A: bueno es porque es papel heh
B: bueno pues ya encontramos la diferencia y punto o sea no
I: y tú sabrías decir empapelado?
B: eh papered o algo así?
I: wall wallpaper
B: wallpaper
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
wall decorated with flowers
The addressee believes she has understood the speaker’s message well enough for their current purposes. As explained in Chapter One, pp. 78-79, interlocutors are not always seeking perfect understanding of each other’s presentations. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) suggest that participants in a conversation follow a principle of mutual responsibility, which means that they “try to establish, roughly by the initiation of each new contribution, the mutual belief that the listeners have understood what the speaker meant in the last utterance to a criterion sufficient for current purposes” (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 33). Depending on the circumstances of their interaction and their goals in each contribution, the criterion of understanding may be higher or lower.

At the same time, they are trying to minimize their collaborative effort and to avoid extra steps in both the presentation and the acceptance phase of their contributions. Speaker and addressee will sometimes agree to tolerate some lack of understanding or uncertainty in order to minimize their joint effort, as long as this uncertainty does not interfere with the principle of mutual responsibility.

In the task we designed for the collection of our data, described in Chapter Three, section 3.2.1, speaker and addressee’s final communicative goal is to identify the differences existing between their two versions of the same picture-story. In the previous excerpt of interaction, which belongs to the description of picture eight, their aim is to identify whether the wall of the house depicted in their pictures is somehow different in their two versions of the story. Whereas for the receiver, learner B, this wall is plain, for the sender, A, it has a pattern with flowers. This is the relevant piece of information they need to communicate. It is therefore not significant whether these flowers are actually painted on the wall or part of a wallpaper.

When B identifies this difference she considers she has understood A’s presentation well enough for their current purposes, i.e. well enough for the successful performance of the communicative task at hand. She interrupts the speaker mid-turn in order to indicate not only that she believes she has already understood the message, but also that she does not need a more extensive description. The relevant content and timing of B’s utterance, ‘mine is plain’, shows her understanding of the speaker’s

---

62 The principles of mutual responsibility and least collaborative effort have been accounted for in detail in Chapter One, pp. 78-80.
63 About the role of interruptions in grounding processes, also discussed in Chapter One, p. 86, see Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 23-24).
presentation, including the CS. The CS episode is closed here. Speaker and addressee move to a new topic. Allowing the conversation to continue the speaker indicates that he accepts the addressee’s interrupting utterance as evidence of understanding of the previous presentation and also as the presentation of a new contribution. In this way speaker and addressee agree that what the speaker meant with the approximation CS has been understood by the addressee well enough for their current purposes.

The addressee’s presentation of a relevant next utterance has made possible the successful grounding of the contribution. This utterance does not constitute the second part of an adjacency pair, as we saw for the CS episode in example 5.6, but is relevant in terms of content and timing. Agreement on meaning and successful communication of the originally intended message have once again been achieved through the collaborative effort of both speaker and addressee.

We are going to analyze here one more example of addressees’ initiation of a relevant next contribution as a grounding procedure in CS episodes. The CS episode in example 5.7 is the result of the speaker and the addressee’s ignorance of the TL item ‘rolled up’. In lines 1-2 the learner presents this meaning using an alternative approximate term of reference, the word ‘upwards’, and a pointing nonverbal strategy. The lengthening, the pause and the pause filler ‘eh’ serve as evidence for the addressee that the learner has encountered a lexical difficulty and is not using the originally intended lexis. This presentation is also marked by rising intonation followed by a pause. As we explained in the analysis of examples 5.1 and 5.5, this indicates the speaker’s uncertainty about the understandability of his presentation and the need of an addressee’s explicit confirmation of understanding. The speaker is thus checking for his addressee’s comprehension.

EXAMPLE 5.8: ADV-ADV LT: rolled up
REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve/ rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (378-380):
1  A: and he’s {still with the sleeve upwards?}
2                {A’s LH points to RA sleeve over her elbow}
3       (2.0)
4  B: ah! okay, mine has no sleeve upwards. but as it the is it as
5       it’s the same, so it’s not. (2.8) i think that’s all.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh después en el siguiente eh ya se está remangando la manga de
la camiseta
B: no el mio so- aparte que sólo se le ve está en la misma actitud
que en la en la vez anterior y sólo se le ve ese brazo
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (378-380):
A: ahí ella no sé si me entendió o no
B: sí le entendí que tenía la manga subida
I: mhm remangada?
B: sí
I: sin embargo no lo apuntaste aquí
B: no pero sí ... es que hay cosas por ejemplo the badge que me preguntaste al principio si me acordaba o no y no me dijiste la palabra pero después ahora ahora me acordé y claro es badge

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
only one arm
not holding his sleeve

The addressee provides evidence of her understanding and acceptance of the speaker’s presentation in the form of acknowledgments: ‘ah!’ and ‘okay’. But she also presents a relevant next utterance: ‘mine has no sleeve upwards’. B’s turn in lines 4-5 constitutes a new presentation and it also indicates in its content the acceptance of the previous utterance. Furthermore, in this new presentation the addressee repeats the learner’s approximation strategy: ‘sleeve upwards’. She is thus indicating not only that she believes she has understood the meaning the learner is trying to communicate, but also that she considers this CS as an agreed alternative term of reference to compensate for the unavailable TL item ‘rolled up’.

Three different procedures are here combined for the purposes of common ground building. The addressee provides acknowledgments, initiates a relevant next contribution and repeats the CS initially presented by the speaker. After these different forms of evidence have been provided, the speaker allows the addressee to continue with the conversation. He is thus indicating his acceptance of the addressee’s acceptance, and collaborating to establish the necessary mutual agreement on meaning for communication to succeed and new common ground to be built.

The examples here analyzed illustrate how the initiation of a relevant next contribution has been used for grounding purposes in NNS-NNS interactions, involving both intermediate and advanced level learners. In Appendix C the reader can also find examples of the use of this grounding procedure by native speaking interlocutors in their conversations with intermediate level students, see, for instance, ADV-NS RA: 384-394; as well as with advanced level ones, see INT-NS PM: 246-248. The CS episodes in Appendix C indicate that this grounding procedure has been relatively frequently used in the four different interactional conditions here analyzed: intermediate-intermediate learner, advanced-advanced learner, intermediate learner-NS and advanced learner-NS.
5.1.4. ALLOWING THE CONVERSATION TO CONTINUE AS A GROUNDING PROCEDURE IN CS EPISODES

We have seen in the previous examples that speakers may respond to their interlocutors’ indication of acceptance by moving on to the next contribution in order to continue with the conversation. In the collaborative model of communication these are considered as signals of presupposed acceptance. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 9), and Clark and Schaefer (1989: 267) argue that initiating a next contribution or allowing the interlocutor to initiate it is mutually recognized by the speaker and the addressee as an implicit acceptance of the last turn.

In the analysis of CS episodes we have found that this procedure is sometimes used by the addressee in order to presuppose their acceptance of a speaker’s previous CS. They may either initiate a next contribution or allow the speaker to go on with their turn and present a new piece of information.

In the CS episode presented in example 5.9, the speaker uses a circumlocution strategy to present the content he wants to contribute to discourse. Lacking in his IL system the TL lexical expression ‘black eye’ he describes the intended referent mentioning what he considers to be its most salient feature, i.e. its color: ‘with his e::ye black’.

EXAMPLE 5.9: ADV-ADV AV: black eye
REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (106-107):
1  A:   a:n::d well, the kid, (0.6) again, (0.4) with his e::ye black.
2       (0.8) and then (0.5) mm the man is standing
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e e o ollo o seu ollo dereito es- teno morado
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o rapaz sigue igual co ollo morado bueno ti nono tes morao
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (20-23):
A: non sei como se di morado ... si viao negro e dixen pois negro
I: e ti sabes como se di morado?
B: no
I: pero cando ela che di que está black
B: entendinlle si
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
eye

The falling intonation after the CS indicates the end of the utterance and of the speaker’s presentation. There is no explicit signal of acceptance from the interlocutor. After a brief pause the speaker continues with his turn and presents a new message not directly related in its content to the previous one. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986: 9),
following Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 728), consider that the utterance of this new presentation constitutes enough evidence of the mutual acceptance of the previous one. By passing up the opportunity to correct any possible understanding problem the addressee is indicating her acceptance of the first presentation. The speaker also recognizes this acceptance by continuing with his turn. The content of the presentation and the meaning of the CS are thus implicitly grounded.

This is considered to be the weakest possible form of evidence for common ground building purposes (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267). It is therefore not always advisable. Both the speaker and the addressee need to be very confident of the understandability of the CS presented in order to use this grounding procedure. In fact, in our data it has not been used very frequently, particularly in interactions involving intermediate level students. It is most often used when a second or third reference is made to the same meaning. In the CS episode here analyzed the speaker and the addressee are mentioning the concept ‘black eye’ for the third time in their conversation. It had already been successfully communicated through a similar CS in two previous occasions –cf. Appendix C, lines 20-23 and 94-97 of the transcript of ADV-ADV AV interaction. It seems that interlocutors can rely on these previous CS episodes and the co-constructed context of their ongoing interaction in order to be able to interpret and accept this new strategic presentation in a simpler and more straightforward way.

In Appendix C, other similar CS episodes supporting this conclusion can also be observed. For an example of the use of this grounding procedure in intermediate-intermediate level learner interactions, the reader can see INT-INT VM: 104-107. NSs allowed also their intermediate and advanced level interlocutors to continue with the conversation after a CS in some CS episodes, such as ADV-NS CS: 43-45 and 99-101, or INT-NS PM: 569-573.

5.1.5. DEMONSTRATION AS A GROUNDING PROCEDURE IN CS EPISODES
Clark and Schaefer (1989) include demonstrations as one of the five main forms of understanding evidence that an addressee can provide in order to indicate his acceptance of a speaker’s previous presentation. In a demonstration the addressee paraphrases all or
part of what the speaker has just said in order to show what it is that they have understood (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267).

In the analysis of CS episodes we have found that a repetition, with the addressee’s own words, of what the interlocutor believes to be the meaning of the CS uttered by the speaker is a relatively often used grounding procedure. But we have also noticed that this paraphrase may be presented in different ways and accomplish other different purposes.

When a learner uses a CS the linguistic form of their presentation is never the originally desired one. CSs are used because the learner feels unable to utter what they believe to be the most appropriate means of expression to present their intended message. There is therefore always a more accurate or native-like form to present this message. Both native and non-native speaking interlocutors are sometimes able to infer not only what it is that the learner is trying to say, but also what TL form are they trying to compensate for by means of the just uttered CS. In these situations they may respond to the speaker’s strategic presentation providing what they believe to be the originally intended but unavailable TL lexical item. With this move they demonstrate their understanding of the speaker’s message, but they also reformulate all or part of the speaker’s initial utterance to offer what they believe to be the correct TL form.

In the collaborative model of communication, based on the analysis of L1 non-strategic interaction, it is assumed that a presentation is accepted when it is understood by the addressee well enough for current purposes. The analysis of L2 non-strategic communicative reveals, however, that interlocutors collaborate to reach not only an agreement on meaning but also an agreement on form. The interlocutor may provide evidence of their understanding of the content of a previous presentation, and at the same time reject its form and negotiate for a more native-like expression.

We have also found that addressees reformulate relatively often speakers’ strategic presentations offering alternative CSs. With this movement they indicate that they believe they have satisfactorily understood the speaker’s intended message and they demonstrate what it is that they have understood. But what they present also constitutes a new version of the speaker’s CS and an attempt to collaborate in the creation of the most adequate and effective possible means of expression to present the originally intended message. We believe that addressees substitute speaker’s CSs with
other alternative CSs in order to show their understanding of the message but also to negotiate for form.\textsuperscript{64}

We will analyze here first those CS episodes in which addressees rephrase a speaker’s just uttered strategy with an alternative CS that demonstrates their correct understanding of the intended meaning. We will then pay attention to those addressee’s acceptance movements that correct the speaker’s initial strategic presentation by offering what the addressee believes to be the learner’s originally intended but unavailable TL lexical item.

5.1.5.1. Offering an alternative CS as a grounding procedure in CS episodes

In the following strategic episode a nonverbal strategy is accepted by a combination of verbal and nonverbal CSs that demonstrate the addressee’s correct understanding of the speaker’s communicative intentions. The speaker, here B, presents a nonverbal strategy in order to compensate for the unavailability of the TL expression ‘black eye’ –cf. lines 3-6 of the transcript. The addressee, A, initiates the acceptance phase providing verbal and nonverbal acknowledgments: ‘yes’ and a head nod. These are followed by two alternative CSs, i.e. a new version of the initial presentation. She presents an additional nonverbal strategy and describes the target referent with a circumlocution: ‘a black e-the eye the eye is black.’. The addressee rephrases thus in lines 8-10 the CS presented by the speaker in 3-6.

EXAMPLE 5.10: INT-INT VM: black eye
REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-267):
1  B:   the the differences that that i: (.) that i wrote on the paper
2       is that you said that the boy had? (1.0) {an eye:
3        {B’s RI points to her
4        eye and draws
5        circles ×2, B holds
6        the gesture}
7       (1.0)
8  A:   {{yes.}} (0.6) {{a black e- eh the eye the eye is black.}}

\textsuperscript{64} Notice that in Chapter One, pp. 85-86, we talked about refashioning the speaker’s initial presentation as a procedure used by the addressee in order to reject this presentation. In the analysis of our data we have found that CSs can be rephrased by the addressee in order to indicate their uncertain understanding of the speaker’s previous utterance, but also their believed correct interpretation of the meaning of this utterance. Refashioning sentences presented with rising intonation are usually interpreted in interaction as signals of understanding problems and will be dealt with in section 5.2 of the present chapter. But when the refashioning utterance is presented with falling intonation or even in combination with some other form of positive acceptance, such as an acknowledgment or the initiation of a relevant next contribution, it needs to be interpreted as a demonstration and therefore an understanding signal.
The acknowledgments and the falling intonation indicate that the addressee believes she has correctly understood the meaning of the CS presented by the speaker. By repeating what this has said in her own words, the addressee is also showing what it is that she has understood. At the same time she is offering an alternative oral CS to the nonverbal strategy presented by the speaker. The speaker alone has not been able to develop a TL expression to compensate for the unavailability of the lexical item ‘black eye’. This purpose has been however accomplished, within the limits of the CS episode, with the help of the interlocutor.

The demonstration, as any acceptance move, constitutes also a presentation. For common ground to be built it needs to be accepted by the speaker. This acceptance is indicated by means of an acknowledgment, ‘hm’, and a relevant next utterance: ‘in my picture, (1.5) he has, (0.5) his eyes, (1.0) normal’. The speaker recognizes thus the addressee’s acceptance and they both establish the mutual belief that the CSs have been understood well enough for their current purposes and the content of the presentation satisfactorily added to their common ground.

For the communication of the meaning ‘black eye’ three different CSs have been used: two nonverbal strategies, in lines 3-6 and 10, and an oral strategy, in 8. These have been created by the speaker and the addressee collaborating in the pursuit of one common communicative goal. Successful communication of meaning could not have been understood by an analysis of the FL learner’s strategy alone. It is this strategy,
together with the strategies offered by the addressee, i.e. the joint effort of the two interlocutors, what has led them to reach the final desired agreement on meaning.

We need to say, however, that this specific form of demonstration has not been very frequently used in the CS episodes analyzed for the purposes of our study. In fact, only three examples have been found, the one here analyzed and two more occurring in interactions between advanced level learners: ADV-ADV AV: 182-191 and ADV-ADV LT: 232-239. Native speaking interlocutors can also demonstrate with a rephrasing of the learner’s CS their understanding, but we will see in the following pages, section 5.1.5.2, that for this purpose they tend to use what they believe to be the learner’s intended but unavailable TL lexical item. We will also discuss in section 5.2 some other uses of rephrasing alternative CSs offered by both native and non-native speaking interlocutors, but presented as confirmation requests, which indicate uncertainty rather than a full understanding of the speaker’s CS.

5.1.5.2. Offering the intended TL lexical item as a grounding procedure in CS episodes

In the following example, the addressee participates in the grounding process of a previously uttered CS providing what she believes to be the learner’s originally intended but unavailable TL lexical item.

In the turn that initiates the CS episode the learner uses an indirect appeal for assistance to indicate to his interlocutor that he is experiencing some kind of lexical difficulty in the presentation of the message: ‘I don’t know how to say it.’. This strategy is followed by a circumlocution that allows the learner to describe the referent he wants to add to his and his interlocutor’s shared common ground: ‘the place where you: introduce the: letters.’. Two enacting nonverbal strategies are also used to illustrate the shape and function of this target referent: outlining the shape of a mail slot and mimicking the action of dropping mail in a mailbox.

EXAMPLE 5.11: ADV-ADV SO: letterbox
REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-149):

1  A: and a:::, (i don't know:::) how to say it, (1.2) e:::h the
   (A’s II draw a rectangle in the air)
2  A: ({place where you: introduce the:: (1.2) the: letters,})
   (A opens her RH and mimics dropping mail in the mailbox ×4)
3  (1.8)
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6  B: oh! the letters! {(the letterbox)}
7                        {A opens her AA, B is not looking}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: están delante de una puerta con un buzón

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (146-149):
A: the letterbox porque no me salía
B: eu puxen mailbox

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no mailbox

According to the comments elicited in the retrospective interview, these CSs are used to compensate for the learner’s inability to retrieve the TL lexical item ‘letterbox’. This item is, however, part of the addressee’s IL system. She is able to recognize the communicative problem encountered by the speaker and to collaborate in its solution providing the originally desired TL word.

In lines 6-7 of the previous transcript the addressee indicates her acceptance of the speaker’s strategic presentation providing an acknowledgment, ‘oh!’, a repetition of the last part of this presentation, ‘the letters’, and a demonstration of what it is that she has understood, ‘the letterbox’. With this response the addressee indicates that she believes she has correctly understood the speaker’s intended meaning. But she also indicates that she has recognized the communicative problem encountered by the speaker and that she believes there is a more accurate form of expression available for the presentation of the intended meaning. She collaborates in the communicative process not only providing evidence of her understanding, but also rephrasing the speaker’s presentation to offer what she believes to be a correct native-like TL form.

By allowing the conversation to continue the speaker indicates that he accepts the evidence of understanding provided by the addressee. This means that he has also recognized ‘letterbox’ as a TL lexical item to express his originally intended message. Agreement on both meaning and form has thus been collaboratively reached, through the joint and coordinated actions of all the interlocutors taking part in this interactional exchange.

In the CS episode illustrated in the next example agreement on what is believed to be the correct TL lexical item to communicate the originally intended message is also reached. In this particular case a CS is uttered by the speaker when he finds out that the desired word to communicate the referent ‘waistcoat’ is available in his IL system but is
not shared with his interlocutor. That is, a CS is used because of the addressee’s, not the speaker’s, lack of knowledge of the TL form ‘waistcoat’.

EXAMPLE 5.12: ADV-ADV SO: waistcoat
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (58-62):
1 A: e::h (0.4) he has two buttons, e:h in bueno (‘well’), (1.3)
2 {e::h he wears a:::} {a waistcoat? (4.4)} (and he has two
3 (A’s RI points to her chest)
4 (A’s RI outlines an armhole on her LA
5 shoulder ×2, A holds the gesture)
6 (A’s RI points to where the buttons
7 would be on her
8 chest ×2 )
10 A: buttons, on it,) (2.6) a:n::d mm
11 (1.2)
12 B: a waistcoat!? (0.6) what’s that?
13 A: heh heh heh °chaleco (‘vest’)° heh
14 B: ah! (1.0) (heh)okay
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: mm un chaleco con dos botones
B: hm
A: eh tiene dos bolsillos también en el chaleco
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (58-62):
A: estaba casi segura ... pero como me puso cara de ... hombre yo yo
es que lo dije así toda la vida pero no
B: no porque é que eu non sabía como se dicía como se di chaleco en
inglés
I: mm entón cando ela di que di waistcoat ti que pensaches que era?
B: eu o primeiro que pensei supuxen que que seria un un chaleco
porque coat waistcoat
I: heh
B: saqueino más ou menos polas súas palabras e tal pero eso ó final
acabamos dicindo a palabra en gale- en castellano
A: sí en castellano
... 
B: eu non me acordaba de nada
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no ‘chaleco’

In lines 2 and 3-5 of the transcript, the speaker presents the meaning ‘waistcoat’. His presentation cannot however be accepted by the addressee because she cannot understand this word. In order to solve this problem and thus collaborate in the successful communication of the message, the speaker refashions his initial presentation substituting the item ‘waistcoat’ with a code switching strategy: ‘chaleco’. This CS allows the addressee to identify the speaker’s intended meaning. In 14 she offers two acknowledgments that indicate not only that she has been able to understand the

---

65 As clearly stated in Chapter Two, p. 131, we consider that CSs are used not only when the speaker is unable to use an unknown TL word, but also when they cannot use a known word because this is not shared with their interlocutor.
message, but also that she recognizes now the term ‘waistcoat’ as accurate TL lexis: ‘ah!’ and ‘okay’. The conversation continues evidencing the mutual agreement on both meaning and form collaboratively reached between speaker and addressee.  

The use of this form of demonstration as a grounding procedure is more frequent in interactions involving native speaking interlocutors. Some representative examples that can be found in Appendix C are the following: ADV-NS CS 389-392, ADV-NS IM: 322-325, INT-NS AE: 234-237 and INT-NS SL: 146-149. This does not mean, however, that learners are not able to offer corrective TL lexis to their interlocutors. But, as we will see in the following pages, when the intermediate or advanced level student corrects another student, they usually modify their correction with a try marker. This kind of acceptance move will be analyzed in the next section of the present chapter.

5.2. PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF TROUBLE IN UNDERSTANDING FOR GROUNDING PURPOSES IN CS EPISODES

In all the CS episodes so far analyzed the addressee has been able to recognize the learner’s presentation as a strategic attempt to compensate for an unavailable TL item, to identify the meaning this intends to convey and to indicate it. But CSs cannot always be interpreted by the interlocutor as intended by the speaker. Less effective CSs can lead to understanding problems on the part of the addressee, who may not be able to identify the message the learner is trying to convey or to understand it to a criterion sufficient for their current purposes.

In face-to-face interaction interlocutors can use a variety of different procedures to collaborate in the solution of these understanding difficulties. Following the work carried out within the framework of the collaborative theory of communication, we have identified two main categories of procedures that addressees can use to indicate their troubles in the interpretation of a speaker’s CS: clarification requests and confirmation checks. The use of one of these techniques initiates a side sequence within the CS episode in which the initial presentation is refashioned by the speaker, the addressee or the two of them working together. This process extends until a mutually acceptable

66 In the present chapter the main focus of our analyses is the meaning creation process in strategic communication, i.e. how learners and their interlocutors collaborate to agree on meaning when the desired TL lexical items or structures are not available. Learners and addressees’ collaboration for the purposes of TL form construction and the implications that this process may have on the development of the learner’s IL system will be analyzed in detail in Chapter Six.
version, which allows them to establish a mutual agreement on meaning, can be reached. The contributions thus emerging clearly illustrate how the final success of strategic communication depends not so much on the initial strategy presented by the FL learner, as on the collaborative effort of this and their interlocutor all along the CS episode.

The collaborative model also predicts that problems can occur within the acceptance phase of a CS episode, even when the addressee believes and indicates they have correctly understood the strategy presented by the learner. The evidence of understanding provided by the addressee may not be recognized by the speaker, it may be considered insufficient or inadequate, or even reveal an actually misunderstanding of the message. This kind of trouble can also be collaboratively solved with the speaker’s initiation of what Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs have called a follow-up (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 24).

In this section we will analyze the role of all these different grounding procedures in FL strategic interaction. We will thus try to identify and understand how the collaborative effort of speaker and addressee makes possible the solution of understanding problems occurring within CS episodes, and the subsequent successful communication of the originally intended message.

### 5.2.1. CONFIRMATION CHECKS AS EVIDENCE OF TROUBLE IN UNDERSTANDING FOR GROUNDING PURPOSES IN CS EPISODES

The use of confirmation checks in FL interaction, either in NNS-NS or in NNS-NNS communicative exchanges, has been widely documented within the negotiation of meaning literature – cf. Long (1980, 1983a), Varonis and Gass (1985), Pica, Young and Doughty (1987), and Pica (1994) for some of the most representative research in this field. Confirmation checks can be defined as moves “immediately following an utterance by the interlocutor which are designed to elicit confirmation that the utterance has been correctly heard or understood by the listener” – adapted from Long (1983a: 137).

Initially confirmation checks were studied as NSs’ responses to NNSs’ utterances and considered to involve always repetition, with rising intonation, of all or part of the speaker’s preceding utterance (Long, 1983a: 137). Subsequent research has
found that NNSs also use this negotiation of meaning strategy when they have difficulties to understand their native as well as non-native speaking interlocutors. The concept of confirmation check has also been widened to include any move from the addressee, repetitive or not, that seeks to confirm hearing and understanding of a previous utterance.

In the analysis of CS episodes we have noticed that, in order to check for confirmation, addressees repeat sometimes all or part of the speaker’s preceding strategic utterance with rising intonation. Furthermore, they can also paraphrase what they think may be the meaning of the CS. For this purpose, they may use an alternative strategy with rising intonation or what they believe may be the correct TL form of the speaker’s non-native-like strategic utterance. In CS episodes a request for confirmation can thus also contain implicit corrective feedback and initiate a process of simultaneous negotiation of both meaning and form. All these different uses of confirmation checks will be here analyzed and exemplified.

Notice also that confirmation checks are considered to project a positive verdict. This means that they are usually answerable by a simple confirmation, an acknowledgment such as ‘yeah’ or a head nod, and require little effort from the interlocutor in terms of production. On this basis we can argue that a confirmation check is generally used by the addressee when they have a certain confidence in the possible accuracy of their interpretation of the speaker’s preceding CS.

Understanding needs to be seen as a continuum, rather than a yes or no issue. What an addressee indicates in their acceptance move is their level of understanding and whether they consider it sufficient for their and their interlocutors’ common purposes. In most of the CS episodes we will analyze here the confirmation check provided by the addressee reveals that in fact they have correctly understood the speaker’s CS. They just do not consider their level of understanding high enough for the satisfactory grounding of the message in this interactional context.

5.2.1.1. Repetition as evidence of trouble in understanding for grounding purposes in CS episodes

In the CS episode presented in example 5.13, with the repetition of the CS just uttered by the speaker, the addressee indicates she is having some trouble to understand the
learner’s intended message. She needs some further evidence in order to be able to accept this strategic presentation.

The speaker, A, uses in the presentation of the content he wants to contribute to discourse the IL item ‘diamonds’ – cf. line 1 of the transcript. This is an approximation CS to compensate for the unavailability of the originally intended TL lexical item ‘rhombus’.

EXAMPLE 5.13: ADV-ADV SO: rhombus
REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (193-197):
1  A: a:n:::d there a::re e:::h (2.0) diamonds? {on the floor, (1.5) {A waves her RH palm down \times n} (1.2)}
2  A: some black and some white,)
3   (0.8)
4  B: diamonds?
5   (0.4)
6  A: yeah, (0.7) e:::h (0.4) {“rombos (‘rhombuses’).” heh=}
7   (A’s RI draws a rhombus shape in the air) (0.4)
8  B: =oh! (2.2) diamonds, sí (‘yes’).
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el suelo pues tiene rombos unos blancos y otros negros
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (193-197):
B: eu aí entendín que había diamantes e dixen onde están os diamantes porque nonos via hai diamantes de verdade? e despois claro fixeime dinme de conta da forma ...
I: mhm y diamond lo dices?
A: como rombo pude decir cuadrados pero me salió eso heh
I: cuando ella no te entiende lo de diamonds
A: pude haberle dicho otra cosa lo dije en español porque no porque no lo pensé no sé
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
nothing painted in the floor

The addressee has heard what the speaker has said and recognized the expression he has used, but she is not sure about the exact meaning he is trying to convey. She responds to the speaker’s CS with a confirmation check that indicates her state of understanding: ‘diamonds?’.

Notice that in this confirmation check the addressee does not repeat all the preceding presentation, but only that part she is not sure about, i.e. the CS. She is thus presupposing she has understood everything but the term ‘diamonds’. According to Clark and Schaefer (1987: 22), the addressee’s acceptance move shows she is in different states of understanding for different constituents of the presentation. Furthermore, by signaling exactly where the trouble is, she is collaborating with her
interlocutor in order to minimize their joint effort. She is indicating what kind of information she needs from the speaker in order to be able to reach a satisfactory understanding of the whole presentation.

Learner A decides to refashion his initial presentation; more specifically, that part of the presentation which could not be accepted by B. He offers the acknowledgment ‘yeah’ and replaces his first CS with a combination of a code switching and an outlining nonverbal strategy. He uses a L1 term in order to compensate for the unavailability of the TL one: ‘rombos’. He also illustrates the meaning of this oral CS with a pictographically representation of the target referent: outlining the shape of a rhombus with his hand.

The use of the code switching strategy is the result of a previously failed L2-based CS. We had already explained in Chapter Four, p. 208, that, in our data, learners generally resort to this kind of L1-based strategy when they feel unable to produce a meaningful TL expression or when they have failed in a previous attempt to convey their messages through a L2-based strategy.

In order to ground the content presented in the first utterance, a side sequence has been initiated. Side sequences, also discussed in Chapter One, p. 81, are defined as a “block of exchanges embedded within or between anticipated contributions to the conversation” (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 7). The process of refashioning is part of the acceptance phase of the CS episode, but is also a new subordinated contribution. The CSs presented by the speaker in 8 and 9 constitute a new presentation of the originally intended meaning that also needs to be grounded.

For common ground to be satisfactorily built, it is necessary for the addressee to accept the speaker’s initial presentation in 1-4 and the refashioned version in 8-9. In 10 she indicates acceptance providing two acknowledgments, ‘oh!’ and ‘sí’, and repeating the learner’s first CS now with falling intonation: ‘diamonds,’. In doing so, she gives evidence of her understanding of everything said before.

In example 5.5 we had already seen how a repetition of a previous CS can be used in order to provide evidence of understanding. The falling intonation projects an acceptance response and indicates that the addressee is confident of the correctness of her understanding. When this repetition is uttered with rising intonation, it is, however, interpreted as a confirmation check and a signal of uncertainty. It could be argued that
the limit between these two uses of repetition is relatively weak, but in everyday conversation so is sometimes the limit between full and uncertain understanding.

The side sequence is closed by the participants when they decide to move to the next topic in the conversation. Speaker and addressee thus establish their mutual acceptance of the initial presentation and its refashioned version. Side sequences are also a collective activity. Solving the addressee’s understanding problems in order to achieve a mutual agreement on meaning always takes the two interlocutors’ collaboration within the limits of the CS episode. A mutually acceptable version of the speaker’s original presentation has been here jointly achieved through the strategic and collaborative actions of both the speaker and the addressee.

Again, the reader can find in Appendix C other CS episodes that illustrate how a verbatim repetition with rising intonation of all or part of the preceding strategic presentation acts as a signal of trouble in understanding and initiates the necessary negotiation between speaker and addressee for final agreement on meaning to be reached. These CS episodes provide further evidence supporting the previous analysis and the conclusions here drawn. Furthermore, similar results to these were also obtained by Anderson (1998), who found as well evidence suggesting that other-repetition with rising intonation is a relatively common procedure used by the addressee to denote their difficulties in understanding a speaker’s previous CS –cf. Anderson (1998: 38).

5.2.1.2. Offering an alternative CS as evidence of trouble in understanding for grounding purposes in CS episodes

A non-acceptable presentation can also be refashioned by the addressee. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs found that once a speaker has finished an utterance, the addressee can reject it by presenting a replacement or an expansion, i.e. an utterance that intends to substitute the initial one or to clarify it by adding new information (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 20-23). In our data we have found that CSs uttered by the FL learner are sometimes refashioned by their native or non-native speaking interlocutor.

In the CS episode in example 5.14, the learner desires to contribute the meaning ‘chin’, but the TL lexical item desired to present this meaning is unavailable in his IL.

67 The function of expansions and replacements in L1 communication has already been discussed in Chapter One, pp. 84-86.
system. To compensate for this linguistic shortcoming he makes use of a circumlocution CS. He presents the meaning ‘chin’ making reference to its location: ‘under his mouth’.

EXAMPLE 5.14: INT-NS AE: chin
REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-281):
1  A: a::n::d the boy, e::h has e:::h (1.2) his hand e:h under his
2      mouth, like is if he was thinking.
3   (1.0)
4  B: (like this?
5       {B’s LH touches her chin}
6    (B’s LH touches her chin)
7  A:  yes}
8  B: okay heh [heh heh heh] heh e:::h (0.7) okay
9  A:             [heh heh heh]
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y el niño aparece ahora con con la mano en y esto cómo se llama
   heh heh bueno con la mano debajo de su boca como pensando así
   como pensando en qué va a ocurrir
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (275-281):
A: es que eso es que no me salía y cuando tuve que explicarlo en
   español sólo se me ocurría en gallego queixo queixo
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
boy supporting his chin

In lines 4 and 5 of the transcript the addressee presents an alternative CS to make reference to this same concept. She uses an all-purpose expression, ‘like this?’, completed in its meaning by a pointing nonverbal strategy: touching her own chin. The addressee does not refashion the whole presentation, but only that part she considers to be problematic. This refashioning is marked with rising intonation and thus presented as a confirmation check. B is explicitly asking A to confirm the understandability of the new CS and also the correctness of her interpretation of the initial circumlocution strategy.

In the collaborative theory this is called a replacement and is considered as a rejection, i.e. a non-acceptance, of the speaker’s original presentation (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 23). The addressee here has heard what the speaker has said and even recognized what he meant. But her refashioning confirmation check indicates she is not certain about her understanding. She does not believe she has understood the learner’s CS to a criterion sufficient for the current purposes of their interaction and therefore cannot accept it.

The addressee’s refashioned version of the speaker’s initial presentation constitutes also a new presentation. It needs to be grounded. In line 6 the learner indicates his acceptance providing an acknowledgment: ‘yes’. This means that A has
understood B’s presentation, i.e. B’s CS; and also that he considers it as enough evidence of B’s correct understanding of the initial CS in lines 1 and 2. The acknowledgment provided by A is also explicitly accepted by B in 7, with laughter and two repetitions of another acknowledgment: ‘okay’. The speaker also provides more confirmative laugher in 8 and after the second ‘okay’ the conversation continues with the two interlocutors moving to the next topic. The side sequence initiated by the addressee is thus considered completed and agreement on meaning successfully established.

Communication of the meaning ‘chin’ has been collaboratively achieved. Both interlocutors have performed and coordinated their individual actions in order to reach this common goal. Furthermore, collaboration along the CS episode involved not only the learner’s presentation of a CS for ‘chin’, but also the addressee’s. The learner’s strategic utterance alone cannot account for the successful communication of the message. It is this CS, together with the CS uttered by the addressee and the grounding effort they have both made, what has made possible the final communicative success of the CS episode.

Sometimes interlocutors get to coordinate their actions in such a way that when the addressee offers a refashioning CS this is actually built in the linguistic structure of the speaker’s initiated but unfinished presentation. That is, speaker and addressee coordinate their actions to produce a single coherent structure that specifies the message they are collaborating to communicate. The presentation is initiated by the speaker but completed by the addressee.

This grounding procedure, usually known as completion, has been widely documented in the collaborative theory literature. In fact, Clark and Schaefer have shown that completions are “surprisingly common in everyday conversation” (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 287). Completions in L1 communication were explained in Chapter One, p. 90. We are going to analyze here how this procedure works in FL interaction within the framework of the CS episode.68

In the following excerpt of interaction two different CS episodes can be distinguished. In lines 8-12 of the transcript, learner A uses an appeal for assistance, ‘I don’t know, (2.6) °how do you call (0.7) this:, (3.0) you know?°’; an all-purpose

68 For a detailed and quite exhaustive study of completions in L1 communication see Wilkes-Gibbs (1995).
expression, ‘this way.’; an enacting nonverbal strategy, i.e. mimicking the action of
rolling up a sleeve; and a strategic pointing gesture, i.e. pointing to his own sleeve. With
these CSs A intends to compensate for the desired but unavailable TL item ‘rolled up’.
The interlocutor, B, accepts this strategic presentation providing acknowledgments and
initiating a relevant next contribution.

In this acceptance move, lines 14-16, B intends to present the meaning
‘unrolled’, but this TL item is also lacking in A and B’s IL system. The pauses, fillers
and drawls act as a signal that B is experiencing some kind of linguistic difficulty. He
makes use of an outlining nonverbal strategy: moving his hand around his wrist. But the
structure of his utterance shows that he has been unable to complete the oral
presentation of his message.

EXAMPLE 5.15: ADV-ADV AV: rolled up, unrolled
REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (174-182):
1  B:   a:n::id what about? (1.0) his clothes?
2       (1.4)
3  A:   his clothes? he’s wearing:::, a shirt?
4       (1.4)
5  B:   {hm}
6       {B nods, AB look down}
7       (1.6)
8  A:   with: a: {(2.8) mm (1.5) i don’t know, (2.6) °how do you call
9       {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve}
10 A:   (0.7) this:, (3.0) you know?° (1.5) he has:, (1.5) his shirt,}
11       {this way.}
12       {A’s LI points to RA rolled up sleeve}
13       (2.0)
14 B:   mm::: heh (2.4) in this picture, (1.0) {he:: has the shirt}
15       {B’s RH moves around her
16       LA wrist}
17       (1.4)
18 A:   {in the normal position?}
19       {A waves her HH palms down}
20 B:   {{in the normal position.=}}
21       {B nods)}
22 A:   =yeah, heh heh okay
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   ten tirantes unha camisa está remangado
B:   aquí non está remangado e tampouco ten tirantes
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (174-182):
A:   quería dicir remangada e non sabía como dicilo
I:   hm e ti entendiches
B:   hm co xesto que facia
I:   uuhh pola mímica e ti saberías dicir remangado?
B:   no
...  
I:   entón aquí entonces cando dis o de in the normal position
B:   heh heh heh
I:   e porque non
In line 18 A offers a refashioning circumlocution strategy, ‘in the normal position?’, that is uttered as a completion of B’s unfinished utterance. That is, she offers what she believes to be an appropriate ending for B’s oral presentation. In this way the two interlocutors co-construct a single unit in terms of both structure and content: ‘he:: has the shirt in the normal position?’ According to Wilkes-Gibbs the structural dependency across B and A’s utterances facilitates grounding (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1995: 247). The addressee is collaborating here to create the form of the speaker’s presentation in order to ground beliefs about its meaning (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997: 247).

This circumlocution, uttered with rising intonation, constitutes also a confirmation check. In the following turn, lines 20-21, B repeats the CS ‘in the normal position.’, together with a nonverbal acknowledgment, a head nod. This constitutes an indication of acceptance. That is, B recognizes the meaning of this CS. He accepts it as evidence of A’s correct understanding of his message and also as an accurate completion of his initiated but unfinished presentation.

In 22 A accepts B’s acceptance providing the acknowledgments ‘yeah’ and ‘okay’, and laughter. The CS episode concludes when the conversation moves to the next topic. Mutual acceptance is thus established not only for A’s CS in 18, ‘in the normal position?’, but also for the presentation jointly created by A’s CS and B’s unfinished utterance: ‘he:: has the shirt in the normal position?’.

A linguistic unit has been co-constructed by B and A, its integrity depending on the coordinated actions of the two interlocutors. As explained in Chapter One, p. 90, completions constitute one of the clearest examples of the collaborative nature of face-to-face oral interaction. In completions we can see how speaker and addressee collaborate in the creation of meaning by co-constructing form.

In our data we have noticed that in FL interaction interlocutors do not only complete each others’ utterances proposing refashioned oral versions of a previous

---

69 If the addressee is confident of the accuracy of their completion, they can utter it with falling intonation. They indicate in this way that they believe they have correctly understood the speaker’s intended meaning. Completions are however more often uttered with rising intonation (Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 286-287). In our data completions offered with falling intonation are rare –cf. in Appendix C ADV-ADV SO: 114-118 and 204-207, INT-INT CL: 309-314, and INT-INT FC: 475-478 and 773-776.
nonverbal CS, in this process, they also complete sometimes each other’s oral CSs. In example 5.16 a circumlocution strategy is initiated by learner A, but finished by the addressee, B.

Here a communicative problem arises when one of the learners intends to present the meaning ‘mailbox’ and finds the desired TL item to convey this meaning is not yet part of his IL system. To compensate for this problem, he decides to attempt an alternate means of communication. He initiates the description of the object of reference, intending to mention first its shape and then its function. This description is illustrated with an outlining nonverbal strategy, in lines 2-7, and an enacting strategy in lines 9-10.

All through the presentation process the silent pauses, pause fillers, repetitions and lengthening phenomena act as a signal for the interlocutor that the speaker is experiencing some kind of difficulty. In 11 the repetition and lengthened pronunciation of the word ‘the’ suggest that A is looking for a way to complete his unfinished utterance.

EXAMPLE 5.16: INT-INT CL: mailbox
REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (480-486):

1  A:  and then there’s also e:::h, (0.8) mm::: (2.0) {like a hole?
2       {A’s HH draw a
3       rectangle in
4       the air, A
5       holds the
6       gesture, B
7       looks down}
8  A:  (2.4) when you::: (2.3)) {for example when the postman? (1.4)
9       {A’s RH mimics dropping mail in a
10      mailbox, A holds the gesture}
11 A:   put the:: the:[:
12 B:      {[[the] letters?]}
13      {[[B’s HH mimic dropping mail in a mailbox]}
14 A:   {[[yeah,]]} 
15      {[[A nods]}
16      (0.5)
17 B:  {so there is the: [the: ] the: mailbox? (0.8) okay
18      {B draws a rectangle in the air}
19 A:    {[[yeah,]]}
20      {[[A nods]}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  y se ve lo de lo de para meter las cartas
B:  lo de las cartas
A:  de bueno que aquí no lo suele haber pero que allá sí
B:  el buzón vamos el buzón?
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
mail box in the picture
In order to help him out, B offers a plausible completion: ‘the letters?’. The addressee presents the final part of the utterance initiated by the speaker: ‘when the postman? put the:: the::’. They thus co-construct the unit: ‘when the postman put the:: the:: the letters?’

The completion is presented with rising intonation. B is thus explicitly checking for A’s confirmation of the accuracy and appropriateness of the completion. Furthermore, this utterance completes the presentation phase of the first contribution, but constitutes itself a new presentation that also needs to be grounded.70 This is accomplished in lines 14-15 with the verbal acknowledgment ‘yeah’ and a nonverbal head nod. A indicates in this way that he has understood B’s previous utterance and that he accepts it as an appropriate completion for his unfinished presentation. This also confirms the correctness of B’s understanding of A’s original communicative intention.

With B’s completion and A’s acceptance, evidence is provided that the speaker’s originally intended meaning has been satisfactorily understood by the addressee. This has been possible through the use of a CS that has been presented neither by A nor by B. It has been co-constructed by both, with the collaborative actions and effort of the learner and their interlocutor.

This CS episode, however, does not end here. B believes there is a more accurate TL form available to communicate the meaning and presents it in a following turn: ‘the mailbox’ –cf. line 17 in the transcript. This constitutes what Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs consider to be a follow-up, i.e. a side sequence opened immediately after the acceptance of a presentation (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 24-25). As seen in Chapter One, p. 81, these authors argue that follow-ups are initiated by the speaker in order to ask for reassurance of their interlocutors’ comprehension or to solve misunderstanding problems that may become evident in the addressee’s acceptance move. In this excerpt of FL interaction, however, it seems that the purpose of the follow-up is not so much to assure the correct understanding of the intended message, as to negotiate a more accurate TL form to communicate it. This interactional exchange shows that in CS

70 As explained in Chapter One, p. 90, in a completion there are at least always two contributions. The completion ‘the letters’ constitutes the presentation of a contribution embedded within a more encompassing contribution, where the content ‘when the postman put the letters’ is presented and grounded.
episodes speaker and addressee collaborate not only to reach an agreement on meaning, but also to create what they believe to be correct TL form.\textsuperscript{71}

We are going to analyze one more example of FL strategic interaction that we consider particularly interesting because it combines the two different patterns of completion illustrated in examples 5.15 and 5.16.

Learner A in example 5.17 desires to communicate the meaning ‘vest’, but lacking this TL lexical item in his IL system decides to attempt an alternate means of expression. With this objective in mind he initiates the description of the object of reference he wants to add to his and his interlocutor’s shared common ground. He tries to describe a ‘vest’ as a ‘pullover without sleeves’. But during the presentation of this circumlocution strategy he encounters a second lexical difficulty: the TL item ‘sleeve’ is also unavailable. To compensate for this problem he presents a nonverbal strategy: outlining the shape of a sleeve along his arm.

The pauses, pause fillers and drawls at the end of the first turn indicate that there is something else to come. They reveal that the speaker is experiencing some kind of linguistic difficulty in the completion of his circumlocution and with it his strategic presentation.

EXAMPLE 5.17: ADV-ADV LT: vest, sleeves
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-95):
1 A: but (1.0) he::: (3.6) but no, i think mine (2.0) wears a::: heh
2 heh (3.4) pullover {without::t (2.8) e::h
3 A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her arm
4
5 (1.2)
6 B: without arms?
7 A: {{arms}}
8 (A nods)}
9 (2.0)
10 B: oh! {{[mine] is just a shirt,}} (2.4) no pullover, (5.7) okay,
11 B shakes her head
12 A: [mm ]
13 B: i think that’s it.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: tiene un chaleco en el tuyo sólo una camisa no?
B: si tiene una camisa
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (90-95):
A: ahi pues bueno ya dije veía los botones pero ya dije pues debe haber algo
I: si porque dice in the bottom of the tie tú no ves el bottom

\textsuperscript{71} As mentioned above, learners and addressees’ negotiation of form within CS episodes and their collaboration in the creation of correct TL lexis will be analyzed in detail in Chapter Six.
realmente
A: claro claro ahí ya dije
B: es que claro yo ahí no sabía ni imaginé que podía llevar chaleco
o sea yo es que yo sabía que algo tenía que tener porque vamos
A: ahí (xxx) sí ... y ella cuando cuando me di- o sea porque dijo
bueno seguro que no tiene chaleco ya lo estaba pensando ya desde
el principio pero cuando me dijo lo del bolsillo de la camisa
pues ya
... 
A: y ahí también no me salía mangas en ese momento y después sí
... 
B: el chaleco yo es que sabía a lo que se refería pero en ese
momento no es que son cosas que no ... cómo se dice chaleco?
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no pullover

In line 6 of the transcript we see how the addressee offers a plausible completion to the speaker’s presentation: ‘without arms?’ The IL item ‘arms’ constitutes, on the one hand, a completion of the circumlocution strategy that the speaker initiated to compensate for the unavailable TL term ‘vest’. This circumlocution strategy is thus co-constructed by A and B. On the other hand, it also constitutes an approximation strategy for the second unavailable TL lexical item, ‘sleeves’, and a refashioned version of the nonverbal strategy presented by A in 3-4.

In Chapter One, p. 93, we explained that one contribution may be embedded within another contribution. In the previous examples we also saw how this can occur within the framework of one single CS episode. An acceptance move for a CS may also constitute the presentation of a new content and initiate a second contribution within the limits of the CS episode –cf. for instance the initiation of a relevant next contribution for grounding purposes in the CS episodes illustrated in examples 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8. Strategic presentations may also consist of two or more contributions when they involve trial constituents or completions –as we saw in example 5.4 and in examples 5.15 and 5.16. Finally, refashioning side sequences, with their presentation and acceptance phases, constitute contributions embedded within the acceptance phase of an all-inclusive contribution, i.e. the CS episode –cf. examples 5.13 and 5.14.

What we see in this excerpt of interaction is the embedding of two different CS episodes. In the first CS episode speaker and addressee try to reach an agreement on the meaning ‘vest’, and in the second CS episode on the meaning ‘sleeves’. The strategic presentation of ‘sleeves’ is initiated within the presentation of ‘vest’. The second CS episode is thus embedded in the first one. The meaning ‘vest’ cannot be grounded
unless an agreement on the meaning ‘sleeves’ can be mutually established by speaker and interlocutor.\textsuperscript{72} With her response the addressee is checking for confirmation of her correct understanding of two different but embedded CSs and thus collaborating in the grounding process of these two CSs. The addressee’s acceptance move is accepted by the speaker with a repetition of the CS ‘arms’ and a simultaneous nonverbal acknowledgment. This is also accepted with a relevant next utterance from B that includes a third CS, the use of the approximate term ‘pullover’ to compensate for the TL lexical item ‘vest’. Final agreement on the meaning of these three different CSs is established when the interlocutors allow the conversation to proceed to the next topic.

Speaker and addressee have thus collaborated in the grounding of two different meanings both presented through CS use: ‘vest’ and ‘sleeve’. With one single acceptance move, the completion of the speaker’s presentation in line 6, the addressee has fulfilled part of her responsibilities in the grounding process of these two different but related contents. The meaning ‘sleeve’ could be successfully communicated through the combination of A and B’s CSs: A’s nonverbal strategy in 3-4 and B’s approximation strategy in 6. The meaning vest has been communicated through a circumlocution strategy co-constructed by A and B in 1-4 and 6, and an approximation strategy presented by B in 10. That is, speaker and addressee have collaborated to ground meaning and along this process they have also co-constructed form. Meaning and form have been collaboratively created by the two learners. The successful communicative outcome of this interactional exchange is the result of A and B’s joint and coordinated actions. It could not have been fully understood through a unilateral analysis of any of these two interlocutors actions as independent or isolated strategic utterances.

In the analysis of our data we have found other CS episodes that support the conclusions here drawn. Both native and non-native speaking interlocutors, independently of their level of proficiency in the TL language, are able to collaborate in the grounding process offering their own CS, either as a replacement or as a completion of the learner’s previous strategic utterance. All these different examples reveal that,

\textsuperscript{72} Embeddedness of one CS within the framework of another CS is a relatively common phenomenon widely discussed in previous research (Bialystok, 1990: 69-70; Poulisse \textit{et al.}, 1990: 65-66). Embeddedness has also been illustrated and explained in Chapter Four of the present study –cf. Chapter Four, example 4.30 in pp. 212-213 and example 4.36 in p. 218.
despite troubles in interpreting a learner’s CS, final agreement on meaning can be reached with the addressee’s active collaboration in the refashioning of this strategy. Apart from the ones here analyzed, other representative CS episodes that the reader can find in Appendix C are: ADV-ADV LT: 1-14, ADV-NS IM: 259-264, INT-INT CL: 170-173 or 201-206, and INT-NS PM: 461-471.

5.2.1.3. Offering the intended TL lexical item as evidence of trouble in understanding for grounding purposes in CS episodes

As already pointed out, a CS uttered by the FL learner may be responded to by the addressee with what they believe to be the speaker’s desired but unavailable TL lexical item. That is, the interlocutor is sometimes able to recognize that the learner is using a strategic means of communication to compensate for an unknown TL word or expression, to identify this TL word or expression, and to provide it in their acceptance move.

If the addressee is confident of their accurate understanding of the message, they will offer what they believe to be correct TL lexis with falling intonation. As explained in the analysis of examples 5.11 and 5.12, this movement is interpreted as a demonstration of what the interlocutor has understood and an acceptance of the speaker’s previous presentation.

But we have also observed that in FL strategic interaction addressees may offer corrective TL lexis with rising intonation, i.e. as a confirmation check. This is interpreted as a refashioning movement and a non-acceptance of the speaker’s initial presentation. The addressee is signaling that they have not understood the previous presentation well enough for current purposes and that they are making a guess of the speaker’s communicative intentions. It is the speaker who has to decide whether this guess is correct or not.

In example 5.18 the learner desires to contribute the meaning ‘holding hands’ to his and his native speaking interlocutor’s shared common ground. In order to present this content he makes use of a combination of a literal translation and a nonverbal strategy. In the lack of the TL expression ‘holding hands’, he translates word by word the NL one ‘coller o neno da mao’: ‘getting:: her (1.0) her boy with e:h (0.8) his hand.’.
This oral expression is also illustrated by an enacting nonverbal strategy: mimicking holding someone’s hand.

EXAMPLE 5.18: INT-NS PM: holding hands
REFERENT: holding hands/ father takes the boy by the hand
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-278):
1 A: she is e:h he’s (0.8)) {getting:: her (1.0) her boy with e:h
2 A’s RH mimics holding someone’s hand,
3 B is not looking
4 A: (0.8) his hand. (1.4) they a:re=
5 B: =he’s holding? he’s holding the boy’s [hand?]
6 A: {{[he’s ] holding.} (0.8)
7 {{A nods}}
8 A: yeah.}}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e a na seguinte vese ó pai que colle da mao ó neno e van camiñando
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: xa non ten ó neno agarrado da man
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (275-278):
A: que está collendo o neno coa man o sea que está colléndoo pola
man e
I: traduciches literalmente do español ó mellor? getting his boy?
A: si si
...  
A: e cando di o de sostelo sostelo non me soou demasiado aínda que
bueno el utilizouno polo tanto
I: e que sóese dicir holding holding the boy’s hand
A: uuhh
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
holding boy’s hand

The addressee is able to identify the meaning the speaker is trying to convey and also that the previous strategic presentation is the result of the learner’s lack of knowledge of the TL expression ‘holding hands’. In line 5 of the transcript we can see how the addressee responds to the speaker’s CSs with a native-like version of his presentation. She presents the TL item ‘holding’ and immediately reformulates the speaker’s presentation, substituting the oral and nonverbal CSs with what she considers to be the correct TL lexical expression: ‘he’s holding the boy’s hand?’ The rising intonation indicates she is not totally certain about the acceptability of her move. She is checking for confirmation of her correct understanding of the message.

In lines 6-8 the learner responds to the NS’s refashioning movement. He repeats part of the confirmation check, including the TL item ‘holding’, with falling intonation and accompanied by two acknowledgments, a head nod and the continuer ‘yes’. He is thus confirming the correctness of the addressee’s interpretation of his CSs and collaborating to ground their meaning. But the speaker’s acceptance move also reveals
that he has recognized B’s turn as corrective feedback and ‘holding hands’ as the appropriate TL expression to communicate the intended message.

After this the conversation continues. Speaker and addressee have established the mutual belief that with the CSs in 1-4 the learner was trying to mean ‘holding hands’ and that the interlocutor has successfully understood this meaning. But they have also mutually accepted that the expression ‘holding hands’ is the correct TL form to present the originally intended message. Agreement on both meaning and form has thus been collaboratively reached and successful communication of the message achieved through the joint action of the learner and the interlocutor.

The desired but unavailable TL lexical item can also be offered as a completion. In the following CS episode a strategic presentation initiated by the speaker gets to be completed with corrective TL lexis provided by the addressee. This coordinates her acceptance move with the speaker’s speech in order to produce a single structurally coherent unit that specifies the meaning they are both collaborating to communicate.

In this CS episode, example 5.19, the speaker, here B, desires to make reference in his presentation to the meaning ‘braces’. According to his retrospective comments, this TL lexical item is not yet part of his IL system. To compensate for this problem he presents a combination of a pointing and an enacting nonverbal strategy: locates the object of reference and mimics an action related to this object.

EXAMPLE 5.19: ADV-NS BS: braces
REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-101):
1 A: and there’s a:::, (0.8) a small man, (1.2) is bald, (1.0) e:h
2 is wearing glasses, (1.6) e::h (1.8) {he’s wearing::,
3 \{A’s HH point to where
4 the suspenders would be
5 on her body\}
6 A: {{hhh}} e:h
7 {{(A’s HH mimic stretching the suspenders)}}
8 B: braces? 9 A: {{yeah!}} heh heh [heh heh] heh
10 {{(A nods)}}
11 B: [heh heh]
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (98-101):
A: no sabía cómo se decía
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (98-101):
B: the braces
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK: braces
The addressee tries to interpret what the learner is trying to mean and, in order to indicate her state of understanding, she provides what she believes may be the learner’s desired but unavailable TL lexical item. She coordinates the structure of her acceptance move with the structure of the speaker’s presentation in order to build one single unit: ‘he’s wearing::, hhh e:h braces?’ The lexical item ‘braces’ completes thus the speaker’s unfinished presentation: ‘he’s wearing::, hhh e:h’.

The rising intonation also suggests that the addressee is not completely confident of the correctness of her interpretation and the appropriateness of this TL item for the purposes of common ground building. A’s move can thus be seen as a form of corrective feedback and at the same time a confirmation check. The addressee is indicating in her acceptance move that she believes the previous presentation has not been understood well enough for current purposes, what it is that she has understood, and what lexical item she considers may be the correct TL form to present the speaker’s originally intended message.

In lines 9-10 of the transcript, the speaker confirms the correctness of the addressee’s understanding. He provides a head nod and two different kinds of oral acknowledgments, ‘yeah’ and laughter. He indicates in this way that he accepts ‘braces?’ as the necessary evidence of comprehension for mutual acceptance to be established. This also means that he has recognized the term ‘braces’ as the originally desired TL form. Accepting the addressee’s completion he is also accepting ‘braces’ as correct TL lexis to communicate his originally intended message.

Through collaboration, coordinating their individual actions in the pursuit of one common communicative goal, speaker and addressee have been able to reach an agreement not only on meaning, but also on form. They have been able to establish the mutual belief that the content originally presented by the speaker was correctly understood by the addressee, and that the term ‘braces’ is the most effective and appropriate form to present this content.

Addressees cannot always succeed in their interpretation of a strategic presentation. For the purposes of common ground building, they sometimes offer confirmation checks that reveal a failed guessing of the speaker’s communicative intentions. When this happens mutual acceptance cannot be established, i.e. the speaker cannot accept the addressee’s acceptance move. The contributor is then expected to
repeat or refashion the initial presentation in order to repair the error. The side sequence thus initiated will not be closed until a mutually acceptable version is reached.

In the following CS episode learner A intends to present the meaning ‘checkered’, but the TL lexical item he desires to use for this purpose is not available in his IL system. In fact, according to the retrospective interview comments, he is unable to use not only the TL form ‘checkered’, but also other desired approximate terms such as ‘tiles’ and ‘squares’. In line 1 he initiates the presentation of the message. The repetitions, pauses and drawls serve as evidence for the addressee that the speaker is experiencing some kind of linguistic difficulty.

EXAMPLE 5.20: INT-INT FC: checkered, tiles squares
REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (521-530):
1  A:   in the: in the floor, (1.2) there’s like a::
2       (1.0)
3  B:   carpet?
4       (2.2)
5  A:   mm::: no it’s a:: (0.5) the floor is e::h (1.5) there are e::h
6       (0.7)
7  B:   draws in the floor?
8       (0.7)
9  A:   cube, {e::h like a::: (. chess, (xxx) a::=  
10       {A’s HH draw a square in the air}
11 B:   (=yes yes) [yes] yes ] yes
12       {B nods}
13 A:              [you know?]
14 A:   mhm
15 B:   yes

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (521-530):
A:   bueno el suelo dije que era como un tablero de ajedrez o algo así
no?
B:   sí
A:   mhm a cuadros
I:   ... ahí estás como pensando... no sé si es que a lo mejor estabas
pensando
A:   sí estaba pensando en todo azulejos o cuadrados o
B:   sí yo también estaba pensando como se diría baldosa brick me
salió
A:   sí o baldosa
B:   pero baldosa cómo se dice baldosa
I:   tile
B:   es verdad! como teja
A:   hm
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the floor is like a chess board

The addressee thinks she may be able to guess the speaker’s communicative intention and offers a completion in which she proposes what she believes to be the speaker’s desired but unavailable TL lexical item: ‘carpet?’. This item is presented with
rising intonation, i.e. as a confirmation check. The addressee is thus indicating her uncertainty about the correctness of her understanding and asking for an explicit confirmation or rejection from her interlocutor.

The speaker cannot accept the completion and the TL lexis offered by the addressee because it is the result of a wrong guess. He rejects it as inappropriate with a non-acceptance signal ‘no’ and an attempt to refashion the initial presentation.

Once again, before the speaker utters a CS in order to present his intended meaning, the addressee interrupts him to offer a new TL expression, i.e. a new guess of the speaker’s communicative intention: ‘draws in the floor?’. But this new guess, line 7 of the transcript, is also erroneous. The speaker now rejects the addressee’s proposal presenting a combination of CSs. He uses an approximation CS, ‘cube’ for ‘squares’, followed by a descriptive circumlocution, ‘like a chess (board)’ for ‘checkered’. These oral strategies are used in combination with an illustrative outlining nonverbal strategy: drawing a square in the air.

The addressee now believes that she has been able to interpret the speaker’s CS and to understand the originally intended meaning well enough for current purposes. She accepts the last presentation providing verbal and nonverbal acknowledgments: ‘yes’ and a head nod.

The CS episode cannot, however, be considered finished. Even though the addressee has accepted the speaker’s presentation, this may still find that the evidence provided by the addressee is not enough for common ground building purposes. Here, the speaker is not satisfied that his interlocutor has correctly understood the meaning they are trying to ground. He therefore initiates a follow-up.

In line 13 of the transcript we can see how the speaker tries to reassure the correctness of his interlocutor’s understanding: ‘you know?’. For this purpose he makes use of what in the negotiation of meaning literature is known as a comprehension check, i.e. a movement by which the speaker tries to determine whether the interlocutor has understood the previous message. A is thus seeking here for more evidence of his addressee’s understanding. According to Long, comprehension checks are used “to anticipate and prevent a breakdown in communication” (Long, 1983a: 136).

The addressee responds to this move with an accepting acknowledgment uttered right after the comprehension check, i.e. the final ‘yes’ in line 11 of the transcript. This
is also accepted by the speaker with an affirmative ‘mhm’, line 14, and followed by a second and final acknowledgment: ‘yes’ in line 15. Mutual acceptance is thus finally reached. A and B have now established the mutual belief that the content the speaker was trying to present in 1, 5 and 9-10 has been understood by the addressee to a criterion sufficient for the current purposes of their interaction. Their collaboration along the refashioning and follow-up side sequences has made possible the successful communication of the originally intended message.

The data elicited for the purposes of our study indicates that this grounding procedure is frequently used with fruitful results, not only by native speaking interlocutors, as illustrated in 5.18 and 5.19, but also by advanced and intermediate level students. The reader can find in Appendix C a relatively extensive set of examples showing that learners are able to correct other learners and reformulate their strategic utterances providing accurate TL lexis. They do this for the purposes of common ground building, i.e. to reach an agreement on meaning, but also to collaborate in the creation of accurate TL forms. Some illustrative examples analyzed in Appendix C are: ADV-ADV SO: 182-184, INT-INT CL: 498-502, INT-INT FC: 713-716, INT-INT SC: 309-311 and INT-INT VM: 277-282.

5.2.2. CLARIFICATION REQUESTS AS EVIDENCE OF TROUBLE IN UNDERSTANDING FOR GROUNDING PURPOSES IN CS EPISODES

As explained at the beginning of this section, when the speaker's strategic presentation cannot be directly understood by the addressee, this can also signal their trouble by means of a clarification request. In the negotiation of meaning literature clarification requests are defined as any expression “designed to elicit clarification of the interlocutor’s preceding utterance(s)” (Long, 1983a: 137). Interlocutors can seek assistance in understanding providing statements such as ‘I don’t understand’, imperatives such as ‘please repeat’ or questions like ‘what do you mean?’.

Whereas confirmation checks can be often responded to just with an acknowledgment, clarification requests are more open-ended. They imply a lower level of understanding on the part of the addressee, who is asking for an explanation of the words or the expression that have not been understood. The speaker needs here to expand the initial presentation, i.e. to add more information, or to recode it, i.e. to
rephrase the original utterance. They therefore tend to require more collaborative effort than confirmation checks; although, as we have seen in the previous CS episodes, confirmation checks can also prompt a speaker’s refashioning of the initial presentation.

A clarification request is used in the CS episode presented in 5.21 in order to indicate understanding trouble and non-acceptance of the speaker’s preceding strategic presentation. The learner, A, lacks in his IL system the TL item ‘frowning’. In order to present this meaning, he makes use of a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy. He tries to describe the action ‘frowning’ by making reference to the related position of the eyebrows, which he depicts with an outlining nonverbal strategy.

EXAMPLE 5.21: ADV-NS IM: frowning
REFERENT: father’s angry/father looks angry/father is frowning
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (200-207):
1  A:   the: father has a:: an upset face, (0.8) because (0.5)
2         {his eyebrows are
3         {A’s II outline the shape of frowning eyebrows on her face,
4         B is not looking}
5  B:   what do you mean (heh)upset?)
6         (0.7)
7  A:   he’s upset. (0.6) like, (. ) that. (1.2) {his eyebrows are
8         (A’s II outline the
9         shape of frowning
10         eyebrows on her face
11         x2}
12 A:   going like that, (. ) you know?
13 B:   {((heh)completely like that? )}
14   {((B’s RI draws a downwards line in the air, B holds the
15   gesture)}
16   (0.5)
17 A:   {yeah,
18     {A’s II form a vi over her eyebrows}
19 B:   {((his eyebrows are like (heh)that?=)}
20   {((B’s HH form a vi in the air})
21 A:   =yeah.) (0.5) like when you’re (0.4) upset.
22 B:   yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   el padre anda enfadado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   sigue teniendo cara de enfadado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (200-207):
A:   claro es que quería o sea decir tiene cara de upset o no? heh
   ...
A:   para decir el ceño fruncido como no no sabía decir frunciendo ceño
   frunciendo tampoco

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father: eyebrows, mouth

This nonverbal strategy is, however, not attended to by the native speaking addressee, who cannot therefore understand the meaning the learner is trying to convey.
She indicates her non-acceptance of the previous presentation with the clarification request ‘what do you mean upset?’.

In order to provide the information required by the addressee the learner refashions his initial presentation. He expands his oral CS, ‘his eyebrows are going like that,’ and repeats the previous nonverbal strategy which is now attended to by his interlocutor –cf. lines 7-12 in the transcript. This refashioning constitutes a new presentation that also needs to be accepted. The addressee, however, is still uncertain about the meaning the learner is trying to convey. She checks for confirmation repeating with rising intonation part of the learner’s previous utterance: ‘(heh)completely like that?’. She also illustrates the meaning of her confirmation check with an outlining gesture.

In line 17 we can see how A confirms B’s understanding with the acknowledgment ‘yeah’ and an additional outlining nonverbal strategy. But this is not yet considered by B as enough evidence for mutual acceptance to be established. She presents a second confirmation check: ‘his eyebrows are like (heh)that?’. This is answered by A with an acknowledgment and an expansion: ‘yeah. (0.5) like when you’re (0.4) upset.’. The speaker adds more information to his previous presentations in order to assure his addressee’s understanding and a final mutual agreement on the meaning they are both trying to communicate.

The CS episode is finally closed in line 22. The addressee provides an acknowledgment, ‘yeah’; this indicates she believes she has now understood what A wanted to add to their shared common ground. She is thus showing her acceptance of A’s last utterance in line 21, and with it, also his previous presentations in lines 1-4, 7-12 and 17-18. The conversation moves to a new topic. The speaker has also accepted the addressee’s acceptance and mutual agreement on meaning has been reached. A and B have, through their collaborative actions, established the mutual belief that what the learner initially meant has been understood by the native speaking interlocutor well enough for the current purposes of their interaction.

In this CS episode the non-acceptance by the addressee of the speaker’s first utterance opened a side sequence in which both of them have collaborated to achieve a mutually acceptable version of this presentation. Every refashioned version of a speaker’s presenting utterance constitutes itself a new presentation that can be accepted
or not by the addressee. If not accepted, as we have just seen here, the initial presentation will be refashioned again as many times as necessary. As Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs explain it, “acceptance cycles apply iteratively”, with one refashion after another until an utterance is mutually accepted and speaker and addressee can take the process to be completed (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 24).

CS episodes can therefore extend to an unlimited and non-predetermined number of turns and each refashioning movement, i.e. each new presentation of the originally intended message, can be responded to by the addressee with any of the grounding procedures here identified. In one single CS episode we can thus find clarification requests, confirmation checks and positive acceptance responses evidencing understanding, such as acknowledgments, repetitions, demonstrations, relevant next contributions or allowing the conversation to continue. As also explained in Chapter One, p. 107, “the collaborative process is flexible, and shrinks or expands in response to the coordination problems of a specific discourse, at a specific point” (Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997: 241). But we also pointed out in the analysis of the first CS episode, example 5.1, that every contribution and every CS episode will ultimate end with the speaker and the addressee proceeding to the next topic, i.e. allowing the conversation to continue.

For more evidence of the role of clarification requests in the grounding of CSs the reader can, again, turn to Appendix C. This kind of grounding procedure has certainly been used less frequently than confirmation checks. It seems that, when understanding problems occur in CS episodes, interlocutors prefer to offer a more or less plausible guess rather than a signal of no understanding. Still, the results of our analyses demonstrate that both native and non-native speaking interlocutors can use clarification requests to negotiate meaning when they feel unable to correctly interpret a preceding CS. For a representative example of the use of this grounding procedure in CS episodes involving two advanced learners, see ADV-ADV LT: 264-273; for a similar episode with two intermediate learners, see INT-INT FC: 82-97; finally, for an analogous example with an intermediate learner and a NS, see INT-NS AE: 422-431.
5.3. COMMUNICATIVE BREAKDOWNS IN CS EPISODES

The collaborative model of communication, as described in Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989), and Wilkes-Gibbs (1997), accounts also for communicative breakdowns in face-to-face oral interaction. Interlocutors are not always able to reach an agreement on meaning. Under certain circumstances they may decide to continue with their conversation even though they know the intended message has not been understood well enough for current purposes. In other situations they cannot recognize this lack of agreement and take as understanding what is in fact a misunderstanding of each other’s communicative intentions. In neither of the two cases is grounding achieved. The content presented by the speaker is not identified by the interlocutor and therefore cannot be added to their shared common ground. We need to talk of unsuccessful or failed communication of the intended message.

Within the field of SLA research, attention has been paid to effective and non-effective uses of CSs –cf. Chapter One, pp. 61-66. These studies distinguish between those CSs that could be successfully understood by the interlocutor and those that could not. In the previous section of the present chapter we have seen that the use of a non-understandable CS, i.e. a non-effective CS, does not necessarily mean a final communicative failure of the strategic exchange. In interaction interlocutors can use a variety of different procedures to solve these understanding breakdowns. With the collaborative effort of the speaker and the addressee, any CS put forward by a FL learner that is not correctly interpreted by the interlocutor can be refashioned as many times as necessary until a mutually acceptable version is reached.

But we have also found in the analysis of our data that sometimes this final agreement on meaning is never reached. Most of the CS episodes we have studied resulted in the final successful communication of the speaker’s originally intended message, despite their and/or their interlocutors’ IL shortcomings. We have however identified some CS episodes that were closed by the speaker and the addressee before this agreement on meaning and the successful communication of the message could be reached. We will analyze these CS episodes here in order to identify the causes of this communicative breakdown.

As seen in Chapter One, pp. 91-92, work carried out within the framework of the collaborative theory has identified three different kinds of phenomena occurring during
the grounding process that can account for the final communicative failure of the contribution (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986: 7-8; Clark and Schaefer, 1989: 267). Under certain circumstances interlocutors may ignore each other’s contributions. That is, a presentation put forward by one of the participants may be ignored by their partner. The latter may not hear or pay attention to what the speaker has just said. Instead of collaborating in the grounding of this contribution, as expected, they continue with the conversation initiating the presentation of a new topic. Since the addressee has not noticed the speaker’s presentation, they are not aware of the communicative breakdown. They do not realize that the speaker has tried to add a new content to their shared common ground and has been unable to do it because of their non-collaborative behavior.

Sometimes addressees notice that the speaker has presented new content and that they have not understood it well enough for current purposes. But instead of indicating their trouble, they feign understanding. They accept the speaker’s presentation as if they had understood it. The speaker is here unaware of the addressee’s problems and the failure of the communicative exchange.

Finally, failures in communication have been accounted for as a result of the speaker and the interlocutor’s misunderstanding of each other’s communicative intentions. When a presentation is put forward by the speaker, the addressee tries to interpret the meaning of this presentation and, if they believe they have been able to do it, they accept the contribution. But sometimes the meaning inferred by the addressee is not the meaning intended by the speaker, and neither the addressee nor the speaker get to notice this misunderstanding. When this occurs, agreement on meaning is not reached, but none of the interlocutors taking part in the conversation is aware of this communicative breakdown.

Following what is known so far about failures in L1 non-strategic communication we have analyzed L2 strategic interaction. We have thus identified three main patterns of failed strategic contributions. The results of our analyses reveal that in CS episodes the originally intended meaning is not communicated when the FL learner ignores their responsibilities in the communicative process and decides to use an avoidance strategy, when one of the interlocutors feigns understanding or when, usually
because of an ignoring behavior, speaker and addressee misunderstand each others’ communicative intentions.

5.3.1. AVOIDANCE CSs AND COMMUNICATIVE BREAKDOWNS IN CS EPISODES

One of the most common causes of unsuccessful communication of an originally intended message when linguistic difficulties arise in FL interaction is the speaker’s avoidance of the presentation of their message. In Chapter Four, pp. 201-206, we saw that the FL learner sometimes, instead of attempting an alternate means of expression to communicate their intended message when the desired TL lexical item is unavailable, decides to avoid it. The speaker uses an avoidance CS that allows them to continue with the conversation as if no problem had been encountered. But they do not compensate for their IL shortcoming and do not communicate the whole of their originally intended message. When using an avoidance strategy, the speaker avoids presenting the content or part of the content they want to add to their and their interlocutor’s shared common ground. The addressee has therefore no clue to identify this content and no agreement on meaning can be reached.

In Chapter Four we identified two different kinds of avoidance behavior: topic avoidance and message abandonment strategies. Topic avoidance CSs were defined as the FL learner’s decision “to avoid reference to an object, action or idea when the desired lexical item to communicate it is not available in their IL system” —cf. Chapter Four, p. 202. This CS was exemplified with the following extract of interaction.

EXAMPLE 5.22: ADV-NS RA: rolled up

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (262-263):
A: he’s wearing suspenders, and a: shirt. (0.7) he’s
wearing a:: shirt,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva la camisa remangada

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (262-263):
I: el señor lleva las mangas remangadas
A: ah! aquí es que no no sabía cómo decirlo eh
I: pero te fijaste entonces?
A: sí sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (262-263):
I: here the man had the sleeves rolled up but she didn’t mention it
B: okay
We know, from the speaker’s retrospective comments on his oral IL performance, that he had the intention to communicate the meaning ‘rolled up’, i.e. to add this meaning to his interlocutor’s shared common ground. But in the lack of the desired TL item ‘rolled up’, he decided to avoid it.

There is a presentation put forward by the speaker describing the clothes one of the characters in the picture’s story is wearing: ‘he’s wearing suspenders, an::d a:: (1.0) a shirt. (0.7) he’s wearing a:: shirt’. The learner has been able to utter this presentation by making use of a topic avoidance strategy. That is, the avoidance strategy allowed him to keep the conversation going on and to communicate part of his intended message. He thus solved a problem that, otherwise, could have resulted in a total communicative breakdown.

But when the addressee accepts this presentation by allowing the conversation to continue, she is evidencing her understanding of the content the speaker has presented. There is no agreement on the meaning ‘rolled up’. Furthermore, the learner is aware that part of the originally intended message has not been grounded, but the addressee is not. The meaning ‘rolled up’ has not been communicated. This CS has resulted in unsuccessful or failed communication of the originally intended message.

In the following excerpt of interaction, also previously included in Chapter Four, p. 204, one of the learners makes use of a message abandonment CS.

EXAMPLE 5.23: INT-INT VM: knocker and mailbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-69):
1 A:   there (0.5) there are the::, (0.8) here are the (0.4) the::
2 A:   (0.4) sorry, hhh e:h they’re in front of a door,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   pois está diante duna porta e non hai número na porta e o cha– o chaval bueno aquí está un pouco un pouco como cara de enfadado

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (68-69):
I:   na túa porta aparece un chamador e aparece pois como un buzón e non mencionas ningunha destas dúas cousas?
A:   esto non sabía e buzón non buzón tampouco podería dicir como the place where you can put the letters inside pero dixen bah! mellor ... porque isto ía dicir así algo como mm letterbox pero non era letterbox exactamente e entón mm pois non sabía ...
A:   esto non sabía ... isto non non sabía como dicilo ía dicir como un ring pero non non sabía ía dicir a ring e sabes esto con pero non ... e despois isto pois iso ía explicar e dixen non! paso e pasei de todo
I:   e aí incluso cando ela che pregunta
A:   se hai un número si aí é cando pensei en dicirle eu isto pero dixen non sei como se di nono digo
According to the retrospective comments elicited on this interactional exchange, the learner initiates here the presentation of the meanings ‘knocker’ and ‘mailbox’. However, he abandons this communicative intention before an alternative means of expression to compensate for the unavailability of the TL lexical items ‘knocker’ and ‘mailbox’ can be developed.

An utterance is left unfinished in the middle of the speaker’s turn: ‘there (0.5) there are the::; (0.8) here are the (0.4) the::’. The structure of this utterance, together with the drawls, pauses, repetitions and the apologizing ‘sorry’ offered by the speaker, act as a signal for the addressee that a communicative problem has been encountered and a CS is being used. The addressee, nevertheless, accepts the speaker’s presentation allowing him to continue with the conversation and to proceed to the next topic: ‘they’re in front of a door.’.

The learner has not succeeded in the presentation of the meanings ‘knocker’ and ‘mailbox’, and the addressee has no clue to identify this content. No agreement on these meanings has therefore been reached. The speaker has not collaborated as expected. He has not presented an utterance that can specify the content he is trying to add to his and his interlocutor’s shared common ground. The addressee has accepted an unfinished presentation that indicates there is a part of the message that has been left unmentioned and that therefore she has not identified the whole communicative intention of her interlocutor. No successful communication of the message has been achieved. Speaker and addressee have failed in the pursuit of their common goal: an agreement on the speaker’s originally intended meanings ‘knocker’ and ‘mailbox’.

As already pointed out in Chapter Four, p. 204, both topic avoidance and message abandonment CSs can also result in a postponement, rather than an avoidance, of the originally intended meaning. That is, speaker and addressee agree sometimes to postpone the grounding of a message, intending to go back to it later on in their conversation. In this case we cannot talk of unsuccessful communication. An analysis of the whole interactional exchange taking place between the two interlocutors needs to be carried out in order to be able to identify this kind of behavior.

The analyses carried out show that avoidance CSs, either topic avoidance or message abandonment, are used by both intermediate and advanced level learners in
their interactions with both native and non-native speaking interlocutors. They are not very frequent in our data but, whenever they are used, they result in a communicative breakdown, i.e. no communication, or at least postponed communication, of the originally intended message. Similar patterns of avoidance behavior to the ones here analyzed can be seen in ADV-ADV LT: 61-62, ADV-NS RA: 395-396, INT-INT SC: 304-305 or INT-NS SL: 12-14.

5.3.2. FEIGNING UNDERSTANDING AND COMMUNICATIVE BREAKDOWNS IN CS EPISODES

Failed or unsuccessful communication in CS episodes occurs also when interlocutors feign understanding of each other’s strategic utterances. Sometimes one of the interlocutors presents a CS that is not understood by their addressee and this, instead of indicating their understanding troubles as expected, accepts it. They pretend to have correctly understood the speaker’s communicative intentions even when they know this has not happened.

In the following extract of interaction the learner desires to contribute the meaning ‘badge’. The TL lexical item desired to present this content is unavailable in his IL system. To compensate for this problem he decides to make use of achievement CSs. In the first turn, lines 1-5 of the transcript, he substitutes the unavailable TL item with two approximate terms, ‘sign’ and ‘flag’, and an all-purpose expression, ‘something’. The drawls, pauses, pause fillers, restructuring phenomena and hedges, such as ‘kind of’ or ‘something like that’, indicate that he is experiencing some kind of linguistic difficulty in the presentation of his message and he is making use of CSs. That is, the terms ‘sign’ and ‘flag’ should not be interpreted in its literal sense but as approximate terms.

EXAMPLE 5.24: ADV-NS RA: badge
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (10-22):
1 A: he’s wearing: a:: (0.7) a jacket. (1.8) e:::h (1.2) a jacket,
2   (with a:: (1.4) tch in the:: left side of her jacket, there is
3   (A’s RH points to her chest and draws circles)
4 A: a kind o::f (1.3) of sign, (1.3) mm (1.5) or flag, or little
5   flag, or something} (0.8) something like that.
6 B: maybe a handkerchief?
7 A: no no=
8 B: (=no not a hand)kerchief?
9 (B shakes her head)
10 A: no.
11 B: because that
12 A: e::h (2.5) a::nd (a sign, (1.0) as it was a sign of a country, 
13 \(A \text{ waves her RH}\)
14 A: or of a:: flag,} [(how) do you? well,) tch e:::h (1.5) have
15 B: \{[okay}\}
16 \(B \text{nods}\)
17 A: you found the differences?
18 B: i think it’s (. ) the flag, in his lapel pocket.=
19 A: \{=okay\}
20 \(A \text{nods}\)

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A: \(eh\ lleva una chaqueta que tiene un un escudo en el lado izquierdo\)

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (10-22):**
A: un escudo quería decir ... si la insignia o eso ...
I: tú ahí qué entendiste que te decía ella? entendiste que te había entendido lo de insignia o?
A: si lo de insignia yo entendí que me entendiera lo de insignia que dice la diferencia de la bandera esta pues y le entendí que sí que la suya que no la tenía

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (10-22):**
I: because you asked her about the lapel pocket did you think?
B: i thought there was something but i didn’t really know what ...
B: this and the badge or the emblem on the suit that was the only thing i didn’t understand

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
a flag in his lapel pocket

The addressee recognizes this difficulty and the previous presentation as strategic. She tries to collaborate with the speaker in the communication of the message. For this purpose she presents what she believes may be the learner’s intended but unavailable TL lexical item: ‘maybe a handkerchief?’.

This confirmation check reveals, however, that she has not been able to interpret the speaker’s CSs as intended. The learner tries then to refashion his initial presentation. He expands the original approximation strategy ‘sign’ including it now in a descriptive circumlocution: ‘a sign, (1.0) as it was a sign of a country,’ –cf. line 12 in the transcript. There is also a repetition of the second CS used in the initial presentation, ‘a flag’, and an initiation of an appeal for assistance strategy: ‘how do you?’.

Before the learner finishes the presentation of this appeal for assistance, the addressee indicates acceptance of the refashioned version of the initial CSs with two continuers uttered as an overlap: ‘okay’ and a head nod –cf. lines 15-16. The speaker is not, however, confident of their mutual understanding of the intended message and checks for comprehension: ‘have you found the differences?’.
In 18 the addressee reaffirms her positive acceptance of what the speaker has previously said. For this purpose she repeats the approximation strategy ‘flag’ within a relevant next utterance, i.e. a conditionally relevant response to the interlocutor’s question in the previous turn. She indicates in this way that she has understood the refashioned version of the first presentation in 12-14 and, with it, also the meaning of the original presentation in 1-5. This evidence of understanding is accepted by the speaker in 19-20 with two acknowledgments: ‘okay’ and a head nod. After this, speaker and addressee consider the CS episode finished and move on to the next topic in the conversation.

Analyzing the interactional exchange taking place between these two interlocutors within the limit of the CS episode, it seems that an agreement on meaning and successful communication of the original intended message has been reached. The retrospective comments elicited from the native speaking interlocutor reveal, however, that in her acceptance of the speaker’s presentation she is feigning understanding. She indicates she has understood the message well enough for current purposes even though she believes she has not been able to interpret the CSs as intended by the speaker. She claims to have understood what she has not in order to avoid an extended refashioning process of the initial presentation.

In the analysis of our data we have found that addressees deceive their interlocutors feigning understanding in order to minimize their collaborative effort in the grounding process. In some situations addressees pretend to have understood their interlocutor’s CS because they consider that the content the learner is trying to communicate is not important for the purposes of their interactional exchange. In other contexts a refashioned version of the initial CS, put forward by either the speaker or the addressee, is accepted by the interlocutor in order to abandon a grounding process that is requiring too much effort. That is, one of the interlocutors considers that the content they are trying to communicate is not worthy of a more extended refashioning process. In both cases agreement on meaning is not reached. One of the interlocutors is aware of the communicative breakdown but, instead of collaborating as expected to solve it, decides to abandon. The other is usually not aware of the unsuccessful communication of the originally intended message.
Although feigning of understanding did not occur very frequently in our data, the reader will see in Appendix C that it was used in the four different types of interactional conditions here considered. That is, both intermediate and advanced level learners, as well as native speaking interlocutors may resort to this strategy in order to minimize their collaborative effort and avoid long refashioning processes. Other examples of interaction in which this kind of communicative behavior resulted in the unsuccessful communication of the learner’s originally intended message are: ADV-ADV AV: 107-111, INT-INT FC 874-875, INT-NS CS 75-77.

5.3.3. MISUNDERSTANDINGS AND COMMUNICATIVE BREAKDOWNS IN CS EPISODES

Finally, we have found that sometimes learners and their interlocutors misunderstand each other’s communicative intentions. The speaker presents a CS that is not interpreted by the addressee as intended, but none of the two interlocutors is able to recognize this confusion. They continue with their conversation believing that an agreement on meaning has been successfully reached, when they are actually making reference to different meanings.

In example 5.25 the learner uses the IL term ‘handle’ as an approximate term of reference to compensate for his lack of knowledge of the desired TL lexical item ‘knocker’: ‘and the door has a: handle?’ This CS is presented as a trial constituent of a more inclusive contribution.

EXAMPLE 5.25: ADV-ADV SO: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (144-146):
1 A: and {the door has a: handle?
2       {A’s RH mimics knocking ×2, B is not looking
3 (1.3)
4 B: oh!} (1.0) okay
5 (1.2)
6 A: e:h {on the top.}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: están delante de una puerta con un buzón y con un no sé como se llama sigo sin saberlo
B: heh
A: bueno el otro sí que lo sabía
B: con un pomo en la puerta
A: sí con un pomo en la puerta de esos de llamar antiguos
B: hm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (144-146):
A: sí porque no sabía cómo se decía
The addressee interprets the approximate term in its literal sense, misinterpreting thus the communicative intention of the FL learner. She believes she has correctly understood the message and accepts the presentation providing two acknowledgments: ‘oh!’ and ‘okay’.

The learner, unaware of the misunderstanding, continues with his contribution and completes his presentation: ‘e:ch on the top’. He accepts thus the evidence of understanding provided by the addressee in the previous turn.

The speaker believes he and his interlocutor have agreed on the meaning ‘knocker’, whereas this believes they have agreed on the meaning ‘handle’. They have therefore not been able to reach a true agreement on meaning and the CS episode has resulted in unsuccessful communication of the speaker’s originally intended message.

A more detailed analysis of the transcript reveals that this misunderstanding has occurred because the addressee did not notice the nonverbal strategy that accompanied the approximation CS. In line 2 of the transcript we can see how the learner mimics the action of knocking, thus completing the meaning he is presenting with the oral CS. The addressee does not pay attention to this verbal behavior and interprets the speaker’s presentation on the basis only of his oral speech. On the one hand, the learner has failed in calling the addressee’s necessary attention to his presentation for a successful interpretation of his communicative intention to be achieved. On the other hand, the addressee has ignored part of the speaker’s presentation and has thus been unable to recognize its strategic nature.

The analysis of our data reveals that misunderstandings occur, almost invariably, because of a literal interpretation on the part of the addressee of a CS uttered by the speaker. That is, because the addressee is unable to recognize the previous presentation
as a strategic utterance and/or the speaker is unable to indicate the strategic nature of his presentation.  

Furthermore, when this kind of misunderstanding problem occurs once in a conversation, it generally leads to future misunderstandings. In the following CS episode the learner uses a circumlocution strategy to compensate for his lack of knowledge of the TL lexical item ‘vest’. He tries to describe this referent as a ‘pullover without sleeves’. He also lacks in his IL system the term ‘sleeves’ and uses an approximate term, ‘arm’, to substitute for the unavailable originally desired one. That is, there is an approximation CS embedded within a circumlocution strategy. The approximation strategy is also accompanied by an outlining nonverbal strategy –cf. lines 4-5 of the transcript; and there is as well a pointing strategy that illustrates the circumlocution –line 2.

EXAMPLE 5.26: INT-NS PM: vest
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-205):
1 A: he’s wearing a shirt, but {as well a::: (0.8) like a
(A’s HH point to her chest)
2 A: pullover,} {but without e::h the arm:::=
3 A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her
4 left arm}
5 B: =sleeveless?)
6 (1.2)
7 8 A: mhm
9 B: uhuh!=
10 A: =with {two pockets} {and two:: buttons.
11 {A holds up two fingers}
12 (A’s HH point to where the buttons would
13 be on her chest)
14 (1.7)}
15 B: right. (0.5) so one difference (he’s) got (0.5) a sleeveless
16 (3.0) jumper,
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (308-322):
1 B: where?
2 A: whe- (3.6) where?
3 B: yeah. ah! on the? [on the shirt?]
4 A: [in the: ] yeah, no not on the shirt
5 because i i cannot see:
6 B: {he’s still wearing} {the jumper?}
7 {B’s HH outline the shape of a jumper on her body}
8 {A nods}
9 A: yeah,
10 B: right. (1.5) but where? where is this pocket?
11 (1.5)
12 A: tch {in the right, sides, (1.7) of the::: (0.5) of the: (0.5)

73 We have also found that misunderstandings can occur because of a mishearing –cf. in Appendix C ADV-ADV LT: 298-302; or an error in the use of TL lexis –cf. in Appendix C INT-INT CS: 144-155 and INT-NS SL: 209-241. These kinds of problems were, however, extremely rare in our data.
CHAPTER 5: The collaborative creation of meaning

In line 6 the addressee, a native speaking interlocutor, offers a native-like refashioning of the last part of the presentation: ‘sleeveless?’ This confirmation check is responded to with an affirmative acknowledgment from the speaker, ‘mhm’, which is also accepted with another acknowledgment: ‘uhuh’. The two interlocutors establish thus their mutual agreement on the meaning ‘without sleeves’.

They believe to have reached an agreement on the meaning ‘vest’ too. The learner believes his addressee has been able to correctly interpret his utterance as a circumlocution to present the meaning ‘vest’. The addressee, however, has interpreted this circumlocution as a literal expression, i.e. she believes that the learner is trying to communicate the meaning ‘sleeveless jumper’. Neither the speaker nor the interlocutor are aware of this misunderstanding.

In line 15 of the transcript B uses the expression ‘sleeveless jumper’ in its literal sense, but A interprets it as an agreed alternative means of expression to compensate for
the unavailability of the TL term ‘vest’. A uses what he believes to be previously co-
constructed common ground to interpret this second use of the expression ‘sleeveless
jumper’. The misunderstanding occurring in lines 1-9 leads A and B to misunderstand
each other’s communicative intentions in 15-16.

Later on in the conversation, speaker and addressee go back to this same object
of reference –cf. lines 308-322 of the transcript of the whole conversation. Here the use
of the terms ‘jumper’ and ‘pullover’ is again misinterpreted. The learner considers them
as approximate terms for ‘vest’ whereas the native speaking interlocutor is using them
in their literal sense, i.e. not as a CS. The misunderstanding never gets recognized by
either the learner or the interlocutor. An agreement on the meaning ‘vest’ is thus never
reached. Communication of this meaning has failed.

We have also found, however, that interlocutors get sometimes to identify each
other’s misunderstandings and to solve this problem in a collaborative way. This occurs
for instance in the CS episode presented in example 5.27. The learner is here trying to
make reference to a ‘knocker’, but he lacks in his IL system the TL lexical item desired
to convey this meaning. In order to compensate for his ignorance he presents a
circumlocution strategy: ‘a:: kind of (1.7) circle’. He describes the shape of the knocker
and illustrates this description with outlining and pointing nonverbal strategies: drawing
the shape of a circle and pointing to its position.

EXAMPLE 5.27: INT-INT FC: knocker
REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (390-399):
1  A:   it has {a:: (0.5) a sp- a:: kind of (1.7) circle,} (2.5) in
2              {A’s RI draws a circle on the table, B is not looking}
3  A:   the:: (2.0) in the:: e::h (1.4) bueno (‘well’), (1.4) tch
4       (2.0) {a:: circle,} {in::} {A’s RI draws a circle in the air}
5                            {A’s RI point upwards}
6  B:   (xxx)?
7  A:   no! in the: in the door.
8      (2.0)
9  B:   ah! a circle in the door. ah! mirilla (‘door peephole’).
10 A:   {=a kind of a:: a kind of (0.8) knocker.
11      {A’s RH mimics knocking}
12 B:   a:::h!} {yes yes} yes [yes yes] (1.4) {to knock?
13      {B nods}
14 A:                         [a::nd ]
15  B:   yeah.} {B’s RH mimics knocking}
16 A:   y tampoco sabíamos decir esto
I: el knocker
B: ah! se dice knocker!
I: sí
A: knocker
I: que tú en un momento llegaste a decir knocker
B: sí!
A: sí pero no no sabía
I: tu dijiste knocker pero como no
B: sí sí
A: dije knocker
B: sí lo dijiste
I: pero como como ya no tal pues entonces volvisteis a entonces no sé tú cuando le oíste decir knocker
B: yo decía sí
I: o sea lo de knocker tú lo reconociste?
B: sí supe que estaba diciendo pero digo yo no sé si será yo sí
I: o sea no sabías si era la palabra o sí
B: claro no sabía si se lo había inventado o si cuadraba realmente
A: uuhh! es que me lo había inventado knocker knocking knocker heh heh
B: heh heh heh
A: está bien

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
to knock, the thing to knock

The speaker’s presentation is followed by a confirmation check from the addressee. We cannot, however, know what kind of information is the addressee asking for because, unfortunately, this part of the conversation is inaudible in our recording. In line 11 the addressee believes she has correctly understood the meaning the speaker was trying to present with the previous CSs. She therefore accepts the speaker’s presentation providing an acknowledgment, ‘ah!’; a repetition with falling intonation of the previous CS, ‘a circle in the door’; and what she believes to be a L1 version of this presentation, i.e. a code switch strategy that acts as a demonstration signal: ‘mirilla’.

The evidence provided by the addressee in order to confirm her understanding of the speaker’s presentation reveals that, in fact, she has misunderstood what the speaker meant. He initiates a follow-up in order to solve this confusion and repair the misunderstanding. For this purpose he refashions his initial presentation. He replaces the CSs in 1-6 with a word coinage strategy and a completing enacting nonverbal strategy. In 12 the speaker creates a non-existent word in his IL system by applying a TL derivative suffix ‘–er’ to an already known word ‘knock’. As explained in Chapter Four, pp. 221-222, this lexis creation process has resulted in correct TL lexis, but, according to their retrospective comments, neither the speaker nor his interlocutor are aware of this. From their point of view the item ‘knocker’ constitutes a grammatical word coinage strategy.
B recognizes now the actual content of the speaker’s initial presentation and her previous misunderstanding. She indicates acceptance of the refashioned version of the original CS providing verbal and nonverbal acknowledgments: ‘ah!’, ‘yes’ and a head nod. In order to confirm this understanding she presents also a comprehension check: ‘to knock?’. She expands the speaker’s previous CS making thus a circumlocution in which she describes the function of the intended object of reference. At the same time she illustrates this function with a repetition of the speaker’s previous nonverbal enacting strategy: mimicking knocking on a door. With rising intonation she asks for the speaker’s explicit acceptance of this new refashioned version of the initial presentation and, with it, for confirmation on the correctness of her understanding. This is provided by A in 18, by means of an acknowledgment: ‘yeah’.

Speaker and addressee’s collaboration has made it possible the successful communication of the originally intended message, despite their ignorance of the desired TL lexical item ‘knocker’ and the misunderstanding of the initial CSs. The follow-up initiated by the learner and the joint effort of this and the interlocutor all through the CS episode have favored the identification and solution of the misunderstanding problems encountered. Final agreement on meaning has been successfully reached.

The reader will find in Appendix C other examples of recognized and unrecognized misunderstandings occurring in CS episodes. See, for instance, ADV-ADV MM: 380-381 and 460-462, ADV-NS CS: 86-88, 116-127 and 146-147, INT-INT SC: 527-558 or INT-NS AE 380-387. The analyses included in Appendix C prove that misunderstandings in FL strategic interaction may appear independently of the learner’s and the interlocutor’s command of the TL and of the nature or type of the CS being used. They rather respond to failures occurring in the grounding process.

5.4. SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS
The objective of this chapter was to describe and understand how language learners and their interlocutors get to communicate their messages in face-to-face FL interaction when the desired TL lexical item or structure to convey an intended meaning is either unavailable or not shared by all the interlocutors.
We initiated our analysis assuming that communication, strategic or not, is always a jointly achieved collaborative activity. For communication to succeed speakers and interlocutors need to agree on meaning and this requires their collaborative effort, i.e. the coordination of their individual actions and beliefs in the pursuit of one common goal.

From this point of view, strategic communication was conceptualized as “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981: 288). In order to identify how this agreement is reached, we have analyzed strategic interaction occurring in NNS-NNS and NNS-NS interactions, involving learners with different proficiency levels in the TL, i.e. intermediate and advanced.

Whereas most previous research on strategic communication has focused almost exclusively on the FL learner’s use of CSs, in our study attention has been paid to the interaction taking place between the learner and their interlocutor in what we believe to be a collaborative creation of meaning process. CSs have been analyzed as part of CS episodes, defined as “segments of interaction in which learners and their interlocutors collaborate to reach an agreement on meaning when the TL item or structure desired to express this meaning is not readily available” – current chapter, p. 244.

Building on previous work carried out on L1 non-strategic oral exchanges within the collaborative theory of communication framework, we have been able to demonstrate that strategic communication in face-to-face FL interaction is a collaborative activity, involving actions from all the interlocutors taking part in the interactional exchange. We have seen that agreement on meaning and successful communication of the message when linguistic difficulties arise from an IL shortcoming cannot be accounted for as the result of the learner’s utterance of a CS alone. When a CS is used, all the interlocutors participate in the communicative process and collaborate with their actions to assure a final agreement on the originally intended meaning.

The analyses carried out through this chapter allowed us also to identify the different procedures or techniques that learners and their interlocutors use in FL strategic interaction in order to build this mutual agreement on meaning. We have explained communication through CS use as a grounding process. It has thus been
argued that learners use CSs to present the meaning they want to add to their and their interlocutors’ shared common ground. But this meaning is not communicated until it is grounded, i.e. until the speaker and the addressee establish the mutual belief that what has been said has also been understood well enough for their current purposes.

In order to establish this mutual belief and thus reach the desired agreement on meaning, the addressee of a just uttered CS needs to provide evidence of their state of understanding. In the simplest case, i.e. when they believe they have correctly interpreted the learner’s CS, the addressee will collaborate in the communicative process accepting the speaker’s CS. We have found that for this purpose both native and non-native speaking interlocutors, independently of their level of proficiency in the TL, may use and combine a variety of different grounding procedures. They may assert their understanding providing verbal or nonverbal acknowledgments. They may not only assert but also show what it is that they have understood with a display, i.e. a verbatim repetition of all or part of the learner’s strategic utterance, or a demonstration, i.e. a paraphrase. Finally, they may presuppose acceptance initiating a relevant next contribution, such as the second part of an adjacency pair, or just allowing the conversation to continue.

With these signals the interlocutor indicates their understanding of the speaker’s communicative intentions, but for agreement on meaning to be reached, the learner also needs to accept the addressee’s acceptance move. In the analysis of the previous CS episodes we have also seen how this may be achieved with an acknowledgment or simply proceeding to the next contribution and thus allowing the conversation to continue.

Furthermore, in the analysis of our data we have observed that in order to communicate meaning interlocutors rarely use one single CS. Meaning is usually presented through a combination of different oral and/or nonverbal strategies and, in interaction, these are not always uttered by the speaker alone. Interlocutors collaborate in the strategic process offering alternative expressions to present what was originally the speaker’s intended message. They may reformulate an initial CS with an alternative CS or even with what they consider to be the speaker’s desired but unavailable TL lexical item. Sometimes they even complete the utterance of a CS initiated by the speaker. In these patterns of CS episodes strategic communication of a message
involves not only a CS uttered by the speaker, but a combination of CSs uttered by both
the speaker and the interlocutor. Speakers and addressees collaborate to ground content
co-constructing form, the form of the alternative means of expression that allows them
to compensate for the lack of knowledge of a desired TL lexical item or structure.

This collaborative co-construction of strategic language form is most clearly
illustrated in those CS episodes in which an initial CS uttered by the speaker is not
understood by the interlocutor well enough for current purposes. When this occurs,
addressees indicate their trouble in understanding using negotiation of meaning
strategies: confirmation checks and clarification requests. In order to check for
confirmation they may repeat with rising intonation all or part of the learner’s preceding
strategic utterance, refashion this utterance proposing an alternative CS, or try to guess
the speaker’s original communicative intention to offer the desired but unavailable TL
lexical item. In order to request for clarification of the preceding utterance they use
questions such as ‘what?’ or ‘what do you mean?’ With these negotiation of meaning
strategies, side sequences are initiated where the initial CS is refashioned by the
speaker, the addressee or the two of them working together. That is, the original
message is presented in a different form, in fact, in as many different forms as necessary
until a mutual agreement on meaning can be reached. This generally means that for the
final successful communication of the originally intended message a combination and/or
sequence of different CSs needs to be used. These strategies may be uttered by the
speaker, but quite often they are also presented by the interlocutor. These CS episodes
and their final successful communicative outcome cannot be understood by an analysis
of the learner’s initial CS alone. Again it is the joint and collaborative actions of this
learner and their interlocutor what allows them to establish an agreement on meaning
and get the message communicated.

We have also analyzed in this chapter strategic excerpts of interaction in which
no agreement on meaning has been reached between the speaker and the addressee.
These CS episodes show that, despite the previously mentioned grounding techniques
available, interlocutors are not always able to communicate their messages when a
linguistic shortcoming is encountered in FL interaction.

We have observed how avoidance CSs lead, because of their nature, to a
breakdown in the communicative process, i.e. to the non-communication of the intended
message. But when achievement strategies are used, the failure of the communicative process needs to be accounted for as a result of a problem in the grounding process, not of the type or nature of the CS being used. We believe that there are more and less effective CSs, as pointed out in previous research. More effective strategies can be directly understood and accepted by interlocutors without the need of refashioning. Less effective strategies, however, are not understood by the addressee as intended by the speaker. However, in face-to-face interaction they can be refashioned as many times as necessary until their content can be safely grounded. Our analyses show that, if interlocutors collaborate as expected in the grounding process, both effective and less effective CSs can lead to the successful communication of the originally intended message. No achievement CS is therefore communicatively non-effective in its nature. Strategic communication fails when the learner, the interlocutor or both of them act in a non-efficient way during the grounding process of a previously uttered CS. This occurs when they feign understanding of each other’s actions or when they ignore all or part of their responsibilities in the collaborative communicative process.

In sum, the results of our analyses taken altogether show that strategic communication is always a collaborative activity and that, in order to understand how meaning is communicated in face-to-face FL interaction despite learners’ IL shortcomings, attention needs to be paid to the joint actions of both the learner and their interlocutor. The coordination of CSs and grounding procedures accounts for the successful communication of the message. Furthermore, we cannot assume that this process responds simply to the learner’s utterance of a CS and the addressee’s use of a signal of understanding. Both learners and interlocutors collaborate to develop alternative means of expression when a desired TL lexical item is unavailable and to ground the content presented by means of these CSs. This process takes place along a unit of conversation we have called the CS episode, interactionally co-constructed along an unlimited and non-predetermined number of turns where the two interlocutors work together to establish a mutual agreement on the meaning they are trying to communicate.

Drawing on the collaborative model of communication, as described in Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986), Clark and Schaefer (1987, 1989), and Wilkes-Gibbs (1997)
we have also been able to outline a framework of analysis that accounts for how this collaborative process gets carried out within the limits of the CS episode.

For the purposes of our research we have analyzed interactional data involving learners with a variety of proficiency levels in the TL and native and non-native speaking interlocutors. Our analytical framework has proved to be suitable for the study and description of four different interactional conditions: intermediate-intermediate level learner interactions, advanced-advanced learner interactions, intermediate learner and NS interactions, and advanced learner and NS interactions.

Our study has certainly some limitations. Further research needs to be carried out in order to identify how this analytical model can explain FL strategic interaction involving less proficient students or even learners with different proficiency levels in the TL. Our analyses have also been focused on interaction within dyads, which suggests that may be the model will need to be adapted in order to account for interaction involving larger groups of conversational participants.

The results so far obtained, however, support the generalizability of this framework of analysis and its suitability for following research on FL strategic interaction. Our study opens in this way a new path for future research paying attention to the interactional nature of CSs.
CHAPTER 6

THE COLLABORATIVE CREATION
OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC KNOWLEDGE:
ANALYZING STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION
AS COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE
In the introduction to our work we argued that the dialogue learners engage in when trying to communicate meaning through CS use in face-to-face FL interaction, can, under certain circumstances, evolve into what Swain (1997, 2000) has called collaborative dialogue. In other words, we believe that, in strategic interaction, language is sometimes used for both communicative and cognitive purposes, providing thus an opportunity for the learner’s IL system to develop. That is, learners do not only collaborate to create meaning, they may also work together to build new TL and TL knowledge.

In the present chapter CS episodes will be examined from a sociocultural perspective, i.e. as social and dialogically constituted cognitive activity. The concept of collaborative dialogue and Swain’s (1997, 2000) theoretical approach to interaction and SLA will be used as a framework of analysis, in an attempt to show that strategic communication can, under certain conditions, constitute an occasion for L2 learning.

Collaborative dialogue has been defined by Swain as “knowledge-building dialogue. In the case of our interests in second language learning, it is dialogue that constructs linguistic knowledge. It is what allows performance to outstrip competence. It is where language use and language learning can co-occur. It is language use mediating language learning. It is cognitive activity and it is social activity” (Swain, 2000: 97).

As explained in section 1.3 of Chapter One, learners and their interlocutors engage in collaborative dialogue when, in face of a linguistic problem, they work to solve it through joint language use. Noticing a hole in the learner’s IL system or an error in their output, they collaborate to co-construct the language needed to communicate their message with an accurate and appropriate TL form. For this purpose they engage in cognitive processes such as formulating and testing hypothesis or offering and assessing alternatives. These cognitive processes are mediated by language and socially constituted through dialogue. Their outcome is new co-constructed TL evident in the modification of the initially erroneous output, i.e. in performance that outstrips competence. This linguistic change represents also co-constructed TL knowledge to be internalized by the learner. Empirical research has demonstrated that socially co-constructed cognitive processes and knowledge are transformed into individual mental resources. This means that problem-solving cognitive activity results in L2 learning and
that, mediating these mechanisms, language mediates also language learning. Collaborative dialogue becomes thus an enactment of cognitive activity and an occasion for L2 development.

In the previous chapter, Chapter Five, we argued that communication of meaning is always a jointly achieved collaborative activity (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986; Clark and Schaefer, 1987, 1989; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997). By changing the framework of analysis from the traditional concept of CS to that of CS episode, evidence was found that in face-to-face oral strategic interaction learners and their interlocutors collaborate to create meaning. The communicative problem that arises when the TL lexical item desired to convey an intended meaning is not available is not solved by the learner’s use of a CS alone, but by the learner and the interlocutor’s collaborative effort to achieve an agreement on meaning. That is, communicative problems are mutually shared problems, and they are solved with the coordination of all the interactional participants’ actions and effort in the pursuit of one common goal: communication of meaning.

In this chapter we attempt to identify whether in strategic interaction learners and their interlocutors collaborate not only to create meaning, but also to create language and language knowledge. We will try to demonstrate that, while communicating meaning, learners may focus their attention on form. That is, they may collaborate with their interlocutors to build the TL lexical form and knowledge required to communicate this meaning in a coherent, accurate and appropriate way.

In Chapter Five we saw that, when the learner makes use of a CS, their interlocutor is sometimes not only able to infer what meaning this is trying to convey, but also what unavailable TL form the learner is trying to compensate for –cf. Chapter Five sections 5.1.5.2 and 5.2.1.3. Both native and non-native speaking interlocutors may respond to a learner’s CS with what they believe to be the intended but unavailable TL lexical item. That is, they may provide new input. With this move, we argued, they are collaborating to reach an agreement on meaning, but also on the most accurate TL lexical form to convey this meaning.

In this chapter we will analyze this kind of behavior occurring in CS episodes looking for evidence of collaborative dialogue. We believe that strategic communication
is not only a source for comprehensible input, but also an occasion for collaborative
dialogue and L2 learning.

CS episodes are problem-solving activities. The learner, in trying to produce
output that is new for them, identifies a hole in their IL system. Since the focus of our
research, as explained in Chapter Two, pp. 131-132, is on lexical CSs, this hole is a
lexical gap, i.e. the lack of knowledge of the accurate TL lexical item desired to convey
the intended message. The act of producing output focuses the learner’s attention on
what they need to know, but do not know yet, about the TL lexical system.

The learner may ignore the message and the problem encountered making use of
an avoidance strategy. But we have seen that, more often, the learner tries to
compensate for this problem making use of an achievement CS.

The resulting utterance is an erroneous, non-native-like or inaccurate non-
desired expression. Producing this utterance the learner is collaborating with the
interlocutor to create meaning despite their IL shortcomings. But they are also
verbalizing their problem. The CS illustrates what the learner is trying to say but is
unable to express in a coherent, accurate and appropriate way. From this perspective,
this strategic utterance, which the learner knows is not accurate TL, constitutes also an
object of reflection. In Swain’s words, it is “an objective product that can be explored
further by the speaker or others” (Swain, 2000: 102).

Learner and interlocutor may collaborate to solve only the communicate
problem. That is, they may focus on meaning ignoring form. But they may also try to
work out together a solution for the linguistic problem. Under certain conditions, they
may collaborate to co-construct correct TL to communicate the intended message and
engage thus in collaborative dialogue.

In order to achieve this sub-goal, they need to pay conscious attention to form.
The addressees, or even the speakers themselves, have to offer alternatives to the initial
strategic utterance. These alternative expressions, i.e. what they believe to be accurate
but originally unavailable TL lexical items, have to be noticed and assessed. Together,
interactional participants need to achieve a joint agreement on the TL form they are
going to use to communicate their message.

For this purpose, they may use the L2 or their L1, and engage in metatalk. That
is, to co-construct language in socially situated interaction, learners and their
interlocutors need to talk, explicitly or implicitly, about language. CS episodes can thus be seen as language-related episodes (Swain and Lapkin, 1995, 1998) where the focus of attention is the CS. More specifically, they can be considered as lexis-based language-related episodes that involve learners and their interlocutors seeking TL vocabulary to convey with accuracy and appropriateness the meaning of an initial CS or combination of CSs.

Learners and their interlocutors need thus to use language as a tool to mediate in the accomplishment of the socially and dialogically constituted cognitive processes that will lead them to co-construct correct language and language knowledge. Interactants’ dialogue, as they talk about language, will illustrate their conscious reflection on form. Their modified output, as they substitute the original strategic expression with the new co-constructed TL form, will represent new knowledge, at least for the learner.

As explained in Chapter One, pp. 103-104, the sociocultural theory of mind (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987) provides the theoretical basis to suggest that this dialogically co-constructed knowledge will be internalized and thus result in individual knowledge. Sociocultural theorists argue that the source of psychological processes is external social cognitive activity which becomes internal mental activity through a gradual process of internalization: “higher psychological processes unique to humans can be acquired only through interaction with others, that is, through interpsychological processes that only later will begin to be carried out independently by the individual. When this happens, some of these processes lose their initial, external form and are converted into intrapsychological processes” (Leont’ev, 1981).

As seen in Chapter One, section, 1.3.3, empirical research in the field of SLA has provided evidence of learners’ acquisition of TL forms in collaborative dialogue. Donato’s (1994) study of scaffolding, LaPierre’s (1994) research on learners’ metatalk and Swain and Lapkin’s (1998) analyses of language-related episodes tried to trace learners’ language development. They showed that students tend to retain the linguistic knowledge they have co-constructed in their collaborative dialogues, which results thus in later individual performance.

74 As mentioned in Chapter One, p. 112, language-related episodes have been defined as “any part of a dialogue where the students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 326).
This means that, if collaborative dialogue is used in some CS episodes, the learner should become able to use, first with the help of the interlocutor, previously unavailable TL lexical knowledge. This social knowledge and the cognitive processes involved in its building should be internalized by the learner who, in the future, ought to be able to use them in an independent and individual way.

What follows is an analysis of selected and representative CS episodes that show how, in strategic interaction, language can be used to serve a communicative function and also as a cognitive tool to mediate language learning. In these CS episodes we can see how, while dealing with communication of meaning, learners and their interlocutors sometimes focus, spontaneously, on the TL lexical form they need to accurately express this meaning: they reflect upon language, they manipulate language, they create new language and new language knowledge. The samples of strategic interaction here presented confirm that CS episodes can evolve into collaborative dialogue, i.e. that in some CS episodes “language use and language learning co-occur” (Swain, 2000: 97). Whenever available, empirical data will be also provided of how the learning that occurs in these CS episodes can be traced as learners accomplish the communicative task at hand.

Before concluding the chapter we will also discuss the possible pedagogical implications of these new insights into CS use. We will see that not all the CSs analyzed within the limits of our investigation result in collaborative dialogue. In some CS episodes learners focus exclusively on meaning, whereas in others they engage in the collaborative creation of meaning, language and linguistic knowledge. We intend to pay here some attention to those individual or social factors that may have an influence on this issue in an attempt to clarify the role that strategic communication can play in the L2 learning process and the position that CS use should subsequently deserve in the FL classroom.

6.1. COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE IN NNS-NS CS EPISODES
The first extract of interaction we are going to analyze here shows the dialogue of two interlocutors, an English language learner and a NS, who collaborate to create meaning and to convey this meaning with accurate TL lexis.
A CS is used by the learner when, in the process of producing output, he notices a hole in his IL system. The learner intends to present the meaning ‘suspenders’ to his interlocutor and finds that the TL lexical item desired to make reference to this concept is unavailable in his IL system. In order to compensate for this problem he decides to attempt an alternative means of communication, i.e. to make use of an achievement CS. He uses what we have called an indirect appeal for assistance or appeal for help strategy. The learner makes explicit his problem, i.e. the lack of the desired TL lexical item, trying thus to elicit his interlocutor’s help: ‘i don’t know how to say, (1.0) hm:’. This strategy is combined with a nonverbal CS that specifies the intended meaning: pointing to where the suspenders should be located on his chest.

EXAMPLE 6.1 ADV-NS RA: suspenders
REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (254-262):
1  A: e::h he has:: (1.5) he’s wearing:: (1.5) tch trousers, (2.0)
2  an::d (0.8) he supports, or he::: (2.6) tch (1.3) e:h
3  (he’s wearing also (1.0) i don’t know how to say, (1.0) hm:}
4  (A’s HH point to her chest)
5  B: suspenders? 6  A: suspenders. {yes.} (0.5) [he’s]
7 {A nods}
8  B: suspenders? {the ] thing?}
9  {B’s HH outline the shape of the
10 suspenders on her chest}
11  A: {yes yes=}
12  {A nods}
13  B: okay. 14  A: he’s wearing suspenders,
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (254-262):
I: ahí supongo que es porque no sabías decir tirantes?
A: sí
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
suspenders

75 As explained in Chapter Five, the learner taking the sender role in the spot-the-difference task is identified in the transcript as A, and the receiver, whether another learner or a NS, as B. A is usually the interlocutor who initiates the CS episode presenting a CS or a combination of CSs. As we also did in the previous chapter, the initiator of the strategic contribution will be always referred to as ‘the speaker’ and treated as a male, and their partner as ‘the addressee’ and treated as a female, independently of their actual sex.

76 For the examples here presented we follow the same pattern as in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. The sender, always A, is here an advanced proficiency level learner, ADV, and the receiver a native speaker, NS. In this CS episode the meaning they are trying to agree on is ‘suspenders’. We include the transcript of the CS episode we are analyzing and the lines of the transcript of the whole interaction to which this excerpt belongs. Whenever relevant we offer also NL baseline data—in this first example there is no related NL data, retrospective data and the differences between the two versions of the task as identified by the participants.
With the combination of two different CSs the learner presents to the addressee the content he intends to add to their shared common ground. CSs, i.e. strategic language use, serve a communicative function. But in this process the learner is also verbalizing and thus exteriorizing the problem encountered. He is constructing an objective product of reflection that can be responded to by the addressee. Furthermore, by explicitly requesting help, he is consciously drawing his interlocutor’s attention to the problem and calling her to collaborate in its solution.

The addressee responds to this strategy providing, with rising intonation, what she believes to be the learner’s intended but unavailable TL lexical item: ‘suspenders?’.

She has been able to recognize that the learner is using a combination of CSs to compensate for the lack of a desired TL word, to identify this word and to use it in her response.

The rising intonation indicates, however, that she is not totally confident of her understanding of the intended message. Her acceptance move constitutes a confirmation check, as explained in Chapter Five, p. 277, a movement “to elicit confirmation that the utterance has been correctly heard or understood” – adapted from Long (1983a: 137). That is, although the NS has correctly inferred the learner’s intended message, her level of understanding is not enough for current purposes and therefore she cannot directly accept the strategic presentation.

This confirmation check constitutes also implicit corrective feedback and input of form. The addressee is offering to the learner an alternative lexical item to communicate their meaning with accurate and appropriate TL. She is thus collaborating with the learner to create meaning and, in this process, she also corrects TL lexical form.

In line 6 of the transcript we see how the learner repeats, now with falling intonation, the TL lexical item offered by the addressee: ‘suspenders.’. He also confirms the accuracy of her understanding with verbal and nonverbal acknowledgments: ‘yes’ and a head nod. The addressee seems still uncertain and checks again for confirmation with an all-purpose expression, ‘the thing?’, and an outlining nonverbal CS: drawing the shape of the suspenders on her chest. Agreement on meaning and successful communication of content is achieved with more accepting acknowledgments from the learner, in lines 11 and 12, and the addressee, in line 13.
With the repetition and the acknowledgments in line 6 the learner is not only confirming mutual understanding, he is also recognizing and accepting ‘suspenders’ as the originally intended TL lexical item. He is focusing on both meaning and form. This movement shows that the learner has noticed the input of form provided by the addressee\textsuperscript{77} and has been able to use it as uptake.

The concept of uptake in the field of SLA makes reference to immediate repairs by the learner of an erroneous language form corrected by the interlocutor. It may take two main forms: repetition and incorporation. In line 6 of this transcript we see uptake as repetition, but in line 14 we see an example of incorporation, i.e. a productive use of the new TL form. At the end of the CS episode, the learner is able to incorporate the TL lexical item provided by the addressee to his output.

The learner modifies thus his initial strategic utterance to express his message with accurate and appropriate TL lexis. This new language has been co-constructed by the learner and his native speaking interlocutor. With the addressee’s help the speaker has been able to use previously unavailable TL knowledge. His performance outstrips thus his initial competence.

In this CS episode we can see output, noticing, corrective feedback, input and uptake, but we can also see collaborative dialogue. The two interlocutors have used language to collaborate in the solution of a communicative and a linguistic problem, i.e. to communicative meaning and to create a TL form. In their dialogue we can see how a hole is noticed in output production, input of form is offered to compensate for it, this new form is noticed and assessed, and the TL knowledge thus built is used to create new and accurate language. Learner and NS have used language to communicate, but also as a cognitive tool to talk and reflect about language, more specifically, about the most accurate and appropriate TL lexical form to express their message. This social and dialogically constituted cognitive process, triggered by the use of an achievement CS, has resulted in new TL and TL knowledge for the learner. We can therefore affirm that this CS episode is a knowledge-building activity. It constructs linguistic knowledge. Here we see language use and language learning co-occurring.

\textsuperscript{77} As indicated in Chapter One, pp. 100-101, for input to become intake some kind of noticing needs to occur. It has been frequently claimed that learners must notice L2 forms in the input they receive in order to acquire them (Schmidt and Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1990, 1994, 1995; Gass, 1990; Gass and Varonis, 1994).
The CS episode presented in example 6.2 has already been analyzed in Chapter Five as evidence of collaboration in the meaning creation process when a CS needs to be used to compensate for an unavailable TL lexical item – cf. Chapter Five, pp. 291-293. We know, from the retrospective interview comments, that the learner, A, has noticed a hole in his IL system: the lack of the desired TL expression ‘holding hands’. This has forced him to stretch his IL and develop an alternative means of communication: a combination of a literal translation and a nonverbal strategy. He translates word by word the NL expression ‘collar o neno da mao’, i.e. ‘getting:: her (1.0) her boy with e:h (0.8) his hand.’; and, simultaneously, illustrates his intended meaning with a nonverbal strategy: mimicking holding someone’s hand.

EXAMPLE 6.2a: INT-NS PM: holding hands
REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-278):
1 A:  she is e:h he’s (0.8) (getting:: her 1.0) her boy with e:h
2 {A’s RH mimics holding someone’s hand, B is not looking}
3 4 A:  (0.8) his hand. (1.4) they a:re=
5 B:  =he’s holding? he’s holding the boy’s [hand?]
6 A:  {{[he’s ] holding.} (0.8)
7  {{A nods}}
8 A:  yeah.}}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  e a na seguinte vese ó pai que colle da mao ó neno e van camiñando
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  xa non ten ó neno agarrado da man
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (275-278):
A:  que está collendo o neno coa man o sea que está colléndoo pola man e
I:  traduciches literalmente do español ó mellor? getting his boy?
A:  si si
...  A:  e cando dí o de sostelo sostelo non me soou demasiado aínda que bueno el utilizouno polo tanto
I:  e que sóese dicir holding holding the boy’s hand
A:  uuh
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
holding boy’s hand

In the act of producing output the learner has noticed a hole that has drawn his attention to a lexical aspect of the TL he does not know yet. He has produced an utterance that he knows is not native-like. The nature of this utterance together with the pauses, repetition, fillers and lengthening phenomena also draw the interlocutor’s attention to the problem encountered.
In line 5 of the transcript we can observe how the addressee has been able to identify the meaning the speaker is trying to convey and also the previous strategic presentation as an attempt to compensate for the lack of knowledge of the TL expression ‘holding hands’. Uncertain of the accuracy of her interpretation of the previous CSs she collaborates in the meaning creation process with a confirmation check. The rising intonation in her response indicates that she is asking the learner to confirm she has correctly understood the presentation as intended. She also collaborates with the learner in the solution of his linguistic problem, by providing what she believes to be the accurate and appropriate TL expression to express the intended meaning.

When dealing with vocabulary it is sometimes difficulty to know whether the speaker is talking about meaning, about form or about both of them simultaneously. In this example it is clear that B is not talking only about meaning, but also about form. In the first part of her turn she indicates her level of understanding of the learner’s message and offers correct TL lexis: ‘he’s holding?’ It could be argued that the item ‘holding’ is used only for communicative purposes, i.e. to collaborate in the agreement on meaning. However, we see here how, immediately, the addressee rephrases and corrects the learner’s previous strategic utterance. She incorporates the lexical item ‘holding’ to the learner’s presentation offering thus a correct TL version of the learner’s non-native-like utterance: ‘he’s holding the boy’s hand?’ The addressee’s attention is focused on both meaning and form. She is collaborating to create meaning and accurate TL to express this meaning.

The addressee’s move in line 5 can thus be seen as a recast. Recasts are “a form of implicit negative feedback where there is a reformulation of a learner’s ill-formed utterance. Recasts occur when an interlocutor produces a target-like version of a learner’s erroneous utterance, without changing the semantic content of the learner’s statement” (Morris, 2002: 2). Although recasts have generally been identified and analyzed in relation to grammar, i.e. as interlocutor’s corrections of learners’ grammatical errors, we believe that this concept can be extended to lexical implicit correction. In B’s response to A’s utterance we see the three main functions of recasts argued by Saxton (1997) and Leeman (2000): implicit negative feedback, positive evidence because the TL form is provided, and enhanced salience of input as the original ill-formed utterance is juxtaposed to the correct TL form. Pica (1993) also
explains that recasts can be provided not only to correct a non-target-like form but also to clarify meaning. This meaning negotiation function is clearly seen in this example where the recast is uttered as a confirmation check.

In the following turn, lines 6-8 of the transcript, the learner repeats part of the addressee’s confirmation check with falling intonation, accompanied by two acknowledgments: ‘yes’ and a head nod. With this acceptance move he confirms the correctness of the addressee’s understanding of the CSs and collaborates to ground their meaning. He is also accepting ‘holding’ as correct TL lexis to express the intended message. He repeats only part of the addressee’s previous utterance, more specifically, that part that constitutes new input for him: ‘he’s holding.’. His attention is focused on this TL form. His utterance shows that he has noticed this form and has been able to incorporate it to his TL use. He agrees thus with the addressee on the message they are trying to communicate and on the accurate and appropriate TL expression to convey this message. In this way learner and interlocutor co-construct not only correct TL but also TL knowledge. The change occurring in the learner’s output represents language learning taking place.

When reviewing previous empirical research on collaborative dialogue and SLA, we have seen that post-tests or follow-up activities, usually conducted with a delay of at least one or two weeks, have been often used in order to trace language learning, i.e. the learner’s individual and delayed use of the TL forms and knowledge built in collaborative dialogue (Holunga, 1994; Donato, 1994; LaPierre, 1994; Swain and Lapkin, 1998). For the purposes of our research no test or activity of that nature were designed. The retrospective interview held with each of the participants after the performance of the picture-story task, as described in section 3.2.2 of Chapter Three, would have certainly biased the results of any kind of delayed post-test activity. In these retrospective interviews participants were explicitly asked to talk about the communicative and linguistic problems encountered and the solutions reached. It would be impossible to establish whether the results of a delayed post-test should be traced to the learners’ collaborative dialogue in the performance of the picture-story task or to the discussion had with the researcher during this interview.

However, as also explained in Chapter Three, p. 155, the communicative task used for the elicitation of our IL data was specifically designed so that students had to
make repeated references to certain objects and actions which, we knew from the pilot study, were likely to pose communicative problems and thus elicit CS use. This allows us, in certain cases, to trace linguistic change beyond the limits of the collaborative dialogue episode.

Furthermore, we will also see in the following pages that although the above mentioned post-interview was mostly conducted in the learners’ NL and was not originally designed with this objective in mind, it sometimes provides data that can be used to trace learning. We will see how some learners make individual use in the interview of TL forms socially constructed in the previous picture-story task. However valuable this data may be, notice that it can never be considered evidence of delayed TL use, since the interview was conducted immediately after the performance of the communicative task. In other words, the interview may help us to trace learning beyond the limits of the CS episode, but not over a relatively extended period of time. Therefore, this interview can never be considered to fulfill the same functions of the post-tests used in previous research, which were usually conducted with, at least, one week delay and in an attempt to trace learning over a predetermined period of time.

The two learners involved in the previous CS episode need to make reference to the meaning ‘holding hands’ on two more occasions during the same conversation, i.e. during their performance of the picture-story spot-the-difference task. In the next excerpt of interaction we see the NS using the expression ‘he’s holding (1.0) the boy, (1.5) with his right hand?’. The learner is here able to identify without problems the form and meaning of the previously unknown TL lexical item ‘holding’. This also provides him with a second opportunity to notice this input of form.

EXAMPLE 6.2b: INT-NS PM: holding hands
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (294-297):

1 B:  they:: e:::h he’s holding (1.0) the bo:y, (1.5) with his right hand?
2 A:  yeah
3 (0.5)
4 B:  the boy’s left?
5 (1.5)
6 A:  {yeah}
7 (A nods)
8

In the following excerpt we can observe how the learner is now able to use the TL item ‘holding’ without the NS’s help, that is, in an individual and independent way.
EXAMPLE 6.2c: INT-NS PM: holding hands
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (334-335):
1  A:   the father is not holding now. (1.4) e::h boy’s:: hand,
2  B:   yeah
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (334-340):
I:   ai utilizas o de holding porque llo oiches a el?
A:   claro

The collaborative effort of learner and NS, mediated by language use, has supported the learner’s internalization of a new TL lexical expression. Social TL and TL knowledge have become individual. The limitations of our study do not allow us to know whether this co-constructed linguistic knowledge will be retained in the future or for how long. The tentative evidence here provided seems to suggest that this issue should deserve more attention in future research. We can, however, conclude, in the light of the data obtained, that some learning is taking place in the CS episode here analyzed. Even if the acquisition of this TL lexical item is not definitive, we can affirm that the learner is in the process of acquiring new TL lexis and this acquisition process is occurring in collaborative dialogue taking place within the limits of the CS episode.

In the next example a problem is identified when the learner intends to present the meaning ‘suspenders’ and realizes that this TL lexical item is not available in his IL system. In an attempt to compensate for this problem he makes use of a combination of circumlocution and nonverbal strategies. In lines 1-6 of the transcript we see how the learner tries to describe orally the intended object of reference and, repetitively, depicts it with outlining nonverbal strategies.

EXAMPLE 6.3: INT-NS PM: braces
REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (461-471):
1  A:   an::d {he’s wearing::: (2.2) these things that you can use
2   {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
3  A:   when you: (0.5) you you wear (1.5) e::h} (2.0) short, e::h
4   trousers, (1.3) [a:::nd
5   (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on
6   her body)
7  B:   ah!} so that your trousers don’t fall {down?}
8   {B’s RI points downwards)
9
10  (1.5)
11 A:   (yes)
12 (A nods)
13 B:   braces.
14 (1.3)
15 A:   braces?=  
16 B:   =right
17 (2.4)
CHAPTER 6: The collaborative creation of language and linguistic knowledge

The learner’s circumlocution strategy is completed in 7-9 by the addressee who, building on the previous utterance, presents an alternative and complementary description of the referent ‘suspenders’. In Chapter Five we saw how, relatively often, addressees collaborate in the meaning creation process offering alternative CSs that intended to replace or expand the initial CS presented by the learner. When this rephrasing is presented with falling intonation, it is generally interpreted as a demonstration and an acceptance move –cf. Chapter Five, section 5.1.5.1. When, like here, it is uttered with rising intonation, it constitutes a confirmation check –cf. Chapter Five, section 5.2.1.2. The addressee does not consider the initial presentation as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and therefore decides to expand it and explicitly check for confirmation. The learner confirms the correctness of his interlocutor’s interpretation of the initial CSs with two acknowledgments: ‘yes’ and a head nod.

Agreement on meaning seems to have been satisfactorily reached through the CSs presented by both the learner and his interlocutor. However, the CS episode does not end here. The interlocutors are not satisfied with this agreement on meaning and also try to co-construct correct TL form. In a following turn, line 13 in the transcript, the addressee offers the learner the TL lexical item ‘braces’, as an appropriate form to express the meaning they have both collaborated to communicate: ‘braces.’. This new input is repeated by the learner in line 15 with rising intonation, i.e. he is also asking for confirmation of the correctness of his uptake: ‘braces?’ . This confirmation is provided by the NS in the next turn: ‘=right’.

At this point both meaning and language form have been successfully co-constructed. But in this excerpt of interaction we clearly see that interlocutors are not
only engaged in the task of creating meaning, they are also focused on conscious reflection about language in order to build new linguistic knowledge. The NS does not only verbalize the lexical form needed by the learner, she also provides a second alternative and an explanation for the differences existing between the two of them: ‘=or if you’re American suspenders.’. Although she is not using metalinguistic terminology, B is explicitly talking about language and dialectological variation. Whereas ‘braces’ is the British term to express their intended meaning, ‘suspenders’ is the American one. She is thus offering to the learner two different alternatives to assess, and she is also drawing his attention to the form, meaning and function of these two TL forms.

The learner considers the two different possibilities and tries to reach a reasoned and joint decision. At the end, the NS being British, they both agree on the British lexical item ‘braces’. This TL form represents new knowledge for the learner, collaboratively built through language use.

Language is here the object and the vehicle of reflection. In this interaction we can observe how these two interlocutors use language to communicate meaning and to talk about language. In doing so, they co-construct an accurate and appropriate TL form to express their message and one of the interlocutors helps the other one to expand his TL lexical knowledge.

Although there was no opportunity for the learner to make a second use of the co-constructed TL form ‘braces’ during the conversation taking place with his native speaking interlocutor, we can see in the interview that he has retained this TL lexical item: ‘tirantes tampouco me saía ... braces?’.

We can thus conclude that in this CS episode there is collaborative dialogue and L2 learning, deriving from the learner’s presentation of a combination of CSs that focuses the two interlocutors’ attention on both meaning and form. Social and cognitive activity aiding L2 lexical development is taking place.

6.2. COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE IN NNS-NNS CS EPISODES

The kind of collaborative dialogue we have just seen in NNS-NS interactions can also be found in NNS-NNS dialogue. Learners’ dyads, in some circumstances, focus their attention on form while creating meaning and help each other to build new TL and TL
knowledge. In example 6.4 two intermediate level learners get engaged in collaborative dialogue as they try to solve a communicative problem through CS use.

EXAMPLE 6.4: INT-INT SC: pointing
REFERENT: father pointing inside/father points to the house
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-311):
1 A: and the:, (2.5) his finger is:: e::h {inside the house?}
2 {A’s RI mimics pointing} (A.5)
3 
4 B: his fin-? {like [pointing?]}
5 {B’s RA mimics pointing}
6 A: [ like] {yeah} pointing (0.7) inside the
7 {A nods}
8 A: house
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: con la mano hacia adentro de la casa como que señala
B: aquí la tiene baja
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y la otra también está señalando
B: ah! es verdad en ésta no no está señalando porque no se le ve
A: ah! vale
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (309-311):
A: ahí no sabía cómo se decía señalar no no me acordaba
I: pero me parece que te lo dijo ella
A: sí después
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
pointing the house

In the turn that initiates the CS episode learner A presents a combination of a circumlocution strategy, ‘his finger is:: e::h inside the house?’, and an enacting nonverbal strategy: mimicking the action of pointing. According to the retrospective comments, these CSs are used to compensate for the unavailability of the TL lexical item ‘pointing’. The learner claims to know this lexical form, but he is unable to retrieve it at this specific moment.

These CSs are the result of learner A noticing a hole in his IL system. They constitute an alternative means of expression to present the speaker’s intended message, but also an objective product to be reflected upon and responded to by the interlocutor or the learner himself. The relatively long pause, the following restructuring of the utterance, the drawls and the fillers indicate that the expression the speaker is using is not the originally desired one. It may be grammatically correct but is lexically inappropriate and certainly not native-like. This presentation is also marked, i.e. uttered with rising intonation and followed by a pause –cf. Chapter Five, p. 251. The learner knows this expression is not correct TL and is uncertain whether it can correctly convey
the intended message. With the try marker he is explicitly checking for his interlocutor’s comprehension and also calling her attention to the form of his utterance.

The addressee is able to infer the meaning underlying these CSs, but her level of understanding is not enough to accept the speaker’s presentation. She checks for confirmation providing what she believes may be the learner’s desired but unavailable TL lexical item, illustrated by a nonverbal strategy: ‘like pointing?’ and mimicking the action of pointing. She provides a TL word to modify the initial presentation, i.e. corrective feedback in the form of positive evidence or new input. B is thus suggesting to A that, if she has correctly understood the message, ‘pointing’ is the word they should use to express meaning with accurate and appropriate TL lexis.

In the third and last turn, lines 6-8 of the transcript, the speaker confirms the addressee’s correct understanding of the message, thus building a mutual agreement on meaning. For this purpose he offers two acknowledgments, ‘yeah’ and a head nod, and a rephrasing of his presentation utterance. He modifies his original output, incorporating the input of form offered by the addressee to create a correct and accurate TL expression. This new utterance, which clearly reveals a change in the speaker’s IL system, has been co-constructed with the addressee’s help. In the dialogue of this CS episode we can observe how two same level learners collaborate to create meaning, language and language knowledge.

NSs, because of their command of the TL, can certainly exert a stronger or at least more frequent influence on the learner’s IL system. But this CS episode confirms that language learners, even intermediate level learners, can also collaborate with their peers in the development of their L2 lexical knowledge.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence available in our data of a subsequent use on the part of learner A of the co-constructed TL form ‘pointing’. The results of previous empirical research and the conclusions drawn from the analysis of examples 6.2 or 6.3 suggest that, if a second reference had to be made to the action of ‘pointing’ by the learner, this might be able to use this TL lexical item in an individual and independent way.

The next CS episode also represents the collaborative dialogue of two language learners, in this case, advanced level learners. The speaker, learner A, intends to present the meaning ‘rolled up’. In trying to produce output, i.e. his presentation of the content,
he notices a hole in his IL system: the lack of knowledge of the desired TL lexical item ‘rolled up’. He presents an utterance with a gap in the place of this unknown TL form and illustrates the meaning he is trying to convey with his gestures. That is, he makes use of a complete omission strategy, ‘e:h with the: sleeves::, (1.2) e:::h’, in combination with a simultaneous enacting CS: mimicking the action of rolling up a sleeve.

EXAMPLE 6.5a: ADV-ADV SO: rolled up
REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-207):

1 A: e::h he wears trousers, a:n::d a shirt, (e:h with the:
2 (A’s RH mimics rolling
3 up her LA sleeve)
4 A: sleeves::, (1.2) e:::h
5 (1.5)
6 B: rolled up. (1.0) or some[thing ]
7 A: [ yes])

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: hay un hombre que está calvo con gafas con tirantes con una
  camisa

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (204-207):
A: si no sabía decir remangado
I: y no sabías cómo decirlo? ti si que sabías non?
B: rolled up pero non sei soábame creo que se di así
I: si si
B: heh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
long sleeves

The addressee is able to identify that the speaker is making use of a combination of CSs to present the meaning ‘rolled up’. She completes his unfinished presentation with what she believes to be the learner’s intended but unavailable TL lexical item: ‘rolled up.’. She demonstrates her correct understanding of the intended message, thus accepting the speaker’s presentation, and at the same time offers new input of form and a possible solution for the speaker’s lexical problem. She is collaborating to reach an agreement on meaning but also to build accurate TL to express this meaning. In completions a single linguistic unit is constructed by the coordinated actions of speaker and addressee. 78 Here we clearly see how language is co-constructed, since the utterance used to communicate the intended message has been co-constructed by the learner and his interlocutor: ‘e:h with the: sleeves::, (1.2) e:::h rolled up.’.

In this CS episode we do not see, however, A’s uptake of B’s input. In the previous examples we have considered speaker’s uptake, i.e. his modification of the

78 For a detailed account of completions occurring in our data see Chapter Five, pp. 281-290
initial output by repeating or incorporating the input of form provided by the addressee, as evidence of conscious attention to form and a change in his IL system. Here the speaker confirms the addressee’s correct understanding of the message with an acknowledgment, ‘yes’, thus admitting her acceptance and building a mutual agreement on meaning. But we believe that with this acknowledgment he is also indicating that he has noticed the new input. He has reflected upon the TL form offered by the addressee and recognized it as the correct TL lexical item to express their message. Otherwise, the speaker would not have been able to accept this form as evidence of the addressee’s understanding.

On this basis we argue that, although uptake is the most obvious signal of noticing of input on the part of the learner, the fact that there is no uptake does not necessarily mean the learner has not noticed a linguistic form and has incorporated it, or has engaged in the process of incorporating it, to his TL lexical knowledge. Previous research has in fact reached a similar conclusion. Mackey and Philip’s (1998) and Morris’ (2002) studies of recast in FL interaction found that, although learners did not always produce repairs immediately after receiving a recast from their interlocutors, they noticed this feedback and accurately perceived it as positive and corrective TL evidence. This noticing process promoted their L2 grammatical development. Morris concluded thus that “even when learners fail to repair their non-target-like structures after receiving implicit negative feedback it does not necessarily mean that the feedback provided is ineffective in promoting acquisition … what learners may have to do for acquisition to take place is to notice the feedback and accurately perceive it as intended; it may not be necessary for them to produce an immediate repair” (Morris, 2002: 131-132).

In our transcripts collaborative dialogue episodes in which learners indicate to their interlocutors noticing of input without any kind of uptake are relatively common. For this particular CS episode evidence was found that language learning is here occurring, even though there is no uptake. In the next extract of interaction we see how learner A uses the TL knowledge built, with the help of his interlocutor, in the previous episode.

79 As mentioned above, recasts have been generally studied in relation to grammar correction and grammar acquisition.
EXAMPLE 6.5b: ADV-ADV SO: rolled up
REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (281-286):
1  A:   a:n::d the man {is rolling up his shirt.}
2       {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve, B is
3       not looking}
4   (2.2)
5  B:   he’s? {rolling? his, okay=}
6       {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve, B is not
7       looking}
8  A:   =yes, the shirt.} (2.2) a::n:d (3.2) eh eh (0.6) the child,
9       (0.4) is in the same position,
10  (1.5)
11 B:   heh
12 A:   a:nd mm::, (2.3) tch well {he’s rolling up the shirt wi:th
13       {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA
14       sleeve, A holds the gesture}
15 A:   his: e::h (2.2) left hand.}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   y y el padre pues se remanga la la camisa como para meterle una
torta

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   y tiene la sigue con la con la camisa remangada
B:   mm
A:   con la la manga derecha remangada

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (281-286):
I:   entonces ahí cuando utilizas rolling up es porque
A:   porque me lo dijo ella heh heh
B:   heh heh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father, rolling up his shirt, at left hand

This learner has not only learnt how to use the TL form ‘rolled up’ independently, but he has also been able to recognize the morphology of the lexical item and to adapt it to a new context. In lines 1 and 12-15 of the transcript we see how ‘rolled up’ has been transformed into ‘rolling up’: ‘a:n::d the man is rolling up his shirt.’ and ‘tch well he’s rolling up the shirt wi:th his: e::h (2.2) left hand.’. The language form co-constructed in the previous extract has now been transformed into an individual mental resource, or at least is in the process of it. In this sense it is significant that the learner supports the verbalization of the new TL lexical item with illustrative gestures that provide the interlocutor with additional information to interpret the message –cf. lines 2-3 and 13-14 in the transcript.

Collaborative dialogue and the double function of language as an object of reflection and the vehicle of this reflection are openly illustrated in the next language-related episode, where learners resort to their L1 as a cognitive tool to focus on and manipulate the L2.
EXAMPLE 6.6a: INT-INT FC: rolled up
REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (547-564):

1 A: he wears:, he wears, he wears a:: (1.8) a:: (1.3) {a shirt,}
2 {B nods}
3 A: with: e::h=
4 B: =one two three four five six, maybe,
5 (0.7)
6 A: one [two three four five.]
7 B: [uno dos tres cuatro cinco (‘one two three four five’),]
8 {cinco (‘five’)}! (1.6) five. (0.8) [buttons.]
9 {B nods}
10 A: [e::h ] one two three
11 four five, (0.5) five. (1.2) a::nd [the:: (0.7) the
12 {A’s LH holds left sleeve}
13 [cómo se llama esto (‘what is its name’)?]
14 B: {[ without::t bolsillos (‘pockets’)?]
15 {B’s RH points to where the pocket would be on her chest
16 (1.5)
17 A: las::: (.) de] la (‘of the’) shirt,} {(0.5) [están (‘are’)?]}
18 B: [ah! e:h ]
19 {A’s LH rolls up right
20 sleeve}
21 B: [no, ]
22 sleeves. (0.7) sleeves. (0.5) {mangas (‘sleeves’),}
23 {A’s RH touches left sleeve}
24 A: eso (‘right’), {están::: (‘they are’)
25 {A’s LH rolls up left sleeve}
26 (1.5)
27 B: uhuh) e::h [rolled?]
28 A: [reman- ] remangadas (‘rolled up’)=
29 B: =rolled up
30 A: rolled [up? ]
31 B: [puede] ser (‘it may be’)
32 A: rolled up?=
33 B: =rolled up (2.0) e::h

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (547-564):
I: y lo de las mangas remangadas tampoco ... lo de las mangas
remangadas que yo no me acuerdo como le dices
B: sleeves rolled up
A: rolled up rolled up
I: si eso lo dices tú después
A: sí
I: pero tú al principio
A: yo le digo yo le hago el gesto le hago el gesto
B: claro
I: y tú sabías que se decía rolled up? te sonaba? no estabas segura?
B: si roll es enrollar y roll up sería subir hacia arriba enrolla
hacia arriba no?
A: hm sí

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the sleeves rolled up

The interactional excerpt here illustrated is particularly complex because it
involves two different CS episodes. Learner A tries to present the meaning ‘rolled up
sleeves’, but, according to the retrospective interview comments, he lacks in his IL system the lexical expression ‘rolled up’ and is unable to retrieve the word ‘sleeves’.

The presentation of this message is initiated in turn 1, lines 1-3 of the transcript. The repetitions, drawls and pauses show that the learner has encountered a problem. He has noticed a hole in his IL system. Before being able to develop an alternative means of expression to compensate for this IL shortcoming, he is interrupted by the addressee. She seems to believe the learner is trying to present the meaning ‘buttons’. Notice how, in trying to reach an agreement on this meaning, B uses her NL to regulate her cognitive activity. She uses the L1 to count the number of buttons depicted in the shirt, ‘uno dos tres cuatro cinco, cinco’, but at the end gives the result of this counting in the TL: ‘five. (0.8) buttons.’. This suggests that the L1 is not used with a communicative purpose, or at least this is not its primary function. The learner is verbalizing out loud an internal cognitive process but in order to communicate the result of this process she switches to the L2.

This use of the L1 in 7-8 helps us to understand how the NL is used in subsequent turns. It constitutes also a tool to perform cognitive activity: not the individual cognitive process of counting, but the collaborative process of reflecting upon and co-constructing TL.

In the next turn, lines 10-13, the speaker calls his interlocutor’s attention back on the originally intended message, i.e. ‘rolled up sleeves’. He makes use of a pointing nonverbal CS by holding his sleeve and an appeal for help strategy: ‘cómo se llama esto?’). The learner has certainly enough command of the TL to utter this strategy in English. Speaker and addressee seem, however, to have agreed on the suitability of using their L1 to manipulate their L2, i.e. to think and talk about TL form. The speaker uses here the L1 to establish the L2 as an object to be reflected upon.

The addressee tries to guess the learner’s intended meaning but fails in this purpose: ‘without bolsillos?’. In the lack of the TL lexical item ‘pockets’, she makes use of a code switching strategy. This is the second time these two learners try to communicate the meaning ‘pocket’ and, unable to find an acceptable TL means of expression, decide to make use of their L1 –cf. Appendix B.2.

In Chapter Five we had already seen a similar pattern of behavior from this same learner –cf. example 5.20 in p. 295. More active than most of the other students acting
also as senders in the picture-story task, this learner tends to interrupt her interlocutor as soon as she realizes some kind of lexical difficulty has been encountered. Without giving the speaker the opportunity to develop an alternative means of communication, this kind of behavior results, relatively often, in a failed guess of the originally intended message.

In line 17 of the transcript we see a new attempt from the speaker to present the meaning ‘rolled up sleeves’. The learner creates a syntactic structure omitting the two lexical items he is unable to retrieve: ‘las: (.) de la shirt, (0.5) están?’ This constitutes a clear example of a complete omission strategy –cf. Chapter Four. He uses the L1 and the L2 for this particular purpose. The use of the Spanish feminine article ‘las’, as opposed to the English one ‘the’, eliminates ‘bolsillos’, a masculine noun, as a possibility. There is also a nonverbal enacting strategy that illustrates the meaning ‘rolled up’: the action of rolling up his own sleeve.

The addressee is now able to infer the speaker’s intended message. She focuses first on the referent ‘sleeves’ and postpones the solution of the second linguistic problem, i.e. ‘rolled up’. In order to show that she has correctly understood the CS as intended by the speaker and thus accept his presentation, she provides the TL lexical item the speaker was unable to retrieve: ‘sleeves. (0.7) sleeves. (0.5) mangas.’. This use of the L1 serves both a communicative and a cognitive function. B is indicating to A that she has understood his message and that ‘sleeves’ is the correct TL lexical form to convey the meaning of the Spanish word ‘mangas’. The L1 is used to attract the speaker’s attention to the L2 form, to enhance the new input and to make it both comprehensible and salient to the learner.

The speaker recognizes and accepts the new input. He then draws the addressee’s attention to the second problem, repeating part of the previous complete omission strategy: ‘eso, están’. The addressee offers first the form ‘rolled’ and then the correct form ‘rolled up’ –cf. lines 27 and 29 of the transcript. In this exchange the speaker also uses the L1 to assure they have reached a satisfactory agreement on meaning: ‘reman- remangadas’. This use of the L1 helps the learners establish what they are trying to express in the L2 and thus single out the object of reflection.

None of the two learners seems completely confident in the correctness of the TL lexical item rolled up. Learner A repeats it twice with rising intonation –cf. lines 30
and 32, and learner B questions its accuracy in line 31, making again use of the L1 for this purpose: ‘puede ser’. Verbalizing it out loud in repeated occasions, and listening to it when produced by her interlocutor, B comes to recognize this form as correct TL lexis. That is, the verbalization of ‘rolled up’ in line 29 provides B with an objective product to reflect upon. It externalizes a hypothesis that gets confirmed by B herself.  

At the end the two interlocutors reach an agreement on this TL form. B repeats again ‘rolled up’ but now with falling intonation, i.e. not questioning it or checking for confirmation, and they decide to carry on with the conversation and move to the next topic.

The speaker never incorporates the TL forms provided by the addressee, i.e. he does not make a productive use of these forms. He repeats, however, once and again the lexical item ‘rolled up’, which, according to the retrospective interview, constitutes new input for him, whereas ‘sleeves’ is only reinforcing input.

Both TL lexical forms, ‘rolled up’ and ‘sleeves’, need to be used again during the same conversation. In the next extract of interaction we can see how learner A, previously unable to produce neither of these two forms, is now able to use them without his interlocutor’s help. He uses first the form ‘arm’ instead of the correct one ‘sleeves’, but recognizing his error he self-corrects his initial output and presents the correct TL form ‘sleeve’: ‘with e::h (1.5) the: (1.0) e::h left (1.0) arm (1.6) e:::h rolled rolled up the: the sleeve’.

**EXAMPLE 6.6b: INT-INT FC: rolled up**

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (745-752):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A: e:::h (1.4) the: (0.8) the father of the boy, (1.8) e::h appears with e::h (1.5) {the: (1.0) e::h left (1.0) arm} (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>{A’s RH mimics rolling up left sleeve}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: e:[::h] rolled rolled up the: the sleeve of of of the::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B: [heh]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A: of the=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B: =like like saying {i’m going to: [push] you,} [heh heh ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>{B mimics punching}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[yeah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[sí (‘yes’) heh]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>heh heh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (784-787):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B: the other one is: {rolling up} hi[s:: ] sleeve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>{B’s RH rolls up left sleeve}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In Chapter One, p. 108, we discussed the role of out loud verbalizations of IL forms as a way to confirm hypotheses about the TL. This use of the language has also been documented in previous research –cf. Swain and Lapkin (1998).
This learner, however, has not been able to adapt the TL form ‘rolled up’ to the new context, as we saw in the previous example. This is done by his interlocutor in the second extract, lines 784-787 of the transcript of the whole interaction: ‘the other one is: rolling up his:: sleeve.’. This is not surprising since the process of lexical acquisition can never be seen as a one-time shift from ignorance to knowledge. We do not want to argue that learners are able to acquire new TL lexis in CS episodes, but that they are in the process of doing so. This process is certainly long and complex, and, as we will see in detail in the next section of this chapter, it may take some time until the learner recognizes all the features of the new word.

In sum, in the first excerpt of strategic interaction presented in example 6.6 we can see the use of the L1 as a tool to regulate learner’s cognitive activity. Through the use of their common L1 these two learners are able to identify the meaning they are trying to communicate in the L2, to set up the L2 as an object of reflection, to ask questions about the L2, to frame their L2 input and to test and confirm hypotheses about TL form. These cognitive processes that in individual thought would normally remain concealed are here manifested in learners’ dialogues, as they use their L1 to mediate the dialogic co-construction of meaning, TL form and TL knowledge. In the second excerpt, evidence is also provided that the TL form ‘rolled up sleeves’ becomes individual knowledge, although incomplete, being later used by learner A in an independent way. We can thus conclude that language learning is occurring in this CS episode.

We need finally to point out that the use of the L1 as a mediating cognitive tool is, however, not very common in our transcripts. It is necessary to take into account the experimental conditions in which the data was collected. Learners were aware that their interaction was being recorded and that they were directly observed by the researcher. In a real classroom situation, with different pairs of students interacting simultaneously and the teacher being unable to supervise all of them at the same time, this kind of CS episode is certainly more likely to occur.
6.3. COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE AND THE COMPLEXITY OF THE L2 LEXICAL ACQUISITION PROCESS

The next CS episode belongs to the interaction taking place between an advanced language learner and a NS of the TL. This example shows that learners and their interlocutors need sometimes to struggle with different possibilities once and again before being able to reach a final agreement on the content they are trying to communicate, and the language and language knowledge they need to express this content. In other words, the change in collaborative dialogue from the learner’s initial strategic utterance to the final correct TL lexical form is not always a one-time shift. Here we see a complex process of both meaning and form negotiation before any actual agreement on meaning and co-construction of language can be reached.

EXAMPLE 6.7a: ADV-NS IM: waistcoat
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-318):

1 A: e:h you can see:: (1.2) like a semicircle? at the back of
2 his:: neck? (2.0) it’s it’s it’s a line of the: jacket,
3 (3.3)
4 B: i have the thing is that i haven’t got a jacket, so=
5 A: =a:::h! it’s not a jacket, (0.4) heh heh heh (.). it’s not a
6 jacket, (it’s one of these things (/’zigz/) things you wear in
7 {A’s II point to her chest}
8 A: in:=
9 B: =braces?)
10 (0.7)
11 A: (it’s like ja- jacket without the:, the arms?) {(.}
12 {A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her LA ×2}
13 {A’s II point
to her chest}
14
15 A: y[ou over, ]} (0.5) no. (.). you (you wear it in:
16 B: [it’s a waistcoat?]
17 {A’s RH outline the
18 shape of a vest on
19 her body}
20 A: under:: a shirt. (.). like that.} (1.3) {you bri-, >i don’t
21 {A mimics putting on a vest}
22
23 A: know how you call it?<
24 B: a waistcoat.)
25 A: a waistcoat?=  
26 B: =it’s like {a jacket without any: sleeves?)
27 {B’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her
28 LA}
29 (0.4)
30 A: yeah.
31 (0.5)
32 B: {like} a waiter might wear?=  
33 {A nods}
34 A: {=yeah! {{like a waiter.}} } (.). that’s what he’s wearing!
35 {A nods and waves her RH to indicate confirmation}
36  {{B nods}}
37  A:  (0.6) "now i can see it."
38  (0.8)
39  B:  "so he’s wea[rning]"
40  A:  {{that’s} (.) that’s why: it has that semicircle at
41  {A’s HH draw a semicircle at the back of her neck}
42  A:  the back, because
43  (0.5)
44  B:  he’s wearing} {a waist{{co[at.]}}
45  (A nods)
46  {{B nods}}
47  A:  {[ye:]ah.} (0.8)
48  B:  so {{(xxx)}}
49  A:  [it’s] a waistcoat. (0.6) mm
50  (1.5)
51  B:  "wearing a waistcoat."
52  (0.6)
53  A:  hhh e:::h {his eyebrows are still the same, (5.0)} {you can
54  (A’s II draw a vi on her forehead, B is not looking}
55  {{A nods}}
56  (A’s RI
57  draws a
58  line in
59  the air
60  ×2, B is
61  not
62  looking)
63  A:  see two lines} {at on his back,
64  (A’s HH touch her back}
65  (2.2)
66  B:  two lines on his back?=)
67  A:  {=well a line. (1.5) vertical line,} it’s made by his
68  {A’s RH draws a vertical line in the air}
69  A:  waist::coat i think.
70  (1.8)
71  B:  a::h! (2.5) on the father?
72  A:  yeah is it’s like a bit also a wrinkle °on the waistcoat,"°
73  (1.5) you can see two buttons and a pocket,
74  (2.3)
75  B:  eh w- well that’s the waist-
76  A:  mm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  lleva unos pantalones una camisa una corbata y un chaleco

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (291):
I:  ahí por ejemplo cuando te dice braces preguntándote tú no?
A:  no sabía lo que me decía eso qué es
I:  braces son los tirantes
A:  ah

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (292):
A:  si en vez de sleeves ... sé que es sleeves pero ... creo que es la primera palabra que me salió inconscientemente

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (293):
I:  y luego también cuando estás describiendo el chaleco dices
A:  ella me dijo la palabra chaleco? waistcoat?
I:  si
A:  me sonaba a raincoat o algo así y dije no no
I:  sí sí y luego te la vuelve a decir creo
A:  y luego le dije ya vi que había entendido lo que decía y dije ya vale
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father wearing jacket waistcoat

The learner desires to communicate the meaning ‘vest’ and realizes he lacks in his IL system an accurate TL lexical item to do so: the British term ‘waistcoat’ and the American one ‘vest’. That is, in the process of producing output he notices a hole and, while trying to create meaning, this focuses his attention on language form, on a TL lexical form he does not know yet.

To meet his communicative goal the learner is forced to stretch his IL. He needs to develop an alternative means of communication to present the content he desires to add to his and his interlocutor’s shared common ground. In lines 5-8 of the transcript we see how he tries to describe the intended object of reference, i.e. makes use of a circumlocution CS that involves also an approximate term, ‘jacket’, and an all-purpose expression, ‘things’: ‘=a::h! it’s not a jacket, (0.4) heh heh heh (. ) it’s not a jacket, it’s one of these things things you wear in in:='’. This circumlocution is accompanied by a nonverbal pointing strategy: pointing to her chest in order to locate the referent.

The utterance resulting from this strategic process, i.e. an unfinished utterance with frequent repetitions, draws the interlocutor’s attention to the speaker’s communicative and linguistic problem. The NS gets involved in the task of creating meaning and language, i.e. in the collaborative solution of the problem. She attempts to guess the intended message even before the speaker finishes his presentation utterance. In line 9 we see how the addressee checks for confirmation of her understanding, i.e. negotiation of meaning, offering what she believes may be the TL lexical form the learner is having trouble with, i.e. providing input of form: ‘=braces?’.

This form, which represents a failed guess, is not understood by the speaker –cf. retrospective comments. Agreement on meaning has not yet been established and the learner needs to elaborate on the previously initiated CS. In his next turn, lines 11-23 of the transcript, he expands the initial circumlocution by providing new features to his description, repeats the previous pointing strategy and offers two more nonverbal strategies: an outlining CS, lines 13-14, and an enacting CS, lines 21-22. She also makes explicit her problem with an indirect appeal for assistance strategy. This serves to indicate there is a TL lexical item she desires to use but is unable to, and to explicitly ask for his interlocutor’s help and collaboration in the solution of the problem: ‘>i don’t know how you call it?<’.
The addressee has now been able to infer the intended meaning. In fact, she had been able to do so even before the learner had finished his second presentation of the content. In line 16 we see how she offers the correct TL form as a confirmation check: ‘it’s a waistcoat?’. The learner’s attention is here focused on his own language production and he does not notice the addressee’s contribution. The addressee therefore repeats this corrective feedback in 24: ‘a waistcoat.’. She is now confident in the accuracy of her understanding and offers it as a demonstration, that is, as a signal of acceptance of the speaker’s presentation.

The speaker has noticed this second contribution and is able to repeat the form provided by the addressee: ‘a waistcoat?’. The rising intonation, as ascertained by the retrospective interview comments, indicates however that he has not been able to recognize its meaning. There is input but is not comprehensible input for the learner. There is uptake of form, but not of the form and meaning relationship.

The addressee clarifies the meaning of the TL lexical item ‘waistcoat’. She needs to use for this purpose more CSs: a circumlocution, in part repetition of the learner’s previous description, in 26 and 32, and an outlining nonverbal strategy, in 27-28. Agreement on meaning is finally reached with the speaker’s acknowledgments in lines 34-35, ‘yeah’ and a head nod, and a repetition of part of the addressee’s previous strategic presentation: ‘like a waiter, (.) that’s what he’s wearing?’.

In line 44, once communication of meaning has already been successfully achieved, the addressee repeats again the TL lexical item ‘waistcoat’ offering a recast to the speaker, i.e. a native-like version of his initial presentation utterance: ‘he’s wearing a waistcoat.’. The learner acknowledges this input of form with a head nod, line 45, and a verbal acknowledgment, ‘ye:ah.’ in line 47, and finally uptakes the TL item in line 50: ‘it’s a waistcoat. (0.6) mm’. He modifies thus his initial output to produce, with the interlocutor’s help, a correct TL version of an originally non-native-like utterance.

Notice that other linguistic problems encountered along this excerpt of interaction have been left aside: the learner’s inability to recognize the meaning of the word ‘braces’, used in line 9, or his erroneous use of ‘arms’ instead of ‘sleeves’, in line 11 –an unconscious mistake according to the learner’s retrospective comments. Learner

---

81 As stated in Chapter Two, p. 131, and illustrated in Chapter Five, p. 275, we consider that CSs are used not only when the speaker is unable to use an unknown TL word, but also when they cannot use a known word because this is not shared with their interlocutor.
and NS have collaborated to create correct TL lexical form, the specific TL form required to express their message in a coherent, appropriate and accurate way.

Language and language knowledge have been co-constructed through collaborative dialogue. In lines 69 and 72 the learner has retained the input provided by the addressee and is able to use it productively. The learner is now using the lexical form ‘waistcoat’ independently, without the NS’s help. What was originally co-constructed language and cognitive processing is now an individual resource. Only three turns, lines 51-68 of the transcript, mediate here between the use of the term ‘waistcoat’ in collaborative dialogue and its independent use. We believe, however, that this can be considered evidence of the learner being in the gradual process of internalizing this TL lexical item, which does not necessarily mean he is going to be able to retain the word in the long term. In fact, later on in the same conversation we see that this learner tries to recall the word ‘waistcoat’ and being unable to do so needs to resort again to the use of a CS: ‘the father. (.) the father:::, (1.0) thing. heh’.

As Swain and Lapkin point out “learning is cumulative, emergent, and ongoing, sometimes occurring in leaps, while at other times it is imperceptible” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 321). We have already argued that L2 lexical acquisition is a complex and gradual phenomenon. We sometimes internalize some features but not others and, in general, we need repetitive input for the acquisition process to be completed. That our learner is not able here to recall the word ‘waistcoat’ does not mean he is not in the process of acquiring it, a process that is gradual, not necessarily linear and not always perceptible.

Assuming, from the analysis of the previous interaction, that no learning has occurred because the learner seems to have forgotten the TL lexical item ‘waistcoat’ would have, in fact, led us to an erroneous conclusion. It is certainly possible that TL
form and knowledge co-constructed in collaborative dialogue do not become internalized, but it is not the case here. In the retrospective interview held between the learner and the researcher, just after the accomplishment of the IL communicative task, this learner is able to retrieve the word ‘waistcoat’ without any kind of modeling support provided by the interlocutor.

EXAMPLE 6.7c: ADV-NS IM: waistcoat

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (293):

I: y luego también cuando estás describiendo el chaleco dices
(and then when you are describing the waistcoat you say)
A: ella me dijo la palabra chaleco? waistcoat?
(she told me the word waistcoat? waistcoat?)
I: sí
(yes)
A: me sonaba a raincoat o algo así y dije no no
(it sounded like raincoat or something like that and i told her no no)
I: sí sí y luego te la vuelve a decir creo
(yes yes and after that she said it again i think)
A: y luego le dije ya vi que había entendido lo que decía y dije ya vale
(and then i told her i notice she had understood what i was saying and i told her okay)

This suggests that in the second extract of interaction, example 6.7b, the learner is not able to accurately produce the TL form ‘waistcoat’ under the time pressure of an ongoing conversation with a NS. This means that he has not yet completely mastered the TL form, i.e. he has no total control over it. It does not mean, however, he has not learnt it at all or he has totally forgotten about it. On the contrary, it seems that the learner is in the process of internalizing it and that, as argued by Swain and Lapkin (1998: 321), this process occurs in leaps being thus sometimes imperceptible.

These conclusions have, at least, two main implications for the analysis of collaborative dialogue. First, collaborative dialogue episodes are occasions for first learning, when new language and new language knowledge are socially co-constructed. But they also need to be seen as occasions for reinforcement, that is, the gradual process of acquisition may be reinforced and thus move on through collaborative dialogue. Secondly, collaborative dialogue initiates a learning (or reinforcement) process that does not necessarily end within the limits of the language-related episode. Relatively often learners are not able to notice and acquire all the features of a new TL form simultaneously, and even when they do so, they may need reinforcing repetitive input before the acquisition of the TL form can be considered definitive.
In the analysis of example 6.6 we saw some data supporting these conclusions. In collaborative dialogue resulting from CS use one of the learners reinforces the knowledge of the TL lexical item ‘sleeves’, a word that this learner claims to know but is unable to retrieve at this specific moment. We also saw how this same learner is able to use the TL expression ‘rolled up’, but not to recognize its morphology and adapt it to ‘rolling up’ when required by a different linguistic context. Here we will provide two more examples of collaborative dialogue in CS episodes that illustrate more clearly these two issues.

In the first CS episode, example 6.8, learner A is unable to retrieve the TL lexical item ‘surprised’. According to the learner’s retrospective comments he knows this word but cannot recall it. He makes explicit his problem by making use of an indirect appeal for help CS: ‘e:h (6.2) >°i don’t know how to say it,°< (1.8) heh’.

This last part of his turn is uttered with low voice and fast speech, which suggest that the learner may be uttering it for himself. That is, it may be considered private speech, i.e. language used to regulate the speaker’s own cognitive activity. However, it is also uttered loud enough for the interlocutor to hear it. In fact, this strategy draws the interlocutor’s attention to the learner’s linguistic problem and elicits her collaboration in its solution. Consciously or not, the learner has brought the interlocutor into the process of building a solution for the communicative and linguistic problem encountered.

EXAMPLE 6.8a: INT-NS SL: surprised
REFERENT: father’s surprised
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (109-118):

1 A:   a:::nd (1.8) his father is::, e:h (6.2) >°i don’t know how to
2     say it,°< (1.8) heh
3 B:   awake? (1.8) heh=
4 A:   =°(i don’t know,)° i don’t know, {afrightened, or:: something
5     {A opens her AA, AB look
6     down}
7 A:   like that,}
8 B:   surprised?
9 A:   yeah, surprised, heh (1.4) a:n::d (3.8) he has::
10 (1.8)
11 B:   his mouth open or?
12 A:   and his mouth is open. [a:n:]d his eyes {very:,} (1.5) heh
13 B:   [uhuh]
14     {A opens her HH in
15     front of her eyes, B
16     is not looking}
17 A:   (0.8) are very open, heh
18 (2.8)
19 B:   yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre se queda asombrado
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (109-118):
A: quería decir asombrado sorprendido
I: no conocías la palabra surprised
A: la conocía la conocía pero no me salía
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK: open mouth

We also see in the transcript that, before an agreement on meaning can be reached, the learner will need to add more CSs to his initial presentation: appeal for help strategies, ‘°(i don’t know,)° i don’t know,’, and an approximation CS, ‘afrightened, or:: something like that,’. The second appeal for assistance strategy is now clearly directed to the addressee.

Although the learner is not able to use the TL form ‘surprised’ in an independent way, when the interlocutor offers different possibilities: ‘awake?’ in line 3 of the transcript, and ‘surprised?’ in line 8, he is able to recognize it. This suggests that at this particular moment the learner had a passive but not an active knowledge of the TL form. With his acceptance move in line 9, ‘yeah, surprised,’ learner and interlocutor build a mutual agreement on the meaning they are trying to communicate and on the accurate TL lexical item to express this meaning.

An analysis of the whole conversation between these two interlocutors reveals that the learner is not only able to notice input of form, recognize its meaning and repeat it, i.e. uptake. We see in the following extracts of the interaction how he is also able to incorporate it and use it, without his interlocutor’s help, in later references to the same idea.

EXAMPLE 6.8b: INT-NS SL: surprised
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (220-221):
1 A: yeah and and the little boy seems seems eh surprised
2 B: yeah
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (271-274):
1 A: the the bald man and the boy’s still surprised with with his mouth open
2 B: yeah
3 A: and the bald man is also surprised with
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-288):
1 A: yeah heh and finally heh heh who is who is surprised
2 B: the (heh)father’s (heh)surprised!
3 A: it’s the father heh

Collaborative dialogue has helped the learner to move from passive to active knowledge. This is also learning. Through dialogue, i.e. language use, learner and NS have contributed to the learner’s gradual acquisition of the TL lexical form ‘surprised’.
In the next example reinforcement in the form of repeated input is also required as the learner is unable to acquire all the features of the TL lexical item ‘stripes’ in one single collaborative dialogue episode.

In the first extract of interaction, lines 91-102 of the transcript of the whole interaction, the learner notices a hole in his IL system: the lack of the desired TL lexical item ‘stripes’. He tries to compensate for this problem presenting a combination of different CSs. He makes repeated use of outlining nonverbal strategies to depict the intended object of reference: drawing lines –cf. lines 4, 7-8 and 11-12 in the transcript. He also makes use of a complete omission strategy, offering an utterance with a gap where the intended but unavailable TL lexical item should be: ‘well ties (.) can see (.) with only one color, or what with’. These strategic attempts to present the content he wants to be added to his and his interlocutor’s shared common ground are also accompanied by indirect appeal for assistance strategies: ‘(heh)i (heh)don’t remember,’ and ‘i don’t (0.5) know,’.

EXAMPLE 6.9a: INT-NS PM: stripes
REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (91-97):
1  A:   a::nd he’s having a tie. {a:: a:::} (xxx) but (heh)i
2                                {A shakes her head}
3  A:   (heh)don’t {remember, hhh the::: (2.6) with;} (2.0)
4                  {A’s RI draws lines in the air ×n}
5  A:   (i don’t (0.5) i don’t know,) {with e:::h hhh} (1.6) well ties
6       {A shakes her head}
7                                     {A’s RI draws lines in the air
8                           ×n}
9  A:   (.) can see (.} {with only one color,} {or what [with]
10                  {A holds up one finger}
11                             {A’s RI draws lines in
12                           the air ×n }
13 B:                                                   [ah! ] with
14 stripes!
15 A:   with stripes. [okay. ]
16 B:                 [ah! he]’s got he’s got a tie with stripes?
17 A:   yeah
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   leva unha corbata que antes non se vía leva unha corbata de raias
SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (91-97):
A:   acordábame que que aprendera o de raias i i non me acordaba como
I:   mhm
A:   expliqueino dixen en vez de ser toda dunha cor dixen as corbatas
     poden ser todas dunha cor ou doutra maneira algo así dixen
RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (91-97):
I:   how did you know the tie was a striped tie? because of the mime?
     because you could imagine it?
B:   yeah because well
I: she told you the tie had two colors
B: yeah yeah and i could imagine
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
plain tie

The native speaking interlocutor identifies the learner’s problem and collaborates to solve it providing what she believes to be the learner’s intended but unavailable TL lexical item and the correct TL form to complete his presentation: ‘ah! with stripes!’. The learner notices this input of form and uptakes it with a repetition: ‘with stripes, okay,’. Notice that, according to the learner’s retrospective comments, this is reinforcement. The learner remembers to have been exposed to the word ‘stripes’ before, but is unable to recall it.

The addressee checks for confirmation in line 16 of the transcript, providing a rephrased TL version of the initial presentation and a second opportunity for the learner to notice the new input: ‘ah! he’s got he’s got a tie with stripes?’ Agreement on meaning and on the co-constructed TL form is definitely established in line 17, with the learner’s acceptance of the modified version of his initial utterance: ‘yeah’.

In the second extract, lines 189-190 of the transcript of the whole interaction between these two interlocutors, we see a second use on the part of the NS of the TL lexical item ‘stripes’ and a new opportunity for the learner to notice this form.

EXAMPLE 6.9b: INT-NS PM: stripes
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (189-190):
4 B:  plain, no {no stripes.}
5      {B nods}
6 A:   {yes}
7      {A nods}

The two previous excerpts of interaction belong to the description of picture two in the picture-story spot-the-difference task. When they come to picture twelve, they need to make a second reference to the concept ‘stripes’. There is now a new character appearing in the story who is also wearing a striped tie.

EXAMPLE 6.9c: INT-NS PM: stripes
REFERENT: striped tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (640-644):
1 A: and he has:: a tie. mm a:: (3.5) strepes? (it [was]?)
2 B:                                              [stri]pes
3 A:  {stripes!=}
4   {A nods}
5 B:   =right
6     (1.5)
7 A:   tie,
The learner tries to use the previously co-constructed knowledge of the TL lexical item ‘stripes’, but is uncertain about the correct pronunciation of the word, i.e. its phonological features: ‘strepes? it was?’ . This reveals that the learner is in the process of acquiring the TL form. He has already internalized some of the features of the word, but not all of them.

The learner is aware of the incompleteness of his knowledge and that his utterance may, subsequently, be ill-formed. He explicitly indicates to his interlocutor the problem he is experiencing, thus triggering more collaborative dialogue: ‘it was?’.

The NS repeats the form ‘stripes’ to correct the learner’s erroneous utterance and provides in this way the help and collaborative support he is asking for: ‘stripes’. The learner notices and uptakes this input, ‘stripes!=’, thus modifying his original output.

We have not enough evidence in our data to trace the learner’s acquisition of this particular form. No more references are made in this interaction to this concept and therefore we cannot know whether, in the future, the learner will be able to make an independent use of this TL lexical item without problems. What is relevant for the purposes of our research is that the interactional exchanges here analyzed show that this learner is in the process of acquiring this TL word. He moved first from passive to active knowledge of the word ‘stripes’, and then from an incomplete to a complete command of the phonological features of the TL word. Through collaborative dialogue these two interlocutors have reinforced the learner’s knowledge of the TL lexical item ‘stripes’. The learner is thus advancing on the gradual process of L2 acquisition. He is actually learning something new in the TL.

6.4. LIMITATIONS OF COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE
In all the examples and CS episodes so far analyzed we have seen how learners and their native or non-native speaking interlocutors build correct TL and TL knowledge. However, when two learners of the same proficiency level are involved in interaction, we cannot always expect them to be able to help each other as desired. Despite their collaborative attempts to solve the linguistic and/or communicative problems
encountered, they may not be able to co-construct the accurate TL form wanted to express their message or, as Swain and Lapkin’s (1998) study has also revealed, co-construct an erroneous TL form and assume that it is correct –cf. Chapter One, pp. 114-115.

In Chapter Five we saw that addressees who collaborate with speakers to create meaning sometimes offer alternative CSs to present the intended message –cf. Chapter Five, sections 5.1.5.1 and 5.2.1.2. From a communicative point of view, this rephrasing of the speaker’s original CS, or combination of CSs, may fulfill two different functions. Sometimes addressees believe that the learner’s strategic presentation has not allowed them to understand the intended message well enough for current purposes. That is, they consider necessary to replace or expand this initial CS in order to be able to build a satisfactory mutual agreement on meaning –cf. examples 5.14 or 5.15 in Chapter Five, pp. 281-285. In other situations we have seen that addressees offer alternative CSs as demonstrations of their correct and satisfactory understanding of the intended message –cf. example 5.10 in Chapter Five, pp. 271-273.

A detailed analysis of this pattern of behavior also indicates that, with this move, the addressee is often suggesting to the speaker that, although the correct and desired TL lexical item to express the meaning they are both collaborating to create is unavailable, there is a TL form that seems more appropriate, or at least more efficient in the current context, than the one initially used by the speaker. In other words, the addressee is collaborating with the speaker to co-construct the most appropriate and efficient TL form available to express their message.

In the next example we see how two intermediate level learners notice a hole in their respective IL systems: the mutual lack of knowledge of the TL lexical item ‘stripes’. After different attempts to develop a means of expression to convey this meaning, the addressee offers the approximate term ‘lines’. Both speaker and addressee agree to use this TL lexical item in subsequent references to the same content. With their IL resources, these two learners are unable to co-construct the correct and desired TL lexical item. They are able, however, to co-construct TL. They co-construct the TL form ‘lines’ as the most appropriate TL lexical item available for these two learners at this specific moment to communicate the meaning corresponding to ‘stripes’.
In the first extract of interaction we see how the two learners establish an agreement on the meaning ‘stripes’ using an approximate term of reference, ‘straps’, and gestures. According to the retrospective interview comments, both learners are aware that this term is not the correct and originally intended TL lexical item, but their phonological similarities help them to build a mutual agreement on meaning. For this purpose they also make repetitive use of outlining nonverbal strategies –cf. lines 7-8, 12-13 and 15 in the transcript.

EXAMPLE 6.10a: INT-INT CL: stripes
REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (139-144):
1  B:   one tie?
2       (1.5)
3  A:   yeah
4  B:   {in his neck,} hhh [e::h]
5       {B’s RH points to her neck with a pencil}
6  A:                      [ah o]kay! {e:h st- with straps? i think,
7                                     {A’s RI draws tie stripes on her
8                          chest}
9  A:   (0.8) that (.) [is]}
10 B:                 {[no]} without stra-, {withou:t=}
11                    {B waves her RI indicating negation}
12                                          {B’s RH draws tie stripes
13                                          in the air}
14 A:   =ah okay, {mine has is is with:, with straps,}
15                {A’s RI draws tie stripes on her chest}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:   eh lleva la ahora se le ve la corbata antes también la llevaba
    pero no se le veía muy bien
A:   mhm
B:   eh no tiene rayas en el tuyo parecía que sí

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (139-144):
I:   tú ahí la entendiste
B:   sí también
...    
A:   sabía que era algo así pero que no
I:   por eso luego pasais a decir lines?
A:   sí lines sonaba mejor

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tie: con/sin rayas

More relevant, for the objectives of our research, is this second interactional excerpt, where the addressee helps the speaker to build an alternative means of expression to compensate for the unavailable one ‘stripes’.

EXAMPLE 6.10b: INT-INT CL: stripes
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (201-206):
1  A:   a:n:::d (1.5) he:: has again the:: {the tie?
2       (A’s LI points to her neck)
3       (1.2)
Learner A tries to present the message using a previously successful outlining nonverbal strategy, i.e. drawing the intended object of reference –cf. line 7. He also makes use of the shared common ground with his interlocutor, describing the tie as ‘like like the other one,’.

Noticing a hole in his IL system, he verbalizes his problem, offers an objective product to be reflected upon and brings his interlocutor into the task of building new TL to communicate the meaning ‘stripes’. The addressee collaborates with him offering, within a confirmation check, the TL lexical item ‘lines’: ‘with lines?’ This is also an approximation CS. The addressee is unable to offer the lexical item the speaker is looking for, but she is able to offer a word that, she believes, conveys the meaning they are both collaborating to communicate in a more accurate way.

This form is noticed and immediately accepted by learner A with an acknowledgment, ‘yes,’ and a repetition, ‘with lines,=’. Learner A modifies his original output incorporating the TL form offered by his interlocutor, which suggests that he recognizes this form as more appropriate and efficient than the ones they have previously used.

Learner A and learner B have co-constructed language. Despite their collaborative efforts to outstrip their command of the TL, they have not been able to reach a correct TL form. They both know ‘lines’ is not the originally intended TL lexical item –cf. retrospective comments. But they have co-constructed an alternative means of expression. Learner A alone was not able to use ‘lines’ as an approximate term for ‘stripes’, he finally does it with his interlocutor’s help.

The agreed term of reference ‘lines’ will be used to communicate the meaning ‘stripes’ twice more during their conversation. They use this form in all future references to the same concept and forget about the previous approximate term ‘straps’,
which suggests, once again, that they have both agreed that ‘lines’ is a more efficient means of expression. In these uses of the word, the rising intonation and the supportive gestures act as a signal that they know the form they are using is not correct TL lexis and needs to be interpreted as an alternative means of expression, that is, as a CS.

EXAMPLE 6.10c: INT-INT CL: stripes
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-310):
1 A: an:id the tie is again {with lines?}
2 (A’s LH points to her neck and draws tie stripes)
3
4 B: hm
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (823-827):
1 B: e:::h (1.4) mm:: the new man has a? (0.5) a tie?
2 (1.2)
3 A: yeah
4 (1.0)
5 B: {with [lines!? ]}
6 (B’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest, A is not looking)
7 A: [with ] lines yes=
8 B: =yes (ah) okay

Learners have focused both on meaning and form, and used language both to co-construct meaning and to co-construct language. Nevertheless, they have been unable to co-construct new correct TL form. Although their communicative problem has been satisfactorily solved, their linguistic problem, i.e. the lack in their IL systems of an accurate and appropriate TL word to express the meaning ‘stripes’, remains an open issue. No learning is seen to occur in their dialogue. But language has been used both as a communicative and a cognitive tool and we can see both communicative and cognitive activity taking place, i.e. collaborative dialogue.

These conclusions have significant pedagogical implications that will soon be discussed. First, we are going to analyze a final a sample of collaborative dialogue occurring in CS episodes. Example 6.11 shows that collaborative dialogues can build incorrect TL form without the learners’ awareness of their error.

EXAMPLE 6.11a: INT-INT FC: badge
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (13-20):
1 A: and and a:: (1.3) {and a jacket,} a:nd with [a:: ] {a kind of}
2 (A’s HH point to his chest)
3
4 B: {{{hm hm}])}
5 {{B nods}}
6 (A’s LH points to where the
7 badge would
8 be on his
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9 A:  e::h (0.8) of painting in::
10 (0.5)
11 B:  painting!?=
12 A:  =a:: bah! painting (0.5) e::h=
13 B:  { (=a blade?}
14 ((B’s RH points to her chest))
15 A:  eso (‘right’)! a blade.)) (1.0) a blade.=
16 B:  =yes

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:  tú ya tienes el escudito?
A:  sí con escudito

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (13-20):
I:  aquí cuando dices a (a kind of) painting?
A:  no sabía cómo se decía escudo no sé no sabía
I:  y tú sabías
B:  bade o blazer o no sé
I:  a badge

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
A blade

Learner A is the one who notices a hole in his IL system. He tries to present the meaning ‘badge’ and realizes he lacks the desired TL lexical item, i.e. the accurate and appropriate TL term to express this meaning. This forces him to stretch his IL system and develop an alternative means of expression. He uses the term ‘painting’, illustrated by a pointing nonverbal strategy, and modified by a hedge, ‘a kind of’, that indicates this is an approximate term and should not be interpreted in its literal sense.

The addressee seems first to be uncertain about the content the learner is trying to present: ‘painting!?’. She soon realizes the learner intends to communicate the meaning ‘badge’ and she offers what she believes to be the correct TL lexical item to express this content: ‘=a blade?’. She is in error, since this word conveys a completely different meaning. A blade is a sword. The learner has erroneously assumed that ‘blade’ means ‘shield’ and that, since in her Spanish NL the meanings ‘shield’ and ‘badge’ are expressed with the same language form, ‘escudo’, this is also the case in English. In Chapter Four, example 4.41, we already saw how the word ‘shield’ was used to communicate the meaning ‘badge’. The analysis of example 4.41 revealed, however, that in this specific CS episode the term ‘shield’ was used as a conscious literal translation CS – cf. Chapter Four, pp. 223-224.

The speaker does not recognize the error either and accepts ‘blade’ as correct TL lexis. He confirms the correctness of the addressee’s understanding, ‘eso’, and uptakes the erroneous input of form provided by his interlocutor: ‘a blade. (1.0) a blade.=’.
Through collaborative dialogue deriving from CS use these two learners have co-constructed incorrect TL and TL knowledge. In future references to the same object during the same conversation they will draw on this co-constructed knowledge and repeat their error. This clearly shows that “learning” is occurring in this collaborative dialogue episode, but this “learning” involves the internalization of an incorrect form.\(^{82}\)

**EXAMPLE 6.11b: INT-INT FC: badge**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (149-151):**

1. B: there’s a bla-? a a:: {a blade} in::?
2. {B's RH points to left side of her chest}
3. 4 A: {yeah,} in the in her jacket, yeah=
4. {A nods}
5. 6 B: =mm:: (2.6) (me not.) (1.3) mm::: not.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (869-872):**

1. B: {with a blade?}
2. {B’s RH points to her chest}
3. (1.0)
4. 4 A: {{with a [blade.]} }
5. {(A nods)}
6. 6 B: [or:: ] blazer, no me acuerdo cómo se dice (‘i don’t remember how do you say it’). (2.3) {blade or blazer.=} 
7. {B’s RH points to chest and draws circles ×n} 
8. 8 A: =yeah

Although in the last excerpt of interaction the addressee seems to start to question the accuracy of the term ‘badge’, neither of the two learners manage to identify the error they have made.

Notice that problems may also occur in NNS-NS interactions. In Chapter Five, example 5.26, we saw how a learner and a NS misunderstand each others’ communicative intentions and their misunderstanding leads the learner to misinterpret the TL expression ‘sleeveless jumper’. The NS uses this TL form believing the learner is trying to make reference to a ‘sleeveless jumper’. The learner believes the addressee has accurately inferred he is trying to express the meaning ‘vest’ and that, therefore, she is offering ‘sleeveless jumper’ as the correct and appropriate TL form to express this meaning –for a detailed analysis of this CS episode see Chapter Five, pp. 311-313.

CS episodes, either between learners or between learners and NSs, resulting in both incorrect TL use and TL knowledge building are extremely rare in our data. Apart

\(^{82}\) Since the term internalized by the learner is not an actual correct TL form to convey this meaning, this cannot be considered real learning. In the lack of a more appropriate term to make reference to this phenomenon we will, however, call it “learning”.
from the two episodes discussed above, the only examples of this kind of behavior we have found are: INT-NS CS: 54-72, INT-NS SL: 209-214, and INT-NS PM: 308-322. Very few examples exhibited the behavior seen in 6.10, i.e. failed attempts to co-construct correct TL lexis leading learners to rephrase an initial speaker’s CS with an alternative CS offered by the addressee: ADV-ADV SO: 204-214 and 314-328, ADV-NS IM: 259-264, INT-INT FC: 521-530 and 875-897, INT-INT SC: 60-69, and INT-INT VM: 264-267. This suggests that, broadly speaking, learners are aware of their limitations and, when unable to build correct TL lexis to express their messages, they prefer to focus exclusively on meaning communication.

These different CS episodes need, however, to be taken into account in our conclusions. They clearly suggest the need, already pointed out by Swain and Lapkin (1998), of some kind of teacher feedback on learner-learner interaction –cf. Chapter One, p. 115.

In example 6.10 we see how an opportunity for the two learners to develop their TL lexical knowledge is being missed. Without some extra help, these learners will remain uncertain about the correct TL form to convey the meaning ‘stripes’. In a classroom situation, as opposed to the experimental condition we are analyzing here, students have always the opportunity to ask for help from the teacher or even a third learner. They have noticed a hole and focused their attention on a TL form they are not yet familiar with. Learning, however, will not occur until they find a means to fill this hole.

Example 6.11 is more problematic from a pedagogical perspective. Learners may remain in error if they receive no negative feedback at all in their interaction. This strategic interactional exchange strongly suggests the need of teacher’s feedback or control on the accuracy of the final product of any collaborative work.

In sum, collaborative dialogues and CS use as a trigger for collaborative dialogue constitute an occasion for L2 lexical development. They offer an opportunity for language learners to influence and expand each other’s IL systems. But the learners’ use of language to build language knowledge has also limitations that need to be taken

83 In previous research learners’ construction of incorrect TL and TL knowledge in collaborative dialogue was also relatively infrequent. In Swain and Lapkin (1998) 24 language-related episodes were analyzed: 23 resulted in a correct solution and only one in a wrong solution. In LaPierre’s (1994) study 140 episodes resulted in a correct solution and 21 in an incorrect one.
into account and compensated for by the teacher. In the context of the FL classroom, the teacher has a significant role to play in the process of SLA through learner-learner interaction.

6.5. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS: THE ROLE OF CSs IN THE L2 LEARNING PROCESS AND THE FL CLASSROOM CONTEXT

Taken altogether, the analyses conducted all through this chapter show that CS use in FL interaction can be a trigger for collaborative dialogue, and CS episodes can be considered as an occasion for L2 lexical development. This research reveals that the use of CSs, more specifically the use of achievement CSs in face-to-face FL interaction, may help the learner not only to communicative their messages but also to enhance their TL knowledge.

From a pedagogical perspective it seems thus that CS use should be seen not only as the result of a learner’s IL shortcoming, but also as an instrument for the development of this IL system. This means that CS use can be exploited for the purposes of L2 development. In general, it seems that encouraging learners to communicate beyond the limits of their current TL lexical knowledge, in their interactions with both NSs and NNSs, may have a positive influence in their SLA process.

However, we need to say that CS use does not always result in collaborative dialogue. The results of the analyses carried out in this chapter cannot be generalized to all CS episodes or all CS uses. Whereas in some episodes learners and interlocutors engage in the collaborative creation of meaning, language and linguistic knowledge; they focus more often exclusively on meaning, ignoring accurate TL construction and TL knowledge building.

In this section we intend to identify some of the factors that may prompt learners to engage in collaborative dialogue after the use of a CS. That is, we intend to identify, within the limits of our research, what are the conditions that may foster more collaborative dialogue in CS episodes and in this way help to clarify the role that CS use may play in the L2 learning process and the FL classroom.

Although no quantitative analyses have been conducted in our data, as this was not certainly the aim of our research, a quick look at Appendix C reveals that
collaborative dialogue in our CS episodes is rather infrequent. In most of the CS episodes elicited and examined for the purposes of our study, learners and their interlocutors, both NSs and NNSs of the TL, concentrate exclusively on meaning. They collaborate to create meaning but ignore form. They care about the satisfactory communication of their messages but they are not concerned with expressing these messages with coherent, appropriate and accurate TL lexis. In sum, in most CS episodes there is conversational dialogue and no collaborative dialogue.

We have included below a table that contains those CS episodes identified in our data that involve some kind of collaborative dialogue. These have been classified into three different groups: firstly, collaborative dialogue and evidence of individual performance, as we saw in the analysis of examples 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9; secondly, collaborative dialogue with no evidence available in our data of later individual performance, as in examples 6.1, 6.4;\(^84\) and, thirdly, collaborative dialogue but no construction of correct and intended TL lexis and lexical knowledge, as in examples 6.10 and 6.11. As we have been doing all through this study, we identify each episode using the two first letters of the first name of the two interlocutors and the lines of the transcript of the whole interaction between these two interlocutors to which the CS episode belongs. In this way the reader can find in Appendix C the full transcription of each of these CS episodes as well as their analysis.

**TABLE 6.1. CS EPISODES AND COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE AND EVIDENCE OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE: Collaborative dialogue is used and there is evidence of a later individual learner use of the co-constructed TL and TL knowledge</th>
<th>ADV-ADV DYADS</th>
<th>ADV-NS DYADS</th>
<th>INT-INT DYADS</th>
<th>INT-NS DYADS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^84\) As explained in the analysis of example 6.7, this lack of evidence does not necessarily mean the learner is not in the process of acquiring new TL lexis.
COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUE BUT NO EVIDENCE OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE: Collaborative dialogue is used but there is no evidence available in our data that the learner has retained the co-constructed TL and TL knowledge.

| BS: 381-385 | IM: 378-381 | BS: 73-78 |
| IM: 444-446 | IM: 381-385 | BS: 64-66 |
| IM: 469-472 | IM: 444-446 | IM: 381-385 |
| RA: 36-39 | RA: 138-143 | RA: 254-262 |

These CS episodes without doubt constitute a rather small percentage of the total of CS uses identified in our data. Furthermore, in this table we can observe clear differences, not only between the four different types of dyads but also between different pairs of interlocutors within the same dyad condition. Whereas some learners and their interlocutors engage relatively often in meaning and form construction processes, others tend to focus almost exclusively on meaning.

In order to understand these results we need, first, to take into account the nature of the task employed for the collection of the data. As described in Chapter Three, section 3.2.1, the picture-story spot-the-difference task designed for the purposes of our research is a referential communicative task, i.e. it is not a collaborative task. It focuses learners’ attention on meaning, not on form. For the successful accomplishment of this task learners and their interlocutors need to communicate meaning and thus be able to identify the differences existing between their two versions of the same picture-story.
They do not need to employ accurate and appropriate TL lexis for this purpose. In other words, focus on form is not a requirement of the task at hand.

This type of communicative task has proved fruitful to elicit frequent CS use and has thus provided us with a considerable amount of data to give answer to the first question which prompted our research, i.e. to explain how meaning is created in face-to-face FL interaction when the desired TL lexical item to express this meaning is not available or not shared by the interlocutors. It has not, however, prompted a frequent use of collaborative dialogue. This kind of dialogue is only used when, in face of a communicative problem, conversation participants decide spontaneously not only to communicate meaning but also to try to do it with accurate and appropriate TL lexis.

This task may therefore not be very appropriate if, in the context of a FL classroom, we want to foster collaborative dialogue between learners. For this end we should rather use a collaborative task. For instance, we could use this same task asking our learners and their interlocutors to present a final collaboratively written report on the differences found between the two versions of the story.85

For the purposes of our research, however, the communicative task we have employed is more interesting. It can help us identify why some learners engage spontaneously in frequent collaborative dialogue as a result of CS use, while others do not do it. Analyzing the performance of the picture-story task and the information obtained from the following retrospective interview, we have been able to identify three different factors that seem to have a direct influence on this issue: linguistic knowledge, personal situation and social variables.

In the case of learner-learner dyads attention is quite often focused only on meaning because the two learners are aware of their TL knowledge limitations to build correct L2 lexis in order to express their messages in a coherent, suitable and accurate way. As explained in the analysis of example 6.10, learners are not always able to help other learners as desired. In our CS episodes, learners, relatively often, identify IL shortcomings that are also shared with their same level interlocutors. Neither of the two

85 As explained in Chapter One, collaborative tasks require learners to communicate meaning in the FL, like communicative tasks, but they also encourage them to focus on the form they use to communicate this meaning. In Chapter One we saw how, by demanding from the learners the joint production of a final written or, less often, oral text, collaborative tasks prompt these learners to focus on form, i.e. to collaborate in the creation of the linguistic structures necessary to produce this final text with the highest possible degree of appropriateness and accuracy –cf. Chapter One, pp. 120-121.
learners knows the correct TL lexical item to express their intended message and they both need to agree on an alternative means of communication, i.e. a CS or combination of CSs.

This is not surprising at all and is certainly an expectable result. However, we have observed that the explanatory value of this argument is very limited. It could, apparently, help us to explain why learner-learner dyads did not engage in collaborative dialogue very frequently, but it cannot explain why certain NNS-NS dyads also tended to refuse this kind of collaboration. No examples of collaborative dialogue use in CS episodes where, for instance, identified in the interaction of the dyad ADV-NS CS, and only four instances of collaborative dialogue occurred in INT-NS SL, as opposed to the twelve occurring in INT-NS PM or the six in INT-INT FC.\textsuperscript{86} It seems, therefore, that there have to be other factors or conditions playing a more important influence on our interlocutors’ behavior than their command of the TL.

During the retrospective interview, we asked the interlocutors involved in the dyad ADV-NS CS about their behavior. The NS acting as the receiver claimed to be aware that the learner had encountered relatively frequent shortcomings in his IL system and used alternative means of expression to compensate for them, i.e. CSs. The native speaking addressee also said that she had never tried to help the learner, providing the TL lexical item he was striving for, because it had just not been necessary. This NS affirmed that the learner had a very good level of English and that she had been able to understand everything he was trying to say, even when he was clearly making use of a CS. Since the task could be successfully accomplished without the need of accurate and appropriate TL lexis, this NS preferred not to correct or rephrase the learner’s use of the TL.

The NS in the dyad INT-NS PM showed, however, a totally different attitude towards the task. In the retrospective interview she recognized to have corrected or rephrased the learner’s speech relatively often, providing on repeated occasions those TL lexical items the learner was apparently having trouble with. The NS also said that she had not acted in this way because she had difficulties to understand the learner.

\textsuperscript{86} This quantitative information has been included here only for illustrative purposes. We do not intend to draw any final conclusion from this data, since, as already explained, no quantitative and statistical analyses have been carried out for this purpose.
According to her comments, she was just trying to help him make a more appropriate and accurate use of the TL.

The learner acting as receiver in the dyad INT-INT FC also displayed a similar attitude. In the retrospective interview she said that she had been sometimes too slow and had spent too much time on the task because she wanted her and her interlocutor to describe the pictures with the highest possible degree of accuracy and appropriateness. Furthermore, she also made explicit on several occasions her intention to identify all the differences existing between the two versions of the story, even though this was not a strict requirement of the task.\(^7\) This suggests she took the performance of the task rather seriously.

What the retrospective interviews reveal is that the different participants approached the performance of the same task in various ways. This variation is in line with Coughlan and Duff’s (1994) already discussed claim that the same task is not the same task for all students –cf. Chapter One, p. 119. The researcher, through task design, imposed a goal: communication of meaning. This goal was accomplished by all the participants. But some of them generated and tried to accomplish a sub-goal: communication of meaning with coherent, accurate and appropriate language use.

It seems that, because of their personality and/or particular learning styles\(^8\) some learners intended to perform the task proposed by the researcher with the least possible effort. Others, however, attempted to go beyond. They cared much more about precision and accurateness. With the collaboration of their interlocutors, they set their own agendas and tried to take advantage of all the occasions that they believed could directly or indirectly help them to develop their TL knowledge.

Notice that there is variability among learners but also among NSs. Some NSs are more ready to help and provide input, whereas others tend to focus on meaning and on solving the communicative problems encountered as quickly as possible and with the minimum possible effort. To correct and to help the learner build new TL and TL knowledge is an investment of time and energy that not all NSs are willing to make.

---

\(^7\) In fact, no dyad was able to identify all the differences existing between the two versions of the picture-story.

\(^8\) Following Ellis (1994), by learning styles we make reference to the different ways in which different individuals, with different cognitive and affective behaviors, perceive, approach and respond to a particular learning task –for a detailed account of learning styles and how they influence the language learning process see Ellis (1994: 499-508).
From a sociocultural perspective, this kind of variability is explained within the theoretical framework of *Activity theory* (Wertsch, 1979b) and its basic principle that “human purposeful activity is based on motives” (Donato, 1994: 36). In this view, different individuals approach the same activity with different motives. These motives shape and guide their activities, lead them to set their own goals and to maximize and select some actions over others so that their particular goals can be successfully accomplished –cf. Donato (1994: 36-37). This means that learners’ “values, assumptions, beliefs, rights, duties, and obligations” (Donato, 2000: 46), in other words, their “experiences and motives for language learning and their linguistic, cognitive, and affective conditions” (Lee, 2000: 84), shape their social interactions and the way these social interactions construct learning.

Tarone (1977) also suggested the possibility that learners’ personality could affect their CS use and, as seen in Chapter One, pp. 51-52; other researchers have tried to build on this issue –cf. Haastrup and Phillipson (1983), Luján-Ortega and Clark (2000), or Littlemore (2001).

More research is required in order to find out what different learners find appealing and relevant about the same activity, in particular, how different learners interpret strategic communication and its learning potential, and what personal variables influence these beliefs, attitudes and behavior. These questions cannot be answered within the limits of our study. We can, however, conclude, from the results of our research, that we cannot always expect learners to engage spontaneously in collaborative dialogue. If, either with pedagogical or research intentions, we want learners' strategic interaction to develop into collaborative dialogue, we need tasks specifically designed for this purpose. That is, we need tasks that encourage students to reflect on language form while still being oriented to meaning creation, i.e. in which learners have to talk about language in order to be able to communicate meaning. But even when using these types of tasks we will always need to consider that different students will approach them in different ways and, subsequently, profit differently from them –cf. Swain and Lapkin (1998) or Swain (2000).

We pointed out above the possibility that some social factors or variables could also influence learners’ and NSs’ behavior during strategic communication. We have found, analyzing again the retrospective interviews comments, that certain social
preconceptions of the individuals taking part in our study have constrained the occurrence of collaborative dialogue in CS episodes.

Some learners and some NSs, although the latter to a lesser extent, have centered on meaning and ignored their interlocutor’s non-target-like forms in order to create an effective social interaction. They feel that correcting or rephrasing their interlocutors’ strategic utterances could be perceived as a face threatening behavior.

The learner acting as receiver in the ADV-NS LT dyad admitted to consider herself a “too impolite” person because she was always correcting her peer classmates. She even affirmed: “I know correcting is too impolite. I do it all the time. I know I should not do it”.  

We know, from previous research (Goffman, 1967; Brown and Levinson, 1978), that other-correction among adults is generally considered a face threatening behavior and, as such, usually avoided –cf. Faerch and Kasper (1983c) and Morris (2002) for a discussion of this issue in the context of FL communication. We also know that learners bring into the classroom their social preconceptions and expectations, and that these affect their behavior, their interactions and their L2 learning processes –cf. Morris and Tarone (2003).

We have also found learners who interpret correction as help giving and actively encourage this kind of behavior. The two learners in the dyad ADV-ADV SO made explicit in the retrospective interview this belief towards error correction. In fact, the transcript of their conversation reveals that it is possible to attend to form while focusing on meaning, to correct each others’ errors or non-native-like utterances, and still maintain an effective social interaction. We need to say, however, that this attitude is rather rare among the learners and NSs participating in our study.

Once again, it is necessary to take into account the experimental conditions in which the data was collected. Attitudes and behaviors in interaction derive to a considerable extent from the social structure of the context and the social relationship existing between interlocutors. These are certainly different in a classroom situation than in an experimental environment.

From a research perspective, this means that the results and conclusions of our study cannot be directly extrapolated to the classroom context. Research conducted in an ongoing classroom may provide a different perspective and will certainly allow a
more realistic assessment of how strategic communication, collaborative dialogue and L2 learning may occur in everyday learner-learner interaction. At the same time, a different kind of research is also needed in order to identify how learner-NS interactions taking place outside the academic context may aid the learner to develop their IL system. The NS is generally perceived as an expert. Therefore the social structure in this kind of context should be different to the one existing inside a classroom where same level students interact with each other.

We can, however, draw some pedagogical implications within the limits of our study. It seems that, if we want learners to collaborate with each other and to take advantage of strategic communication as a source for collaborative dialogue and L2 learning, the appropriate social environment needs to be created. We argued above that for collaborative dialogue to arise and for learners to engage in the co-construction of accurate and appropriate TL, tasks specifically designed for this purpose are necessary, i.e. collaborative versus communicative tasks. These collaborative tasks may not yield the desired results if a positive attitude towards collaborative work is not fostered among learners. Our research supports Donato’s (1994) claim that learners can exert a positive influence on each others’ IL systems. But it seems that for this to occur, or at least for learners to be able to take the maximum advantage of their peers’ help, a favorable social context is also needed. Again, this brings the teacher into the stage of the SLA process. The teacher, as moderator and facilitator of learner-learner interaction, may play an important role, raising their students’ awareness to the value of collaborative work and creating in the classroom a positive environment for SLA to take place.

6.6. SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter evidence has been offered suggesting that in CS episodes language is sometimes used for both communicative and cognitive purposes. When lexical difficulties arise in FL interaction and a CS needs to be used, learners and interlocutors may collaborate not only to create meaning, but also to build accurate and appropriate TL lexis to express this meaning, and new TL knowledge for the FL learner. This means that, under certain conditions, CS use can be a source for collaborative dialogue and
strategic communication an occasion for the development of the learner’s FL lexical knowledge.

In the CS episodes analyzed all through this chapter we have observed different ways in which learners and their native or non-native speaking interlocutors collaborate to create meaning, form and knowledge. We have seen them formulate and test hypotheses, offer and assess alternatives, and apply the resulting knowledge to solve their shared linguistic and communicative problems. In these processes they have explicitly talked about language, and have used both their L1 and their L2 as a cognitive tool to reflect on and manipulate the TL. These language mediated cognitive activities have built, or have initiated the building of, new TL lexical knowledge. In some situations, they have also served to reinforce already existing knowledge.

The limitations of this particular form of knowledge building activity have also been pointed out. In learner-learner interactions some feedback is sometimes required in order to guarantee that the co-constructed TL form is actually correct and accurate TL lexis. In general, we cannot expect strategic communication to evolve spontaneously into collaborative dialogue. In the FL classroom the necessary conditions for this to occur need to be fostered by the teacher. Learners’ attention needs to be drawn to both meaning and form, for instance through the use of collaborative tasks; furthermore, a favorable environment for collaboration has to be created.

On the one hand, our research has served to relate CS use to the process of SLA. As seen in Chapter One, pp. 66-67, CSs have been generally studied as part of language use, but not of language learning. Research on CSs has thus been considered to belong to the “more humble approach” of describing L2 use without making claims about L2 learning (Yule and Tarone, 1991: 169). Our analyses reveal, however, that CS use may be directly related to L2 learning, and that it can be seen and studied as a trigger for cognitive processes leading to SLA.

Strategic communication fosters noticing, input, feedback, attention to form and collaborative dialogue. Most of these phenomena have been generally studied in relation to negotiation of meaning interaction and feedback interactional moves, i.e. as a result of message comprehensibility problems or learners’ erroneous utterances. Our research suggests that CS use, more specifically the use of achievement CSs in face-to-face FL interaction, can also set off these processes, prompt collaborative dialogues, and be thus
an aid to L2 learning that needs to be taken into account by SLA researchers and FL teachers alike.

On the other hand, we have shown that collaborative dialogues have an important role to play in L2 lexical development. As seen in section 1.3.2.2 of Chapter One, Swain and Lapkin (1998) paid some attention to lexis-based language-related episodes where learners need to talk about TL vocabulary in order to create meaning. However, most research on collaborative dialogue, as most research on interaction and SLA, has focused on grammar and grammatical development. In fact, Swain concludes her theoretical account of the concept of collaborative dialogue and its role in SLA claiming that “tasks which engage students in collaborative dialogue … might be particularly useful for learning strategic processes as well as grammatical aspects of language” (Swain, 2000: 112). Our study suggests, however, that the role of collaborative dialogue for the learning of lexical aspects of the FL should not be overlooked.

On this basis we can say that our investigation has implications for both the SLA research and the FL teaching practice. CS use as a trigger for collaborative dialogue and a subsequent aid to L2 development can be promoted in the FL classroom. But, apart from this, it also seems to constitute an interesting object of research. It may contribute to enhance our understanding of how L2 lexical knowledge is acquired and developed. We have here provided some initial evidence of what collaborative dialogue occurring in CS episodes can do for learning, but certainly much more research is still required on this issue.

As also pointed out in Chapter Five, p. 320, the present study is limited to the analysis of FL strategic interaction within dyads involving learners with a considerable command of the TL. Further research is therefore necessary in order to establish whether low level learners can offer the same kind of collaborative help to their peers as intermediate and advanced proficiency students. It will also be interesting to examine how this collaboration is carried out in larger groups of conversational participants; and if overhears, that is, learners not directly involved in collaborative dialogue but observing the collaboration of other learners, can also benefit, and to what extent, from this form of knowledge building activity.
The experimental condition of our research is also a limitation of the present study that needs to be taken into account. More than a drawback, however, we consider this a necessary condition for the particular kind of investigation we have conducted. By controlling the context and nature of the interaction, we have been able to elicit the specific kind of data we needed to bring CS use and strategic communication into the arena of language learning studies. This research design has made it possible to show the relationship existing between strategic interaction and L2 learning, a first and necessary step to suggest the need and suitability of further research investigating this issue in a variety of conditions and contexts.
CONCLUSIONS
AND
SUGGESTIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
The evidence yielded by this project shows that the objectives of the study have been satisfactorily accomplished. We can conclude that when a CS is used in FL interaction learners and interlocutors collaborate to create meaning and, under certain conditions, language and linguistic knowledge are also constructed.

In this final chapter we intend to complete our work with a general discussion of the project, its results, conclusions and research as well as pedagogical implications. We evaluate the theoretical background outlined for the purposes of our investigation, the methodological design employed for the collection of the data and the framework of analysis that guided our project. We summarize the main results obtained in an attempt to clarify the relationships existing between them and thus assess their value for the understanding of CS use and strategic communication in FL interaction. This will allow us to draw some final conclusions on the theoretical and practical implications of the present work and to highlight what we consider to be the main contributions of this study to the SLA field.

To close this chapter, and our work, we consider the limitations of the current investigation, discuss the questions that have arisen and that could not be answered within the limits of our study and, on this basis, make some suggestions for future research.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE PRESENT STUDY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have approached the study of CSs by drawing on three primary areas of knowledge: CS research, L1 communication studies and interactionist perspectives on SLA. The theoretical background of our investigation has therefore been outlined taking into account previous advances made in these three different fields. We have been able to integrate their theoretical and analytical frameworks, to make these separate strands of research fit together and to relate them to the study of CSs. This has made it possible to describe and explain CS use and strategic communication from quite a comprehensive perspective and, in this way, to achieve a broader and deeper understanding of how CSs work in FL interaction. On these grounds we can now conclude that the investigation has contributed, on the one hand, to highlight the relationship existing between these three different areas of knowledge, and on the other hand, to confirm, as previously
suggested by some scholars such as Kasper and Kellerman (1997), that new and interesting insights on CSs can be obtained by linking the study of these strategies to the work being carried out in other related domains of research.

With the aim of gaining a better and more comprehensive understanding of the concept of CSs, the use that FL learners make of these problem-solving devices and the current state of the research on this issue, our work was initiated with a review of the most influential literature published to date on CSs. This review, carried out in section 1.1 of Chapter One, reveals that the study of CSs has been approached within the field of SLA from two different perspectives: the psycholinguistic and the interactional. Psycholinguistic scholars have treated CSs as mental processes and focused their attention on the cognitive activities learners engage in when becoming aware that a linguistic difficulty has arisen in FL communication. The defenders of the interactionist position, however, have considered CSs as elements of the interaction and centered their analyses on the linguistic features and communicative value of the strategic utterances learners produce as a result of these strategic cognitive processes.

The interest of the present study lies in CS use in FL interaction. One of its main objectives is to explain how learners and their interlocutors manage to communicate their messages when a CS needs to be used in face-to-face oral exchanges. For these reasons, CSs are described and analyzed as elements of this interaction. In other words, within the controversy existing between psycholinguistic and interactional researchers, we have clearly placed ourselves on the interactional side.

Our review of CS literature also shows that, even among researchers adopting a similar theoretical perspective, there exists a lack of agreement on the issue of the definition of CSs and the criteria that need to be used in order to distinguish these from other related IL phenomena. With the aim of illustrating our understanding of the concept of CS and thus delimiting the object of study of the present investigation, at the beginning of our empirical study we propose our own working definition of CSs.

Like Tarone (1981), we consider strategic communication as “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981: 288). In our study, CSs are regarded as interactional tools used to build a mutual agreement on meaning. This implies that strategic communication is understood as an overall communicative process involving
actions by both the speaker and the interlocutor; and CSs are conceived and analyzed as a necessary part of this overall process.

Within this framework we outline a definition of CSs that builds directly on Tarone’s (1981), and is therefore a development of her original proposal. We thus characterize CSs as problem-solving devices consciously used by the speaker when they believe the linguistic structures desired to convey their messages are not available. We also distinguish two main forms of strategic behavior: the avoidance of the originally intended message or the attempt to develop an alternative means of expression to convey this message.

Tarone’s original description of CSs accounts for the interlocutor only as a possible source of linguistic difficulties. CSs are employed when an initially intended TL item or structure cannot be used for the purposes of communication either because it is not available in the speaker’s IL system or because it is not yet part of the interlocutor’s TL knowledge. We agree with her on this issue. However, on the basis that problems occurring during face-to-face interaction are mutually shared problems and their solution the responsibility of all the participants, we believe that an interactional definition of CSs needs to acknowledge at least another two levels for the role of the interlocutor. Our definition makes explicit that a CS may be used with both the speaker’s and the interlocutor’s awareness that a linguistic difficulty has been encountered. This means that both the speaker and the interlocutor can collaborate to develop the CS or CSs used to solve this shared difficulty.

CSs result relatively often in erroneous or non-target-like utterances and are accompanied in interaction by pauses, fillers, drawls, repetition, hedges or appeals for assistance. These constitute evidence that a communicative problem is being confronted and a CS is being used. The analyses conducted in Chapter Four for CS identification purposes confirm, as previously suggested by Færch and Kasper (1983b), that learners may deliberately avoid the occurrence of these IL performance features in order to conceal their problems as well as their strategic behavior from their interlocutors. More often, however, they make a more or less conscious use of these features that serve to raise their interlocutor’s awareness of their shared problem. Subsequent analyses suggest that they intentionally use them to elicit their interlocutors’ help for the solution of the problem and/or to warn these interlocutors that they are making use of a CS that
cannot always be correctly interpreted in its literal sense. In Chapter Five, section 5.3.3, we see the interlocutor’s literal interpretation of a CS as being a major source of misunderstandings and communication breakdowns in strategic interaction.

The analyses conducted in our study also yield empirical data that suggests that, although the speaker originally encountering a linguistic deficit is the one who usually develops an alternative means of expression to compensate for it, interlocutors may also play an active role in this process. They may infer the meaning the speaker is trying to communicate and offer their own CS to convey it, propose an alternative CS to complete or clarify the content of an initial strategy presented by the speaker, or collaborate with the speaker to create a joint but single CS.

Chapters four, five and six thus provide empirical support for the coherence and consistency of the working definition of CSs proposed in Chapter Two. They confirm that, in face-to-face interaction, a CS may be developed by the speaker who originally experiences the linguistic gap or by their addressee. They also suggest that, for a mutual agreement on a meaning to be successfully achieved, often all the interlocutors need to be aware that a communicative problem is being confronted and that a CS is being used. It seems, therefore, that the changes we make on Tarone’s (1981) original description of CSs enhance its explanatory value. Our working definition seems to offer a more comprehensive framework of analysis for the identification and description of CSs in face-to-face oral interaction.

This definition has also made it possible for us to narrow down the scope of our research to the study of lexical CSs –those CSs used to overcome lexical IL shortcomings, ignoring other possible sources of difficulty, such as phonological, grammatical or pragmatic deficits. This could be considered a drawback. However, the study seems to have benefited from this restriction in focus. The analyses conducted in subsequent chapters show that it would have been impossible to carry out a rigorous and exhaustive study of every type of CS within the limits of our project.

In this sense it is also necessary to say that the IL data collection procedure specifically designed for the purposes of our research has proved to be a fruitful source of evidence, eliciting frequent use of this particular form of CSs in an interactional context. Picture-story tasks have been frequently employed for the study of CSs because they allow the researcher to obtain representative samples of unplanned and extended IL...
discourse but with a certain degree of control on the content. Chapter Three describes how, for the current work, the traditional picture-story task was adapted and converted into a spot-the-difference activity. In this way we managed to keep the necessary level of control on the content of the data while at the same time fostering interaction between our participants.

This communicative task encouraged different dyads of interlocutors to try to establish a mutual agreement on a fixed set of pre-established items. The selection of these items – the non-shared target referents, was based on the results of a previous pilot study, which guaranteed that they would pose frequent lexical difficulties to both intermediate and advanced level learners. This made it possible to elicit a substantial and representative amount of strategic interaction and to analyze different individuals’ strategic behavior in the communication of the same set of referents.

As explained in Chapter Three, this picture-story spot-the-difference task was performed by a total of sixteen dyads of subjects: four dyads of intermediate level learners of English as a L2, four dyads of advanced level learners, four dyads of intermediate learners interacting with English NSs and four dyads of advanced level learners in interaction with NSs. The participation in our project of students with two different levels of proficiency in the FL, who interacted with other same level students as well as with NSs of the TL, helped to enhance the representativeness of our data and the generalizability of the results obtained.

FL learners were also asked to complete a second version of the picture-story task in their NL, after which all the participants had to hold a retrospective interview with the researcher. In this post-activity comments were elicited on their English language interactions, the communicative problems they had confronted and how they had tried to solve them. These two instruments provided us with a combination of NL baseline material and retrospective data that turned out to be an invaluable source of information for the purposes of CS analysis.

Although the content of the spot-the-difference task was pre-selected, participants had a considerable degree of freedom to decide the specific aspects of the content on which they wanted to focus their attention, and how or when they were going to try to communicate them. We intended, in this way, to make our data as close as possible to spontaneous and unplanned naturally occurring FL interactions. This posed
an added difficulty for the researcher, who had to screen learners and interlocutors’ IL performance in search for lexical difficulties and subsequent CS uses.

The procedure followed for the purposes of CS identification is described in section 4.1 of Chapter Four. It is based on a triangulation of three different sources of evidence: IL performance features, NL baseline data and retrospective comments. As previously claimed by scholars such as Tarone and Yule (1989) or Poulisse et al. (1990) the results obtained confirm that, for CS identification purposes, the researcher cannot rely exclusively on the analysis of IL speech. We have already mentioned that some learners, in certain situations, are able to conceal the strategic nature of their interactional behavior. These hidden uses are not very frequent, but they can only be recognized with the speaker’s help. On this basis we conclude that in order to be able to identify CS uses in FL interaction with the highest possible degree of reliability and consistency the researcher always needs to resort to retrospective and, if possible, NL data.

The aim of this project was not to compare different learners’ use of different CS types. However, in order to organize an otherwise too heterogeneous and unmanageable sample of data, we had to classify the strategies identified in the previous stage of the research into a limited set of categories. Our review of CS literature shows that previous scholars have designed a wide range and variety of CS taxonomies. In Chapter One we examine and discuss these different taxonomic proposals. For the purposes of this study, in Chapter Four we decide to draw on Dörnyei and Kormos’ categorization of what they have called ‘lexical problem-solving mechanisms’ (Dörnyei and Kormos, 1998).

So far, we consider this to be the most updated and comprehensive taxonomy of CSs available within the SLA field, although we have had to revise it in order to make it coherent with the working definition of CSs outlined in Chapter Two. Here we ignore Dörnyei and Kormos’ 1998 classification of specific CS types into more encompassing psycholinguistic categories. We do, however, maintain their binary distinction between avoidance and achievement CSs. The three types of avoidance devices proposed by these scholars are reduced to two –topic avoidance and message abandonment. Restructuring is considered an IL phenomenon directly resulting from CS use, but not a CS in itself. Finally, a category of nonverbal strategies, previously overlooked by Dörnyei and Kormos (1998), is also included in the taxonomy. The classification
analyses carried out in section 4.2 of Chapter Four attest to the suitability of these changes and confirm that the taxonomy selected provides a coherent and consistent framework of analysis for the classification of our data.

In line with the theoretical perspective adopted in our research and the definition of the object of study discussed above, CSs are classified from an interactional approach. This means that we analyze the interaction taking place between the two interlocutors. We understand CSs not as independent units but as elements of this interaction. Therefore, we pay attention to the surface realization of these strategies and to the context in which they are used. Whenever necessary, NL baseline data and retrospective comments are used as a complementary source of information to understand the phenomena occurring in FL interaction.

The results obtained with this analytical approach reveal, first, that in face-to-face interaction speakers and interlocutors rely very rarely on the use of one single CS to convey their intended messages. They usually resort to sequential or simultaneous combinations of different types of strategies. For instance in section 4.2 of Chapter Four we see that circumlocutions sometimes involve the use of an approximation strategy, that all-purpose words are quite frequently supported by strategic gestures, or that appeals for assistance appear, almost invariably, in combination with some other kind of oral or nonverbal CS.

Two combined strategies illustrate and support each other in such a way that one cannot be totally understood without the other. In particular, our analyses show that nonverbal strategies are used extremely often in face-to-face interaction to clarify or complement the content of co-occurring oral strategies. Previous research has tended to ignore nonverbal devices for methodological convenience. Our study suggests, however, that even when attention is focused on oral CSs, serious consideration also needs to be given to concurrent strategic kinesic and paralinguistic activity. A real and accurate understanding of oral CSs cannot be achieved if nonverbal behavior is ignored or overlooked.

When different strategies are used to convey one single meaning, not all of them are always presented by the same interactional participant. We have already explained that our working definition of CSs accounts for the fact that a strategy may be uttered by the speaker, who originally encounters a lexical gap in their IL system, or by their
interlocutor. In Chapter Four, as well as in subsequent chapters of the present study, the evidence shows that interlocutors sometimes respond to a speaker’s CS or problem indicator offering an alternative means of expression to convey what they believe to be the speaker’s intended message. Furthermore, it also shows that certain CSs, such as circumlocutions, can be extended through several turns and be jointly constructed by two interlocutors. The addressee may add new information to a description initiated by the speaker if they believe it necessary for the successful communication of the message. Whether we consider this kind of behavior as a single circumlocution strategy co-constructed by two interlocutors or as two different CSs, it is clear that, in order to understand how communication of meaning is achieved in these interactional exchanges, attention needs to be paid to the interrelated strategic actions of all the conversational participants. Speaker and interlocutor build on each other’s utterances and their behavior cannot be truly understood if their CSs are interpreted as independent units and isolated from the context of the interaction.

Finally, the classification analyses conducted in Chapter Four also show that speakers and addressees rely on the co-constructed context of the ongoing interaction for the purposes of CS use. Certain approximations, all-purpose words and complete omission strategies cannot be understood if what has been said before in the conversation is not considered. Some avoidance strategies are in fact used with postponing rather than real avoidance intentions, but this cannot be recognized by the researcher if subsequent interactional moves are ignored. These analyses also reveal that, when a second or third reference is made in the same interaction to the same object, action or idea, speakers build on the strategic means of expression used for the first reference. Often they simplify a previously successful strategy or resort to an apparently empty or meaningless expression that, however, makes sense when it is examined in the context of the whole interaction.

In sum, the analyses conducted in section 4.2 of Chapter Four suggest that, although the classification of CSs into independent categories is certainly helpful for descriptive purposes at an initial level of analysis, for a comprehensive and accurate understanding of CSs and their function in FL interaction, these strategies cannot be studied as isolated and autonomous units. Attention needs to be paid to other CSs co-occurring with them, to the interlocutor’s actions and to the context of the interaction.
Subsequent analyses carried out in chapters five and six confirm this argument and show that a more encompassing understanding of strategic communication can be achieved if a more comprehensive framework of analysis than the CS unit is adopted.

On this basis and building on an empirical analysis of the data collected for the purposes of our research, in the final section of Chapter Four we introduce the concept of CS episode. This theoretical construct is presented as an analytical framework that extends the limits of the CS unit and is able to capture the whole complexity of strategic communication. The CS episode, as defined in this study, begins with the learner’s intention to communicate a message and the realization that the TL lexical items or structures desired to convey this message are not available in their IL system or not shared with their interlocutor. It ends when the speaker and the interlocutor establish a mutual agreement on the learner’s originally intended meaning or, in the case of failed communication, when they decide to abandon their attempt to agree on this meaning and to move on to the next topic in the conversation. For this purpose and within the limits thus established, learners and interlocutors may use one single CS or an unlimited combination of CSs, and resort to both verbal and nonverbal behavior. The CS episode, therefore, involves the utterance of at least one CS and the two interlocutors’ response or responses to this utterance, and may consist of a variable and unpredictable number of turns. It may even incorporate other embedded CS episodes.

As discussed above, in Chapter Two we argue for an analysis of CSs as a necessary element of strategic communication, understood as a more encompassing communicative process involving “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situation where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981: 288). The concept of CS episode establishes the limits of what we consider to be strategic communication and offers a fixed and coherent framework to describe and explain CS use in FL interaction as part of a collaborative activity, jointly co-constructed by the speaker and the interlocutor.

The work carried out in chapters five and six, using the CS and the CS episode as two different but interrelated units of analysis, provides empirical support for the description of CS episodes made in Chapter Four. This analytical framework allows us to understand how communication of meaning is actually achieved in face-to-face strategic interaction, and to identify and describe how learners and interlocutors
collaborate to create not only meaning but also language and linguistic knowledge when lexical problems arise in FL communication.

Taking into account the results obtained, we can now conclude that the configuration of the CS episode construct is one of the main assets of the present investigation and constitutes, at the same time, a significant contribution to this field of research. The concept of CS episode offers a new and consistent framework of analysis making it possible to approach the study of CS use and strategic communication in all their complexity. On this basis, we believe that it can be used to good advantage in future research which aims to enhance the understanding of strategic FL interaction.

The review of previous literature on CSs suggests that most scholars have relied on the concept of CS as their main unit of analysis. Consequently, they have adopted a learner-centered approach to the study of these strategies. Interactionist researchers have focused on the linguistic features of the strategic utterances produced by the FL learner and psycholinguists, for their part, on the cognitive processes underlying these utterances. Generally, these scholars have not studied how the CS is understood or responded to by the interlocutor, how the speaker and the addressee work to establish a mutual agreement on the meaning of the CS, or how they negotiate for this meaning when comprehensibility problems occur.

Researchers have gained many significant insights on the cognitive and linguistic features of CSs, on the factors that may have an influence on the FL learners’ use of these strategies, on the communicative effectiveness of different CSs types and even on the possibility of teaching these strategies. However, since most previous research has overlooked the role of the interlocutor in the strategic communication of meaning process, very little is still known about how learners and interlocutors actually manage to reach a mutual agreement on the content of their messages when the TL items or structures desired to convey these messages are not available or not shared.

We believe that communication of meaning in face-to-face interaction is a collaborative activity. Meaning is not sent and received but jointly created by all the interlocutors. Therefore, in order to understand how communication is achieved through CS use, attention needs to be paid to the interaction taking place between the learner and their interlocutor. The joint actions and collaborative effort of all the individuals taking part in the communicative exchange become the focus of attention.
Existing research on CSs, because of this learner-centered nature, does not offer a model of analysis able to account for strategic communication as a collaborative process. We have found, however, that studies carried out in the field of L1 communication and conducted within the framework of the collaborative theory of communication have successfully demonstrated that in face-to-face interaction speakers and addressees collaborate to create meaning (Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986; Clark and Schaefer, 1987, 1989; Wilkes-Gibbs, 1997). In the present dissertation we build on this research and apply the collaborative model of communication, originally designed to account for L1 non-strategic communication, to the analysis of FL strategic interaction occurring within the limits of the CS episode construct.

Taking this into account, we describe and analyze strategic interaction as a common ground building activity. We assume that learners use CSs to present the content they want to be added to their and their interlocutors’ shared common ground, but for communication to be successfully achieved this content also needs to be grounded. It is essential that the two interlocutors work together to establish the mutual belief that the meaning of the CS uttered by the speaker has been understood by the addressee well enough for the current purposes of the interaction.

Chapter Five shows that, in face-to-face interaction, a learner’s CS is followed by a movement from the interlocutor in which this indicates, in a direct or indirect way, their state of understanding of the just uttered strategic expression. If the interlocutor believes they have correctly interpreted the CS and inferred the meaning the learner is trying to contribute to the discourse they accept the CS and expect the speaker to recognize this acceptance. To establish this mutual acceptance, conversational participants resort to a limited set of grounding procedures. They offer verbal or nonverbal acknowledgments, repeat or paraphrase what the other speaker has just said, initiate a relevant next contribution or, in the simplest case, presuppose their understanding by allowing the conversation to proceed to the next topic.

When the interlocutor feels unable to interpret the learner’s strategy well enough for the current purposes of the interaction, they also indicate this. Addressees resort to comprehension checks and clarification requests in order to initiate a negotiation of meaning process in which all the interlocutors are expected to work together to solve the comprehensibility problem encountered. The CS is then repeated and/or rephrased as
many times as necessary, until the addressee manages to infer the meaning the learner is trying to contribute to the discourse and to build with this learner the mutual belief that the initial CS has been understood as originally intended.

Previous studies on CS effectiveness have made a distinction between effective and non-effective CSs. The first are comprehensible for the interlocutor and the second are incomprehensible. Thus, the latter are assumed to lead to miscommunication. Our research reveals that in face-to-face interaction, a CS that is not directly understood by the interlocutor does not necessarily result in a final failure of the communication of meaning process. From our approach, unsuccessful communication occurs when speaker and addressee are not able to settle a satisfactory mutual agreement on meaning. To understand how and why this occurs, we should study not only the nature of the CS being used but also possible failures occurring in the grounding process.

CS episodes resulting in failed communication are analyzed in section 5.3 of Chapter Five. The results of these analyses reveal that communicative breakdowns occur when interlocutors do not behave and collaborate as expected: when they make use of an avoidance strategy to present an utterance that they know does not convey the content of their originally intended message, when they feign understanding of each others’ communicative intentions in order to abandon the grounding process before a mutual agreement on meaning has been satisfactorily established, or when they are unable to recognize misunderstanding problems, usually because they do not pay the necessary amount of attention to each others’ contributions.

In this way we also show that the collaborative model makes it possible to account for the use of avoidance as well as achievement CSs. An interactional analysis reveals that learners resort to avoidance strategies in order to circumvent a linguistic difficulty, to keep communication continuous and to present a reduced version of their original message. Avoidance strategies allow speaker and interlocutor to collaborate to reach a mutual agreement on this reduced content and prevent bigger communicative breakdowns. The collaborative model suggests that in this kind of strategic exchanges the speaker is not behaving as expected. They are not presenting an utterance able to convey the whole content of their messages and are therefore neglecting their responsibility in the communicative process. The analysis of avoidance strategy use confirms that, in strategic interaction, for successful communication of meaning as
originally intended by the speaker to occur, the necessary amount of collaboration between this speaker and their interlocutor is required. When this collaborative effort is reduced or disregarded, the intended meaning cannot be communicated, or at least not in all its complexity.

In sum, Chapter Five shows that problems arising in FL interaction when the desired TL lexical item to convey an intended message is not available are mutually shared problems and their solution the mutual responsibility of all the interlocutors. These problems cannot be overcome by the learner’s use of a CS alone. For successful communication to be achieved the interlocutor also needs to participate in the solution of the problem being confronted. It is important that the learner and the interlocutor coordinate their individual actions and beliefs in order to be able to establish the desired mutual agreement on meaning. Strategic communication of meaning is a collaborative activity, involving the joint action and effort of all the interactional participants.

Notice that this collaboration does not mean that all the interlocutors have to be aware of the strategic nature of the interactional exchange in which they are participating. Interlocutors may collaborate with the learner to establish a mutual agreement on a meaning without realizing that the means of expression used to convey this meaning is not the one initially desired by the speaker or that the meaning they are trying to agree on is in fact a reduced version of the originally intended one. This means that, in order to understand how meaning is communicated in strategic interaction, attention always needs to be paid to the ‘two sides of the page’. Like Wagner and Firth (1997), we believe that, more than being a mere suggestion, this is a condition sine qua for a full and comprehensive understanding of what is actually occurring in FL interaction when lexical difficulties are being confronted. Research focused exclusively on the FL learner’s actions and on the analysis of strategic utterances ignoring the interactional context in which they are used can only provide a partial understanding of the strategic communication of meaning process. It can offer many interesting insights on the linguistic and cognitive nature of CSs, as we have already seen, but it cannot explain how meaning is actually communicated in face-to-face FL strategic interaction.

The framework of analysis outlined in Chapter Five has proved to be able to account for both avoidance and achievement CS use in a coherent and consistent way. It has made it possible to identify and describe the actions that intermediate and advanced
level learners, as well as their native or non-native speaking interlocutors take for the purposes of building a mutual agreement on meaning when the desired TL lexical items or structures to convey this meaning are not available or not shared. It has allowed us to demonstrate that for the successful communication of meaning in strategic interaction learners and interlocutors need to collaborate with each other. Therefore, we need to look at the two sides of the conversational exchange to describe and explain CS use. We have contributed to the interactional study of CSs at both a theoretical and a practical level by demonstrating that strategic communication in face-to-face interaction is a collaborative activity and by providing a framework of analysis able to account for this collaboration.

The results of our project also have implications beyond the field of CS research. Our study shows that the collaborative model is able to account not only for L1 communication but also for L2 strategic interaction. In the FL, linguistic problems are certainly more common and, when they occur, learners and interlocutors need to make an extra effort for successful communication of meaning to be achieved. The learner has to stretch their IL system to develop an alternative means of expression to convey their intended message, i.e. to make use of an achievement CS. The interlocutor needs to interpret this CS and to face relatively common comprehensibility problems. Too often this leads to an extended and complex negotiation of meaning process. What is significant is that, in order to build the desired mutual agreement on meaning, FL learners and their interlocutors use in L2 strategic communication the same procedures NSs use in L1 non-strategic communication. As previously suggested by scholars such as Kasper and Kellerman (1997), this confirms that CS research can draw on L1 communication studies and at the same time inform the work being carried out in this separate but related field of research.

The analyses carried out in Chapter Five also illustrate the relationship between CS and negotiation of meaning studies, as pointed out by Yule and Tarone (1991), Suni (1996) or Anderson (1998). As mentioned above, when learners’ CSs are not directly understood by their interlocutors, the former resort to the use of negotiation of meaning strategies, such as comprehension checks or clarification requests. During interaction these negotiation of meaning movements are almost invariably followed by a speaker’s refashioning of the initial CS, i.e. by an additional CS. In certain circumstances, the
confirmation check is in itself a CS. In section 5.2.1.2. of Chapter Five we see that interlocutors sometimes rephrase speaker’s CSs offering, with rising intonation, an alternative CS to convey what they believe to be the speaker’s originally intended meaning. Our research confirms that in face-to-face FL interaction these strategies work often in combination. To understand how communication is successfully achieved in these interactional exchanges, we have to concentrate on the learner’s and the interlocutor’s joint use of CSs and negotiation of meaning strategies. In sum, CS research cannot ignore negotiation of meaning strategies and negotiation of meaning studies cannot overlook CSs.

The results obtained in Chapter Five also constitute the starting point for the analyses conducted in the following chapter. They reveal that when a CS is used by the learner, the interlocutor is sometimes able to infer not only the meaning the speaker is trying to convey but also the TL lexical item they are compensating for. In the process of achieving a mutual agreement on meaning they may respond to the strategic utterance providing this TL lexical item; that is, offering new input for the learner. This particular kind of behavior, occurring in certain CS episodes as a direct result of a CS use, is analyzed in Chapter Six as a possible source for language learning.

In the first chapter we see that CSs have been generally treated and analyzed as part of language use, but not as a part of language learning. Although theoretical claims have been raised on this issue, empirical research on CSs has generally overlooked the potential role of these strategies for the learning process. However, a different branch of SLA studies concerned with the relationship existing between language use and L2 development has paid attention to interaction as a possible source for language learning. In this study we draw on this previous research regarding interaction and SLA, in an attempt to demonstrate that CS use in face-to-face interaction can, under certain circumstances, trigger cognitive processes fostering L2 learning and that CS episodes can, therefore, constitute an occasion for L2 lexical development.

Approaching the study of SLA from a sociocultural perspective and directly building on the postulates of the sociocultural theory of mind, Swain (1997, 2000) shows that learners’ dialogue in certain collaborative problem-solving situations is both a social and a cognitive activity fostering L2 learning. Swain refers to this form of interaction as collaborative dialogue. Speakers and interlocutors use language to
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

communicate meaning, as well as a psychological tool to perform socially constituted cognitive processes that serve to build new language and linguistic knowledge. This dialogue constitutes an occasion for the learner’s IL system to develop and an enactment of language-mediated SLA processes.

The analyses conducted in Chapter Six reveal that CS episodes can, under certain conditions, evolve into collaborative dialogue. Learners make use of a CS when, in the attempt to produce new output, they notice a hole in their IL system, that is, a lack of knowledge of the TL form needed to convey their message with accuracy and precision. The CS serves to verbalize their problem and thus draw both the speaker’s and the addressee’s attention on the linguistic difficulty encountered. The two interlocutors may then decide to collaborate only to reach a mutual agreement on meaning, by focusing on meaning, or try also to build an accurate TL form to convey this meaning, by focusing on meaning and form. For this second purpose they formulate and test hypotheses, they offer and assess alternatives, and they use the L2 as well as the L1 to, explicitly or implicitly, manipulate and talk about the language they are using. The outcome of this socially and dialogically constituted cognitive activity is a new TL form that is used to modify their initial non-target-like output and thus convey the originally intended message in a coherent, accurate and appropriate way. From a sociocultural approach, this TL form represents new TL knowledge for the learner.

In the CS episodes analyzed in Chapter Six we observe these different processes enacted in learners’ dialogue. We see native and non-native speaking interlocutors offering relevant, comprehensible and enhanced input. We can also observe learners noticing, assessing and uptaking this input. As a result, the learner becomes able to use the originally unavailable TL lexical item that prompted the CS use. In other words, the learner’s performance outstrips their initial competence.

Further data is analyzed showing that these socially constituted processes and TL forms are internalized by the learner and transformed into an individual mental resource. Our analyses prove that the learner becomes able to make individual and independent use of the originally unavailable TL lexical item in later references within the same conversation to the same meaning. On this basis we conclude that CS use can be a trigger for collaborative dialogue and that in CS episodes learners and interlocutors may collaborate to create not only meaning but also language and linguistic knowledge.
Subsequently, CS use and CS episodes need to be seen as an occasion for the learner’s IL system to develop towards the TL norm.

Previous research on collaborative dialogue has been mainly focused on how learners and their interlocutors, usually having a similar command of English, collaborate to create accurate TL grammar and grammatical knowledge. This investigation thus represents a contribution to this field of research, suggesting that collaborative dialogue can also arise from lexical problems and that more attention needs to be paid to the role of this form of interaction in the learner’s development of their L2 lexical knowledge.

In general, it seems that the study of interaction within the field of SLA should not overlook CSs and CS research. Our study suggests, on the one hand, that CS research can gain new insights by looking at CS use as part not only of language use but also of language learning, and on the other hand, that interactionist researchers can enhance their understanding of SLA by expanding their focus of research in order to take into account CS use and strategic communication. Our investigation shows that those processes that have been the object of most previous research on interaction, such as noticing, input provision, corrective feedback, attention to form, uptake or collaborative dialogue, often occur in strategic interaction. Traditionally these phenomena have been studied as a result of comprehensibility problems or learners’ erroneous utterances. Here, however, we see that CS use can also set them off. It follows that the analysis of strategic communication can contribute to our understanding of how L2 development occurs in FL interaction.

In sum, we have integrated in our investigation previous advances made in the fields of negotiation of meaning, attention to form, feedback, collaborative dialogue and sociocultural approaches to SLA, and related them to the analysis of CSs. We have highlighted the relationships between these different strands of research and the study of CSs, made their theoretical frameworks fit together, and in this way brought CSs into the current debate about learning. Our work represents thus a contribution for the study of CSs; but it also has implications for all these different fields of research.

It is now necessary to point out that, as explained in Chapter Five, we believe “learning is cumulative, emergent, and ongoing, sometimes occurring in leaps, while at other times it is imperceptible” (Swain and Lapkin, 1998: 321). In other words, learning
is not a one-time shift, but a complex process that cannot be reduced to the limits of one CS episode. We do not intend, therefore, to argue that learning of a new TL lexical form is accomplished in a CS episode. Rather, we suggest that CS episodes involving collaborative dialogue may initiate or reinforce the acquisition process of this TL form.

Our analyses show that CS episodes can aid the learner to move from a passive to an active knowledge of TL lexical items, reinforcing the learning of a TL form that is already part of their IL system. We have also found that learners are not always able to acquire all the features of a TL word within the limits of one single CS episode. They need sometimes reinforcing input from their interlocutors in order to become able to use this word with accurate TL phonology and/or morphology. Finally, other data suggests that, when the learner is in the process of acquiring a new TL lexical item, they are not always able to use it under the time pressure of ongoing interaction. This means that the learning process is not always directly observable for the researcher.

In previous research, learning was traced using post-activities in which learners were tested, usually with a delay of one or two weeks, on their knowledge of TL forms co-constructed in earlier collaborative dialogue episodes. In the present study such a kind of delayed post-test could not be implemented. In order to compensate for this problem the communicative task used for the purposes of IL data collection was specifically designed so that learners had to make more than one reference within the same conversation to the same objects. The retrospective interview held with the researcher immediately after the performance of the picture-story task could also be used in certain situations with this same aim.

The lack of delayed data allowing us to trace our participants’ learning after one or two weeks can be considered a drawback of the present investigation. However, the research design of this study allows us to observe the use of an item earlier and later within the context of the same interaction and this provides us with a kind of evidence that cannot be obtained through the use of post-tests. Analyzing the performance of this task we see partial and sequential acquisition. We see learning as a gradual process: how learners move from passive to active knowledge of a TL lexical item and from incomplete to complete command of all the features of this item. On this basis we believe that the methodological design of the present study represents a contribution not only to the study of CSs but also to the study of TL lexical acquisition.
Previous research on collaborative dialogue has generally relied on the use of collaborative tasks, specifically designed to focus learners’ attention on both meaning and form. The picture-story spot-the-difference task employed in our study is a communicative rather than a collaborative task. For the successful completion of this particular kind of activity learners and interlocutors need to agree on the content of their messages, but they are not asked or prompted to use accurate TL lexis to convey these messages. As a result of this design, in most of the CS episodes analyzed in our study participants focus exclusively on meaning, unconcerned about linguistic accuracy or precision. This means that when the two interlocutors engage in collaborative dialogue, they do so in a spontaneous way, which makes it possible to observe some of the factors that may affect or foster this form of collaboration in face-to-face interaction.

We have found that learners’ and interlocutor’s command of the TL may have a certain influence on this process. Non-native speaking interlocutors are not always able to help as desired other learners having a similar level and sometimes they even collaborate to create what they believe to be a correct TL lexical means of expression that is, in fact, an incorrect TL use. This confirms that however helpful collaborative dialogue occurring between learners may be for their IL development, some kind of control or feedback from the teacher is always necessary (Swain and Lapkin, 1998).

Individual learning styles and personalities seem also to play a significant role in this form of interaction. Whereas some NSs and NNSs are eager to help the learner and collaborate with them to create new language and linguistic knowledge, others are not ready to invest the necessary time and energy for this to occur. They try to accomplish the task with the least possible effort and, if focus on form is not explicitly demanded, they concentrate exclusively on meaning. We know from previous research that different interlocutors interpret the same task in different ways and, subsequently, do not take the same advantage of the language learning opportunities that this task may offer to them (Coughlan and Duff, 1994). On this basis we conclude that CS use may be a source of learning that needs to be taken into account in the FL classroom. Yet, for CS episodes to develop into collaborative dialogue, tasks specifically designed to draw learners’ attention to form while communicating meaning need to be offered.

Finally, the results of our analyses reveal that learners tend to see peer correction as an impolite or even face threatening behavior, rather than as a help giving act.
Consequently, they try to avoid corrective feedback in order to maintain effective social interactions (Færch and Kasper, 1983c; Morris, 2002). This means that, when engaging learners in collaborative work, we need to take into account that individuals bring into the classroom their social preconceptions and that these affect their interactions with their peers (Morris and Tarone, 2003). As a result, they can be a constraint for the occurrence of collaborative dialogue in CS episodes. This suggests that a positive attitude towards collaboration needs to be fostered so that our students can take the maximum advantage of their peers’ help. Again, we believe that in the FL classroom the teacher, as facilitator and moderator of learners’ interactions, may play a significant role raising their students’ awareness on the value of collaborative work and creating a favorable environment for cooperation to occur.

Evidence presented in Chapter Six suggests that CSs may be a tool for communicative as well as for learning purposes. These implications concern the SLA research field as well as the FL teaching practice. In the FL classroom activities designed to encourage learners to communicate beyond the limits of their current TL lexical competence, within the conditions here discussed, can have a positive influence on their SLA process. In the context of research the analysis of CS episodes occurring in the performance of these activities can provide an invaluable source of knowledge for a better and more comprehensive understanding of L2 lexical development.

We hope that our work might contribute and encourage a reconsideration of the value of CS research within the field of SLA. CS studies have been generally regarded as the paradigm of a ‘more humble approach’ (Yule and Tarone, 1991: 169), that has much to say about how learners use the L2 but little about how they learn it. Our study suggests that under certain conditions CS use may be directly related to L2 development and that CS studies can aid to our understanding of the L2 learning process. It seems that future research on SLA and FL pedagogy might benefit from paying attention to this particular kind of interactional phenomena.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
We would like to conclude this project by discussing some issues that have arisen through our investigation and that could not be answered within its limits. In a way, these unanswered questions exemplify the limitations of the current study. Yet, they
also serve as a call for further research on CS use and FL interaction and allow us to make some suggestions for future investigations.

The results and conclusions of this study are based on the analysis of FL interactions involving learners with two different proficiency levels working in dyads with other same level students or with native speaking interlocutors. In this way we have been able to show that in face-to-face strategic interaction both intermediate and advanced level learners are able to collaborate with both native and non-native speaking interlocutors to create meaning, language and linguistic knowledge. Furthermore, we have seen that, for this purpose, they resort to the same interactional procedures and engage in the same kind of knowledge building cognitive processes.

Previous studies on CSs have demonstrated that the learners’ command of the FL has a significant influence on their strategic behavior. Different proficiency level students are able to make use of the same kind of CSs, but in different proportions and with different communicative results. Research on collaborative work has also suggested that low level learners may not be able to collaborate with their interlocutors in the same way as students with a certain command of the TL. This means that we cannot know, within the limits of this project, to what extent our results may apply to lower level students. Future research is needed in order to clarify if low or beginning level learners can offer the same kind and amount of help to their peers for both communicative and learning purposes as can intermediate and advanced learners. This research should also help us to discern whether learners can profit from CSs, as a trigger for collaborative dialogue, in beginner FL classroom contexts.

This dissertation has been limited to the analysis of strategic interactional exchanges occurring in dyads. Taking into account that group as well as pair activities are a common practice in the FL classroom, it would be interesting to examine how collaboration is carried out in larger groups of conversational participants. The framework of analysis outlined in Chapter Five has proved to be adequate to describe how learners and interlocutors collaborate to create meaning in dyads. It may, however, need some kind of revision in order to be able to account for how several different interlocutors coordinate their individual actions and beliefs to agree on a meaning when the TL lexical items desired to convey this meaning are not available for all or some of them.
A further issue still open for future research to answer is whether overhears may benefit from collaborative dialogue. In the classroom, learners often act as observers of interactional exchanges taking place between other learners or between one of these learners and their teacher. It should therefore be relevant for the FL teaching practice to know to what extent learners’ observation of a collaborative creation of language and linguistic knowledge in which they are not directly involved can aid their L2 development.

Within the limits of the present investigation interactional strategic behavior has been analyzed in the performance of one single communicative task, that is, the picture-story spot-the-difference task. Previous studies on CSs have, however, shown that task-related factors have a strong influence on CS use. On this basis we believe that future research should also be able to compare learners’ performance across a variety of activities, and thus try to establish whether differences in task design may have a direct influence only on the type and frequency of the CSs being used or also on the process of establishing a mutual agreement on the meaning of these CSs.

As explained above, in order to collect the data analyzed for the purposes of our research, we designed a communicative task that focused learners’ attention on meaning, whereas studies on collaborative dialogue have usually resorted to collaborative tasks, which encourage learners to focus on both meaning and form. Future research on CS use may benefit from this particular kind of methodology. It will certainly be able to elicit a wider and more representative amount of CS episodes involving collaborative dialogue and probably offer new data on this form of knowledge building activity in the context of strategic interaction.

We have also mentioned that one of the limitations of our data collection method is that it does not allow the researcher to trace learners’ acquisition of TL lexical forms in CS episodes along an extended period of time. We are still in need of a procedure able to combine the elicitation of retrospective data with the implementation of some kind of post-test activity and of a research project that can offer a longitudinal analysis of the learning processes here examined.

The design of our investigation made it possible to analyze second and third references to the same concepts within the context of the same conversation. In these situations learners and interlocutors generally resort to preceding CS episodes in order
to minimize their collaborative effort. When one of these CS episodes involves collaborative dialogue, subsequent references may serve to reinforce the initial socially constructed TL knowledge. We believe that this issue also deserves more attention in future research. Bygate (1996) showed that learners may benefit from task repetition. In light of the results obtained in our study, it can be hypothesized that learners may also benefit from making repetitive references within the same task to the same objects.

Our study has been carried out in an English as a FL context and can be regarded as a contribution to English as a FL research. Most previous investigations have been conducted in English as a FL or L2 settings, yet very little attention has been paid to the specific use that Spanish NSs make of CSs in their use of English as a FL –some notable exceptions are Manchón (1989) or Pons Sanz (2001). The linguistic background of the FL learner is one of the factors that, together with proficiency level and task demands, has been found in previous research to have an influence on CS use. In the present work we have also seen that social preconceptions affect collaborative work in strategic interaction. On this basis we believe that more research needs to be carried out involving students with a variety of sociocultural background and NLs, as is usually the case in English as a L2 contexts.

Furthermore, our students share a bilingual command of two different languages: Spanish and Galician. A comparative analysis of the strategic behavior of these students and of Spanish monolingual learners of English could also provide new insights on strategic communication, helping to clarify the role of the L1 on the strategic use of the L2 for both communicative and learning purposes.

Our aim was not to carry out a comparative analysis of strategic behavior across different proficiency level groups of students or different dyad conditions. Such a task would have exceeded the limits of this project. The data obtained is still open to this kind of analysis. In the future we hope to be able to compare CS use and collaborative work in CS episodes involving intermediate versus advanced level learners, and native versus non-native speaking interlocutors. There are certain questions that have yet to be answered: Do intermediate level learners need to make more effort than advanced level students in order to be able to establish a mutual agreement on the meaning of their CSs with their interlocutors? To what extent does the interlocutor influence this process? Do learners need to devote more time and energy to build this agreement with other
students of the same language level than with NSs? Since we have seen that the TL forms built in collaborative dialogue episodes are sometimes directly internalized by the learner whereas in other situations reinforcing processes are required, to what extent is this influenced by the learner’s and the interlocutor’s command of the TL? Do learners take more advantage from collaborative dialogue involving NSs of the TL than from their collaboration with other same level students?

It should also be interesting to examine to what extent the type and features of the CSs used may have an effect on collaboration in strategic interaction. Research on this issue could help to establish which CSs or CS combinations are less effective and require more collaborative effort for the purposes of mutual agreement on meaning, or whether certain CSs are more likely to trigger collaborative dialogue than others.

The conclusions drawn in our dissertation have also been based on a qualitative analysis of FL interactions, but we believe that in future research, trying to answer these and other related issues, we can also benefit from a quantitative analysis of the data.

It is also necessary to remember that the scope of our investigation has been restricted to the analysis of lexical CSs. The data collected for the specific purposes of our research has confirmed that, as suggested in Chapter Two, FL learners make frequent use of these strategies which also play a major role in communication. Despite this restriction in focus, we have been able to achieve a relatively comprehensive understanding of how strategic communication works in FL interaction. However, further research is still required in order to establish to what extent the conclusions drawn here can be extended to the use of CSs to solve linguistic or sociolinguistic problems arising from phonological, syntactical or pragmatic IL deficits.

The results of our investigation suggest that the social context of the interaction has a major influence on strategic behavior. This means that, in order to understand how strategic communication works in everyday learners’ interactions within the classroom or in possible non-academic interactions taking place between these learners and NSs, data from these different contexts needs to be obtained and analyzed. Such a kind of research can provide a different perspective on most of these issues. It may help to understand how different learners interpret strategic communication and their learning potential and, subsequently, how they benefit from CS use and collaborative dialogue as a possible source for L2 knowledge.
Although our study, despite its experimental condition, has allowed us to draw some implications for the language teaching practice, we certainly believe that in order to clarify the role that CSs can play in the FL classroom more future work in this specific context needs to be conducted. This kind of investigation may offer an invaluable source of knowledge for the researcher to enhance their understanding of CSs and for the teacher to approach the task of dealing with CS use in the FL classroom. Classroom research on CSs will definitely contribute to establish a closer link between research and the teaching practice, between the SLA researcher and the FL teacher, which, we believe, should be the final aim of the work being carried out in the field of SLA.

The present investigation suggests that many new and interesting insights on CS use can be achieved if CS studies extend their scope of analysis, if researchers start to pay serious and systematic attention to the two sides of the communicative act and to the learning as well as the communicative significance of CSs.

Our work has posed some questions for future research to answer, but it has also outlined a theoretical and analytical framework that may facilitate the study of these and other related issues. We believe that the CS episode construct and the collaborative approach to the analysis of strategic interaction constitute in this sense an important contribution. They can help future research to take notice of previously overlooked aspects of strategic communication and, at the same time, to definitely integrate CSs into current debates on SLA.

We hope our work has contributed a clarification of the use that learners and interlocutors make of CSs in their FL interactions. We further hope that this contribution has highlighted the value of an interactional approach to the study of CSs, one which is able to account for the whole complexity of the strategic communication of meaning process.
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RESUMEN
La comunicación en una lengua extranjera, en nuestro caso el inglés, resulta siempre difícil para el aprendiz. Éste se enfrenta al proceso comunicativo con un conocimiento limitado de los elementos, estructuras y normas de uso de la lengua, lo cual le plantea frecuentes e inevitables dificultades, tanto a la hora de expresar sus propias ideas como en el momento de comprender los mensajes de sus interlocutores. Uno de los problemas más recurrentes en el uso de una segunda lengua surge cuando el aprendiz, al intentar comunicar un mensaje, encuentra que carece de los recursos lingüísticos necesarios para ello; es decir, que la palabra o expresión que desea utilizar para referirse a un determinado objeto, acción o idea no forma parte todavía de su sistema interlingüístico.

Para solucionar esta dificultad el aprendiz puede optar por ignorar o reducir parte del contenido de su mensaje. A fin de salvar una posible ruptura en el proceso comunicativo, el hablante evita mencionar aquella parte de su mensaje que le ha planteado un problema lingüístico. El alumno puede también intentar compensar sus deficiencias lingüísticas, sustituyendo ese elemento que desea utilizar pero desconoce por, por ejemplo, un sinónimo, una paráfrasis descriptiva, una creación léxica, un término de la lengua materna o un gesto; en otras palabras, el hablante puede recurrir a su conocimiento de la lengua meta, de otras lenguas o de la comunicación no verbal para desarrollar un medio alternativo de expresión que le permita transmitir el contenido original de su mensaje.

Este conjunto de técnicas, a las que los aprendices recurren tanto para sortear como para compensar las dificultades lingüísticas con las que tropiezan al intentar comunicarse en una lengua con un limitado dominio de la misma, son conocidas en el campo de la adquisición de segundas lenguas con el término de estrategias de comunicación –‘communication strategies’. La investigación previa en esta área ha demostrado que los aprendices de lenguas, incluso aquellos con un avanzado nivel de competencia lingüística, hacen un uso relativamente frecuente de estas estrategias, que constituyen, por lo tanto, un componente significativo de la comunicación en la lengua extranjera. No es por ello de extrañar que tanto investigadores como profesores de lenguas hayan prestado gran interés al estudio de las estrategias de comunicación.

Este interés se ha traducido en un número considerable de investigaciones teóricas y empíricas. En la actualidad sabemos no sólo que los aprendices de lenguas utilizan con frecuencia las estrategias de comunicación, sino también qué tipos de
estrategias emplean, qué procesos cognitivos subyacen al uso de cada una de ellas y qué características lingüísticas diferencian a los distintos tipos de técnicas comunicativas. Se sabe, además, que el comportamiento estratégico de los aprendices de lenguas se ve directamente influido por su nivel de competencia lingüística (Tarone, 1977; Hyde, 1982; Bialystok, 1983; Paribakht, 1985; Poulisse et al., 1990; Jourdain, 2000), por su personalidad y estilo de aprendizaje (Haastrup y Phillipson, 1983; Luján-Ortega y Clark, 2000; Littlemore, 2001), por la relación entre la lengua materna y la lengua extranjera (Palmberg, 1979; Si-Qing, 1990), por el método de enseñanza (Labarca y Khanji, 1986) o el entorno de aprendizaje (Herschensohn, 2003); igualmente se ve condicionado por factores relacionados con el contexto o la naturaleza de la tarea comunicativa a realizar (Galván y Campbel, 1979; Bialystok y Fröhlich, 1980; Poulisse y Schils, 189; Poulisse et al., 1990; Luján-Ortega, 1997). Se han acometido igualmente estudios sobre el valor comunicativo de los distintos tipos de estrategias de comunicación (Ervin, 1979; Palmberg, 1982; Bialystok y Fröhlich, 1980; Bialystok, 1893; Poulisse et al., 1990) y sobre la posibilidad de instruir a los aprendices en el uso efectivo de estas técnicas (Faerch y Kasper, 1986; Dörnyei y Thurrell, 1991; Dörnyei, 1995; Scullens y Jourdain, 2000; Faucette, 2001; Jourdain y Scullens, 2002).

La investigación realizada hasta el momento ha hecho innumerables avances en lo que al uso de las estrategias de comunicación por parte del aprendiz se refiere. Sin embargo, esta investigación ha adoptado en la mayoría de los casos una perspectiva de análisis centrada fundamentalmente en torno al hablante, ignorando el efecto que estas estrategias tienen en el interlocutor o la posible colaboración de éste en el proceso comunicativo –notables excepciones constituyen los trabajos de Wagner y Firth (1997) o Anderson (1998). Además, se han estudiado las estrategias de comunicación como parte del uso de la lengua, tendiendo a ignorar la influencia que estos mecanismos puedan tener en el proceso de aprendizaje lingüístico.

Estas dos cuestiones constituyen precisamente el objeto del presente trabajo de investigación. Movidos por un interés en el uso que de las estrategias de comunicación hacen los estudiantes gallegos de inglés lengua extranjera dentro y fuera de aula, analizamos la función de las mismas en las interacciones de estos estudiantes, tanto con otros aprendices de dicha lengua como con hablantes nativos de la misma. Consideramos que el uso de una estrategia de comunicación en la interacción oral
personal no puede ser entendido en toda su complejidad si se ignora el papel del interlocutor en el proceso comunicativo. Por ello, en una primera fase de nuestra investigación prestamos atención a la interacción entre aprendiz e interlocutor, intentando demostrar que la comunicación estratégica es un proceso colaborativo en el que participan activamente hablante y oyente. En una segunda fase analizamos esta colaboración como una posible fuente de conocimiento lingüístico; es decir, intentamos determinar si el uso de una estrategia de comunicación en una situación de interacción puede contribuir al desarrollo de la competencia lingüística del aprendiz.

Para poder investigar estas cuestiones realizamos un estudio de campo en el que participaron un total de 32 individuos: 24 estudiantes de Filología Inglesa de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela –estudiantes con un dominio bilingüe de las lenguas gallega y española– y 8 estudiantes internacionales de dicha universidad, hablantes nativos de lengua inglesa. Doce de los 24 estudiantes de inglés poseían un nivel intermedio en esta lengua y los restantes 12 un nivel avanzado. Estos 32 alumnos fueron agrupados en 16 parejas: 4 parejas de estudiantes de nivel avanzado, 4 parejas de estudiantes de nivel intermedio, 4 parejas compuestas por un estudiante de nivel avanzado y un hablante nativo, y 4 formadas por un estudiante de nivel intermedio y un hablante nativo.

Estas 16 parejas completaron una tarea comunicativa específicamente diseñada para obtener muestras representativas de interacción oral en lengua inglesa entre aprendices de distintos niveles, y entre estos aprendices y hablantes nativos. A cada uno de los 2 miembros de la pareja se le proporcionó una versión diferente de una misma tira de viñetas en las que se representaba una historia. Se pidió a los estudiantes que describieran y comentaran sus dibujos con el objeto de identificar, sin ver las viñetas de sus compañeros, las diferencias existentes entre las dos versiones de la historia. La realización de esta actividad fue grabada en video, permitiendo así obtener las deseadas muestras de interacción.

A continuación, los estudiantes repitieron la misma tarea pero en su lengua materna. Finalmente, los alumnos participaron en una entrevista en la que el investigador les pidió que comentaran la realización de la tarea, los problemas comunicativos encontrados en este proceso y las estrategias utilizadas para intentar solucionar estos problemas. Las muestras de lengua materna y la información
retrospectiva proporcionada por los alumnos fueron fundamentales en el análisis de la comunicación estratégica, permitiendo al investigador identificar ciertos usos y aspectos de las estrategias de comunicación que no son directamente observables en la interacción (Færch y Kasper, 1987; Tarone y Yule, 1989; Poulisse et al., 1990).

Las viñetas empleadas en esta tarea incluían un total de 32 diferencias. Estas diferencias estaban relacionadas con objetos, acciones y conceptos que el aprendiz debía comunicar a su interlocutor y que, en general, representaron dificultades comunicativas tanto para los estudiantes de nivel intermedio como para los de nivel avanzado. Para comunicar estos elementos y poder alcanzar así el objetivo final de la tarea, es decir, identificar las diferencias entre las dos versiones de los dibujos, los alumnos tuvieron que recurrir con relativa frecuencia al uso de estrategias de comunicación. Los análisis de nuestra investigación se centraron en estas estrategias, utilizadas siempre para solucionar deficiencias lingüísticas de carácter léxico.

En una primera fase del análisis fue necesario identificar, en las muestras de interacción recogidas, las estrategias utilizadas por nuestros aprendices para hacer referencia a los elementos preseleccionados. En nuestro estudio elaboramos una definición del concepto de estrategia de comunicación directamente basada en la caracterización que de estas técnicas hizo Tarone en 1981. Siguiendo los presupuestos teóricos de esta autora, pero adaptando su definición al contexto de la interacción oral entre dos interlocutores y a los objetivos específicos de nuestro estudio, identificamos como estrategia de comunicación aquellas formas lingüísticas utilizadas por uno de nuestros aprendices cuando:

1. el aprendiz desea comunicar uno de los elementos preseleccionados,
2. el aprendiz (y/o su interlocutor) advierte que la unidad léxica necesaria para comunicar este elemento no forma parte de su sistema interlingüístico y/o del de su interlocutor,
3. el aprendiz (y/o su interlocutor) opta por:
   (a) eludir la comunicación de este elemento, o
   (b) desarrollar una expresión alternativa para la comunicación del mismo.

Las estrategias de comunicación identificadas en esta primera fase de la investigación fueron clasificadas en categorías, a fin de facilitar el análisis de las mismas. Para realizar esta tarea utilizamos una versión adaptada de la taxonomía de
estrategias de comunicación propuesta por Dörnyei y Kormos (1998), hasta el momento
la clasificación más actualizada y detallada de las existentes en este campo de estudio.

En línea con Tarone (1981), consideramos que la comunicación estratégica es un
proceso en el que dos interlocutores intentan construir un significado de forma conjunta
en situaciones en las que las estructuras lingüísticas para expresar ese significado no
están disponibles —“a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in
situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1981:
288). El hablante y el interlocutor utilizan las estrategias de comunicación como un
instrumento para la construcción conjunta del significado.

Si bien Tarone ha siempre defendido esta idea, nunca llegó a explicar de forma
sistemática cómo se desarrolla este proceso: qué acciones llevan a cabo hablante y
oyente, cómo se coordinan estas acciones y hasta qué punto la comunicación final del
mensaje inicial es el resultado del esfuerzo colaborativo de al menos dos interlocutores.
El primer objetivo del presente trabajo fue pues delinear un modelo de análisis que
permitiera describir esta construcción conjunta del significado y demostrar así que la
comunicación estratégica es siempre tarea de dos participantes.

El concepto de estrategia de comunicación es fundamental en nuestro estudio,
pero no suficiente, pues generalmente da cuenta únicamente de la acción del hablante en
el proceso comunicativo. En la presente investigación las estrategias de comunicación
fueron examinadas como parte de secuencias estratégicas —‘communication strategy
episodes’. Con este término definimos aquellos segmentos de la interacción en los que
hablante y oyente colaboran para construir un significado cuando carecen de las
estructuras lingüísticas necesarias para expresar dicho significado. La secuencia
estratégica se inicia con la intención del hablante de comunicar el mensaje que plantea
el problema comunicativo y abarca hasta el momento de la interacción en el que el
hablante y el interlocutor se ponen de acuerdo sobre el contenido de esta idea. Esta
unidad engloba por lo tanto las acciones tanto del hablante como del interlocutor, puede
incluir una o varias estrategias de comunicación y extenderse a lo largo de un número
indeterminado de cambios de turno.

Para el análisis de las secuencias estratégicas identificadas en nuestras muestras
de interacción recurrimos al modelo colaborativo —‘collaborative model’; diseñado por
para describir, originalmente, la comunicación no estratégica en lengua materna. Los resultados de estos análisis demostraron que los aprendices recurren al uso de una estrategia de comunicación con la intención de presentar un contenido o significado que desean sea añadido al conocimiento mutuo que este aprendiz y su interlocutor tienen del mundo –‘their shared common ground’. Para alcanzar este objetivo, es necesario que el interlocutor interprete esta estrategia e infiera correctamente el contenido que el hablante está intentando transmitirle. Es decir, si el hablante desea hacer referencia a un objeto pero desconoce la palabra que habitualmente se utiliza para nombrar dicho objeto en la lengua extranjera, intentará describir sus propiedades, usar un término equivalente de su lengua materna, hacer mímica, etc. El interlocutor debe ser capaz de interpretar a qué objeto está intentando hacer referencia el hablante.

Sin embargo, esto no es suficiente para garantizar una comunicación satisfactoria del mensaje. El hablante y el interlocutor han de establecer un acuerdo mutuo sobre el contenido de ese mensaje. Aprendiz e interlocutor deben llegar a la conclusión conjunta de que lo que ha dicho el hablante ha sido, en efecto, correctamente interpretado por el interlocutor; es decir, que ambos han construido un mismo y único significado –este proceso se conoce en la bibliografía especializada en este campo con el nombre de ‘grounding process’.

En nuestros análisis encontramos que una estrategia de comunicación es siempre seguida, en la interacción oral, por una respuesta del interlocutor. Si éste considera que ha interpretado correctamente el mensaje que el aprendiz intenta transmitirle, acepta la estrategia. El aprendiz, por su parte, si cree que en efecto el oyente ha comprendido su mensaje, acepta también su respuesta. Este proceso mutuo de aceptación es siempre necesario para garantizar la satisfactoria comunicación del mensaje original y es tan importante en el proceso comunicativo como la estrategia en sí misma.

En ocasiones, la estrategia de comunicación presentada por el hablante no puede ser directamente comprendida por su interlocutor. Nuestros análisis revelan que, cuando el oyente no se cree capaz de interpretar, con la necesaria confianza, el contenido que el hablante está intentando transmitirle, se lo indica explícitamente. Para ello recurre al uso de las llamadas estrategias de negociación del significado –‘negotiation of meaning strategies’. Se inicia así un proceso de negociación en el que la estrategia comunicativa original es reformulada tantas veces como sea necesario. La comunicación del mensaje
puede extenderse a lo largo de varios turnos y englobar un número no predeterminado e ilimitado de estrategias comunicativas. El proceso no se completa hasta que el hablante y el oyente no establecen el necesario muto acuerdo sobre el contenido del mensaje.

En resumen, cuando el aprendiz encuentra que carece en su sistema interlingüístico de las estructuras o elementos necesarios para expresar un mensaje, recurre al uso de una estrategia de comunicación. Con esta estrategia presenta el contenido de su mensaje, pero este contenido no se considera comunicado hasta que no es aceptado por el interlocutor. La comunicación estratégica engloba siempre el uso de una estrategia de comunicación y un proceso de aceptación mutua del contenido de esa estrategia. En este proceso hablante y oyente colaboran para construir de forma conjunta el significado. La comunicación estratégica es por lo tanto un proceso colaborativo, que implica siempre la intervención de dos interlocutores.

Para describir este proceso y entender cómo consiguen los aprendices comunicar sus mensajes en la lengua extranjera a pesar de su limitado dominio de la misma es necesario prestar atención a la acción tanto del aprendiz como del interlocutor. El modelo colaborativo de la comunicación, tal y como fue descrito y aplicado en este trabajo, permite dar cuenta de forma sistemática y objetiva del proceso estratégico de la comunicación del significado en la interacción oral directa y personal, es decir hablante frente a interlocutor. Con nuestro trabajo demostramos, además, que este modelo es aplicable tanto al análisis de la interacción entre dos aprendices, como al de la interacción entre aprendiz e interlocutor, independientemente de si el estudiante tiene un nivel de competencia lingüística intermedio o avanzado.

En nuestro estudio encontramos que, en ocasiones, aprendiz e interlocutor colaboran no sólo para crear significado, sino también para crear una forma lingüística que les permita expresar ese significado con precisión y corrección léxica. El interlocutor es capaz de interpretar que el aprendiz está utilizando una estrategia de comunicación para compensar una laguna de su conocimiento de la lengua extranjera. En ocasiones identifica esa laguna, es decir, qué palabra o expresión desea utilizar su compañero pero, por desconocimiento, ha sustituido por una estrategia de comunicación. En el proceso de aceptación de la estrategia de comunicación el interlocutor aporta, a veces, esa palabra. Los hablantes nativos, pero también los aprendices tanto de nivel avanzado como de nivel intermedio, reaccionan a veces ante
una estrategia de comunicación ofreciendo al aprendiz una palabra nueva –‘input’– que éste desconoce pero necesita utilizar para la adecuada comunicación de su mensaje.

Examinamos este tipo de comportamiento intentando identificar si en la interacción se dan las condiciones necesarias para que esta palabra sea incorporada por el aprendiz a su sistema interlingüístico, es decir, para que este vocablo sea aprendido o adquirido por el estudiante. Los resultados de nuestros análisis indican que, cuando esto ocurre, hablante y oyente utilizan una forma de interacción que en la bibliografía especializada en adquisición de segundas lenguas se conoce como diálogo colaborativo –‘collaborative dialogue’. Los interlocutores utilizan la lengua no sólo para comunicar significado, sino también para hablar y reflexionar sobre la propia lengua. La interacción que se desarrolla en el marco de la secuencia estratégica sirve para que el aprendiz advierta una laguna en su sistema interlingüístico, el interlocutor le proporcione el elemento necesario para compensar esa laguna, aprendiz e interlocutor reflexionen sobre ese elemento y sus características y, con la ayuda de su compañero, el alumno llegue a ser capaz de utilizar una palabra nueva que antes desconocía.

En nuestro estudio encontramos además datos que dejan patente que el aprendiz es capaz de interiorizar esa nueva palabra y de utilizarla a posteriori de una forma independiente. La secuencia estratégica sirve para que el aprendiz obtenga y utilice, con la ayuda de su interlocutor, una palabra que antes desconocía, y para que ésta sea incorporada a su sistema interlingüístico y se transforme en un recurso para la comunicación futura. En resumen, el uso de una estrategia de comunicación sirve para comunicar un mensaje, pero también, en ocasiones, para adquirir una nueva forma lingüística, es decir, para aprender un determinado elemento lingüístico.

Todos estos datos nos permiten concluir que las estrategias de comunicación pueden y deben ser vistas tanto por investigadores como por profesores de lenguas como un posible recurso para el desarrollo de la competencia lingüística del aprendiz. En nuestro trabajo advertimos, sin embargo, que el diálogo colaborativo aparece en algunas de las secuencias estratégicas analizadas, pero no en todas, ni siquiera en la mayoría de ellas. Para que surja diálogo colaborativo, es decir, para que hablante e interlocutor colaboren no sólo en la construcción del significado sino también en la construcción de una nueva forma lingüística, y que esta forma sea interiorizada por el aprendiz, han de darse una serie de condiciones.
En primer lugar, el interlocutor debe conocer ese elemento lingüístico que el aprendiz desea utilizar pero desconoce. Si bien en la interacción con hablantes nativos esto no es un problema, cuando dos aprendices con un dominio similar de la lengua meta interactúan, esto no siempre ocurre. En ocasiones el interlocutor no es capaz de ayudar al aprendiz como desearía, simplemente porque él también carece en su sistema interlingüístico de los elementos necesarios para expresar el mensaje que los dos están colaborando en comunicar. En estos casos la intervención y ayuda del profesor es fundamental.

En segundo lugar, tanto el aprendiz como el interlocutor deben centrar su atención no sólo en los aspectos comunicativos de la tarea a realizar, sino también en los aspectos formales. Es decir, deben intentar no sólo construir significado, sino también la forma lingüística necesaria para expresar ese significado con la mayor corrección y adecuación posible. Los resultados de nuestros análisis muestran que la mayoría de los estudiantes intentan realizar las tareas comunicativas propuestas con la mayor rapidez y facilidad posible. Si esta tarea requiere exclusivamente la satisfactoria comunicación de una serie de contenidos, pero no que estos contenidos sean expresados con corrección gramatical y léxica, la mayoría de los alumnos prestarán atención única y exclusivamente a los aspectos comunicativos. Intentarán construir significado, pero no colaborarán entre ellos para crear nuevas formas lingüísticas que puedan repercutir de forma positiva en su conocimiento de la lengua extranjera. Es decir, de nuestro estudio se deduce que los aprendices pueden ayudarse entre ellos, a través del uso del diálogo colaborativo, a avanzar en el dominio de la lengua extranjera. Sin embargo, para que esto ocurra el profesor debe proponer tareas específicamente diseñadas para centrar la atención de los estudiantes no sólo en la comunicación del mensaje sino también en las formas lingüísticas utilizadas para esa comunicación. Este tipo de tareas se conocen en el campo de la didáctica de lenguas con el nombre de tareas colaborativas – ‘collaborative tasks’.

Finalmente, encontramos que, en ocasiones, los aprendices rechazan el diálogo colaborativo por motivos de carácter sociocultural. Consideran que ayudar a un compañero a expresar el contenido de sus mensajes con una forma más adecuada que la inicialmente utilizada por éste puede ser percibido como una falta de respeto. Interpretan el diálogo colaborativo como un mero proceso de corrección que puede
molestar o incluso ofender al compañero. Otros aprendices entienden, no obstante, que este tipo de comportamiento en lugar de ofender puede ayudar y contribuir al desarrollo de la competencia lingüística de sus compañeros. Este tipo de actitud ante el diálogo colaborativo debe por lo tanto ser fomentada en el aula por el profesor de lenguas si queremos que nuestros estudiantes aprovechen al máximo las oportunidades que la interacción oral y el uso de las estrategias de comunicación les ofrecen para avanzar en su conocimiento de la lengua extranjera.

En definitiva, los resultados del presente trabajo de investigación revelan que, cuando en la comunicación en lengua extranjera surge un problema lingüístico, éste es solucionado de forma conjunta por todos los interlocutores. Aprendiz e interlocutor colaboran en este proceso. El hablante desarrolla una primera estrategia de comunicación, pero es la acción conjunta de este hablante y de su interlocutor, el proceso conjunto de construcción del significado que sigue a la presentación de esta estrategia, el que permite alcanzar el fin último de la comunicación. Este proceso, en ocasiones, puede además constituir una ocasión para el aprendizaje lingüístico. Los aprendices utilizan las estrategias de comunicación no sólo para solucionar sus problemas comunicativos, sino también para conseguir de sus compañeros la ayuda necesaria para compensar sus lagunas de conocimiento. Utilizan las estrategias de comunicación para obtener nuevas muestras de lengua, nuevo \textit{input} que es incorporado a su sistema interlingüístico.

Nuestro trabajo tiene, en consecuencia, implicaciones tanto para la investigación en el campo de la adquisición de segundas lenguas como para la práctica didáctica. Por una parte demostramos que para entender la comunicación estratégica en toda su complejidad, el investigador no puede prestar atención única y exclusivamente a las estrategias de comunicación utilizadas por los estudiantes, debe atender a todo el proceso de interacción, a la colaboración entre aprendiz e interlocutor. Por otra parte, nuestro estudio sugiere que el uso de las estrategias de comunicación puede contribuir al desarrollo del sistema interlingüístico del aprendiz y que, por lo tanto, puede constituir un recurso de aprendizaje dentro y fuera del aula, a ser tenido en cuenta tanto por los aprendices como por los profesores de lenguas.

Existen todavía muchas cuestiones por resolver antes de poder alcanzar un conocimiento claro y completo del valor y función de las estrategias de comunicación
en la interacción oral personal. Es preciso llevar a cabo más estudios con el fin de clarificar si los resultados obtenidos en la presente investigación son extrapolables a otro tipo de alumnos con otros niveles de competencia lingüística, a la interacción no sólo entre parejas sino también entre grupos, o incluso entre toda una clase, y a contextos más naturales como es el uso de la lengua dentro de la clase o fuera del contexto académico. Creemos en este sentido que la línea de trabajo seguida en nuestro trabajo ofrece importantes posibilidades para esta investigación futura que, sin duda alguna, aportará nuevos y enriquecedores datos, tanto para el estudio de la adquisición de segundas lenguas como para la práctica didáctica de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras.
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APPENDIX A.1

 PLACEMENT TEST
Oxford Placement Test 2

Listening Test

Name ____________________________

Total Listening __________ / 100
Total Grammar Part 1 __________ / 50
Total Grammar Part 2 __________ / 50
Grand total __________ / 200

Look at the example below. Listen to the tape. You will hear the example once only. Decide which word you hear, 'soap', or 'soup'.

a  Will you get me some __________ at the supermarket?

The word was 'soup', so 'soup' is ticked. Now look at these examples, and listen to the tape again. This time, you tick the words you hear. For example, if you hear 'shorts' tick 'shorts'.

b  The team need new __________

c  They've recently developed a new kind of __________

The words on the tape were 'shorts' and 'wine', so the correct answers look like this:

b  The team need new __________

c  They've recently developed a new kind of __________

Now the test will begin. Listen to the tape and tick (✓) the words you hear.
2. He asked if it could be given in a bit late and I said yes, today yesterday was OK.
3. I think Agassi's winning it to love two-love.
4. I'd have lied liked to help him.
5. At least last you understand what I mean.
6. I think she lives at No. 68. 60A.
7. He was rapped by his team-mates because he hadn't trained hard enough.
8. Seas are killed each summer off the Newfoundland coast.
9. They asked if I was sending anybody and I said Mike or myself I might go myself.
10. I'm afraid we've only fifty fifteen left in stock.
11. She lacks that little bit of class.
12. He's just become a member of the Hockey Jockey Club.
13. They're going to Wrexham Wrexham for their holidays.
14. What do you think those ships shapes on the horizon are?
15. Did you realize he slept slipped out last night?
16. It's an amusing story, isn't it?
17. The roads were absolutely impossible last week.
18. Sooner or later we'll have to chuck check them out.
19. Is it ready for typing taping yet?
20. Most of the new wave bands sound really good.
21. We need a cork chalk board in our classroom.
22. Do they have many orchids in Tunisia?
23. I see Oxford University is advertising the chair in metaphysics matter physics.
24. Can you help Bridge Richard to get it finished?
25. It'll be difficult to keep within these parameters, but you must try.
26. I think they now give the weather report from the news studio.
27. He's working on a new model module at the moment.
28. I must say I quite fancy his latest film.
29. She's one of the most evil even-tempered people I've ever met.
30. His house is really tidy.
31. The bathroom's small, but it's got a flash too.
32. Iran has been particularly successful in reducing its dependence on American experts exports.
33. Is land cheaper in Australia than it is here?
34. Do you think he feels a bit about it now?
35. In the late sixties neo-colonialist attitudes could have posed a real threat to the Kenya nation.
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36 We just can't get our gardener to cut the hedges, edges neatly.
37 If you add soda, cider, it'll make it nice and fizzy.
38 She said that as far as she was concerned we'd been no trouble at all.
39 The longer we went on, the hotter, harder it became.
40 If you're looking for John I think he's in the lab, lav.
41 He's teaching the computer to play a new game - not chess but something similar, simpler.
42 Did you know your rear offside light's gone?
43 I'm leaving! I'm not going to let you ruin my life.
44 That was the first of a series of dramatic, traumatic events that took place in his teens.
45 My son got a new pair of flipflops, slippers to take on holiday with him.
46 If only one could test learners' attitudes, aptitudes it'd be a lot easier to group them.
47 I'm told there are a lot of tigers, Thai girls in the north of the country.
48 I wish that guy I could be given more help at times.
49 The main advantage of this material is that it's expandable, expandable.
50 Do you know if this text is copyright, copied right?
51 Have you heard the results yet?
52 Is Susie's horse ready for shoeing, showing?
53 Do you know if he's gone aboard, abroad yet?
54 To get accurate results you need to use a wide range of text types.
55 She's a member of the National, Natural Childbirth Trust.
56 She bought him a Bulova, pullover for Christmas.
57 He was best known for his work in musicals, music halls in the fifties.
58 I understand the Prime Minister is back in backing Britain.
59 Several teams have paid dearly for underestimating the Brazilians, their resilience.
60 I think he said he wouldn't be back till eight, late.
61 Are we going to be able to send him the remainder, reminder in time?
62 I don't really think she has any intention of leaving, living with him.
63 Seeing that has made me feel really angry, hungry.
64 Let's eat, heat that stew up tomorrow. It seems a pity to waste it.
65 Have you tasted, teasted it yet?
66 I honestly thought you were joking, choking.
67 I don't know if he heard her or not.
68 Mansell left the pits fast, first, but Senna was soon after him.
69 Do you have any idea what the prize price is?
70 I can't put anything in this bucket, pocket because there's a hole in it.
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71 You know I'd like to see you whenever possible.
72 The only way to get there in winter is by the old route up the mountain pass.
73 Are you going to help us get the boat out?
74 Have you seen those pills I was looking for?
75 I believe Peter's chairman isn't he?
76 He won several Grand Prix races in the Surtees thirties before he retired.
77 Was the Mini money recognizable afterwards?
78 He works for the highlands islands tourist board.
79 James was one of the Stuarts stewards, wasn't he?
80 The finance committee were told that the extra house hours would cost £40,000.
81 They'd be surprised if they realized what people like Caroline and I have to do.
82 AJ HA Foyt is the only driver to have won the Indy 500 three years in a row.
83 The conference is scheduled for Friday the 13th 30th of May.
84 I'm afraid I've no idea if they've finished.
85 I could do with an ice-cold a nice, cold drink.
86 He's recently become an MB MP.
87 Farmers in the north and in Scotland lost a lot of lambs rams last winter.
88 This pen is no use – it keeps leaking.
89 It was several hours before they found us.
90 Cambridge is about 80 miles from Norwich and 60 also or so from London.
91 The police said they would find the offender immediately.
92 If you like the style, there's a wide choice of collars available.
93 The race was ruined by the rain.
94 He ran off before we could ask his name.
95 That was quite a fright we had, wasn't it?
96 Import restrictions on Catalan cattle and sheep are now likely to be lifted.
97 I've strained my wrist, so I won't be able to play tomorrow.
98 What he said was true in either case.
99 Norwich grew faster than ever before after the Renaissance.
100 This selection doesn't give one much of a choice, does it?
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Oxford Placement Test 2
Grammar Test  PART 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Listening / 100</th>
<th>Total Grammar Part 2 / 50</th>
<th>Total Grammar Part 1 / 50</th>
<th>Grand total / 200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Look at these examples. The correct answer is ticked.

a In warm climates people [ ] likes [ ] are liking [ ] sitting outside in the sun.

b If it is very hot, they sit [ ] at [ ] under [ ] the shade.

Now the test will begin. Tick the correct answers.

1 Water [ ] be freezing [ ] is freezing [ ] freezes [ ] at a temperature of 0°C.
2 In some countries [ ] there [ ] is [ ] it [ ] is dark all the time in winter.
3 In hot countries people wear light clothes [ ] for keeping [ ] to keep [ ] for to keep [ ] cool.
4 In Madeira they have [ ] the good [ ] good [ ] a good [ ] weather almost all year.
5 Most Mediterranean countries are [ ] more warm [ ] the more warm [ ] warmer [ ] in October than in April.
6 Parts of Australia don’t have [ ] the some [ ] any [ ] ran for long periods.
7 In the Arctic and Antarctic [ ] it [ ] there [ ] is [ ] it has [ ] a lot of snow.
8 Climate is very important in [ ] most of [ ] most [ ] the most [ ] people’s lives.
9 Even now there is [ ] little [ ] few [ ] less [ ] we can do to control the weather.
10 In the future [ ] we’ll need [ ] we are needing [ ] we can need [ ] to get a lot of power from [ ] the sun and the wind.

11 Pela is still perhaps [ ] most [ ] the most [ ] the more [ ] famous footballer in the world.
12 He [ ] had been [ ] is [ ] was [ ] born in 1940.
13 His mother [ ] not want [ ] wasn’t wanting [ ] didn’t want [ ] him to be a footballer.
14 But he [ ] used [ ] ought [ ] has used [ ] to watch his father play.
15 His father [ ] made him to [ ] made him [ ] would make him to [ ] practise every day.

subtotal / 15
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16. He learned to use his foot or his left foot or his right.
17. He got the name Pele when he was only ten years old.
18. By 1956 he had joined Santos and in 1957 he had joined the Brazilian national team.
19. In 1967 he was picking Santos and had scored in his first game.
20. The World Cup Finals were won in 1958 and Pele was looking forward to playing for Brazil.
21. But he hurt his knee in a game in Brazil.
22. He thought that he wasn’t going to be able to play in the final.
23. If he hadn’t been there wouldn’t be so important to the team, he would have been left behind.
24. But he was a such a brilliant player, they took him anyway.
25. And even though he wasn’t allowed to play, he was injured he helped Brazil to win the final.

The history of the World Cup is quite a long one.

Football has been played for over a hundred years, but the first World Cup competition was held until 1930. Uruguay could win the Olympic football final in 1924 and 1928 and wanted to be World Champions for the third time.

Four teams entered from Europe, but with a few players, they took him anyway.

It was the first time that the first time. The 1934 World Cup was again won by a home team.

After this, it has been the case several times since then. The 1934 final was among European teams, Czechoslovakia and Italy. which team won, went on to win the 1938 final. Winning successive finals is something that has not been achieved again until Brazil did it in 1958 and 1962.

If Brazil would have won in 1934, they would have needed to have made the original World Cup replaced.

But England stopped the Brazilians to get a third successive win. An England player, Geoff Hurst, scored three goals in the final and won it almost by himself. 1966 proved to be the last year that England would have won.

| subtotal: | 56 |
Grammar Test  PART 2

51 Many **persons**, **people**, **peoples** nowadays believe that everyone should learn to use computers.
52 The majority of children in the UK **have** **has** **are having** access to a micro-computer.
53 There are more computers per head in England than **anywhere else** **somewhere else** **anywhere other** in the world.
54 Learning a computer language is not the same **as like than** learning a real language.
55 Most people start off with **Basic** *, **who** **what** **which** is the easiest to learn.
56 Children seem to find computers easy, but many adults aren't used to **work** **the work** **working** with microtechnology.
57 There aren't **no any some** easy ways of learning to program a computer.
58 The only way to become really proficient is to practise a lot **on your own** **by your own** **on your self**.
59 You can pick up the basics quite quickly if you **want to** **would are willing to** **make an effort**.
60 Most adults feel it would be easier if only they **would have started** **would start** **had started** computer studies earlier.
61 Some people would just **rather prefer better** not have anything to do with computers at all.
62 A lot have resigned themselves to never even **know** **known** **knowing** how a computer works.
63 Microtechnology is moving so fast that hardly **anybody** **nobody** **no one** can keep up with it all.
64 It's no use **in trying to try trying** to learn about computers just by reading books.
65 Everyone has **difficulty in learning difficulties to learn** it difficult to learn **if they can't get hands-on experience**.

Below is a letter written to the 'advice' column of a daily newspaper. Tick the correct answers.

Dear Marge,

I am writing **will write** **should write** to you because I
am not knowing **don't know** **know not** what to do. I'm twenty-six and a teacher at
a primary school in Norwich where **I'm working** **I've worked** **work** for the last five years.

When I **was** **have been** **had been** there for a couple of years, one of the older members of staff
would leave **left** **had been leaving** , and a new teacher
would be **became** **was** appointed to work in the same department as me.

We **worked** **have worked** **should work** together with the same classes during her first year
and had the **opportunity for building** **possibilities to build** **chance to build** up a good professional
relationship. Then, about eighteen months after she **has arrived** **to have arrived** **arriving**
in Norwich, she decided to buy **her own herself her a** house.

subtotal 25
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Placement Test 2</th>
<th>Grammar Test Part 2</th>
<th>Page 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She was tired of <em>to live</em></td>
<td><em>live</em></td>
<td><em>living</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by her own</td>
<td>of her own</td>
<td>of herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was given</td>
<td>have been given</td>
<td>gave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what I was living</td>
<td>that I had lived</td>
<td>I was living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and who asked me if</td>
<td><em>I liked</em></td>
<td><em>had liked</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she would pay</td>
<td><em>would have paid</em></td>
<td><em>had paid</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the bills</td>
<td><em>it there</em></td>
<td><em>they wouldn't be</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us to</td>
<td><em>we should</em></td>
<td><em>we may</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seemed like a good idea, so after</td>
<td><em>we'd agreed</em></td>
<td><em>we could agree</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of this month</td>
<td><em>we have lived</em></td>
<td><em>we have been living</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live</td>
<td><em>I'm living</em></td>
<td><em>I've lived</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should guess</td>
<td><em>I might have guessed</em></td>
<td><em>I'd have guessed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yours in any desperation,</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Look at the following examples of question tags in English. The correct form of the tag is ticked.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Correct Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a He's getting the 9:15 train, <em>hasn't he</em>?</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b She works in a library, <em>doesn't she</em>?</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Tom didn't tell you, <em>didn't he</em>?</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Someone's forgotten to switch off the gas, <em>haven't they</em>?</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Now tick the correct question tag in the following 10 items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correct Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Steve's off to China, <em>has he</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>It'll be a year before we see him again, <em>won't we</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>I believe he's given up smoking, <em>hasn't he</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I'm next on the list to go out there, <em>aren't I</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>No doubt you'd rather he didn't stay abroad too long, <em>wouldn't you</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>He's rarely been away for this long before, <em>hasn't he</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>So you think he'll be back before November, <em>will he</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Nobody's disagreed with the latest proposals, <em>have they</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>We'd better not delay reading this any longer, <em>should we</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Now's hardly the time to tell me you didn't need a test at all, <em>is it</em>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** 25
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DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
DATA COLLECTION TASK IN 1999 STUDY

INSTRUCTIONS

Look at the following pictures. They form a story. Try to tell this story in as much detail as possible. Pay attention to the clothes the characters are wearing, the objects appearing in the pictures, what the characters are doing, what they look like, how they are feeling, the expression of their faces, etc.

Make sure all the information included in the pictures is included in your narration. Do not worry about your English. Mistakes do not really matter as long as you tell the story as precisely as possible, in such a way that it can be understood by an English native speaker.

Use your imagination, but do not invent a radically different story since afterwards you will have to retell it in your mother tongue.

If you have any doubt, do not hesitate to ask me.

STORY

DATA COLLECTION TASK IN THE PRESENT STUDY

INSTRUCTIONS

PARTICIPANT A:

Look at the following pictures. They form a story. Your partner has the same story, but there are a few things in your pictures that are either missing or different in his/her pictures. Your pictures have more details and are in general more complex. These differences are related to the clothes the characters are wearing, the objects appearing in the pictures, what the characters are doing, what they look like, how they are feeling, the expression of their faces, etc.

You and your partner will have to identify these differences, more specifically, what are the things or events in your story that are missing in your partner’s pictures. There are a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 5 differences in each picture. Since you cannot look at each other’s pictures, you will have, for this purpose, to describe them in as much detail as possible. Make sure you are able to convey all the information presented in these pictures. You will need not only to describe the pictures but also to narrate what is going on and to talk about what the characters are doing and how they are feeling. You will also have to ask your partner about their pictures in order to be able to establish an agreement with your partner on the differences existing between them. He/she will note down all the differences you have been able to identify.

Always try to give as many details as possible. If you do not know the exact word to refer to an object, an action or an idea, it is OK if you find another way to communicate it. Try not to be silent, not to leave things unmentioned. Make sure all the information is included in your account of the story.

Do not worry about your English mistakes; we are not testing your proficiency level. Mistakes do not matter that much as long as you tell the story as precisely as possible. The idea is that you can make yourself understood and that you can make clear the objects and actions you see so that your partner can identify them.

The first story is meant to let you practice and see if you have any questions. If there is something you don’t understand or if you have any doubt, feel free to interrupt it and to ask me as many questions as you may need. Try to solve all your doubts during the first session; afterwards, during the actual recording, I will not be able to help you.
PARTICIPANT B:

Look at the following pictures. They form a story. Your partner has the same story, but there are a few things in his/her pictures that are either missing or different in your pictures. Your pictures have less details and are in general less complex. These differences are related to the clothes the characters are wearing, the objects appearing in the pictures, what the characters are doing, what they look like, how they are feeling, the expression of their faces, etc.

You and your partner will have to identify these differences, more specifically, what are the things or events in your partner’s story that are missing in your pictures. There are a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 5 differences in each picture. Since you cannot look at each other’s pictures you will have, for this purpose, to describe them in as much detail as possible. Make sure your partner conveys all the information presented in his/her pictures. He/she will need not only to describe the pictures but also to narrate what is going on and to talk about what the characters are doing and how they are feeling. You will also have to talk about your own pictures in order to be able to establish an agreement with your partner on the differences existing between them.

Try to note down these differences in the grid we have given you. You can do this in English, but also in Spanish or in Galician if you feel unable to do it in English. One word is usually enough to identify the missing item.

Listen carefully to what your partner says in order to be able to accomplish the task successfully. If there is anything you do not understand, if you think your partner is not giving you enough details, feel free to interrupt him/her and ask as many questions as you need. Make sure you partner gives you enough information to identify all the possible differences.

Do not worry about your English mistakes; we are not testing your proficiency level. Mistakes do not matter that much as long as you and your partner tell the story as precisely as possible. The idea is that you can make yourselves understood and that you can make clear the objects and actions you see so that you can identify them.

The first story is meant to let you practice and see if you have any questions. If there is something you don’t understand or if you have any doubt, feel free to interrupt it and to ask me as many questions as you need. Try to solve all your doubts during the first session; afterwards, during the actual recording, I will not be able to help you.
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DATA TRANSCRIPTION
APPENDIX B.1

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
APPENDIX B: Data transcription

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS: SIMPLIFIED SYSTEM

A: participant A’s turn
B: participant B’s turn

? rising intonation contour, not necessarily a question
! animated or emphatic talk, not necessarily an exclamation

wor- cut-off of the prior word or sound

(word) doubtful or uncertain speech
(xx xx) unintelligible speech, each double x represents one unintelligible word
(xxx) unintelligible string of speech, the number of unintelligible words is uncountable

heh laughter, more laughter symbols indicate laughter of extended duration
heh! strong laughter
(heh)word laughing quality of a word

((cough)) non-verbal vocal noises
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS: EXTENDED SYSTEM

A: participant A’s turn
B: participant B’s turn

word= latching at the end of an utterance
=word latching at the beginning of an utterance

[ beginning of temporal overlap between two utterances

] end of temporal overlap between two utterances

(0.6) pause measured in tenths of seconds
(.) micro-pause, a timed pause of less than 0.2 seconds

. falling intonation contour
, non-falling or continuing intonation contour
? rising intonation contour, not necessarily a question
! animated or emphatic talk, not necessarily an exclamation

word lengthened sound or syllable, more colons prolong the stretch
wor- cut-off of the prior word or sound

>word< rapid speech, faster than surrounding talk
<word> slow speech, slower than surrounding talk

WORD loud speech, louder than surrounding talk
°word° soft speech, lower than surrounding talk
word stress on a word, syllable or sound

(word) doubtful or uncertain speech
(xx xx) unintelligible speech, each double x represents one unintelligible word
(xxx) unintelligible string of speech, the number of unintelligible words is uncountable
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word (/'w3:d/) phonetic transcription, added to orthographic representation when a
non-standard pronunciation of a word or string takes on special
significance for the spoken interaction

d’abra (‘word’) code switching to the speaker’s first language and English translation

((cough)) non-verbal vocal noises

hhh audible inhalation

hhh audible exhalation

w(hhh)ord breathiness within a word

heh laughter, more laughter symbols indicate laughter of extended duration

heh! strong laughter

(heh)word laughing quality of a word

{{((nod))}} non-verbal behaviour

{} beginning of temporal overlap between speech and non-verbal behavior

} end of temporal overlap between speech and non-verbal behavior

{{ beginning of temporal overlap between speech and non-verbal behavior

before the end of a first overlap

}}} end of an embedded temporal overlap

... part of a turn has been omitted

Key to abbreviations for non-verbal behavior transcription

A participant A

AA arms

AB participant A and participant B

B participant B

HH hands
II  index fingers
LA  left arm
LH  left hand
LI  left index finger
RA  right arm
RH  right hand
RI  right index finger
×2  gesture is repeated twice
×n  gesture is repeated an uncounted number of times
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TRANSCRIPTS
APPENDIX B: Data transcription

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-ADV AV

PARTICIPANT A: Antía, female, 21, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, Erasmus student during 1 year in England

PARTICIPANT B: Verónica, female, 21, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student

1 A: eh in the first picture there is a boy and is wearing a
2    jacket and a short trousers and
3 B: ((coughing))
4 A: he’s going to to be given a punch given a punch on the face
5 B: mhm
6 A: and eh let’s see well his face is of surprise you know when you
7    are going to receive a punch you react this way
8 B: (xxx)
9 A: a punch when someone eh tch hits you? on the face with his hand
10 B: in my picture the hand is open
11 A: oh the hand is open! oh mine is a punch?
12 B: no
13 A: okay
14 B: mhm
15 A: and then the kid is wearing a jacket and he’s he’s standing up
16 yeah and short trousers with eh socks and shoes
17 B: mm nothing else about this picture
18 A: hm hm
19 B: okay in in the second
20 A: eh yeah in the second mm well you see the same kid but he has
21 already been given a punch and and his right right eye is
22 completely black
23 B: in my picture he he’s smiling heh heh heh
24 A: he’s smiling?
25 B: yeah heh
26 A: no i think he’s that he is i don’t know about his face his
27 expression but i think that you know? i can see some stars? you
28 know? over his head
29 B: yeah four stars
30 A: yeah and he’s not smiling at all heh heh
31 B: (xxx) in my picture it seems to be smiling
32 A: smiling
33 B: he seems to be smiling
34 A: mhm he’s wearing a a tie?
35 B: hm hm
36 A: and it’s a striped black and white stripes and eh
37 B: in my picture the the tie is completely white
38 A: white and striped and then is wearing a jacket with short
39 trousers socks and shoes
40 B: mhm
41 A: mm mm and that’s it
42 B: (xxx)
A: well in the next one eh this boy is running crying but running to
a man sitting on a sofa and the kid is crying with eh the same
clothes on and the man on the sofa is eh is black hair
B: hm hm
A: with a mm moustache?
B: in my picture eh he does not wear a moustache
A: uuuuh okay in mine he does
B: and he he has a newspaper
A: yeah on his right hand?
B: yeah
A: uuuuh
B: yeah eh (xx) the boy is mm crying?
A: yeah is crying and like running towards the man on the sofa
B: in my picture he seems to be walking
A: walking?
B: yeah not running
A: mm the man on the sofa is wearing a a shirt a waistcoat
B: in my picture he he doesn’t he wears only a tie
A: hm hm
B: and a shirt
A: mhm
B: but not a coat and not a jacket
A: mi- well it’s not a jacket it’s you know? this with no
B: ah! in my picture he doesn’t
A: uuuuh and then the trousers and a pair of shoes
B: mhm
A: and that’s it there is nothing else in the next one the boy seems
to be crying and shouting heh at the same time the same clothes
and then the man on the sofa his face is expressing like surprise
you know?
B: yeah
A: he’s eh looking at the kid crying and with his mouth open and his
eyes wide open
B: and what about the tongue? heh heh
A: what!! the tongue!? you mean the man or the kid
B: the kid heh heh
A: yeah well heh
B: heh heh heh
A: yeah yeah i can see his tongue and then
B: uuuuh?
A: and then the man has eh mm has let fall down the the newspaper is
on the floor is not in his hand any more
B: in my picture it is still in his hand
A: in his hand? okay
B: yeah
A: in this one the newspaper is on the floor and the man has nothing
special that’s it face of surprise moustache moustache nothing
else the next one tch eh the man is holding eh the kid’s hand
B: in my picture eh he doesn’t
A: he doesn’t?
B: yeah
A: and again the kid’s eye the le- the the right eye of the kid is
eh is black
B: well in my picture the eye doesn’t have well any- anything
special but the he’s crying
A: mhm yeah
B: he’s he’s still crying
A: yeah and then the man looks like angry and he’s very angry his
face
B: here he doesn’t seem mm eh he seems serious
A: yeah well serious yeah and they’re walking
B: yeah they’re in the they’re walking
A: and i don’t think there is nothing mm? in the next one they are
in front of a door and well the kid again with his eye black and
then mm the man is standing and is not with the he’s not going to
knock the door already and the the door has like like a like a
hand? you know? to knock something like that
B: hm (xxx) here in my door only have a number seventeen
A: i don’t have any number on my door
B: (xxx) does the man seems to to be waiting?
A: yeah yeah and in my door in the middle in the middle of the door
we can see like a quadra- quadrangular a hole you know?
B: yeah
A: for for the mail
B: oh in my picture he doesn’t (xxx)
A: well i i can’t see any any sign on it but it’s just like a
quadrangular hole
B: mm
A: and that’s it in the next one the man is knocking knocking on the
door
B: here in in the next one is identical with the the other picture
with the previous
A: the previous one? is identical?
B: yeah where are you? you have said that he’s knocking? on the door
A: no no i i’ve changed
B: in the new?
A: yeah
B: in in the
A: in the previous one? now he’s standing with his arms
B: that’s no in the new?
A: in the new one?
B: in the new one he’s knocking
A: yeah
B: and here the new one is similar to the
A: ah! to the previous one?
B: hm
A: oh! no! here the man is you know? with his arm up? he’s knocking
on the door and you can see the signs of of knocking on the door
and the and the the kid his expression is like like the previous
one yeah
B: mhm
A: like waiting or oh yeah! and look at the kid because mine has his
hand on his eh cheek
B: he has his (hands back) he’s not
A: the kid has on mine eh his hand on the cheek and the man is
knocking on the door
B: yeah and what about the face the boy’s face
A: the boy’s face? he’s like surprised
B: mm no
A: no!? no
B: no heh heh
A: no! i think it’s the typical face that you put when your father
is knocking on heh the neighbor’s door heh heh to shout at them
no i think it’s the psk his eyes are wide open
B: yeah
A: and his mouth shows that he’s not happy heh
B: hm
A: and the man i think it’s he looks mm serious not angry you know?
he’s serious

in this picture it he he seems angry

angry?

and the next one?

yeah someone has opened the door yeah and and he’s well an old
man because he has no hair and he’s wearing glasses?

hm

and a and he’s standing he’s smiling and i think he’s talking to
them like mm like saying what do you want? heh but he’s happy

is he tall?

no

no heh

he’s very small

and what about? his clothes?

his clothes? he’s wearing a shirt?

hm

with a mm i don’t know how do you call this you know? he has his
shirt this way

mm heh in this picture he has the shirt

in the normal position?

in the normal position

yeah heh heh okay and he’s wearing trousers and a tch i don’t
know what you do you call mm you know? like the you know fraga?

heh

he’s always wearing this kind of heh heh yeah heh this kind of
you know? to mm to prevent to your trousers from falling down you
wear (i think) this mm? and then his trousers and

in this picture he doesn’t wear the heh heh heh

okay

tirantes heh heh mm

okay and the kid has his mouth open

he he he seems to be (xxx)?

hm

and the father and

well the father he’s not smiling but but you know he doesn’t look
that angry

by the expression you think?

yeah yeah his eyebrows yeah

mhm

doesn’t seem and what about the kids’ arms? they’re just standing
like this

yeah yeah mm in in hi- in his back

yeah in his back yeah

hm

and the you see the floor? of of the of the house

yeah

inside the house mine is like with eh tch is black and white

mine is only black only white heh heh heh

mine is black and white again with quadrangles or something like
that and then it seems like paper in the on the wall you can see
the wall? mm

yeah inside the house

yeah in- inside the house mine is eh covered with flowers

mine is completely white

white? mine has flowers and the house has bricks? on the outside

yeah

some bricks and that’s it and the next one well the father is
really angry and he’s shouting

he he he seems to be he is not talking
A: he’s not talking?
B: his mouth is closed
A: ah! no no here i can see it’s it’s clear heh
B: mm eh the short man or the tall man?
A: the tall one
B: okay because here the short man is talking he seems to be talking
A: no in my picture the one who is talking is the the tall one
B: and the boy?
A: and the boy ah is again like the previous one
B: yeah the same expression
A: (his) mouth is open and his arms that way again and the the
the the short man is with his arms mm wide open and eh and
his expression well in your picture he’s talking the small one is
talking the short one in mine has like a face of what? something
like that and again and you know the the tall one? he’s with his
arm like pointing
B: here he seems mm psk
A: his left arm is pointing
B: mm here his right hand is open
A: it’s open?
B: yeah as he
A: what? is it up? or is it down?
B: down
A: okay but the other one?
B: (xxx)
A: the left? his left arm?
B: i can’t see i can’t see the left arm
A: ah okay because mine is pointing
B: mm here the the right hand is eh it’s open and seems that as if
the tall man was mm was going to heh heh
A: really?
B: well (xxx)
A: in my picture i i can’t see that
B: the next one?
A: uuhh the short man is calling someone in the house
B: here he’s only looking at someone heh heh inside the house
A: yeah he’s looking?
B: only looking
A: some place in- into the house because mine is like mm you know?
shouting for someone because his hand is just near his mouth like
when you call some- someone
B: mhm
A: aloud and again the the kid was (under) the same gesture
B: in this picture he seems to be very scared
A: very scared? yeah again his mouth open and his eyebrows this way
B: hm hm heh heh heh
A: and the and the tall man has a the right the right his right arm
is like this? mm like a punch that
B: here it’s again (xxx)
A: open?
B: yes
A: mine is closed and the
B: in the same way that
A: mhm?
B: the other picture
A: and that’s it mm
B: uuhh {(clearing throat)} the next one
A: in the next one? the tall man is like preparing himself to give
mm the other man a punch you know when when someone eh does this
to give someone a punch and eh
B: and the boy?
A: the boy is again eh with the same face as the previous one no
changes and and the short one has his face like like
B: (xxx)
A: like he didn’t understand what’s happening his mouth is open
B: oh!
A: and he’s staring at the at the tall man
B: here the tall man eh is talking to the short man and the short
man seems to (xxx) for (xxx)
A: is his mouth open?
B: (xxx) mm the short man has the the mouth close and the tall one
has the mouth open but only it seems only he’s speaking
A: uuhh
B: he’s talking
A: mhm
B: to the other man
A: no mine the the short man in my picture has his mm his expression
is like he doesn’t understand why he’s gonna give him a punch
B: mm (i don’t know) but in my picture the the tall man eh he’s not
preparing to give the punch heh heh
A: no!?
B: to the no
A: in mine he is
B: he’s going this in the same way in the same way as in the other
picture in the previous one
A: uuhh
B: and the boy he doesn’t (xxx)
A: yeah the boy is the same way but in my picture he’s gonna give
him a punch he’s preparing himself
B: and the last one?
A: in in the last one well there’s a really really tall and big guy
mm behind the small man
B: yeah
A: and he’s standing with his face he looks like a bit angry and
this huge guy heh is wearing like a cap?
B: yeah
A: it’s not a hat but a cap?
B: he he he doesn’t wear anything but he seems to be in the same the
psk clothes?
A: mhm
B: of the big boy are similar to the clothes
A: the clothes of the small of the kid?
B: yeah of the
A: and he’s wearing the same clothes (as here)
B: (xxx)
A: yeah mhm mhm his hair is black
B: yeah black
A: okay and now the father of the kid i suppose is eh his face shows
sur- surprise or more than surprise you you know he’s like a bit
scared
B: the face of the of the father the (xxx) the short man or the boy?
A: of the of the
B: short man
A: of the short man? he’s eh smiling
B: mm heh heh
A: and (change) something and he’s you know pointing with his thumb
the
B: the boy
A: the boy behind yeah
B: mhm
A: and the kid is eh is looking at the floor looking down
B: the big? the big boy?
A: no
B: (the other)
A: yeah the kid
B: oh
A: (xxx) picture
B: in my picture he’s watching at the big boy and he has scared face
A: heh heh heh
B: the kid here has like a face of like he’s surrendering like
redemption heh heh has nothing to do with the big one and the big
one is looking at at the the kid yeah
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PARTICIPANT A: Luisa, female, 22, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 2 months in England
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A:  eh in the first picture eh there is a a child a little boy who is
    1  receiving a blow? or something like that eh she he wears a
    2  uniform eh and short trousers eh in the second one eh
    3  B:  wai- wait a minute okay so eh tch he is there a eh
    4  A:  hand?
    5  B:  yeah with? that is giving the blow?
    6  A:  yeah
    7  B:  and how many fingers does it have?
    8  A:  five
    9  B:  okay
   10  A:  but it’s not open it’s
   11  B:  okay and does the hand have eh lines? underneath? indicating
   12  A:  movement?
   13  B:  how many?
   14  A:  eh three
   15  B:  mine has two and eh is his hair combed or does he does he have
   16  A:  the hair you know like eh spunky
   17  B:  like heh
   18  A:  spuky heh okay yeah
   19  B:  the uniform has a kind of symbol
   20  A:  where?
   21  B:  on the?
   22  A:  on the jacket
   23  B:  on the jacket okay mine doesn’t have symbol
   24  A:  eh
   25  B:  i think that must be it because he’s wearing shoes?
   26  A:  yeah
   27  B:  okay so
   28  A:  and
   29  B:  well eh the uniform is white? and the shoes are white? or there
   30  A:  is something black
   31  B:  okay
   32  A:  then eh in the second picture eh there is the same the same boy
   33  B:  lying on the floor?
   34  A:  on the floor?
   35  B:  i don’t know perhaps heh he’s still in th- heh in the air
B: yeah it’s not really
A: eh he sees four stars eh because of the blow and he has a black
eye eh his arms are open and his hands also eh he eh now you can
see the tie of the uniform who has black and white stripes
B: in mine it’s white
A: eh and i think that’s all
B: can you see his face?
A: yeah mm and his shoes are eh you can see the the back of the
shoes
B: the bottom? of the shoes?
A: the bottom of the shoes eh then eh on the third picture eh the
boy enters his house it seems and his father is sitting on the
sofa tch eh his father is dark hair
B: has has dark hair
A: and has a big moustache
B: okay mine has no moustache
A: and he seems to be sleeping eh he has a newspaper on her right
hand eh he wears a tie also and a i don’t know the boy enters
crying and pointing at the entrance with
B: okay in mine he’s not pointing at anything heh
A: and
B: and are his sho-? are his feet? eh and the shoes are together? or
they are apart?
A: they are apart and
B: one is behind the other?
A: one behind the other and the other arm is behind his body
B: i cannot see it
A: eh then in the following picture eh
B: wait the father must have something
A: the father? eh
B: yes because has he got? the father has he got dark hair?
A: yeah
B: eh
A: he’s sleeping and
B: the hand with the
A: the newspaper?
B: can you see all the
A: only four fingers
B: only only four fingers and it’s the other one closed or open?
A: closed
B: mm and in the bottom of the tie can you see two dots? like
buttons or something?
A: yeah
B: and does the shirt have a pocket?
A: two pockets
B: okay mine has only one pocket
A: but he but no i think mine wears a heh heh pullover without eh
B: without arms?
A: arms
B: oh
A: mm
B: mine is just a shirt no pullover okay i think that’s it
A: eh in the next one eh the father wakes up eh and looks surprised
he looks to to his son and his son is pointing at his i think at
his black eye?
B: okay in mine the boy is not pointing at anything you can’t see
his arms
A: and he’s still crying eh his legs are separated also eh the
newspaper of the newspaper that the father the father has is on
the floor now
B: okay mine has it in his hands
A: and his hand is open and
B: the other one the one that didn’t have the newspaper is it closed
or open?
A: the newspaper? is
B: hm the other one
A: is closed
B: closed?
A: and now is half open eh the father has the has his mouth open
B: mine has it closed well he still has the moustache in mine not
A: yeah
B: he doesn’t have the moustache
A: and and i think that’s all
B: okay
A: and in the following eh the father is holding his son’s hand
B: okay my in mine no
A: and with a with an angry face and the boy is still crying and and
i can see only her black eye only that part of the face
B: well eh in mine he didn’t have a black eye heh so
A: and
B: can you see his arms?
A: yeah both arms
B: i on- i can only see one arm
A: mm he has again one leg eh after the other
B: (xxx)
A: and his father is now eh has now stood up
B: is eh? his father is like walking?
A: eh yeah and the clothes are the same heh
B: okay
A: eh in the next one eh they arrive at a at a door perhaps a
neighbor’s door or a friend a friend of the son
B: yeah probably the one that hit the the little boy heh heh
A: eh heh mm he he’s not holding the hand of his son now eh and both
are looking at the door and
B: no i think my father isn’t he’s has the head turned he’s looking
that and not at the door
A: here
B: the gi- can you see the eyes of the?
A: the both eyes yeah but
B: is there a number on the door?
A: no
B: yes mine has a number sixteen
A: there are bricks in both sides of the of the door
B: yeah but they’re not completely they are just sketches
A: hm
B: and it’s there a? well i don’t know heh has the little boy? can
you both of the arms of the boy and the father?
A: mm yeah
B: mm hhh eh has the little boy the the jacket closed?
A: yes i think he has
B: mm and his feet together?
A: and his feet together
B: mm
A: they both are in a similar position
B: there must be some other mistake
A: mm
B: and a stair before eh is there a step? to go to the door (xxx)
A: only one
B: only one
A: mm eh can you see the belly of the father? heh heh
B: the belly? no
A: ah! eh i can heh
B: mine the father
A: he’s not totally eh
B: just or
A: no no the eh hhh
B: well is he s-? eh he’s standing a- in the front or he’s turned to
a side
A: he’s half turned
B: okay mine is completely standing
A: then in the following eh tch the father is knocking at the door
and
B: okay mine is not knocking he’s just it’s in my picture they’re
more or less the same they everything is more or less the same
A: no eh
B: there is no changes
A: in my picture the father is knocking at the door with more or
less the same face as in the picture before
B: does he have the mouth open or closed?
A: closed in both
B: okay
A: eh and the child the child now is eh touching his well this part
of the (heh)face heh like this
B: is touching the? okay
A: his chin eh
B: in mine he’s not touching his chin at all at all okay
A: and i think the rest are the rest of the things are the same as
in the previous picture and then the following eh the door is
open heh and there is eh a little boy eh
B: heh (xx)
A: who wears glasses and
B: yeah he has a smile in the face
A: yeah he has no hair and
B: well in mine it seems it has like two or three hairs something
like that it’s only
A: two hairs yeah two heh heh
B: yeah something
A: and behind him there’s a wall eh decorated with flowers or
B: mine is plain
A: and the the floor inside the house has black and white squares?
B: black and white tiles? mine has no tiles heh heh
A: squares no
B: yeah tiles squares
A: ah! tiles eh the boy is with his arms eh at his back?
B: can you see? can you see? his hand? one of the hands?
A: one? yeah a small one
B: a small one yeah it’s pretty small and has his eh jacket eh
buttoned? or it’s (open)
A: buttoned
B: buttoned
A: and and the father is a bit eh inclined?
B: okay
A: mm
B: he’s wearing the same clothes?
A: yeah
B: he has his mouth closed?
A: he has still an angry look
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B: mine is not really angry he’s like indifferent something like
that heh heh heh
A: eh the boy wears eh big trousers
B: yeah
A: i think yeah
B: and does he have shoes or?
A: eh
B: no just to go i don’t know the word
A: to wear inside
B: eh yeah
A: in the house
B: in a house heh heh
A: eh and he has eh
B: he’s stan- he’s standing on the step? right?
A: yeah
B: or i- he’s inside the house? on the step
A: and instead of wearing a belt he has i don’t know
B: ah! mine has no belt and no
A: heh heh
B: like steve urkel heh heh heh
A: eh in the in the next picture eh the father is shouting because
there are lines eh
B: okay the father is not shouting
A: out of his mouth with the mouth open eh and pointing out inside
the house eh he seems to be calling another one or
B: okay
A: asking him something
B: here the father is not pointing
A: eh the boy looks a bit surprised or
B: and has his mouth open? the boy?
A: yeah a bit open yeah he seems to be jumping a little or
B: jumping? well mine is not jumping he’s not doing anything he’s
just like in the in the other pic- in the other two pictures
before (this one) he’s just standing
A: and the boy who opens the door is eh making a gesture as if he
B: like i don’t i don’t know anything that’s
A: yeah i don’t know
B: okay and does? eh he have a line over his mouth? a small mouth
and a line?
A: yeah
B: mm mm mm
A: the same (i think) eh the rest i think it’s the same
B: mm yeah okay now the following one?
A: in the following one eh the father is not eh pointing inside the
house he’s with his hand closed as if
B: eh but can you see both arms? and both hands?
A: no only one only
B: and does
A: the right one
B: ah and it has it has it got it closed or open?
A: closed
B: in mine is open
A: closed and he looks as if he wanted eh to revenge for
B: mine seems indifferent
A: heh eh the boy is very similar as in the previous picture and the
one who opens the door is eh like calling
B: looking inside
A: yeah and with the hand making a gesture
B: okay so mine
A: (to call) something
B: i think it’s not making well i don’t know if that’s a boy or if
it’s i suppose it’s the father of the other boy because you know
he hasn’t he has no hair so
A: yeah
B: heh heh mm
A: eh
B: mm so he’s not calling anyone
A: yeah he (xxx) and he’s looking inside the house
B: yes and he had one hand near his mouth right?
A: yeah
B: and is he he had his mouth open?
A: yeah
B: no because in mine is he has his arms just eh at the side of his
legs
A: mm in the next one eh the boy is still in the same in the same
manner
B: same position yeah he’s
A: yeah and now i can see both arms of the father
B: eh no i can only see one
A: eh one is folding his sleeve like eh as if he were going to to
hit someone
B: mine he’s not he doesn’t intend to hit
A: (xx xx) and the father who opens the door eh eh is a bit worried
or surprised
B: i think mine eh mine is all indifferent it’s only i don’t think
heh (xxx) and the can you see both of his arms?
A: eh no only the the left one
B: okay and is there anyone behind him or something?
A: no the door is the same
B: and the has he got his mouth closed or open?
A: open
B: in mine has it closed and the other father the the father of the
little boy has he got his mouth open or closed?
A: eh closed
B: closed that’s the same i don’t know i think that’s it
A: and in the last picture eh
B: heh the father is really surprised
A: the
B: heh heh
A: the the dark one? the dark hair?
B: mhm
A: eh the the boy eh is looking downwards the little boy
B: ah! okay mine is looking to the big boy heh heh
A: and there is a big boy behind the one who opens the door who
wears eh tch
B: the school uniform but in a huge eh heh size heh heh
A: yeah but he wears a cap or
B: ah! a hat?
A: eh a hat heh heh
B: ah!
A: i don’t know
B: okay yes eh
A: mm
B: mm mhm i can’t remember now heh
A: and
B: okay
A: and he has eh speckles or i don’t
B: okay mine has not speckles
A: and the uniform i think it’s the same as the one of the little
boy
B: and does this uniform have the same? eh eh well the symbol?
A: yeah
B: this one doesn’t have
A: mm the the father of the big boy heh is pointing at him
B: yeah and he’s with a happy smile
A: yeah
B: heh heh
A: heh
B: is like this is my father (xxx) heh heh i have
A: and the boy eh
B: is the boy smiling?
A: no
B: no he’s with an unhappy face
A: yeah
B: and and the fa- eh the dark haired father has he got his mouth?
like a
A: open
B: open? yes but it’s it eh like it’s round? and it’s black?
A: yeah round and black
B: ((coughing))
A: and
B: mm mm mm mm
A: and the big boy is looking at the little one
B: and is the big boy’s hair is it black? or white? or is it a
mixture? just some lines of black with some
A: some lines of black yeah and the the hat he wears eh has the same
B: okay i don’t have well it’s not a hat well i don’t have no hat no
(heh)symbol and heh heh
A: heh heh
A: mm and does he does the big boy have the his
hands open or closed?
A: closed both of them
B: and can you see eh o- of the first and the boy and father can you
see only one arm or both arms?
A: eh only one arm
B: okay i think that’s all because more or less heh (xxx)
A: and he’s still with the sleeve eh upwards?
B: ah! okay mine has no sleeve upwards but as it the is it as it’s
the same so it’s not i think that’s all
A: yeah
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A:  eh first first scene there’s a boy wearing a school jacket like an uniform shorts eh short trousers i mean eh eh shoes with eh socks eh he has mm short brown well mm tch dark hair
B:  dark hair
A:  yeah a wide nose heh and he seems eh to be astonished (xx) something like that he’s been punched by a hand heh heh heh heh with a (xxx)
B:  really punch or or just?
A:  no no no no no not really just eh coming back from it or going forward heh heh i don’t (heh) know heh heh
B:  heh heh heh
A:  heh heh heh
B:  you mean you can see the hand?
A:  i can see
B:  and and and the face and that’s it
A:  yeah i- i- it’s separated
B:  okay
A:  and he seems to be wearing a a ti- a tie too or something like that
B:  yeah
A:  and he mm heh he only has three fingers on his hand heh heh
B:  heh heh
A:  and tch
B:  heh
A:  the the ears the ear i (heh) see heh is quite big too eh three buttons on the jacket and else a so- eh pocket (xxx)
B:  mm
A:  and the all the clothes are white
B:  uuhh
A:  i mean not color
B:  yeah
A:  hhh and eh he seems to be have dark eh a dark eye al- also i mean it’s not blue not gray it’s dark heh heh and that’s all i see any question? .hhh
B:  he has a dark eye!? 
A:  i i mean the eye seems to be black not not black because of the punch i mean black because it’s not blue green or
B:  ah! okay
A:  heh heh it’s just a dot heh heh
B:  yeah
A:  and and i can’t see any other thing
B: the same as mine just the same exactly the same
A: (it) can be heh heh heh let’s go slower heh heh mm the socks are
white yeah?
B: hm
A: well let let’s see the shoes the shoes are? like those eh
B: how do you kno-? how do you know he’s wearing socks?
A: because the the shoe over ov- over the shoe there’s a little a
white stripe
B: a little yeah okay yeah
A: eh
B: heh
A: mm it it has like a little wheel
B: yeah yeah i know
A: heh heel oh! heh heh heh but i i i can’t i don’t know the the the
hand which is punching punching him
B: is it closed? or open?
A: it’s closed
B: ah! okay
A: ah! heh heh (at least) and it it has a leeve a
B: yeah
A: is wearing a shirt or a jacket or something like that which is
whi- also white
B: yeah
A: and
B: does it have any kind of indication? that it that the hand is
moving or or not?
A: yeah
B: yeah
A: like lines heh heh
B: yeah
A: and ah i- it has a black eyebrow
B: yeah
A: okay
B: big a thick one?
A: a thick one yeah
B: yeah heh
A: heh heh heh a oh! the hair is like like a hedgehog you know? a mm
all eh straight and
B: yeah
A: upwards eh .hhh! (you see a) three buttons?
B: yeah
A: oh!
B: it’s three three small dots
A: yeah
B: really really small
A: real- and the first one is almost
B: yeah (xxx)
A: heh yeah heh three thr- three fingers and heh heh you see the the
two legs? hi- of him?
B: yeah
A: oh!
B: not completely but
A: yeah not completely you see the two parts of the shorts?
B: yeah
A: okay mm and the fee- a- a- and the feet? and everything? heh heh
B: i- is his mouth open or not?
A: it is
B: yeah
A: well you know?
B: partly
A: partly yeah
B: yeah
A: and how many fingers on the punching hand? heh
B: five
A: well heh heh heh
B: heh heh heh
A: oh i i i (know) what else eh the the the shoes are like a like
balletina ones i mean having a small part that in the sock (be
seen)
B: yeah
A: on the front of it ah! i i don’t know heh it’s quite simple mm
heh mm
B: okay let’s go
A: yeah let’s go on heh heh heh tch second scene a
B: four stars?
A: four stars
B: yeah
A: and the guy is
B: smiling?
A: not smiling!
B: ah! okay
A: he’s like eh when you are aching and you’re like oh
B: yeah this one is smiling
A: okay so heh one black eye completely black heh heh heh heh ah now
i can see the tie it’s striped white and black
B: ah
A: eh oh! the jacket has? in the first too has a a no not a sword
the thing (you) go with a sword a a shield eh like a college
shield on it
B: on the first one?
A: yeah
B: yeah okay
A: heh heh heh heh
B: okay
A: perfect heh heh heh and the second one too
B: yeah
A: okay eh three buttons two two pockets
B: yeah
A: and four fingers on each hand
B: yeah
A: eh two strange stripes ove- eh near the left eye hhh eh like
showing like he’s opening his eyes or or he can
B: ah! okay
A: mm he’s wearing a white shirt too
B: or eh stripes are you sure the the they are stripes?
A: yeah yeah
B: or they are just? eye- eyebrows?
A: no no no no the eyebrows are o- over his eyes i mean on the on
the left side
B: ah! okay
A: they’re vertical
B: yeah
A: okay and well it has three buttons on each side of of the
B: yeah
A: of the jacket i don’t know if it’s the hole or or the button but
anyway heh heh
B: heh heh
A: eh well how many there?
160   B: four
161   A: four hhh well let’s leave (xx xx) here
162   B: yeah next one
163   A: the same boy comes crying to his father he’s weeping
164   B: really wide open mouth?
165   A: yeah
166   B: yeah
167   A: two sides of of the teeth one up and one down heh heh
168   B: yeah i think so i don’t know if if i think it’s the tongue
169   A: well the tongue and the teeth
170   B: yeah
171   A: up there eh about four or five tears i i don’t know if the first
172   one it it’s a tear or
173   B: yeah
174   A: a big eye heh heh heh heh and he’s pointing a- at something
175   (heh)i (heh)suppose it’s outside the (heh)house
176   B: he’s not pointing here
177   A: oh! cool heh heh heh
178   B: heh heh
179   A: and he’s he’s wearing the same shoes eh
180   B: yeah
181   A: socks eh socks everything
182   B: yeah
183   A: eh
184   B: what’s his father doing?
185   A: yeah eh now his father his father is sleeping
186   B: yeah
187   A: he has the newspaper on his right hand
188   B: yeah
189   A: and the left hand is closed
190   B: yeah
191   A: and he’s wearing a psk a he’s wearing a sh- a long shirt long
192   sleeve shirt and
193   B: tie?
194   A: a tie how do you call the word again? this part heh heh it’s
195   a not belt it is not belt it’s like belt? no but that’s no that’s
196   not it heh heh heh
197   B: okay like a pocket?
198   A: yeah no two two of them
199   B: two?
200   A: one on each side yeah and a strange vertical line over the right
201   eh pocket a no (xxx)
202   B: eh!?
203   A: heh heh you see the right pocket and the left pocket? you don’t
204   see the left pocket?
205   B: i only have the left one
206   A: the small one? yeah so over the the one you see there’s a
207   vertical line i don’t know what is for a a heh heh eh it seems
208   that that mm cloth is too tight for him because over the the near
209   the second button of the that cloth
210   B: yeah
211   A: whatever it is hhh eh there are two lines like i’m too tight i’m
212   too tight
213   B: heh
214   A: he’s wearing trousers with a
215   B: shoes?
216   A: ye- yeah no and the part you close the trouser with i mean the
217   the z- the zip?
218   B: yeah
A:  eh he’s sitting on a sofa
B:  single sofa?
A:  yeah
B:  yeah
A:  an armchair or something like that eh the shoes have
B:  what about his mouth?
A:  his mouth is
B:  it’s open? open?
A:  like smiling but not eh too heh much heh
B:  open? or?
A:  eh he has a a big a big very big moustache heh heh heh that’s why
you see it different his hair is eh black and curly
B:  yeah
A:  more or less
B:  yeah more or less
A:  eh the shoes have two lines of
B:  yeah yeah
A:  and the tie is white
B:  this is done yeah
A:  the the the eh?
B:  i have five
A:  ah! then heh heh
B:  (xxx) heh
A:  heh heh heh eh as the father realizes that the guy is coming
crying he mm leaves the newspaper so it goes to the floor
B:  ah!
B:  eh though the second hand is closed
B:  yeah
A:  eh
B:  the boy is crying
A:  the guy is crying four four tears i now i see that’s an eye
B:  four?
A:  yeah four tears and eh the eye heh heh heh
B:  yeah
A:  his tongue is is partly out of his mouth
B:  yeah
A:  heh heh heh and he’s now he’s pointing his eye eh you can see the
same clothes as in the others?
B:  yeah
A:  cool eh well the newspaper has a picture eh
B:  yeah
A:  three lines of words and a
B:  just three lines!??
A:  three lines no three blocks of
B:  yeah
A:  yeah eh the title and a square by eh there’s something strange in
the lef- father’s left hand there’s a something like a triangle
over the bottom part of the of the shirt i don’t know how to
express it (let’s see) there’s a part of the on the on the shirt
you have to you have a button to
B:  yeah
A:  close it so there’s a strange figure a very like a triangle i
don’t know maybe the the jewels men use to close them
B:  ah!
A:  eh eh heh heh
B:  yeah
A:  twins? heh heh heh heh heh
B:  i have them yeah twins
A:  heh heh heh heh heh eh heh
B: maybe that’s the name
A: heh heh i don’t know
B: heh heh heh
A: it’s (heh)really (heh)stupid heh and the father is kind of
as- astonished
B: yeah
A: he’s quite fat is it?
B: no not here
A: no!?
B: no
A: he has the the neck is quite fat it has a line (it’s a wrinkle)
the neck from the face because it (looks like)
B: has no neck?
A: heh heh heh heh a poof i don’t know the clothes are strictly the
same
B: yeah
A: five fingers on each hand? well five fingers on one and three on
the other? four on the other?
B: who? the father?
A: yeah
B: no the the one holding the newspaper has four and the other
one
A: holding? no it’s not holding
B: bueno okay here
A: okay okay
B: and the other one three or three and a half something like that
A: well the eh the hand that left the paper fall down it has
five fingers
B: mm
A: psk ah! a a
B: maybe because he left the the the newspaper
A: ah! no i got it’s a mistake
B: (xxx) you only see four
A: yeah okay ah! the the i didn’t tell you that the guy crying the
other hand the the right one you can’t see it because
B: yeah
A: it’s (back) it’s yeah mm oh! do you remember that i told you that
in th- in the second one the (guy) wh- have two lines or
B: yeah
A: near his eye because it was opening the father has something like
that in this one but just one line
B: well his mouth
A: his mouth is widely open well not as widely as the heh heh
(heh)one
B: yeah
A: as the guy but
B: yeah that’s it one three five
A: okay i i i can’t see any di- any difference well that’s it
B: next one father and son the guy is still crying? or not?
A: yeah two two tears and black eye heh eh tch same clothes for the
guy
B: yeah
A: about four (heh)fingers on his free hand he’s holding his
father’s hand
B: ah!
A: eh so his father is holding his kid’s hand
B: (xx) heh
A: heh heh eh the the boy’s
B: (xx)
A: quite unexpressive but the father seems to be very angry
B: yeah here the boy is crying and the the he has his mouth open
or not?
A: yeah it’s it’s open but it’s not expressing nothing
B: are they walking?
A: they’re walking yeah
B: yeah
A: and eh well now i can see he the father has a s- this kind of eh
combing like one side
B: yeah
A: heh and the other heh heh
B: heh
A: heh eh well in this one the father’s shoes has three lines on
B: yeah
A: each one with a dot?
B: yeah (after)
A: mm i can see the other father’s hand just a part of it like the
part of the arm but i can’t see the other (side) poof eh i can
see the two (xx) of the vest! is that the word? vest?
B: (i don’t know) no no idea
A: mm (heh)okay heh heh
B: heh heh
A: eh tch the the eyebrows of the father see- mm show that he is
that he’s angry like going up down and down up
B: ah no!
A: and the trouser eh it also shows the zip
B: yeah
A: eh mm hhh oh the guy’s free hand is closed and tight
B: yeah
A: eh
B: can you see the other hand? no?
A: is holding the other
B: okay
A: heh heh and psk tch tch well i i can’t see any other
B: no i have two two differences
A: two differences? tch oh quite good well
B: next one?
A: next one
B: number?
A: no number heh heh heh heh ah let’s see the door the door is
B: no handle?
A: no there’s the kind
B: okay
A: of thing you use to knock? and the that hole for the letters the
mail? box or whatever eh it has you to walk a step to go in
B: one?
A: one step
B: yeah
A: there are
B: can you see the bricks?
A: yeah
B: yeah (xx)
A: eh tch well the eh there’s a how can i say that hhh eh like a
mark over a around the door
B: yeah
A: holding it to the wall eh tch the guy seems to be angry now and
B: the mouth goes down? (xxx)
A: the mouth goes up down yeah and he has a tha- that line i told
you
B: yeah heh
A: heh heh heh and the two arms are closed and well you can see the
two legs? the two hands?
B: yeah
A: two socks? eh two pockets?
B: yeah
A: three buttons?
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh
B: (xxx) yeah
A: heh heh and the father i- the father is is a bit bit fat
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh
B: (xxx) yeah
A: heh heh heh
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh hhh yeah you see that cloth? the vest! eh
B: he’s not wearing a vest no no
A: he’s not wearing a vest!? and in any of the other
B: no
A: that can’t be true heh
B: just a shirt
A: heh heh heh where are the the the the
B: (the first one)
A: pockets? where are the pockets then on?
B: on the shirt
A: on the shirt!?
B: yeah
A: no no no he’s wearing a tch with two buttons like this and the
and the tie goes down like you have got a shirt?
B: yeah
B: then you have the the tie
B: i have a shirt with one pocket here
A: no no no no
B: and two buttons but they are
A: and the
B: on the shirt!
A: on the shirt!? sure?
B: yes yeah yeah
A: well well he’s wearing a vest heh heh heh
B: (xxx) i’m not sure now
A: something is wrong then? maybe in the the on the?
B: yeah on the third one
A: the third one?
B: that you said that
B: maybe that the the part of the fingers no that was in the four-
fourth one oh! heh tell me the differences in the on the third
A: one
B: he ah! a smi- no hhh the guy is pointing at
A: the guy’s pointing
B: yeah one pocket just one pocket and you said two
A: two
B: it had a vertical line that was the vest
A: maybe maybe it’s just maybe that’s it he’s wearing a vest
B: yeah heh
A: heh heh heh well let’s go (down) then eh they are in front of the
door mm?
B: yeah
A: how many differences do you have on this?
B: three
A: eh which were?
B: number on the door handle no handle we- well you had like a
something to knock?
A: yeah yeah yeah
B: and the mailbox
A: you don’t have a mailbox?
B: no
A: hhh tch well
B: and the se- and the the next one has a?
A: is is the father eh eh
B: looking at
A: anything? heh
B: no!
A: heh (xxx)
B: he’s not looking at the door
A: no? he’s not?
B: no
A: or maybe he’s because the the the this heh heh heh (xxx) heh heh
heh heh heh eh he is he’s also angry the the eyebrows go the same
B: no
A: but maybe it’s the same thing
B: yeah
A: tch
B: (xxx)
A: eh the the the vest? i- is no he’s not (heh)wearing (heh)a
(heh)vest so nothing at (heh)all
B: no
A: eh mm can you see the heel of the shoes?
B: yes
A: of the? of both of them?
B: yeah
A: tch
B: the next one is just the same exactly the same
A: ah! he’s knocking but not using the handle like toc toc toc and
the the guy is like caressing his chin like hm! apart from that
it’s almost the same yeah heh heh heh still angry
B: yeah
A: next one (xxx)
B: ah! here is closer to the door i think
A: closer?
B: yeah
A: they’re quite closer yeah but here is too closer to the door
B: okay
A: mm well somebody opens the door
B: yeah
A: it’s like mortadelo but
B: yeah heh heh heh
A: heh heh heh heh it’s something
B: wearing glasses
A: in between like mortadelo
B: yeah
A: and a small smart heh heh heh heh heh
B: heh heh
A: wearing yeah round glasses eh
B: hm
A: round head round nose
B: yeah
A: round ears heh heh he
B: he’s smiling?
A: smi- smiling? yeah funny smile heh
B: long neck? long thin neck?
A: uh compared to the head it is but he’s quite fat mm
B: yeah!?
A: mm compared to the neck heh heh
B: he’s wearing a shirt?
A: a shirt with one two three four five six
B: yeah
A: no six? no five five buttons long trousers ah! mm mm how are
B: these things called? the things you you pick your trousers with?
B: ah! yeah
A: heh heh
B: (xxx)
A: tights heh heh hhh heh heh
B: yeah tirantes?
A: yeah heh heh heh and the
B: he’s wearing slippers i think
A: slippers?
B: yeah
A: i think slippers it’s like a a like hoses? like panty hoses? i i
B: think i don’t know
A: they’re
B: heh heh heh i don’t know oh! no! slippers aren’t that? those?
B: he’s wearing kind of shoes you wear when you are at home
A: yeah yeah yeah
B: yeah
A: yeah yeah yeah
B: i don’t know
A: completely true
B: i don’t know
A: heh heh
B: heh
A: it’s completely true and he’s wearing tch them yeah well the you
B: can see the wallpaper?
A: no
B: it’s horrible tacky
A: heh
B: cheese heh heh heh wallpaper the the s- the floor is squared a
A: chessed checked oof heh heh and the the sleeves are like rounded
B: to the to take them up
A: the what? the?
B: the sleeves of the shirt
A: ah!
B: the the small man shirt like when you pull them up?
A: up?
B: rolling them?
A: yeah
B: oh how many differences there are?
A: five
B: five! well i haven’t talked about the guy yet
A: the guy is like surprised
B: i i i think
A: or something like that
B: yeah ex- expecting
A: and the and the father is
A: he seems to be about to hold something from the floor
B: yeah hm
A: on his way to
B: hm
A: maybe there is not another difference
B: hm
A: well the father starts shouting there are lines to show it you
see the?
B: shouting? no
A: he’s pointing the
B: the little man is explaining something is is
A: the little man is like he seems to be troubled i mean what are
you trying to tell me? i
B: yeah
A: i can’t understand it and the man the big man is pointing the
inner part of the house like inside
B: yeah
A: eh the guy is almost the same as in as in the other i think
B: yeah
A: yeah and i can see the big man’s eh left sock
B: yeah
A: kind of heh heh
B: yeah
A: eh what’s he do-? what’s he doing with you know? his left hand or
po- oh right hand in your picture?
B: nothing
A: nothing?
B: yeah
A: like four fingers?
B: yeah
A: about to hold something or something like that?
B: yeah but he’s like that because the other man is really small i
think as to
A: i don’t know .hhh heh heh a let’s see you know tha- that line you
have on the face when you up up like this and
B: yeah
A: it’s like
B: the small man has one?
A: man has it yeah
B: yeah heh
A: heh eh and what about the eyebrows? on the a-
B: mm
A: apart part of the head
B: you can see you can distinguish one heh
A: well i can see well maybe the- there’s just one yeah i i i don’t
know heh
B: has
A: it’s quite messy with the flowers
B: in the middle of the head?
A: eh?
B: he has no hair?
A: no completely bald
B: okay
A: mm can you see the hand lines?
B: the what?
A: the hand lines?
B: yeah
A: okay in both hands?
B: yeah
A: how many fingers?
B: five
A: cool .hhh what’s he doing the guy? what’s doing the guy with a?
mm right hand? it has (xxx)
B: the boy?
A: yeah it’s closed?
B: the small boy? yeah
A: you can can you see the the left one?
B: no
A: cool eh i i i don’t think there is any other
B: no not
A: eh
B: in the next one the small man is looking inside
A: shouting? like?
B: shouting?
A: yeah she he’s calling somebody
B: he is just looking
A: he is eh in fact he is eh he has moved his hand to hi- near his
face mouth like well to make the echo
B: i think that’s part of the shouting
A: yeah
B: yeah okay the guy is just exactly the same
A: heh yeah the the this
B: yeah
A: th- the drawer wasn’t very inspired heh heh
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh (xxx)
B: what is the father doing?
A: he is like threatening with his eh closed hand like if he was
going to punch somebody hm! he seems to be very angry now a with
one? foot he is steeping on
B: turning to the door?
A: no he’s steeping on the other yeah?
B: yeah
A: yeah heh heh heh eh you see the the bald? the bald the small man
is on the step i told you there was a
B: yeah
A: okay uh two eyebrows?
B: what about the mouths?
A: the the the small man the small
B: yeah okay one is?
A: he’s he’s shouting
B: he’s shouting and the other one is?
A: closed
B: closed? okay
A: eh
B: yeah i think that’s i mean he is shouting and
A: you see the the two? the no of course you don’t you don’t
(heh) see (xxx) the vest heh you can’t see heh
B: no! heh
A: heh heh heh heh you see the the bottom?
B: i can’t i ca- i can’t see the the pocket now
A: any of them?
B: no
A: but maybe just belongs to
B: yeah because
A: because i see two of them
B: but in the first one i i could see one in in the in the previous
one
A: well i can see two of them just
B: yeah
A: points
B: yeah
A: because we don’t have five so heh heh
B: heh
A: and i can see the the right the big man’s right arm like by the
body
B: yeah
A: okay mm well
B: next one?
A: next one
B: they’re looking at each other? that’s here
A: well you know at the the the sleeves were rolled up?
B: yeah
A: for the small man
B: yeah
A: the the big man is doing the same he is doing it now now i
see (maybe) he wants to punch somebody you see it?
B: yeah
A: okay
B: no i don’t have it here but you said it before he’s threatening
A: ah! it’s maybe it’s the same thing maybe it’s not
B: yeah okay
A: the the foot are the feet are the same?
B: the same as before
A: yeah the the small man is like wha- wha- what are you going to
do? to me heh heh heh he
B: is he? is he frightened or something?
A: oh completely
B: yeah
A: scared and like no this can’t be happening to (can’t be)
happening to me heh the the eyes are? tch they are not just a dot
are like a line i mean it seems to be wide open be- behind his
glasses
B: mm
A: eh
B: and the mouth?
A: open and sad heh heh heh heh should i (heh)say heh heh and two
eyebrows for
B: yeah
A: everybody but the guy heh
B: yeah the guy has just one
A: yeah heh just one eye just one heh heh heh heh and you see the
the the small small man trousers are really wide for him?
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh and
B: the shirt?
A: the shirt does it have neck?
B: yeah
A: cool and you can see the two lips of the kid?
B: yeah just one one on
A: the trousers zip?
B: of the? of the?
A: of the of the both man
B: both yeah
A: eh i think there’s anything left tch no
B: the next one
A: the last one eh well you see muzzy big
B: heh heh heh
A: (heh)big (heh)muzzy heh heh heh huge (heh)huge
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh and well he’s wearing a a cap? like a baseball cap?
B: yeah
A: bo- the small man well he has the the shield on the on the cap
and on the jacket you know a c d c!?
B: yeah
A: the band? heh heh heh
B: heh heh heh
A: heh heh heh heh ee he has eh dots ah! how is this?
B: the mm nada
A: how how do you call eh?
B: i don’t know the name
A: cool heh heh heh
B: little brown dots!
A: little brown dots
B: okay
A: heh heh and he doesn’t seem to be very (heh)happy
B: yeah
A: heh heh but i’m scared to tell the (xx)
B: what is the little man doing? smiling? and
A: this is my son heh heh heh heh heh ee yeah the the guy
B: is the guy wearing shorts?
A: the the just the same uniform as the other guy?
B: yeah
A: the same shoes socks
B: yeah
A: everything but the the the the hands are closed tightly
B: yeah
A: very (heh)tightly heh and the the man’s pointing to his son the
the small man i mean
B: the small man yeah
A: yeah
B: what is the little man doing? smiling? and
A: the the kid is looking to the floor like oh (my god)!
B: looking to the floor!?
A: yeah well to the floor to the step
B: yeah
A: there’s a line and it’s like (xx) man he’s not going to (heh)do
anything heh heh eh he’s sad in fact the the mouth is ah mm tch
B: yeah
A: eh mm i have well yeah five
B: five?
A: yeah so heh heh heh
B: that’s it
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A: in the first picture eh there’s a boy
B: hm
A: eh he’s wearing a jacket with short trousers
B: yeah
A: and a pair of shoes
B: heh yeah heh yeah
A: eh he has dark hair
B: mm
A: eh and a a hand is beating him heh heh heh eh he has eh three buttons in the jacket and i think he had he has a flower on the jacket
B: ah!
A: in the left side
B: okay
A: psk and eh his mouth is open heh
B: eh wide open or heh heh just a little bit?
A: i think wide open (xx xx)
B: like a heh
A: yes
B: heh
A: tch eh on the second picture eh there’s a the same boy heh eh with the with a black eye heh heh
B: yeah
A: eh and eh four stars over his head
B: heh
A: and he has a a tiep tie tie a tie?
B: a tie yeah hm
A: a tie hhh and a shirt and mm mm eh he’s like mm i don’t know
B: he is
A: he has his face as mm
B: where is the?
A: eh?
B: the he has a a black eye? now?
A: yes
B: the is his mouth open? heh
A: no
B: no
A: it’s closed
B: it’s he’s like? of course he is heh heh
A: eh the third picture eh in the third picture eh there’s a the same boy eh he’s crying
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42  B: yeah
43  A: and eh he has his mouth wide open
44  B: heh heh heh
45  A: heh eh he’s pointing with his finger eh behind heh heh and mm he
46  wears the same clothes
47  B: yeah
48  A: and his father is eh near him eh i think he doesn’t eh hear him
49  heh
50  B: is he?
51  A: heh he’s sitting on a armchair psk and he he has a a newspaper on
52  her hand
53  B: in which hand? heh heh
54  A: in the right hand
55  B: okay
56  A: and he’s looking at the other side heh
57  B: yeah
58  A: heh eh he has two buttons eh in bueno eh he wears a a waistcoat?
59  and he has two buttons on it and mm
60  B: a waistcoat!? what’s that?
61  A: heh heh heh chaleco heh
62  B: ah! (heh)okay
63  A: and he has a shirt and he wears trousers large trousers and a
64  pair of shoes and
65  B: is he wearing a tie?
66  A: i think no no
67  B: okay
68  A: maybe a i don’t know
69  B: mm
70  A: ah! yes! he’s wearing a tie
71  B: heh does he have a? a little pocket in the?
72  A: two
73  B: two?
74  A: two little pockets and the boy too and mm mm in the newspaper
75  there’s a picture
76  B: yeah
77  A: and a headline
78  B: and a ah! yeah
79  A: mm psk ah! eh the father have has a moustache
80  B: oh!
81  A: a black moustache
82  B: heh
83  A: and black hair
84  B: mm
85  A: short black hair and mm eh i don’t know tch well eh on the fifth
86  picture eh
87  B: in the fo-
88  A: on the left
89  B: fourth?
90  A: fifth
91  B: ah!
92  A: heh heh heh
93  B: okay (xx)
94  A: ah! sorry heh i think i passed eh to the
95  B: forward?
96  A: four picture
97  B: heh heh
98  A: heh and i was describing you the third on the third picture
99  he’s looking to the other side
100  B: yeah
A: well eh all is the same on the fourth picture the boy is crying
B: yeah
A: he has his finger pointing his head his mouth is wide open hhh
B: mm
A: too and mm the father is looking to him?
B: yeah
A: looking at him hhh he has his mouth open the father
B: in the fourth one?
A: yes
B: mm
A: tch and the newspaper is on the floor?
B: uhh
A: and eh
B: and he’s wearing a?
A: the same clothes
B: okay
A: on the fifth picture heh heh
B: and he has a moustache? heh
A: yes
B: in the third? and in the fourth?
A: in all the pictures
B: in all the pictures
A: heh
B: of course
A: heh heh on the fifth picture eh the father eh is taking the hand
B: of the boy or the boy’s hand
A: uhh
B: yeah
A: the boy hhh tch the father has eh the father is eh eh angry
B: in the fifth one? he’s angry
A: yes yes
B: mm
A: and mm mm i don’t know what bueno mm eh the two persons are up
B: s- stood up?
A: sí stood up
B: hhh
A: and in the sixth picture
B: mhm
A: eh they are eh next to
B: a door?
A: yes and the door has a handle?
B: oh! okay
A: eh on the top and a i don’t know how to say it eh the place where
you introduce the the letters
B: oh! the letters (xxx)
A: okay mm eh mm there’s a step eh on the door
B: mhm
A: hhh eh
B: is there some number in the? in the door?
A: no tch eh there are some bricks
B: yeah
A: eh on the sides
B: of the door
A: yes eh
B: what is the expression of the child?
A: eh the child is behind the father
B: mhm
A: and eh the two are looking to the door at the door
B: yes
A: and the boy has his his arms eh on both sides of the body and the
father too
B: what about the expression in the face? the his mouth
A: eh i think eh well eh the the child is not crying anymore heh
B: heh heh heh thanks god
A: and the mouth is closed and i think
B: he’s sad
A: both are angry they’re sad
B: do you think the bo- the child is sad? (like)
A: yes i think
B: okay heh heh heh thanks god
A: and the mouth is closed and i think
B: he’s sad
A: both are angry they’re sad
B: okay heh heh heh
A: yes i think
B: okay
A: the door is the same heh
B: yeah
A: the child is touching his mm mm tch the place
B: chin?
A: behind the mouth heh heh his chin heh (sí)yes and mmm mmm mm
B: okay he’s behind his father?
A: yes
B: okay
A: eh in picture number eight eh there’s someone at the door heh
B: hm hm
A: there are curtains with flowers
B: oh! heh heh
A: heh and there are eh diamonds? on the floor some black and some
white
B: diamonds?
A: yeah eh rombos heh
B: oh! diamonds sí
A: and eh the person on the door is a man eh she’s bo- bald bold?
B: bald
A: bald he ha- he wears glasses
B: hm hm
A: hhh and he is smiling
B: heh heh
A: heh and heh he wear eh what you put eh to tch mm tch well eh he
wears trousers and a shirt eh with the sleeves eh
B: rolled up? or something?
A: yes and he wears he wears eh i don’t know heh
B: slippers?
A: how to say that
B: he has slippers in? the feet
A: eh he has i don’t know
B: tirantes?
A: yeah
B: heh heh (heh)okay heh
A: and he wear slippers on the sh- on the feet
B: okay
A: and mm the father is looking at him
B: mhm
A: and and eh the child is in the right side of the father on the 
right side
B: mmm
A: and he has the the mouth open
B: mhm
A: hhh eh and the father mm no
B: what about the the child’s he- eh arms? are they
A: are in both sides of the body
B: straight? okay
A: and
B: (xx)
A: the father too
B: yeah
A: eh in the next picture eh the father is pointing indoors 
B: uuh
A: eh the man eh ha- eh mm holds a- holds up the hands?
B: hm
A: and he we- he wears the same clothes
B: and the glasses?
A: yes and the father is shouting
B: oh! eh he is he? his mouth open? the father’s mouth?
A: yes wide open and he’s shouting i think and the child is on the 
in on the right side too
B: yeah
A: and he has his mouth open too
B: mm
A: and i think
B: in the same position as in the?
A: yes
B: okay
A: eh in the next picture eh the man is shouting indoors i don’t 
know to whom
B: heh
A: and he has his hand eh near her head maybe he’s touching his his 
B: the father?
A: his head i don’t know no
B: oh! the child
A: the man 
B: ah! the man 
A: the man on the door sorry heh heh 
B: heh heh 
A: heh eh he has the the other arm eh eh near his body 
B: mm
A: on the right side 
B: yeah
A: hhh and the father has his his hand clo- bueno his fingers closed 
B: mm
A: hhh and he i don’t know bueno he has his hand near his breast?
B: okay
A: and mm the child is in the same position
B: in the same position?
A: yes and the father i- eh has his mouth eh closed 
B: the father okay
A: yes
B: mm
A: and i think it’s all hhh eh in the next picture eh the man is eh 
surprising i think or amazing or
B: the man eh?
A: eh on the door he has his sh- his mouth a little open
B: hmm
A: and he is looking to the man
B: yeah
A: tch and the man is rolling up his shirt
B: he’s rolling up his okay
A: yes the shirt and eh eh the child is in the same position
B: heh
A: and mm tch well he’s rolling up the shirt with his eh left hand
B: heh heh
A: on the door
B: heh yeah
A: a big boy i think
B: he (heh) yeah
A: heh eh with school uniform?
B: heh heh heh
A: eh
B: with a tie?
A: with a tie with with straight lines
B: oh! okay heh
A: as the boy
B: the little boy?
A: yes in all the pictures
B: and the big boy? a has a?
A: yes in all the pictures
B: with stripes?
A: yes psk and
B: okay
A: the boy has a hat wears a hat
B: which one? heh heh the big one? heh
A: the big one
B: heh
A: sorry
B: heh
A: on the door heh and he has a a badge? on the hat?
B: a badge!?
A: hm and he has sprinkles? i think eh
B: i understand what you say (heh) but i don’t know
A: mm well i don’t know hhh
B: pimples?
A: eh? ah!
B: pimples?
A: yes
B: (xxx) hhh
A: no
B: no!
A: eh he has eh
B: lunares? heh
A: mm
B: reckles? reckles?
A: (i don’t know) heh heh and mm mm eh he has black hair i think mm
B: he has his mouth down
A: mm tch and the other man on the door is pointing him with the
B: right? arm?
A: yes with the right
B: and with the thumb
A: yes
B: okay
A: and the he has his mouth open but he’s smiling heh
B: mm okay
A: heh and i don’t know psk eh the father is surprising i think heh
B: heh heh heh
A: the eyes wide open
B: oh yeah!
A: and the child is looking at the floor of the
B: at the floor!?
A: yes oh!
A: the ground mm
B: okay
A: and the the eyebrows of the father are arched?
B: okay heh
A: and i don’t know eh the big child eh is wearing eh short trousers
B: mm
A: yes?
B: mm
A: and that’s all heh
B: okay heh
A: do you want to? some question?
B: eh the big? is the the big child has soc-? socks?
A: the?
B: the big child
A: the big child?
B: does he wear socks?
A: yes yes
B: mm
A: and the little child too
B: okay
A: and the father has eh tch three lines on the shoes heh heh
B: on the?
A: shoes
B: oh! ah! yeah
A: hhh mm and he has pockets two on the waistcoat
B: okay but the chi- your child is wearing a waistcoat?
A: no the father
B: in all the pictures?
A: the father
B: the father okay
A: the child is wearing a jacket
B: okay
A: with a shirt and a tie
B: hm hm tch i think that i have all
A: i think that’s all
B: the differences heh heh
A: yes?
B: heh heh
A: many differences?
B: yeah
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A:  
   eh well the ri- eh first picture eh i can see a a hand that is 
   supposed to hit someone mm is hitting the boy or has just hitted 
   him
B:  
   has it hit or thrown?
A:  
   eh maybe thrown well (that) the boy is eh like
B:  
   uuh
A:  
   he he recei- received a punch and the the boy and he has brown 
   hair and his mouth is open and the he’s wearing a a jacket? and 
   short trousers and shoes with socks i think
B:  
   uuh
A:  
   and the i i can see the the pooh fist?
B:  
   uuh
A:  
   yeah? and just the a a small a part of the sleeve of the man and 
   i don’t know what else is different could be different in that 
   picture heh
B:  
   is there anything else in the picture?
A:  
   there’s nothing apart of the boy and the fist let’s go to the 
   second one?
B:  
   mhm
A:  
   yeah and in the second one there i- there are four stars heh
B:  
   uuh
A:  
   heh heh and the boy eh eh we can see that he is wearing a a tie 
   and a she’s still like flying or something heh and one of he eh 
   one of his eh left eye is a black you know? as in?
B:  
   a black eye?
A:  
   yeah and hhh there’s nothing apart of the of (xxx)
B:  
   how many? buttons are there on the jacket
A:  
   three buttons and the the tie is full of a stripes? stripes?
B:  
   stripes
A:  
   stripes? yeah and and a two pockets and a badge
B:  
   a badge?
A:  
   yeah and i don’t know what else
B:  
   okay
A:  
   did you find the differences?
B:  
   yeah three
A:  
   yeah? okay next one eh we see the boy crying and there are a 
   couple of eh
B:  
   tears?
A:  
   tears yeah and a she’s pointing eh backwards i don’t know what 
   and there’s a man with a big moustache eh who’s sitting in a sofa 
   and he’s wearing well he’s handing a a newspaper on his right 
   hand
B:  
   uuh
A: and eh he’s wearing a waistcoat and a tie and and
B: is he awake or (sleep)?
A: yes he seems to be slept heh
B: what else is he wearing? does he? he’s got a waistcoat yeah?
A: eh the the waistcoat and the and the tie as was the there are two
buttons in the waistcoat and a couple of pockets
B: okay
A: and i don’t know but the the man is a on the right of the picture
B: yeah
A: and the boy on the left yeah and then next one?
B: yeah
A: eh the boy is crying and he’s eh hhh well the tears again and his
mouth is .hhh open heh and the he’s with his finger like
(sobbing)) and the the man or the father or i don’t know
who he’s is eh now he he’s eh looking at the boy his mouth is
open also and and he throws the the newspaper on the floor and
the he he’s having his right hand open (xx) open and the left
hand is closed on the sofa
B: uuhuh
A: eh next one eh there’s no sofa is a we can see just the boy and
the man and the the the man is mm taking the boy? in like
B: holding hands?
A: holding the hand with the boy and the boy is still crying and and
both seem to be walking to somewhere to somewhere but i don’t
know where and well they they’re walking they seem to be walking
and the next one eh they’re just at the door in front of the door
and eh in the door there’s a a handle? i don’t know just to knock
on the door? you know?
B: uuhuh
A: small and the the place where you eh leave the letters the the
pos- the
B: the letterbox?
A: yeah hhh
B: is there (a) number?
A: mm no number just the door eh with those two things and the both
of them the man and the boy seem to be very angry and
B: uuhuh
A: and mm the the boy seems to be hiding himself eh
B: (xxx) okay
A: eh yeah next one the man is knocking on the door and the boy is
eh with his right hand touching his eh face
B: uuhuh
A: like worried about
B: yeah
A: what’s going to happen psk and i don’t know what else and well in
the next one there’s a
B: is the door open? or?
A: no no it’s it’s closed
B: it’s (closed) okay
A: eh eh the man is is knocking on the door
B: hm
A: (that’s) the image of his hand knocking
B: okay
A: in the next one eh the door is open and we can see a beautiful
flowered curtain or something and there’s a a small man is bald
eh is wearing glasses eh he’s wearing hhh eh
B: braces?
A: yeah! heh heh heh heh and the he’s smiling and is eh seems to
be talking to the man and and the man is a eh tch listening to
what he’s saying but eh he seems to be very angry and
B: uhuh where? where are his hands?
A: eh
B: they’re on the side?
A: yeah
B: and the boy?
A: the boy eh he has his hands eh behind the the well at the back
B: uhuh
A: and his mouth is open the boy has the mouth open
B: okay
A: and well the floor eh the well inside the the house the floor is
full of squares black and white
B: ah!
A: and the next one and the man is a supposing well he’s supposed
not to understand what is happening
B: uhuh
A: and the the man the father eh is crying and and
B: the man is crying?
A: yeah well sh- mm shouting? well he’s saying
B: shouting?
A: yeah shouting and he’s pointing inside the the house something
inside we don’t see what and the boy is just eh observing heh
B: uhuh
A: what is happening mm the the attitude of the man is really
aggressive and and the man inside the house is just trying to
explain but he’s unable to do it
B: okay
A: in the next one eh the man eh inside the house is is eh shouting
the name? or calling someone eh his mouth is open and he’s eh
B: (all right)
A: saying like darling come here! heh
B: heh
A: and the man has his eh right hand closed and in a very aggressive
position as to hitting him or
B: uhuh
A: something and and the boy now seems really afraid and in the next
one tch eh the the man inside the house seem to be scared
about what’s going to happen and the the father is eh mm doing
this just to
B: uhuh
A: to hit him eh and the boy is again observing and really afraid of
his father and finally eh heh heh heh there’s a enormous a huge
B: uhuh
A: boy inside the house wear- wearing a a cap
B: a cap?
A: a cap and the the same uniform as the the same clothes as the boy
the other boy the small one
B: yeah
A: psk and the this big boy is just heh heh looking at both the
father and the children and the father now seems to be more mm
B: shocked?
A: yeah heh heh heh and he’s completely shocked and the his mouth is
open and very big big big eyes
B: where are his hands?
A: eh just by the body no no gesture at all and the small man eh
seem to be introducing seems to be introducing the boy to the
father or saying
B: uhuh
A: something (xx) to say something talked to him or something
162  B:  uhuh
163  A:  and that could be the end well the boy is eh looking at the at
164       the on the floor looking yeah?
165  B:  yeah
166  A:  looking down with his head down
167  B:  (that’s) the the little boy?
168  A:  yeah the little boy and that’s all
169  B:  okay
170  A:  so
171  B:  i think that’s it
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B: okay
A: okay so i can see eh eight pictures eh in the first one i can only see a a a child like flying in the in the in the air and the hand of a another person and (the sign) of the other person who seems to have kicked the the one eye of this of this child the the child is with the eh psk mouth open and he has he seems to have the uniform of a school with the blazer and a sh- eh shorts and eh trousers and he also seems to have eh tch socks and he has the dark short hair and eh tch i think that he seems to have the uniform of the school because of the symbol that he has on one of of the of the flaps?
B: mm
A: and
B: good when you said that he has socks are the socks very big? or
A: no not not really because i can only see a a very eh tch eh a very eh part of the of the
B: mm
A: of the socks
B: mhm
A: yeah yeah and i can distinguish that they are socks because eh they seem to to be two parts of first the the shoes and then only a small (xx) of of that’s why i said that it’s a shock eh socks
B: very good and what about the hand? do you see the normal hand?
A: that has five fingers for example
B: yeah it has five fingers and yeah completely closed it’s just the fist i can only see the fist
B: oh! the hand is closed!
A: yeah yeah i can only see the fist and a very very small part of the of the sleeve of the tch eh probably a jacket or something like that
B: all right and is the hand moving? can you see movement?
A: oh i cannot see movement but i can infer that it is moving because of the (xx xx) because the other the the other boy is moving as well but i can i poof i couldn’t say
B: the- the- the- there are no there are no lines of movement under the hand?
A: yeah yeah i see yeah
B: ah!
A: there’s a couple of them yes yes
B: right very good
A: okay so the next one now?
B: mhm

A: mm now i can see that this boy has been kick because he kicked
because he has the psk eh psk a bruise in his ri- right eye and
he seems to be eh feeling sick as well because i can see the
starts heh eh

B: how many stars?

A: four stars over his over his head and he seems to be fall- almost
falling down the falling down

B: mm

A: eh i can confirm now that he has his eh the the uniform of a
school not only because of the symbol bu- but because of the of
the tie it has eh psk eh stripes black and white black and white
very eh typical from from tch from eh uniforms of of schools and
poof i can see that well he seems to be sick because of the sha-
sha- eh appears of his of his of his face and the boy eh he have
the he has the his hands open with i can only see four fingers
but probably because the hands are eh psk eh with the thumb eh
towards eh pointing towards the floor and i cannot see the thumb
the thumb and poof

B: mm

A: (what else to say)

B: and what what about his face? you you said he looks unhappy? or

A: yeah unhappy de- definitely unhappy and tch and and sad as well
he’s he almost seems to be sort of crying or something like that

B: mm tch very good very good mm

A: eh

B: what about the third picture?

A: the third? and now the the the boy’s crying and goes to eh goes
home to see his father to to tell him that well somebody has
kicked him his eye he’s crying eh eh crying and shouting with the
with the tch the the mouth is completely open and he’s pointing
towards the well towards outside to tell him that he that he has
been kicked and the boy’s outside he also seems to be running
because his his psk eh his legs are completely open and i can
only see one of the hand the right hand is pointing with one of
the fingers eh towards outside and the other hand is probably in
the in the pocket though i ca- i cannot tell you and well i can
see that he’s crying because of the water that

B: mm

A: goes out from from his from his eyes and the father eh seems to
be sleeping in the in the couch with well because (i think) that
he has the he’s is is that his mouth is is open even snoring
probably and he has a a newspaper is in his in his right hand but
he’s not reading it just lying in the sofa and eh in relation to
the clothes he has a trousers and one of these eh tch eh jerseys
but without sleeves a heh

B: ah! hm hm

A: and the

B: ((coughing))

A: probably he has a a shirt and and shoes and he has the one of his
hands is closed and the other one is open with the with the tch
newspaper and he has eh a big very big very big mou- moustache
and the tch the eyes the eye that i can see is closed and he has
also very big ear and the the hair is is is black

B: very good (xxx) it all

A: okay so next one now?

B: mhm

A: eh now the boy seems to be explaining what happened and he seems
to be pointing he’s pointing actually to to his eye that is
bruised and he’s still crying and shouting eh complaining about
the other boy probably and the the father now eh is looking
at him eh with a very surprised face and he has his his his mouth
is open and very big moustache heh and his eyes are completely
open and now the newspaper has fallen down and the hand that
eh had the newspaper is completely open i can see the five
fingers and the other hand is still closed

B: so eh he’s dropped the newspaper?
A: yeah yeah now
B: mm
A: yeah now the newspaper is in the in the in the floor yeah
B: yeah
A: and the hand it is completely open
B: brilliant
A: yeah so is enough for this one?
B: does he have a pocket? on his shirt
A: ah! ah yes one (actually) he has on the shirt or on the jersey
without sleeves?
B: ah!
A: well i don’t know if it is a a jacket of a jer- or a jersey
B: mm
A: without sleeves and yes he has two pockets
B: mm
A: and it’s eh completely eh buttoned and i say that it’s a a
jersey without sleeves becau- sleeves because it has only two two
buttons
B: right very good very good
A: and
B: and does he have the tie? does the father have a tie? like the
son
A: he yeah probably well yeah i don’t know if it’s a tie or a bow
tie but i think that it is a tie but if it’s a tie eh completely
white yeah but probably it is a a tie and i can only see the hhh!
psk eh the the the upper part of the of the of the shirt and yes
B: mm
A: yes yes it’s a tie but completely white white not like the the
one of the child which is eh black and white (with) is striped
B: ah! very good okay good good you want to (xx) the next picture
or?
A: okay now the the father seems to be very very very angry eh his
s- his face says that he actually is very very very angry (say)
like mm eh tch eh closing his teeth and pushing one against the
the the other and the the boy now seems to between quieter than
before still crying and they go eh outside to probably to the
other to the others boy eh house to talk to him now i can see not
clearly that he actually yes have a have a have a tie and the tch
the this jersey without the the sleeves has a one pocket still
buttoned he’s fa- the father is very very very big very yes very
big eh he’s yeah actually very fat and poof i can see that he has
eh psk eh shoes eh and he has to tie his shoes and eh what else?
B: what’s? what’s he doing with his hands?
A: with his hands? well he has a yeah he has eh psk eh one of his
ha- his hands with the hand of (this) his child they go together
B: mm
A: yeah eh and the other hand is well i cannot see really the other
hand just one part of the other side
B: yeah
A: is just lying beside his body
B: tch right and what about the next picture?
A: in the next picture they're eh in front of the the in front of a
    door probably the the door of the house of the the boy that
    kicked eh his son they’re eh just wait- eh waiting in front of it
    eh eh now eh they're together but he their hands are not together
    but the boy’s behind or beside beside and behind the the the
    father now now he seems to be quieter eh i can see his his eye
    still completely black and mm now the the ja- the jacket of the
    boy is buttoned or seems to be have buttoned at least
    B: mm
    A: and the father is waiting there his hands is well the right hand
    the only that i can see is open completely open and hhh!
    B: good and what about his expression? is he angry? or sad?
    A: yeah he see- he see- he seems to be angry i can see his his eyes
    are completely open his eyebrows are you know? eh this eh psk
    face of surprise or
    B: mm
    A: something like that and his mouth is closed completely closed
    B: and and what about the door? what’s the door like?
    A: mm eh there sees to be there seems to be one well this hole to
    put the the letters on
    B: mm
    A: and sort of eh bell but well not exactly a bell but eh sort a
    ring so as to
    B: mm
    A: to knock knock in the door and i can see some bricks eh in both
    sides of the of the door and one stair eh one stair to go into to
    go through to to go into this house you have to to go up one
    stair at least that i can see
    B: mhm and what number is the door?
    A: no number
    B: no number?
    A: no number no
    B: hm
    A: (xxx)
    B: good
    A: mm
    B: what what about the next picture?
    A: the next picture i can see the man knocking knocking on the on
    the on the door he has not used this ring that i suppose that it
    is to bell but just he’s knocking with his with his hand with his
    fist the hand is closed and i see eh because of the
    B: ((cough))
    A: of the picture i can see that eh he’s knocking he he’s moving his
    hand and eh he has the same face as the as in the previous
    picture
    B: mhm
    A: and now the tch now the boy seems to be surprised because eh well
    the the other boy seems not to be in the house he has his hand in
    the in his chin so as eh thinking about well
    B: mm
    A: my friend or the person who kicked me is not in the house how can
    that be possible .hhh and well he seems to be surprised and well
    B: hm
    B: very good (that must be useful)
    A: okay
    B: and what about the next picture?
    A: in the next picture now the eh somebody opens the door smiling
    smiling
    B: heh heh
A:  
  eh well i think that he’s a yes a boy yeah yeah a boy he has no 
  no no hair he’s mm eh psk bald?

B:  
  bald yeah

A:  
  yeah bald yeah and he has glasses round glasses he’s smiling and 
  well smiling face (totally) the opposite to the father that now 
  seems to be even hhh angrier than before . hhh and the boy who has 
  been kicked is surprised with his well his o- hi- his mouth is 
  completely open and the other boy is eh eh he has a big no- eh 
  nose as well he has trousers with yeah he the this trousers eh 
  tch has not a belt but has some eh well some tch eh well similar 
  to a belt but you you do not put it eh round your waist but round 
  your back and

B:  
  ah! yeah

A:  
  two stri- stripes well i don’t know how to (xxx)

B:  
  i i can’t remember hm

A:  
  okay well i hope you (heh)understand me

B:  
  yeah heh

A:  
  and he has a shirt and and the sleeve of his shirt is eh tch is 
  eh it’s a long sleeve but it is eh brought back because probably 
  it is hot

B:  
  hm

A:  
  and i can see ha- eh half eh half of his eh half part of his of 
  the front part of his arm until the the up to the elbow

B:  
  good

A:  
  and he seems to have slippers instead of hhh shoes or something 
  like that

B:  
  mm

A:  
  and he’s eh psk eh well the the house with the i can see only 
  a part of the house very funny because the the walls are painted 
  or decorated with eh flowers?

B:  
  mm:

A:  
  tch and the the the floor is with eh the bricks are black and 
  white black and white

B:  
  mm

A:  
  like a a chess eh board

B:  
  mm

A:  
  and the the yeah well i see (xxx) yeah the the top part of the 
  house is

B:  
  mm

A:  
  is the ceiling is

B:  
  mhm

A:  
  is white

B:  
  good

A:  
  and well i cannot

B:  
  (that’s brilliant) yeah and in the next picture what? what do 
  you have there?

A:  
  the the father seems yeah now he s- started to shout and he seems 
  to be eh asking for his father in order to to tell him that eh 
  he has been kicked his his son and well he’s actually 
  speaking because i can see the that that he’s speaking because of 
  the picture

B:  
  mhm

A:  
  and he’s eh with his left ha- left left hand he’s pointing with 
  one finger eh towards the inte- interior of the house in order to 
  well he seems to be pointing to his to his father and the boy who 
  opened the door is surprised with his hands opened

B:  
  mm

A:  
  the typical expression of surprise with the mouth and the and the 
  and the ha- ha- and the hands eh typical expression eh well he
seems to be saying well i don’t know what you’re talking about

A: and the psk the boy who has been kicked is in well identical
position as in the previous previous picture

B: mm

A: yes and the father is yeah oh well yeah he’s just pointing
towards inside and and and and shouting it’s the only difference
that i can see

B: good very good

A: yeah

B: and what about the next picture?

A: mm the next the next the next picture eh the the psk the
boy of the of the house seems to be eh calling at somebody

B: mm

A: he he’s calling because well even shouting because he has his
hand near his near his mouth a open completely open hand near
his mouth and he’s looking at (one side) eh eh calling to the

B: mm

A: to the other person who is well somewhere in the in the in the
house

B: mm

A: now the boy who has been kicked is in identical position as
in the previous one the father now seems to be eh more relaxed
because in fact there’s somebody inside and his right hand is is
bent and with the with the the (hand) is closed and psk in his
in his eh well in front of his stomach probably or well in front
of his body anyway hhh

B: but this is the father?

A: yeah the father

B: yeah

A: yeah

B: and his his hand is in front of his stomach?

A: yeah more or less more or less yeah

B: like the last picture or different?

A: the the sorry?

B: is it like the last picture? or?

A: well yeah but he’s not shouting any more and i cannot see his
left h- left hand pointing towards the interior of the house

B: mm!

A: he’s now he’s not shouting he’s not even talking

B: mm

A: now he seems to be quieter and more

B: mm

A: pleased because eh well he thinks he had eh got what he intended
to to get that is the father of the boy

B: mm hm

A: and well

B: very good and what about the next picture?

A: mm the next the next picture eh the father seems to be well the
father wants to talk to the not only to talk probably to talk to
the father of the of the boy but only to have a fight with him
because he seems to to be pulling his sleeve the sleeve of the
right hand eh eh back typical fight eh heh fight eh

B: gesture

A: scene yes yes the boy who has been kicked is in completely
identical position and the boy inside is surprised now looking at
what the the father is the father of the kicked boy is is doing
because well he seems eh that he’s not a that he does not
understand well he’s not really understanding anything at all

B: mhm and what what’s he doing with his hands?
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A: with his? the the boy?
B: mm yeah the on the step the
A: the boy on the step? nothing really he has eh his hand he has his
hand the just lying beside his his body
B: right
A: he’s doing nothing i can see only one one hand
B: good good very good
A: and open mouth of sur- sur- surprise
B: open mouth!?
A: yeah yeah half opened at least yeah of of surprise mm (seeming)
not to understand what the man is doing
B: hm hm very good and then what about the last picture?
A: in the last picture eh the person who was eh inside the house
appears and he seems to be the you know the big cousin eh
B: mmm
A: eh a very very big man .hhh eh even bigger than the father of the
kicked boy and he’s eh (worried) eh he seems to be eh tch eh
colleague of the kicked boy just because of the at least they
seem to go to the same school because he has a the the uniform
with the tie and i see i can see the symbol of the of the the
school in the one one eh side of of the jacket
B: mmm
A: and he has a a cap with the symbol as well eh he has very very
big face and he seems to be surprised i can see that his hair is
is is psk black and he has pimples in his in his face and his
mouth is that of surprise
B: is the mouth open?
A: no no no completely closed
B: mmm
A: yeah and that of s- surprise and probably he’s also angry and the
the person who opened the door now seems to be pointing towards
well that is the person who kicked your your boy probably is the
person who kicked eh your boy so now the person who opened the
door is probably the father and not
B: mmm
A: heh
B: mmm
A: eh (a boy) and he’s he’s
pointing towards the the the wi- he’s pointing with his thumb of
the right hand
B: hm
A: towards the the boy behind now he seems to be pleased and even
happy the mouth is open tch and the the boy behind the big big
boy has eh shoes and also socks very i can see only a small part
of the of the socks and now the boy who has been kicked eh seems
to be eh psk eh probably sad with his his head is eh tch he’s
bending his his head looking towards the floor eh and now the
father is the completely surprised his mouth is open
B: mmm
A: eh hhh his (xx) his eyes are completely open as well
B: mmm
A: and poof
B: what about his hands? does he?
A: his hands? eh his hands are his sleeve is still eh pulled pulled
back
B: rolled up
A: but eh now his fis- eh his hand is open not closed
B: mmm
A: as in the previous one
B: mm
A: and i can see only one one arm
B: mm
A: and
B: and what what about the? tch you you described the boy you the
boy
A: the big boy?
B: no the boy who was kicked
A: uuh
B: what? is he the same as the last picture? no he’s different
A: no no no no eh in the in the last picture he was looking at the
man who opened door
B: mm
A: but well he his mouth was open
B: hm
A: he even seems to be talking but now he’s he probably saw the the
other big boy and now he seems to be eh sad even he’s
frightened and he seems to be eh tch he seems to be bending his
head
B: mm
A: towards the towards the floor
B: beautiful beautiful very good mm okay?
A: okay
B: i think that’s everything
A: fine
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A: okay first picture there's a little boy eh and someone has punched him you can see that the a- eh half of the arm and the hand
B: is his hand like that?
A: oh! closed
B: is a fist?
A: yeah
B: (heh)okay heh
A: it’s his fist
B: yeah (xxx)
A: and there must be more differences okay he’s wearing shor- shorts
B: yeah
A: eh shoes it’s all white his (xx) his hair is black
B: yeah
A: and he has big eye- thick eyebrows a long a big nose big ears his mouth is open we can’t see any of his teeth
B: you can’t?
A: you can’t
B: hm
A: and he looks like he’s falling backwards a little bit
B: yeah
A: like he’s bent backwards and i don’t know (more) differences eh he’s wearing a short jacket like a school jacket it’s
B: yeah
A: like a school uniform
B: yeah
A: and how many differences do you have? heh
B: i’ve only got one difference
A: one eh heh heh
B: so is is are there lines? beneath you know where the fist? there’s there’s lines?
A: yeah there’re three lines
B: three?
A: two lines and the third one is like dots more than lines
B: (xxx) heh heh
A: eh his mouth is open and you can see one of his arms one of his hands and you can’t see his socks
B: i’ve got you can’t?
A: mm
B: no not really but i but i haven’t got the lines i’ve got i’ve got two lines
A: and the third one is like dots no?
B: i haven’t got that
A: like that one (xx) okay let’s go to the next one yeah
B: next picture heh
A: okay next picture he has one black eye eh you can see four stars
around his head
B: yeah
A: like someone’s punched and he has four fingers on each of his
hands instead of five
B: yeah
A: four fingers and you can see now you can see his tie
B: yeah
A: which is striped it has black lines black and white lines
B: mm does he have three buttons? no four bu– three buttons?
A: yeah three buttons
B: three buttonholes?
A: yeah
B: two pockets? one a pocket on each side?
A: yeah
B: is he? is he got an expression like that?
A: yeah and his mouth is going like that
B: no heh heh
A: no!?
B: (in mine) not
A: and you have? you can see? two small wrinkles on his left side?
B: where?
A: here two wrinkles? you can see both his eyebrows and he’s bent
to the to the right to this side
B: to? yeah i thi– i’ve got four differences
A: okay next one eh now we can see his father sitting on the sofa
slee– eh he’s sleeping he’s holding a newspaper on his right hand
and and the boy is going to his father like he’s eh crying you
can see four tears two on each of his cheek
B: yeah but
A: his cheek
B: you know his eye? is it black?
A: his eye!?
B: yeah
A: yeah but very small
B: yeah it’s closed
A: yes yes
B: it looks like a tear
A: yeah but it’s his eye
B: yeah
A: and he’s pointing to the left probably saying someone’s hit me
B: is pointing to the left?
A: hm hm his father is looking to the right well he has his eyes
closed but he’s
B: he’s looking?
A: facing the right he has a very big moustache
B: at the right? his left? is facing the? well right on the picture
but it’s his left?
A: (xxx) well his left yeah and he has a big black moustache and
black hair he’s wearing long trousers and a jacket with two
buttons and underneath you can see a white shirt and a white tie
B: he’s wearing a jacket!?
A: yeah it’s like a jacket
B: cause mine looks like a shirt with a tie
A: no he’s wearing a jacket on on the shirt the jacket it’s very
similar to the one the kid’s wearing with two pockets on each
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side
B: no mine is not
A: and two buttons his left eh hand is closed
B: yeah
A: and with his right hand is holding the (xxx)
B: has he got four fingers?
A: yeah four fingers yeah
B: on his shoes has he got two?
A: two lines on each
B: yeah
A: hm yeah
B: and
A: and everything is white nothing is colored well there’s a small
kind of drawing in the magazine
B: yeah on the pa- magaz- pap- newspaper
A: yeah newspaper
B: yeah?
A: yeah
B: okay what about the armchair? it’s just normal?
A: it’s normal armchair white
B: is it? (the one) got? what are his ears like? rounded?
A: his ears? ears?
B: yeah
A: they’re round big and round similar to the kid’s ones
B: yeah
A: the kid’s ears
B: is the child’s mouth open?
A: yeah you can see
B: he’s crying?
A: yeah his tongue
B: you can see his tongue? yeah?
A: yeah and his upper teeth
B: yeah
A: it looks just like a line but it’s supposed to be his teeth and
his
B: head is up?
A: yeah up
B: and his?
A: his mouth is very open
B: his legs are separated?
A: hm hm he’s walking
B: yeah okay (xx) heh heh heh
A: okay next one eh the child is more or less the same in the same
position but now his right eh eh hand is pointing his eye his
black eye
B: his hand is pointing to his eye?
A: mhm like saying look what he did to me or we can se- see four
tears again well in in the previous picture you couldn’t see his
eyebrow now you can see a very small line
B: small eyebrow and is is his eye?
A: it’s the same
B: like (round) and it’s got a black thing in the middle
A: it’s just a black dot (xxx)
B: because my eye is like a circle and then it’s got a black thing
in the middle
A: no i mean it’s not even a circle
B: no we- tch like (xx) and then is in (xx xx)
A: no this is
B: no?
A: eh the whole eye is black
B: no
A: it’s like the one before it looks like a semicircle actually i don’t know
B: that’s how mine was like before but not now
A: here it looks the same and his mouth is even more open now
B: is he sticking his tongue out?
A: mm?
B: is he sticking his tongue out? his tongue?
A: yeah! i think that’s his tongue yeah heh heh
B: is it like that?
A: yeah
B: is it? every it oh! no! (we have done) his arms (haven’t we)?
A: and his hair is straight like that phew!
B: yeah
A: hm
B: and in the? and in the one before?
A: mhm yeah on both
B: and what’s his father doing?
A: now his father’s looking at him
B: yeah
A: with a surprise face he has his mouth open
B: no
A: his eyes are very open and you can see his nose his eyes his eyebrows
B: is his eye like? it’s like that or?
A: yes like that
B: is his mouth just a line? a hole (xxx) the line?
A: no it’s open it’s black and
B: oh yeah!
A: you can see a line underneath his
B: no
A: you see his mouth and then a line underneath eh now his his newspaper has eh he has dropped the newspaper on the floor and his hand is open you can see all his fingers and his left arm hand is still closed on the arm of the armchair
B: hhh
A: his clothes are the same everything else it’s the same i think
B: okay i think (xx xx)
A: on this picture the father has a an upset face his eyebrows are
B: what do you mean (heh)upset?
A: he’s upset like that his eyebrows are going like that you know?
B: (heh)completely like that?
A: yeah (xxx)
B: his eyebrows are like (heh)that?
A: yeah like when you’re upset
B: yeah
A: and also his mouth he’s
B: what’s his mouth like? heh heh heh heh
A: heh heh heh i don’t know how to express this he looks upset and he’s he’s holding his his son’s arm he the left ar- hand and they’re walking to the right tch the
B: (xx) the right?
A: (xx) the right yeah
B: hm is the son crying?
A: yeah you can see two tears and his eye is now completely round
B: round and black?
A: mhm round and black
B: oh! but we fou- we’ve found this difference before so i don’t think we’ve got to write it again no heh heh heh
A: okay mm his tie is shorter than before (xxx)
B: his tie!
A: his tie
B: it’s up to there’s his shorts and then it’s the tie
A: yeah
B: yeah
A: mhm he’s walking they’re both walking
B: yeah
A: and the kid has his right hand closed
B: yeah
A: his mouth open you can’t see his tongue or his teeth or his teeth you can’t see anything just his mouth open eh the father has three lines on each shoe and the circle that (xxx)
B: yeah i’ve got one two three four four differences
A: ah! the the man’s ear is a bit smaller now you can see a black dot in the center
B: yeah it’s his hair like that?
A: mhm and he has these things i don’t know how you call them psk (still) they were there
B: eh but up to there?
A: yeah very short
B: sideburns that’s it i think heh heh heh
A: okay next (story) eh th- they’re in front of a door
B: is it got a number? on the door?
A: mm?
B: is there a number on the door? a number?
A: what’s a number?
B: a number
A: a number!?
B: well (sorry) seventeen
A: oh! sorry! no no
B: no number on the door?
A: no number there’s just a letter hole? in the center it’s like a rectangle with a line
B: hhh let- a letterbox?
A: hm
B: i haven’t got a letterbox
A: tch okay there’s a there’s also a circle on the top to knock at the door?
B: heh heh heh i don’t know that heh heh heh
A: like
B: a door knock?
A: door knock okay .hhh you can see bricks on the side on both sides of the
B: yeah is there like a step?
A: yeah there’s one step mhm
B: what about? is the boy still holding the father’s hand?
A: no he’s the father is in front of the door and the boy’s on his left
B: yeah
A: also facing the door
B: is behind him?
A: behind him mhm
B: is he like that?
A: yeah like that with his mouth his mouth is a straight line the boy’s mouth
B: my mouth is a line
A: it’s a straight line a bit (down) but almost straight and the
father has his arms both a bit bent to the front like that but
B: (xx xx)?
A: not completely straight a bit to the front
B: yeah
A: and you can see a big stomach
B: heh yeah heh
A: eh you can see like a semicircle? at the back of his neck? it’s
it’s it’s a line of the jacket
B: i have the thing is that i haven’t got a jacket so
A: ah! it’s not a jacket heh heh heh it’s not a jacket it’s one of
these things things you wear in in
B: braces?
A: it’s like ja- jacket without the the arms? you wear (over)
B: it’s a waistcoat?
A: no! you you wear it in under shirt like that you bri- i don’t
know how you call it
B: a waistcoat
A: a waistcoat?
B: it’s like a jacket without any sleeves?
A: yeah
B: like a waiter might wear?
A: yeah like a waiter that’s what he’s wearing now i can see it
B: so he’s wearing
A: that’s that’s why it has that semicircle at the back because
B: he’s wearing a waistcoat
A: yeah
B: so (xxx)
A: it’s a waistcoat mm
B: wearing a waistcoat
A: hhh eh his eyebrows are still the same you can see two lines at
on his back
B: two lines on his back?
A: well a line vertical line it’s made by his waistcoat i think
B: ah! on the father?
A: yeah is it’s like a bit also a wrinkle on the waistcoat you can
see two buttons and a pocket
B: eh w- well that’s the waist- mm i think i’ve got five differences
now
A: okay
B: three four five
A: in the next one he’s knocking at the door you can see one two
three four eight lines around his hand or on the hand he’s using
to knock at the door mm the little boy’s touching his eh how do
you call this?
B: chin
A: chin yeah with his right hand like if he was wondering heh and i
can’t see any other differences well his hand is in front of his
tie so you can’t see his tie
B: father expression exactly the same?
A: more or less he’s (i think it’s) a bit more (like that) he was
like that and now he is like looking a bit more upwards but it’s
more or less the same
B: mine is exactly the same you know the father? in between the
hair? the hair on his head is there like a gap?
A: yeah
B: in between of the head? a white gap?
A: mhm but very small
B: yeah because in in the one before there’s there’s not one
A: mhm
B: the hair is like together
A: yeah well there’s a line that goes from one part of the hair to
the other so there’s not exactly a gap it’s
B: yeah
A: (xxx) here
B: yeah
A: and at the back
B: yeah
A: mm yeah
B: (xxx)
A: everything’s the same
B: picture eight?
A: eh there’s a boy no there’s a man heh heh okay
B: heh
A: there’s a bald man wearing glasses
B: there’s a bald man?
A: he’s smiling
B: yeah
A: you can see a a black
B: semicircle?
A: yeah semicircle he’s wearing glasses he’s very small
B: yeah
A: and
B: he’s up to the man? the father’s shoulder?
A: mhm eh and his eyes are two black dots he has a big nose and his
head is quite rounded
B: has he got a bit of hair? on his head?
A: no
B: he hasn’t got any hair?
A: no here you can see two lines here it’s like i think it’s his
eyebrows
B: oh yeah! i’ve got that
A: yeah and the paperwall is very flowery
B: the wall- is the wall- is
A: you can see daisies
B: is got wallpaper inside?
A: mhm it’s flowers daisies i think hhh and the tales tiles? eh of
the floor are black and white squares he’s wearing slippers
B: yeah
A: and he has a shirt with one two three five buttons and trou- big
trousers and something to hold the trousers?
B: braces
A: mhm and his shirt is i don’t know how to say this like this?
B: rolled up
A: rolled eh the father is bent to talk to him he has the same face
angry face eh the kid has his mouth open he looks like (xx xx)
A: i think that’s it
B: well i can only see one
A: he has both hands on the back the kid has both hands on the back
well i can only see one
B: completely? cause on mine you can see his hands like that
A: well you can see but it looks like he’s trying to put them on the
back the- it must be like your picture
B: cause
A: you can see his hand completely but i think he looks like he’s
B: it’s like that? but it’s?
A: yeah
B: it’s got a (xx) yeah?
A: yeah the pocket the kid’s pocket on his jacket it’s black
it’s a black rectangle

B: a black rectangle?

A: it was white before now it’s black it’s colored

B: eh heh heh

A: what?

B: i’m just thinking about (what to write) that’s it

A: okay

B: one two three four

A: eh picture nine the the father is pointing psk with his eh left
hand he’s pointing inside the house and he’s talking he has his
mouth open and you can see three lines coming out of his mouth
like if he was talking (just like that) (xxx) and the the old man
the bald man is like that

B: yeah

A: like (if you say) i don’t know

B: has he got a line above his mouth?

A: mhm yeah he has a very thin neck?

B: yeah

A: and the boy looks exactly the same

B: yeah

A: and how many differences do you have? (xxx)

B: two but there might just be two is the fa- the father?

A: ah! the the boy’s pocket is white again

B: yeah

A: it’s a rectangle again you can see four fingers on the father’s
right hand

B: right hand

A: right hand and you can hardly see the boy’s hand

B: maybe that’s it

A: okay

B: picture ten

A: next one eh the bald man is calling the his son i suppose he’s he
has his left hand like that

B: who?

A: the bald man he’s

B: yeah

A: facing his left well his look is facing the inside of the house
and i suppose he’s calling the boy and now his eyebrows are black
do you remember the the lines we saw on his fa- on his head?

B: they’re black now

A: they’re like that

B: they’re like that

A: yeah and they’re coming out his head

B: yeah

A: .hhh hhh eh psk on on the drawing before the previous one eh you
can see next to the boy’s black eye you could see a line like a
wrinkle and now you can’t see it

B: yeah

A: okay tch the father is has his hand closed like that

B: the fist?

A: fist like he he was gonna hit someone he has his mouth closed you
can’t see his mouth just his moustache .hhh mm tch his eh his
legs are together you can’t

B: ah!

A: they were open a bit open

B: before?

A: before and now they’re closed they’re together

B: does he have his left le- right leg behind his left leg or (xxx)?

A: mhm almost yeah almost

B: do the bricks? you know?
A: the bricks keep keep changing but i don’t think we have to
B: yeah
A: say that
B: because in picture in picture four five sev– six and seven?
A: mhm
B: the bricks come (up) to the same level then pict-
A: then they’re lower
B: then the picture eight the bricks are lower again and then in
picture nine they’re low
A: and now i– they come up again yeah
B: and they come up again mm okay shall we go on? heh
A: yes
B: picture eleven
A: eh next picture eh now the fa– the the old the father heh heh is
B: doing that thing now
A: the father’s rolling his sleeves up?
B: rolling his shirt e– we can’t see his mouth (either) now
A: you can’t see his mouth? not even a line?
B: (no)
A: no it’s just the moustache
B: oh! just the moustache because in mine he hasn’t got a moustache
A: but you can see the mouth so but i suppose that that’s the
difference
B: picture eleven
A: yeah
B: before heh (heh)again heh
A: mm hm eh the boy’s looking wow! heh he’s just he’s just looking a
bit higher it’s more or less the same
B: the boy is he? is he still like that?
A: yeah and he’s even a bit more bent than before but
B: yeah what about the man? the short man? the bald man?
A: hhh his his eyebrows are two lines again well three lines and his
mouth is like a semicircle
B: a semicircle?
A: yeah it has a straight line underneath and it’s black tch you can
B: only see one button on the the father the father thing heh
A: so? so in picture eleven now all there’s is the boy? the man?
B: with the man rolling his sleeve up?
A: mhm
B: and the man stood like that? the short man stood like that?
A: yeah he’s like that
B: just okay
A: like wondering
B: shall we go to twelve?
A: mhm eh (it) looks like he’s called his kid heh heh heh
B: heh heh heh
A: it’s a big big boy he’s almost touching the ceiling?
B: yeah
A: and he looks upset his mouth is a line going down
B: yeah
A: his nose is like a three eh well like a three like a something
B: like that?
A: yeah like if it was a three
B: heh mine is like mine is like a hat upside down like that
A: yeah just the the low part of the hat
B: yeah
A: yeah it’s the same and he’s looking down
B: and
A: he’s yeah his eyes are down
A: he’s wearing a cap
B: a cap!?
A: mhm you can see part of his hair on the left or his left so i and
he’s wearing the same uniform the jacket the shirt the a tie with
lines
B: are his hands in a fist?
A: yeah both hands
B: and is his fa- what’s his father’s hands like?
A: eh his his left hand is in a fist as before
B: yeah
A: one hand is closed and his right hand is like that
B: yeah
A: pointing his son
B: is he got a smile on his face?
A: yes
B: with a semicircle
A: mhm
A: a black semicircle
A: as in number eight his face is like number eight in number eight
B: yeah
A: it’s the same and the father looks surprised he has his mouth
open we can see ha- half a semicircle and then his (xx xx)
B: mine’s mine’s a black circle a black round circle
A: yes it’s the same it’s just that mine mine has a moustache
B: he’s got a moustache
A: moustache covering part of the he has his eyes wide open and his
eyebrows seem semicircles
B: yeah has he got?
A: and now he has a big round nose it’s bigger than before
B: like a (xx)?
A: mhm
B: is is he got is he got two ah! is he got two wrinkles by his
face?
A: mhm one one wrinkle
B: one wrinkle?
A: and a very small dot his hair
B: so mine it’s like a big wrinkle and then a little line
A: mm
B: it’s yours like that?
A: yeah a dot it’s not even a line it’s like a dot
B: cause mine is like a mine is like a line
A: eh the little boy is eh faci- facing the ground?
B: facing the ground!?
A: he’s like that eh his mouth you can see a line like that
going down and the boy’s wearing the big boy’s wearing the same
shoes as the little boy
B: yeah one two three four five i’ve got five differences
A: mm
A: okay that’s it
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1 A: in the first picture there’s a little boy tch eh a hand is on the
2 left side and in front of his nose the eh the hand is in front of
3 her hea- her face and it seem as it is was a a bunch or a a bunch
4 you? or a or a blow you know?
5 B: a punch
6 A: a punch (xx)
7 B: it’s yours a boy or a girl?
8 A: it’s a boy
9 B: okay
10 A: it’s a boy eh it’s a boy he’s wearing a a jacket eh a jacket with
11 a tch in the left side of her jacket there is a kind of of sign
12 mm or flag or little flag or something like that
13 B: maybe a handkerchief?
14 A: no no
15 B: no not a handkerchief?
16 A: no
17 B: because that
18 A: eh and a sign as it was a sign of a country or of a flag (xxx)
19 B: okay
20 A: tch eh have you found the differences?
21 B: i think it’s the flag in his lapel pocket
22 A: okay tch eh the following picture .hhh the boy has received the
23 punch and he he sees stars i don’t know how do you say but eh
24 B: how many stars?
25 A: four stars
26 B: yes!
27 A: and he’s wearing also a tie with
28 B: hm hm
29 A: diago- diagonal mm stripes! black and white stripes
30 B: that
31 A: tch eh
32 B: that’s the difference
33 A: okay tch eh bue- mm the jacket of the the child’s jacket has two
34 two pockets one on each side
35 B: mhm
36 A: on each side of the jacket and he has one one eye in black eh it
37 ha- it seems that it’s the harmed eye or the wounded wounded eye
38 B: okay he has a black eye
39 A: it it is his his right eye tch and i don’t know eh he seems
40 to be mm tired or has fallen or something like in a position that
41 he have it seems that he can’t move or
42 B: okay
43 A: like (xx) or something like that hhh eh .hhh the follow- have you
found the differences?
B: i found two
A: two differences eh the following picture the boy is crying
B: heh
A: and he goes to tell his father about what ha- had have happened
to him tch eh the boy is crying and his father is sleeping on a
sofa
B: right
A: he has in his
B: on a sofa? or an?
A: on an armchair
B: okay
A: eh tch on his right si- right hand he has a newspaper?
B: mhm
A: but he is sleeping so
B: right
A: he’s not he’s not reading the paper the boy eh enters crying and
i suppose that he is going to tell her father tch eh the boy is
wearing the same clothes that before and i am going to tell you
how the father is dressed
B: okay
A: tch eh he has dark hair eh he is sleeping as i tell you and i can
see only eh one eye of him only one eye i don’t know if you see
both eyes?
B: no i don’t see both eyes (heh)either
A: right okay eh he’s wearing a a tie also a bla- a white tie and
tch he al- he wears a a kind of of pullover i don’t know if i eh
waistcoat or? tch
B: okay
A: you know? eh the the man tch has also two pockets on each side of
her waistcoat
B: there’s a there’s a mother on your picture?
A: no there’s no mother there are only both men the little me- the
little guy and the the father i suppose
B: the father? okay i’m sorry
A: eh i don’t know tch the the waistcoat eh has two buttons buttoned
up
B: mhm
A: and tch on the newspaper there are
B: ((cough))
A: many many spelling many writing many i don’t know articles or
something like that and in the middle there is a a picture it
seems to be a a picture
B: okay
A: tch eh the boy has tears in his eyes
B: mhm
A: on both sides of hir her of his face tch and i don’t know
B: i only found one difference
A: one difference
B: so
A: eh the boy is pointing out to somewhere
B: okay because
A: in this manner i think (xxx)
B: okay because in mine he is only he has his hands in his pockets
A: he has a big mouth because he’s shouting or crying and i don’t
know but the father although her his child is crying seems not to
be cared of him
B: right
A: tch eh the following picture tch eh the boy still continues
crying

A: and the father has waken up he has dropped the newspaper and it’s
looking at the at the baby or at the guy tch eh the boy eh tch
shows him the tears in his eyes and i suppose that also eh shows
him her her hand in (the) eye her tch how how he has her eye i
know you know? tch

B: his black eye? he’s showing his father

A: his his yes

B: his black eye

A: ok i’m in my picture the little boy is still crying

A: yes i- eh here also is crying he has also tears

B: okay

A: on both sides of her fa- of his face

B: where are his hands?

A: where? ah! eh

B: the little boy’s hands?

A: yeah the right hand of her of his right hand is mm showing
like that

B: ah!

A: eh

B: okay

A: showing her eye and tch i don’t know if i tell you that the
father eh had a big moustache?

B: oh! no! okay

A: and now he seems to be surprised because of seeing her boy crying
tch eh he still is sitting set sat on on her armcher armchair and
he wears the same clothes mm he’s wearing a tie i think that i

B: mhm

A: said it before tch and i think that nothing else happens in these
pictures

B: okay

A: i don’t know tch the following picture eh father decides eh going
to the house of the boy that gave her his child the punch and
both both men are eh tch are with her hands ti- are are going by
hand

B: they’re holding hands?

A: holding hands

B: okay

A: yes the boy still continues crying he has his we i can see his
black eye tch and he’s he has given her father his eh left left
hand and the father seems to be very serious and angry eh the
father mm is psk eh has no it’s giving a step it’s it’s walking

B: he’s walking?

A: is yes i suppose that the boy al- the boy also is walking eh mm
mm mm tch her fa- eh the father has the has closed mouth

B: uhh

A: and the boy it seems eh with it has her his mouth open i think
that is some medium open or not open at all but a little open

B: right

A: and he’s looking eh upside her f- eh his father’s face?

B: mhm is he still crying in you picture?

A: no he still is crying it has two tears in his

B: hm hm

A: hand in his eye sorry hhh and i think that that’s all i don’t
know

B: i only found one difference

A: one difference
B: the that they were holding hands
A: eh they’re holding hands okay he’s walking both are walking and i
think that’s all tch so next eh both father and bo- and son eh
arrive at a door the door is big big up on the up on the father
and it has a kind of you know to to to call at a door you have a
tch a handle? or i don’t know how
B: uhh
A: a handle and eh down the handle there’s a hole a rectangular hole
a hole where eh letters and mail is supposed to be put there tch
B: on the door?
A: on the door
B: okay
A: yes on the door
B: so there’s a knocker?
A: yes
B: and a place to put mail
A: there’s
B: is it a slot that you put mail through?
A: yes
B: okay
A: yes up on the knocker hhh and tch both father and child are
B: ((cough))
A: waiting it seems as they have eh mm called to the door or knocked
the door and are they are waiting
B: so the father has knocked already?
A: no ye- i suppose yes i don’t know
B: okay
A: he is he’s not knocking at the door he’s just waiting
B: is he looking anywhere?
A: eh he’s looking like that eh
B: okay
A: to his
B: that’s the same
A: right side and the boy is on on the left side
B: mhm
A: of his parent his father sorry eh mm
B: where are their hands?
A: mm boy has his hands like that eh tch sti- he he seems
B: in his pockets? or not?
A: no! outside his pockets
B: okay
A: i don’t know
B: (at the sides)?
A: mm
B: and is there a number on your door?
A: no there’s any number in my door
B: okay
A: the door only has what i have said before and on the borders of
the door
B: mhm
A: there are mm bricks?
B: bricks okay
A: bricks and a eh just eh down in the door at the end of the door
down there is a little step?
B: right
A: it seems a there is a little step hhh eh mm the boy also is
looking at the door and it seems serious ah! eh he has stopped
crying
B: okay in my picture too
and i think that we move to the other picture?

okay

eh psk now the father is knocking at the door but not with the knocker but instead with his hand he is he’s knocking with his hand

with his hand? okay

good

eh psk eh the little boy has his eh his hand on his chin?

okay

just as just mm tch he’s looking also at the door and the father continues looking to her to his right side

mm

and nothing else i think and tch mm mm mm

everything looks pretty much the same in my picture

ok except that the father is

yeah

knocking at that the father is knocking at the door

ok

tch mm on the next picture eh a a boy of i think that it has the same a- it is the same age as the as the little boy eh appears on the on the door eh he’s wearing glasses and he has no hair

ok to me it looks like the father!

no it looks like it would be the father of the

ok could be could be could be the father

he’s he’s he’s a small man but it looks like it should be the father

yes yes it seems that it’s a small father or a short is it is very short it has no hair as i said

he uuh

he has no hair eh he’s wearing glasses

right

and at first sight he’s smiling

mm

eh i can see her smile eh from one ear to (heh)another eh he has he’s wearing tch trousers and he supports or he tch eh he’s wearing also i don’t know how to say hm

suspenders?

suspenders yes he’s

the thing?

yes yes

okay

he’s wearing suspenders and a a shirt he’s wearing a shirt eh the little boy now is

is he? i i’m sorry

yeah

is he wearing shoes or?
i think that yes there are shoes or shoes that you wear when you are at home

house slippers? okay

house slippers okay

hm hm

yes eh the floor of the flat eh it’s eh it’s made of mm tch eh mm black and white eh rectangulars? or

black and white tiles?

(bl-) black and white tiles okay and the and the wall is painted with flowers many flowers all the all the wall is covered with flowers

mm

and tch eh i i don’t know mm the little boy has his hand out of
his pockets and he’s looking at the father the at the father of
the other guy the fa- eh the mm the father that is inside the
house is very i don’t know if surprised but he’s re- he’s talking
quietly with eh the man with mous- in moustach moustache he
B: are we still on picture eight or nine?
A: eh eight
B: okay
A: in picture eight
B: okay
A: yes and i think that pretty much is the same i don’t know
B: okay
A: if you have fou-
B: i’ve found a lot of differences
A: okay heh so we move to the other eh now the man in with moustache
is shouting and pointing out to the inside of the house he’s with
his
B: he’s shouting?
A: he’s shouting yes and he’s pointing with his eh with his left eh
arm to the inside of the house he seems to be looking for the guy
that hhh harmed his son
B: okay
A: eh then the other man seems to be surprised and he seems to tell
him that he has nothing what he what does he want because he
don’t knows he’s with the hands o- open just like
B: (right)
A: i don’t know what happens or something like that hhh he’s wearing
the same clothes of course
B: if? does your man have glasses?
A: tch yes
B: okay
A: it has glasses also
B: hm
A: eh the walls are painted in bueno in the same manner as before i
think that is that is the same hhh the little boy is eh tch
is in the same gestures and manners than before he’s like that
and he has no new expression in her face or eh i don’t know what
hhh the big man it’s very angry and furious because of her
expression that i can see here i don’t know
B: hm hm
A: and what else eh wall is painted in the same manner so i don’t
know if you have found any difference?
B: mhm
A: eh we go to the other picture?
B: okay
A: picture number (xxx) four five six seven eight ten to picture ten
hhh eh now the owner of the house is making a sign as i don’t
know as if he was referring to hi- to his son i suppose because
he is saying he ha- he is with his hand open and it seems like is
he as if he was making reference to his son or something like
that hhh and the father and the son are waiting to the tch to the
other guy comes and explains them what has happened hhh eh the
father now the father with moustache is eh is with her tch with
her right eh arm ba- bended or bounded no bended? bent! with her
bent not
B: mhm
A: not like that i yes
B: so the father of the little boy has his arm bent?
A: yes
B: okay
A: yes and the little boy still continues on the same gestures and manners he’s waiting just looking surprised i don’t know to the other eh old man
B: okay
A: tch eh the house is still the same and i think that nothing else new there’s in the ah! is there in the picture
B: okay
A: tch eh next picture (xxx) the the old the father of the boy hhh is eh
B: the father of which boy? the one with the moustache? or the?
A: the moust- the one with the
B: the one who beat up the little boy?
A: the father tch with the moustache
B: okay
A: the fat man is eh is making a gesture with the sleeves of his tch of his tshirt he’s i don’t know eh
B: like he’s getting ready to fight or something?
A: i don’t know eh he’s eh tch rising? his sleeves
B: that’s what that’s what people do when they’re getting ready to fight
A: okay
B: they start (to put) up there
A: yes yes
B: okay
A: it seems that he wants to beat the other guy
B: heh heh
A: and now the the little man eh it has a a expression of i- he’s very sad because his fa- his mouth is not smiling is just showing his sad face he’s sa- he’s sad and at the same time i don’t know defeated or something like that as i don’t know tch eh it seems that the fat father the fa- the father with moustache is going to to beat his he the other man’s son hhh the little boy still remains the same
B: okay he still looks surprised and?
A: yes
B: okay
A: the same as before and i think that the new difference of the other picture is that of the of the arm tch
B: okay
A: eh mm the rest of the picture i think it’s the same
B: okay
A: tch and the final picture eh heh at last appears the the this pro- the the big boy appears and he is very very very tall and fat he’s wearing a capel a cap
B: okay
A: he’s wearing a cap in front of eh the yes in front of the cap there’s a the same as before the o- the same sign that the other
B: okay
A: boy wear on the jacket he wears here
B: tch it must be the sign of their private school
A: yes! probably
B: okay
A: i think probably hhh and he also wears the same the same suit than the little boy
B: right
A: because i can see that it also has the same sign tch eh si yes i think it’s the same because he’s wearing also a tie with black and white stripes hhh and now the little boy is looking down tch you know?
B: the little boy is looking down?
A: the is looking down yes
B: okay
A: hhh and the father is the father the man with moustache is very surprised
B: uhuh heh
A: is looking like that and is looking up eh
B: right
A: he remains with the tch with the sleeve of the tshirt up?
B: uhuh
A: and and now the man with glasses seems to be very happy because his son has appeared and has no problem if there’s
B: is the?
A: any problem the his son has appeared
B: is the man with the glasses doing any gestures?
A: eh it it’s
B: making any gestures?
A: it’s making a tch it’s making a sign with her with her finger and pointing out to
B: his son?
A: to his son
B: okay
A: and he seems to be very proud of his son and if there’re any problem if there i- are any problem that i don’t know his son can resolve it
B: right
A: i don’t know and i think mm yes?
B: i think so!
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1. A: so i begin?
2. B: okay if you want
3. A: eh the first picture
4. B: mhm
5. A: is eh a mm man? heh who is eh like jumping because it’s supposed that a another man eh has just eh oh! eh kicked? i i don’t know eh
6. B: hit?
7. A: s-? sleep? oh no sorry! sla-? slap yeah slap in in his face
8. B: mm so- eh you can see the both man?
9. A: no! you only
10. B: just one?
11. A: can see the arm and the
12. B: the hand?
13. A: yeah yeah
14. B: okay hm hm
15. A: and ((cough)) there’s nothing nothing more i think okay the man which is jumping eh is not is not tall
16. B: mhm
17. A: and he wears a a jacket a short trousers and shoes?
18. B: yes (xxx)
19. A: and he’s black and
20. B: black?
21. A: sorry his hair is black
22. B: ah! okay! hm hm
23. A: and and i think that i don’t know if you want to ask ask ask me something or
24. B: mm does the man eh have a big nose?
25. A: yeah
26. B: yes?
27. A: (heh)mhm
28. B: okay heh heh eh i think that’s
29. A: have you found the? the mistake or
30. B: mm no heh heh heh
31. A: okay eh in his mm jacket
32. B: hm hm
33. A: he has a tch
34. B: pocket?
35. A: like a emble-? i don’t know the the name like a emblem when you for example in in the psk when you have a a shirt of the for example of one university which puts for example university of
36. B: santiago you know what i mean?
37. A: and he has this i don’t know if it’s a
B: uuhh
A: like a picture here
B: yes
A: you know what i mean?
B: hm hm yes
A: okay and .hhh i don’t know ah! he is surprised with with his
B: heh (xxx)
A: his face is really surprised like
B: uuhh
A: he has the tch the the mouth open
B: yes?
A: and the i don’t know
B: is there any pocket? in the jacket?
A: yeah one on the
B: in the left?
A: okay he’s not
B: (xx)
A: he’s
B: no? heh heh heh heh heh
A: (heh) (xxx) heh heh heh heh heh
B: yes
A: have you found the difference? no?
B: i just have found one but i don’t know how many differences are
in this picture
A: mm the the trousers are short
B: mm and the shoes?
A: the shoes eh it has the the they have like a
B: they have something in mm
A: i don’t know
B: down the shoes there is something?
A: what?
B: eh this is the shoe something here
A: yeah a heel?
B: it’s
B: a heel
A: yeah
B: very big heel (or not)?
A: eh mm yeah
B: no i i (xxx)
A: i can only see one one shoe
B: yes
A: so i don’t know
B: okay mm
A: his e-
B: (xx)
A: eh his eyelashes? i think that (xx) you know? this heh heh
B: heh yes heh
A: are black
B: yes
A: and i don’t know
B: how is the? the hair is? how is the hair?
A: black and short
B: short
A: ah! okay he has the s- eh ooh! how do you say? mm okay he’s not
B: brushed?
A: yeah he tch it’s like he has the mm the hair all in in you know?
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104 B: yeah
105 A: in in that way if
106 B: ah okay! hmhm
107 A: i don’t know if if i if it’s the (heh) same or not
108 B: yes i i kno- i know what you mean (xx)
109 A: okay so we can
110 B: go on hm hm yes because i can’t find any any difference more okay
111 in picture two? number two
112 A: yeah
113 B: eh there’s the sa- mm the same man
114 A: yeah
115 B: eh and it seems that hhh he had eh received a very big hit?
116 A: hm hm
117 B: you know? and he’s watching the stars
118 A: yeah eh
119 B: eh
120 A: how many stars?
121 B: there are four st- four
122 A: yeah
123 B: stars and he has the mouth closed?
124 A: yeah
125 B: and his eyes look eh as
126 A: both of them?
127 B: both of them
128 A: no in mine there’s only one the other is black completely black
129 B: no the both of them are open the the eyes
130 A: so is one difference
131 B: uuhh and
132 A: so you?
133 B: mmhm
134 A: okay
135 B: yes so eh there’s one black
136 A: the right one
137 B: mmhm the right okay eh i can see two tch two pockets in the jacket
138 A: yeah
139 B: and the three i don’t know how to say this okay one tie?
140 A: yeah
141 B: in his neck hhh eh
142 A: ah okay! eh st- with straps? i think that is
143 B: no without stra- without
144 A: ah okay mine has is is with with straps
145 B: eh then the hands are
146 A: open
147 B: open
148 A: yeah
149 B: and there’re just four fingers in each of them
150 A: yeah
151 B: eh the trousers are short
152 A: yeah
153 B: again and the eh i can see both eh tch shoes?
154 A: yeah
155 B: shoes (xxx) and the hair is as in the same eh in the same way
156 than in the picture before
157 A: yeah okay
158 B: and i don’t know the ea- i can see just one ear?
159 A: yeah!
160 B: and and the both eh
161 A: yeah
162 B: yes eh heh the i can see the nose and i don’t know if you have
any difference (xx)?
A: no i think that that it’s the same
B: so there were the the eyes? and the tie
A: yeah
B: mm?
A: mm
B: okay
A: and eh he in the in the jacket?
B: the same thing (that in the)?
A: yeah
B: okay (xxx) okay well that’s it
A: okay eh in the third one tch
B: hm hm
A: eh the boy eh because i thought that it was a (heh)man but no
it’s a
B: heh heh (heh)a (heh)boy
A: a boy
B: (heh)okay heh
A: eh is crying and is going to say to his father eh who’s sitting
on a sofa?
B: mhm
A: resting and
B: in a sofa or in a in an armchair?
A: sofa
B: sofa? okay
A: mm yeah no yeah i mean a sofa is only one and an armchair is the
big one or is on the contrary?
B: i think that is in the (heh)contrary heh heh heh i don’t know i
think it’s in the contrary
A: now i’m i’m doubting heh
B: i think that the the armchair is only one but
A: okay is eh in my picture is only eh
B: it’s the same? just one for one person?
A: sí yes
B: okay so that’s fine a
A: and sorry heh eh okay the boy’s crying? he has eh the the mouth
open?
B: yeah
A: and he has again the the tie?
B: yes
A: eh with you know? like like the other one
B: (with) lines?
A: yes with lines
B: okay no
A: and eh i can ((sniff)) see only one eye
B: yes
A: and and one ear
B: hm hm
A: and the tch he has the legs open?
B: (xx) heh heh
A: heh heh
B: yeah
A: and he’s going to say his father that eh someone has slapped
B: (xx)
A: eh her
B: him eh
A: oh! sorry him
B: eh his father is sleeping or is eh
A: yes he’s like sleeping like resting
B: he’s like sleeping uhuh eh mm his father has a newspaper in his right hand?
A: eh yes but he’s handing the newspaper is not open
B: yes
A: he’s just
B: uhhuh
A: handing
B: eh eh the father’s mouth is open?
A: mm yes ah!
B: more or less?
A: he has mou- eh moustache
B: mhm
A: the father and he has the he has black hair
B: yes
A: and he has a tie a normal tie
B: a normal tie (heh)okay
A: and the he has a shirt? and then he has a ah! i don’t remember the name ah! okay! like a mm mm mm tch heh (yes) eh he has long trousers
B: yes
A: eh normal shoes i think and the he has eh a i don’t remember the name sorry eh your your father has only the?
B: the
A: without
B: (you mean) the the shirt?
A: yeah
B: yes he has and there is a pocket in the shirt
A: no
B: so
A: because no
B: (heh)there (heh)is (heh)something hhh who is difference okay
A: no i i i’m going to explain eh he has like a jumper?
B: okay
A: like a sweater or jumper yes but without?
B: okay
A: sleeves i think
B: uhhuh
A: i don’t remember the name and in he has two pockets
B: yes
A: but okay i think that is just the difference the
B: yes i think heh okay
A: and i don’t know
B: his left hand is open or closed?
A: closed
B: closed okay eh
A: okay
B: i think that’s all the heh in the fourth picture eh the father is eh
A: tch speaking with her or his
B: eh no speaking his mouth is closed but he’s looking at his his boy
A: no in my picture the the his mouth?
B: mhm
A: is open like if he was (going) or he he’s talking with with the or asking
B: mhm (xxx)
A: the the boy why he’s crying
B: mm the boy has a? has his mouth open?
A: yeah very open
B: with heh heh very very open
A: with tears?
B: with a lot of tears as in the (xx xx)
A: a lot!?
B: yeah
A: no
B: (xxx) four tears four
A: eh two
B: (maybe) five
A: in each eye?
B: in each eye
A: ah okay!
B: yes eh i can see the boy’s tongue?
A: yeah
B: eh psk he has hi- mm both of his arms behind
A: no!
B: of him?
A: eh in my no he has one like saying that you know? like signing
B: his eye
A: yes
B: (doing) like this?
A: uhuh
B: his eye because it’s suppose that eh he
A: hm ah! okay he’s explaining
B: yeah
A: hm
B: that that the
A: okay
B: the eye hurts eh him and the tie is again with lines?
A: hmm
B: and the heh
A: the yes the emblem! that
B: he had on his? jacket
A: and i think that nothing more
B: his eyes are very open? too
A: mm no because in mine i can only see one eye
B: well eh yes his eye is
A: but it’s
B: open
A: i don’t know it’s not so open heh
B: heh heh heh
A: i mean it’s not too too open is like his mouth is very very o- eh
B: very open yeah
A: open but not his eye
B: mhm but well as that’s i i think that that’s all i don’t know mm
A: ah! he’s eh how eh is the newspaper?
B: the newspaper has a
A: in the same way?
B: picture in the yes! in the same way
A: no! in mine is is eh he’s not handing the the newspaper
B: in the fourth picture?
A: yeah
B: mhm how is the newspaper?
A: eh
B: where is?
A: on the floor
B: on the floor? okay
A: yeah
B: hm
A: and his eh hand is is open
B: eh which hand? the the one which?
A: yes the hand which
B: was handing the the newspaper
A: before was handing the
B: okay
A: the the newspaper
B: mm i think that’s all mm?
A: okay mm in the (clearing throat))
B: picture number five
A: fifth? picture
B: yes
A: eh the the father of the boy?
B: hm hm
A: eh goes eh with with eh with his son eh tch i mean it’s like if
they
B: is moving?
A: yes they’re walking
B: (okay) they’re moving mm
A: and his father is very angry his face seems like
B: well in my in my picture yes the the man the father of the boy
A: hm
B: is like eh thinking about something
A: no no no in my picture is really really like he if he was
B: hm hm
A: really angry you know?
B: okay hm hm mm
A: and he’s very fat
B: very very fat? heh heh
A: fat! heh heh
B: fat (xxx)
A: i don’t know if very very fat
B: well it’s it’s bigger than the the boy
A: (xx) it’s quite fat
B: okay (xx)
A: and i think that the same he has moustache eh the black hair
B: hm
A: and the
B: can you see both eyes?
A: yeah
B: yeah? and the mouth is open? closed?
A: closed
B: closed okay mm he?
A: and the boy eh has the the eye the right eye eh black
B: i just can see one eye
A: yes and how is this black?
B: you can see both?
A: no i only i can see only one black
B: the right one? and it’s black?
A: yeah
B: okay mm
A: and he go- and and he goes on crying
B: yes
A: okay
B: eh the boy
A: and his father is handing with with eh the ha- is handing the the
boy i mean you know? he’s handing the boy
B: yes
A: okay
B: okay eh in my picture the man i- has both hands in the pockets in
the trousers pockets
A: ah! no!
B: no?
A: no
B: okay eh eh the boy has his right hand befo- behind of him like
walking?
A: eh no
B: no?
A: no in my picture he’s like with the hand with the hand open
B: the hand open!?
A: oh sorry with the sí yes oh sorry! yes heh heh hm
B: the right eh hand is open?
A: yes is not behind him
B: in my picture is mm like this and closed
A: in my picture is like this
B: open? heh i don’t know okay
A: i mean i think
B: yes
A: sorry but i i understood that you told me that eh the the the man
of the the hand of the boy was behind him but in my picture
B: no (was) in this way
A: ah! okay
B: (okay) no eh you can see both eh shoes? of the father
A: yeah
B: and of the boy
A: yeah
B: yes? eh the both pockets of the trou- of the jacket? of the boy
A: in the? yeah
B: yeah! okay i don’t know if there is any more one two three five
A: i think that it’s okay
B: yes that that’s okay in the picture number number six in the both
of them arrive to a to a place well to to a door i think that
it’s the the place were the other boy lives so eh in in the door
there’s a number which is number six-
A: no!
B: seventeen?
A: there is no number in my door
B: ah! okay eh number eh eh the man is mm watching at the number
A: no hi- his face is really really now is is is worse than than the
B: heh heh heh
A: the previous one
B: is angry? okay
A: yes he’s really angry
B: okay mm there’s just one step?
A: yeah
B: before be-
A: yeah
B: in front of the door the boy is mm now is calm he’s not crying
A: yeah
B: his mouth is closed?
A: yeah
B: eh
A: but the the eye one eye the re- the i mean
B: right?
A: yeah it’s black
B: is open or closed? eh is still black
A: it’s black so
B: okay
A: i suppose that i don’t know if it’s closed or
B: okay
A: open
B: eh i don’t know
A: he’s worried his face is like
B: the boy?
A: yeah
B: sad?
A: mm tch
B: more or less?
A: uhh
B: okay i think that’s the same that he’s (xxx)
A: i think that he’s worried
B: okay mm mm tch .hmm there’s something mm in the door that eh psk
the thing that i don’t know how to say the
A: in my door there’re like eh a thing when you have to in the old
houses when you instead of the the bell you have to
B: knock?
A: you know? with the hand
B: ah okay! uhh (xxx) mm
A: and then there’s also eh mm like a hole when you for example when
the postman? put the the
B: the letters?
A: yeah
B: so there is the the
A: yeah
B: the mailbox? okay
B: is there any anything? in the
A: no just is the
B: you have something around the door? as little squares
A: as little!?
B: squ- squares
A: yeah
B: yes okay
A: like bricks?
B: mhm eh yeah i think that’s all
A: yeah
B: heh heh okay (heh)number seven
A: now the father is eh how do you say?
B: ((knocking on the table))
A: heh heh
B: knocking? uuhh
A: mm yes sorry he’s knocking on the on the door and the the face
more or less i think that is the same he’s angry
B: (xx xx)
A: and the the boy now is i think that he’s eh more worried than
than before he has his hand eh near the mouth which is closed
B: which eh? which hand? left? or right?
A: eh mm eh left the left one
B: the left one eh left hand
A: he’s like waiting for what is going to happen heh
B: okay eh the man mm was knocking no? eh with?
A: yeah
B: which with ha- hand?
A: with the right one
B: right one one two three four eh there is no number on your door?
A: no
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B: and there isn’t any any (xxx)
A: yeah
B: okay mm
A: and the thing to (knocking)
B: yeah okay then (xxx)
A: and one step and
B: that’s the same no?
A: okay
B: (okay) in picture
A: seven?
B: (number)
A: i think
B: eight!
A: ah! yes
B: eight eight heh
A: heh heh
B: there’s a a a man a little man i don’t know if it’s
A: yeah
B: a man no! it’s a (heh)boy heh
A: i think yeah
B: it’s a boy okay with mm big glasses?
A: yeah
B: eh with
A: big nose?
B: big nose eh he’s smiling?
A: yeah
B: because he don’t know what what’s happening
A: with the open with the mouth
B: with the door open and the mouth open?
A: yeah
B: yes and he’s
A: he has no hair?
B: yes he has no hair
A: okay
B: and he’s on the step?
A: yeah
B: tch he’s wearing
A: with slippers?
B: yes slippers
A: hm hm
B: and the with a big trouser?
A: yeah
B: and long trouser?
A: yeah
B: and the father is like speaking to him talking to him
A: ah! there is no father
B: ah there is no father!
A: no
B: okay heh heh well (xxx)
A: just the the boy speaking with the with the father of the of the
B: boy
A: i think heh heh well (xxx)
B: in number eight? there is the bo- the father of the boy?
A: yes the father no
B: (heh)okay so
A: the is is just the the boy speaking with the father of the boy
B: the first boy?
A: yeah
B: is speaking or talking with the the other boy?
A: no! the the first boy is just with the open mm mm mouth
B: mouth?
A: sp- eh
B: speaking? or
A: eh seeing no
B: just seeing?
A: it’s like seeing and the father of the boy
B: of the first boy
A: is speaking
B: to the boy?
A: with the boy
B: ah! okay
A: which is smiling who is smiling sorry
B: heh okay that’s okay but you heh heh you have you told me that
there’s no father? of the boy
A: yes but no father of the of the boy
B: of the other boy?
A: yes
B: okay heh well mm i don’t know the the new boy is wearing a a long
well a not a jacket a
A: shirt?
B: shirt yes
A: yeah
B: a shirt eh with one two three four five mm
A: heh heh
B: i don’t know how to say the word
A: (li-) buttons?
B: i don’t know if it’s said
A: what do you? ah!
B: yeah i i i think that (heh)it’s not (xxx)
A: i mean the thing that you put to sustain the trousers?
B: heh heh heh heh
A: heh you know what i mean?
B: heh (heh)yes (heh)yes i think yes
A: yes okay
B: hm hm eh (xxx) the boy the first boy
A: yeah
B: it has his mouth open and
A: yeah
B: and has mm the same things than in the in the picture before or
there’s something new?
A: mm yes but eh the the pocket he i can see one pocket in the right
B: side of the jacket?
A: side and is black because in the other it seems that is white you
know what i mean?
B: yes it’s black
A: yeah and the his eye both (heh)are black
B: black
A: and he i can see only one hand?
B: yes
A: which is like eh normal i don’t know if mm okay
B: yes in in this way okay mm now eh
A: and!
B: you you still watching the the thing to knock on the door?
A: no! because the door is completely open i can see hhh eh
B: can you see the the (xx) and the door?
A: no i cannot see the door i i see the the hall of the
B: what can you see?
A: i mean the hall only the the wall
B: the wall? (or the door)?
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A: which is eh with flowers
B: okay so heh you can see the wall
A: and with eh on the floor?
B: hm hm
A: eh it’s black and white
B: ((sniff)) okay
B: eh is there anything? you ca- eh can you see anything more in
the?
A: no
B: in the wall? eh there’s
A: no just the the
B: the flowers?
A: the flowers like
B: yes
A: if it was decorated with flowers you know?
B: yes
A: and on the floor what i
B: the white and black is there any carpet or something?
A: yeah it ca- it seems that’s the carpet i suppose
B: okay maybe tch mm the the father has the mouth open or
closed?
A: closed
B: closed? and
A: and he’s like bow
B: he’s like?
A: like bowing because
B: yes like watching the the little boy?
A: yes yeah
B: okay yes mm i think that’s all
A: okay
B: hm?
A: heh
B: heh heh (heh)okay heh so in picture (heh)number nine
A: yeah
B: eh mm the second boy is wondering what what’s happening because
he hadn’t he hadn’t i think he he’s saying i haven’t done nothing
A: a strange face?
B: yes he has as i don’t know as
A: like doing this?
B: yes what’s happening
A: yeah okay
B: yeah? okay he has mm both hands in this way
A: yeah
B: and he has the the mouth ((clearing throat)) between open and
closed i don’t know
A: mm mm more (heh)or less
B: mm no it’s i don’t know heh (heh)it’s mm mm i don’t know
A: ((heh))what’s (heh)what’s happening
A: mm yeah i think that it is the same i don’t know
B: he has still the glasses?
A: yeah
B: and the man the the first boy’s father
A: yeah
B: it’s looking at at him
A: yeah
B: mm
A: really angry?
B: no!
A: like shouting to the to the boy
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694  B: okay no no
695  A: okay go to to to tell your father
696  B: what’s going (heh)on or call your father or
697  A: yeah
698  B: something no? okay no my this (heh)father heh heh the father
699  which is in my picture he’s not shouting and he’s not angry eh
700  tch (xxx) eh he tch i don’t know eh can you see the the flowers?
701  and all of (these things)?
702  A: yes it’s the same
703  B: it’s just the same?
704  A: yeah
705  B: okay eh
706  A: yeah and as well the boy the little boy
707  B: mmh is the the first boy is mm mm surprised?
708  A: yeah
709  B: he’s like saying oh my! i don’t know
710  A: yes what i told you before that
711  B: okay
712  A: he’s like okay
713  B: he’s in the same in the same way that in the (xx)
714  A: yeah
715  B: in the picture (five)
716  A: i think that the difference is the father of the of the little
717  boy
718  B: yes i me me (heh)so that’s okay i think that’s that’s all
719  A: so in the other one the new boy is calling her father is like
720  with the bo- open mouth
721  B: in the picture ten? number ten?
722  A: yeah
723  B: okay
724  A: he’s saying like father or something like that
725  B: mmh
726  A: with his hand eh in this way like okay like saying father
727  B: come here!
728  A: yeah
729  B: as saying (come)? okay eh wait! hand mm and the mouth was open
730  no?
731  A: left hand
732  B: ay! (heh)okay left (heh)hand calling his father and the mouth is
733  open? mm?
734  A: yeah
735  B: okay
736  A: and black
737  B: mm
738  A: (xx) heh heh heh
739  B: heh heh heh (heh)black okay and the the father of the first boy
740  what what’s what he’s doing? what is he doing?
741  A: he’s again really angry
742  B: (xxx)
743  A: and he’s like saying okay say explain me what happens it’s like
744  okay i want to explain you what happened and he’s like waiting
745  B: so he’s thinking!
746  A: for the father
747  B: he is still angry?
748  A: yeah yeah he’s still an- but is like he’s he’s waiting for for
749  the father of the boy
750  B: (for the father) okay
751  A: and he’s with his le- eh right hand eh near his tie
752  B: holding his tie or not holding
A: no no no no
B: (over)?
A: no he’s like in this way just
B: okay so then (xxx)
A: and with the other hand behind him
B: the mi- yes and can you see the the the new boys ca- can you see
760 the mm mm both hands (xxx)
A: yes the other is in a normal position is just
761 B: yes but the the the new boy the boy with the glasses
A: yes
B: eh he was the the one who was calling his father
A: yeah
764 B: so okay that’s okay
765 A: and the other eh (xx xx xx) surprise
766 B: is in the same position?
767 A: is is surprised just waiting
768 B: the same position? that the the (xx xx)
A: yes just waiting
769 B: okay mm
A: maybe he’s (so) mouth is a little bit open but i i i don’t know
770 if it’s a difference or or not
771 B: no i think it’s in the in the same
A: i don’t think so okay
773 B: (wait)
A: the the other picture?
775 B: hm
A: is eh heh heh
777 B: the eleven?
779 A: yeah the the new boy is is really surprised because the the the
father of the of the little boy is eh i don’t know how do you say
with with one with his hand is like doing this
784 B: oh my god! heh heh heh okay
A: you know? like i’m going (heh)to
785 B: (heh)hm (heh)hm heh heh heh to hit you okay so eh tch the the
father of the first boy
787 A: yeah
789 B: is okay eh eh
790 A: and the and the new boy is is really surprised like oh (heh)my
791 god what’s heh heh
792 B: heh (heh)what’s (heh)going (heh)on okay eh the new boy has the
793 the mouth open?
A: yeah
794 B: or closed or? open okay
796 A: not so open it’s like
797 B: but it’s it’s
798 A: it’s not really open like in in the previous one
799 B: okay in number ten the the new boy has the bou- the mouth open?
800 A: yes yeah
801 B: okay yes mm tch so in this in the number eleven it’s a bit more
802 open or a more or less? is open? again?
803 A: no
804 B: hm hm and
805 A: and the the door is eh i i i can’t see the door it’s the same
806 that you know?
807 B: with the flowers and (all of these)?
808 A: yes
809 B: okay mm
810 A: tch and i don’t i i okay?
811 B: i think yes
A: the last one?
B: yes
A: the last (heh)one!
B: hm! heh there’s heh heh (heh)a (heh)very big man
A: yes really
B: (xx)
A: really big man and really fat
B: mm yes he’s very fat and he’s yes fat and
A: he has a cap?
B: mm yes
A: with an emblem? (xx xx) heh i don’t know
B: yeah yes with the eh mm the new man has a a tie?
A: yeah
B: with lines!? 
A: with lines yes
B: yes (ah) okay eh with his?
A: and again the the thing that the little boy had the
B: the same or well more or less
A: yeah
B: yeah the same thing okay in on his jacket?
A: yeah
B: mm the
A: i think that he’s the the boy who who hit the the little boy and
B: the other is the father because h- he seems a boy
A: heh heh heh
B: a fat boy and a (heh)very (heh)tall boy but a a boy
A: okay so
B: okay so
A: i think
B: the new
A: boy or (heh)whatever
B: (it is) the son of the little man?
A: yes he’s the biggest one on o- o- on the picture
B: yes mm
A: he’s even taller than than the father of the little boy
B: of the little okay eh mm the new boy’s mouth eh?
A: closed
B: it’s closed and mm sad?
A: yeah
B: and smi-? and smiling?
A: well not sad it’s like
B: mm okay more or less yes eh (so are) the same eh can you see both
A: eyes?
B: yeah
A: his hair is more or less black?
B: more or less not not
A: i don’t see
B: so black that the other
A: much more hair because he has the the cap so i just see a little
B: of the hair? he?
A: hair
B: eh (xxx) nose?
A: and he has like? you know? i don’t know
B: yes! mm hm hm eh eh tch hi- eh his hands are open? closed?
A: closed
B: eh the the trouser is
A: short
B: short? okay mm the little man is mm? tch saying this is the one
who
A: yeah
B: i was calling? with the right hand? his right hand?
A: eh yes
B: okay and tch the the father
A: and he has as well the the left? eh hand? with eh arm sorry eh i
mean in this way
B: the the new man?
A: yeah
B: well the the tch the boy the very big boy or the for his father?
A: no the other the
B: his father?
A: the fa- his father
B: is doing the same that the first father
A: no no is he’s not doing the same he just has the
B: he’s not doing that?
A: the shirt
B: he has that? in that way?
A: no he’s he just has the the shirt
B: mhm
A: in this way but he’s not doing like the other which
B: which was doing that heh heh before okay so he has
A: yeah at the same time he has as well the
B: uhh
A: the skirt in that way i don’t know if?
B: yes i kn- i know it
A: okay
B: eh mm the the father of the first boy is surprised? with eh
A: yeah really surprised
B: his mouth open
A: yeah
B: and he and he has the both eyes very very open
A: yeah
B: and he (heh)i don’t know he is mm (xxx) i don’t know eh
A: the the little boy
B: mhm?
A: is with the
B: the first boy?
A: yeah
B: yeah
A: with the mouth closed and he’s like i don’t know like eh heh he’s
not doing anything special but he’s like okay come on heh heh
B: let’s let’s go so he has hi- eh he’s looking at the floor?
A: yeah
B: uhh okay mm the other boy the the very big boy
A: hm hm
B: has? shoes shoes?
A: hm hm
B: yes eh can you see both of them or just one?
A: just one
B: the left one?
A: mm yes
B: okay i think that
A: it’s all
B: it’s all
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A: it appears a a school boy
B: mhm
A: and and
B: someone is? has give him a? a how do you say? a splash?
A: yeah yeah
B: maybe
A: a splash heh heh heh
B: heh heh heh heh heh
A: and he wears he wears a a school uniform
B: mhm
A: which with a eh
B: short short pants and
A: short short short short short pants and a and a jacket and with
B: hm hm
A: a a kind of eh of painting in
B: painting!?
A: a bah! painting eh
B: a blade?
A: eso! a blade a blade
B: yes
A: and eh
B: mhm
A: he ha- he is eh his hair is mm he- his hair is is eh black and
B: and it’s like this? eh straight on?
A: yeah yeah .hhh
B: and he has a a tiny?
A: hm hm
B: like a i don’t know something hair in next to her ear?
A: mm yeah yeah
B: and he has an eyebrow?
A: eyebrow yeah eyebrow but (i don’t know)
B: and a big nose
A: nose
B: he has the? open
A: (xx) open the mouth
B: open mouth
A: yeah and
B: and the the hand is is we only see a hand
A: with
B: with one two three four five fingers
A: three fingers
B: three!?
A: yeah
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B: i have five
A: i’ve three the man of the the man of the hand of the of the boy?
B: no! the hand of the
A: ah! yeah yes
B: splash
A: five and the boy it appears (with) three
B: huh yes okay and he seems to be mm eh flowing? he seems to be flowing
A: flowing?
B: yes flowing not in the eh in the on the earth
A: of flying?
B: yes
A: flying oh! yeah
B: flying but flowing to
A: yeah yeah hm
B: and vamos a ver and he has eh mm his ee his legs together
A: yeah
B: and he has shoes
A: sí yeah boots or shoes
B: and shoes with a
A: mm
B: mm socks
A: yeah yeah
B: the socks in in rolled or or something like that
A: yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah
B: rolled
A: hm hm
B: and he has two buttons in her blazer?
A: i see three
B: three?
A: yeah i think so three one two three
B: mm i have two i think
A: mm hm hm
B: mm and (xxx)
A: the next one?
B: the next one?
A: yeah
B: the next one he seems to be flowing
A: yeah
B: in the earth
A: he has a
B: in the air
A: her right eye is black
B: mm!? what?
A: her her his his right eh eye is black
B: his right?
A: eye
B: eye is black?
A: yeah
B: mine no mine not
A: full black
B: no mine is normal eh a black eye? no?
A: yeah black eye
B: eh ,hhh (xxx)
A: eh
B: he has a he wears a tie?
A: yeah
B: and
A: black and white
B: black and white!?
A: yeah
B: mine not mine is is white mm
A: (xxx)
B: eh he has one two three four five six seven eight
A: eight
B: fingers
A: eight fingers
B: one of those is seems to be the thumb seems to be mm eh déjame ver i don’t know how do you say when when you get a
A: open? mouth
B: yes seems to be big
A: what?
B: no maybe maybe (it seems)
A: hm
B: and
A: and
B: mm and (dónde vamos)
A: he
B: there’s there’re four stars?
A: yeah
B: yes or
A: over over over him
B: over him making as a semicircle heh
A: a semi- heh heh heh sí
B: heh
A: heh sí
B: and his hair is black?
A: yeah
B: and is straight on
A: yeah like in the other (xxx)
B: he’s he has a big ear
A: yeah
B: and his mouth is is closed
A: yeah
B: and a tiny smile
A: loo- looking at looking at eh yeah
B: the smile?
A: mhm
B: and three buttons
A: three buttons and
B: and two holes to put the
A: yeah
B: the hands
A: mhm
B: there’s a bla-? a a a blade in?
A: yeah in the in her jacket yeah
B: mm (me not) mm not mm ay!
A: what else? next one? the next
B: no there’s something more in the in the boy i only see four stars
A: no happy
B: no happy?
A: not happy no
B: surprised?
A: eh her her mouth is a making
B: mm
A: (like) when you
B: like he’s like he
A: when you are afraid of afraid of of some- of something
B: yes no mine is happy
A: yeah
B: so your is afraid
A: mm afraid yes
B: and there’s something around him?
A: no there’s no- there’s nothing
B: and he wears short eh
A: short short trousers and and shoes and
B: okay next?
A: next eh he has the boy crying
B: mhm
A: with a with an open mouth
B: mhm
A: and and he appears with a with an arm eh pointing to the to
the left
B: hm hm
A: and he came running and there’s a a man in a
B: moment mm (mine) is eh the boy i have eh is is crying with the
open mi-
B: yeah
A: with the open
B: eh mouth
A: open mouth
B: but he he seems to to have the the to has the ay dios! he he
seems to have the the hands inside his eh holes
A: one of? one of?
B: no mine two
A: no one of these and the other is
B: the other is pointing pointing
A: is pointing to to the street or to
B: mhm
A: i don’t know
B: to his back? it seems
A: to the left yeah to the back mmhm
B: and mine seems to be running too
A: running too
B: and he wears
A: he wears eh eh short trousers and the the shoes and the same a as
in the other
B: a tie
A: in the other in the other
B: hm hm
A: picture
B: and the man?
A: the man is sitting in a armchair and he he’s sleeping he has a
black eh black hair
B: si mine mine too
A: and a (long) moustache and
B: oh! no mine not no moustache
A: he has a a white eh a white jacket and a a white tie a
white eh skirt eh skirt! eh mm camisa
B: camisa? mm shirt
A: shirt and white eh trou- eh trousers and white shoes and he was
in her in his eh in his right hand a newspaper
B: uuhh hm hm
A: and
A: mm no no in the shirt but in the in the jacket
B: in the jacket?
A: it’s a especie de chaleco
B: ah! not no no no mine is a a shirt with with a a joder! cómo se dice bolsillo? with a? bolsillo!
A: vale heh heh he has a a jacket with
B: eh you- your man hasn’t eh?
A: no
B: hasn’t a bolsillo?
A: no no no no no no no
B: uuhh and has a an over jacket without eh arms? mm?
A: yeah yeah and he eh it ha- it has a two button two buttons two buttons or botones
B: si buttons
A: buttons and
B: two buttons
A: and two places to to wear things eh two bolsillos
B: in the? in the chaleco?
A: yeah
B: mhm and the trousers has bolsillos? heh heh heh
A: no
B: heh heh
A: no no it doesn’t appear
B: mhm
A: and the
B: then?
A: the boots eh has have two
B: si two
A: bueno eso
B: si mm eh threads or threads?
A: si lo que sea
B: thr- si threads se dice así
A: hm? and the newspaper had has a photograph
B: do you see the photograph?
A: more or less a photograph
B: uuhh
A: i
B: yeah
A: imagine myself
B: and the the highlines no?
A: ah! yeah eh black and
B: mhm
A: and has eh it has a a rectangle in the
B: a what? ah!
A: a rectangle
B: sí sí sí
A: yeah
B: okay
A: and i don’t know
B: and now eh the next eh he seems to eh wake up?
A: wake up with
B: and
A: because of the of the cry of the boy of crying of the boy and
B: he’s still crying?
A: yeah
B: mhm
A: the the boy is pointing at a her eye black eye he’s crying a lot
and with a (yawn) the mouth open the mouth (i don’t know)
B: mhm
A: mm psk the the man the old man eh wake up surprised
B: mhm
A: wake up wi- wi- with his mouth open
B: ah! no mine not
A: and her the the
B: he still has the chaleco?
A: yeah
B: and he has now the bolsillo?
A: no
B: mhm
A: and the newspaper a- appears on on the on the floor
B: on the floor no eh eh mine has still has the
A: the newspaper in the hand?
B: the newspaper in the hand
A: ah!
B: eh mm mm eh
A: he has eh the eyebrows
B: the boy is pointing
A: eyebrows ah
B: open?
A: open
B: ah! and surprised
A: yeah surprised a lot of of surprise in (xxx) on his face
B: mine not mine (xx) a a very normal
A: and the boy is pointing (out) the the yeah the the black eye and
B: what?
A: the tongue of the boy tongue
B: ah! the tongue is outside of the mouth?
A: yeah it appears
B: mm
A: i think
B: yes in mine too
A: and the the clothes of the boy are the same of the in the
B: picture?
A: and the the clothes of the boy are the same of the in the
B: picture?
A: the man?
B: wha-?
A: the man?
B: no no
A: the boy?
B: the boy seems to to
A: i i i can- i only can see a a black a black eye
B: mm hm claro bueno ah! claro si
A: and the next eh picture is the boy is still crying then
B: mm
A: yeah
B: he is eh more eh
A: i believe that this this one is
B: is calm
A: is his father i think of the
B: he’s calm now no?
A: yeah
B: and his father is walking?
A: is angry
B: angry!?
A: angry yeah
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339  B:  mine seems to be normal
340  A:  angry ((sniff))
341  B:  mm and the boy is is looking at him?
342  A:  yeah
343  B:  eh with
344  A:  with the other
345  B:  two tears
346  A:  yeah mmh
347  B:  and he he only i only i can only see his eh right hand and his
348  right arm because the other is is eh is in his back or something
349  like that i i can’t see the other
350  A:  but i i can see the two of the arms
351  B:  mmh
352  A:  i can see them
353  B:  eh the father seems to has to have the tch eh hands into his
354  bolsillos
355  A:  it eh only the only the the left because the right the arm is
356  eh
357  B:  is pointing? to something?
358  A:  is van de la mano
359  B:  ah!
360  A:  le agarra de la mano
361  B:  no no no
362  A:  hm
363  B:  mine not my picture
364  A:  the father holds the
365  B:  hm hm
366  A:  the hand of the boy
367  B:  the father holds the hand of his son
368  A:  tch the boots of the of the father has eh have three
369  B:  sí sí yes yes heh heh heh
370  A:  (xxx) psk and eh
371  B:  yeah it’s okay
372  A:  i don’t know
373  B:  there’s something more in the picture?
374  A:  i don’t know
375  B:  you only see the the two eh the two people?
376  A:  yeah only two people yeah
377  B:  hm hm okay next?
378  A:  the next eh
379  B:  they’re in front of a door?
380  A:  in front of a door
381  B:  eh with the seventeen?
382  A:  yeah
383  B:  number seventeen number
384  A:  sevent- no no no no
385  B:  which number is it?
386  A:  no number
387  B:  no number!?
388  A:  no
389  B:  mine has a number seventeen
390  A:  it has a a sp- a kind of circle in the in the eh bueno tch a
391  circle in
392  B:  (xxx)?
393  A:  no! in the in the door
394  B:  ah! a circle in the door ah! mirilla
395  A:  a kind of a a kind of knocker
396  B:  ah! yes yes yes yes yes
397  A:  and
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B: to knock?
A: yeah and in the in the center of the door there’s a a rectangle
to i i imagine to introduce eh the po- eh the post i think
B: hm hm o sea una post? postbox?
A: si
B: o boxpost
A: es como it’s like a a rectangle in the in the in the door
B: a
A: no sé si me explico?
B: a triangle?
A: no a rectangle
B: rectangle?
A: rectangle
B: yes
A: ((sniff)) well there’s a
B: on the door?
A: yeah on the door
B: hm hm ah claro! ((clearing the throat)) la rejilla esa
A: eso
B: tch and something to knock?
A: yeah something to kn- to knock
B: and he’s angry?
A: yeah
B: mm mine is normal calm
A: is still angry
B: eh
A: with her two arms eh close to her to joder! to his eh
B: body?
A: to his body
B: hm
A: and the boy too
B: is behind him?
A: the boy is behind him with the arms
B: looking
A: closed to the
B: looking something like eh furious? or
A: yeah yeah not furious but
B: but yeah
A: yeah
B: he’s eh
A: hm
B: mm yeah
A: like he he feels protect by her father
B: yeah
A: and
B: and he’s normal he has the his two arms eh
A: are close are close to the to her
B: close to his body
A: (to his) body psk
B: and
A: the clothes are the same
B: the next?
A: the next i think there’s a
B: he’s still eh in front of the door making the same things as the
A: as the eh cómo se dice anterior? as the last
B: as the last no eh the the father is eh knocking at the door
A: uuhh! mine is normal is doing nothing is is the same as as the
B: other one
A: the father is knocking on the on the door
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B: hm hm
A: and the boy has eh her right hand
B: hm hm a right (xx) right
A: in in in the in the mouth
B: ah!
A: and like (doing) this
B: mhm
A: he’s still eh too angry and protect
B: hm hm
A: like in the other the other photograph
B: hm hm
A: or picture ((sniff))
B: and the the knock? eh the thing to knock is still in the door?
A: yeah it is still in the door
B: mhm mm
A: but the father uses her
B: hm
A: her hand to to knock not the
B: and the? mm rectangle of the the
A: yeah
B: postbox
A: it’s still there yeah
B: and the door it has eh has bueno you see the door and like
A: bricks?
B: huh
A: yeah
B: eh next to it
A: yeah and the in the other picture too i
B: hm hm
A: (xxx)
B: and you you see a a a a step? on
A: yeah
B: on a stair?
A: an step yeah yeah
B: mm
A: (xxx) hm hm
B: vale next?
A: next eh
B: yeah the oth-
A: appears a a man
B: no it’s a
A: a a
B: it’s a boy i think it’s a boy
A: a boy!? yeah?
B: yes yes yes it’s a man it’s a man it has to be an man
A: an old man
B: yeah
A: he has a
B: he doesn’t hav-
A: yeah
B: bald?
A: heh heh and in the in the wall of of the house there are full
B: of sunflowers
A: a a
B: ah! no
A: yeah
B: mm mm
A: like a s– like like sunflowers i think
B: no mine is has open the door and it seems to to (just) to see a a
A: corridor
B: yeah
B: but without flowers without pictures without nothing
A: nothing there’s flowers
B: without anything
A: okay eh
B: eh
A: in the in the floor there’s like a
carpet?
A: mm no it’s a the floor is eh there are eh
draws in the floor?
B: cube eh like a chess (xxx) a
A: yes yes
B: you know?
A: okay eh
B: yes yes yes
A: mhm
B: yes and esto
A: and the man eh
B: sí
A: wear wears a glasses he is he’s laughing smiling eh he wears a
eh the man smiling
B: he has the two arms next to him
A: yeah
B: but i am i only can i can only see one
A: one of them
B: and he’s
A: (xxx)
B: he seems to be in eh with pantuflas heh heh heh
A: yeah but i don’t know how zapatillas
B: hm and
A: and
B: the boy is
A: he wears he wears he wears a a a shirt with eh
B: one two three four five six maybe
A: one two three four five six
B: uno dos tres cuatro cinco cinco! five buttons
A: eh one two three four five and the the cómo se llama esto?
B: without bolsillos?
A: las
B: ah! eh
A: de la shirt están?
B: no sleeves sleeves mangas
A: eso están
B: uuhh eh rolled?
A: remangadas
B: rolled up puede ser
A: rolled up?
B: rolled up heh heh heh
A: heh heh heh
B: eh
A: and
B: mine not mine ha- mm the mine mine old man has eh the sleeves eh
A: (long)
B: and
A: he we- eh he wears eh tirantes como esto tirantes
B: ah! tirantes
A: sí
B: sí no sé cómo se dicen tirantes
A: ni idea
B: and tch
A: and ((clearing throat))
B: bueno
A: the man the
B: (xxx)
A: the man is looking at him
B: hhh
A: angry
B: no mine is has a a a look in the face like a stupid man you know?
A: no i i i i
B: it’s it’s always like this
A: the o- the the father of the boy?
B: yeah the father of the boy is is is unexpression
A: is angry
B: eh all the time
A: mhm
B: and the boy is angry
A: and the the boy the boy is is eh surprised
B: yeah
A: like eh who
B: hm hm
A: who's there
B: to see the
A: with his his mouth his mouth his mouth open and looking
B: the the the old man wear glasses?
A: yeah
B: ah! vale
A: the man of the house?
B: yeah
A: yeah
B: and the father is is mm eh
A: looking at him
B: yeah looking at him and he’s still with the chaleco?
A: yeah yeah
B: without bolsillo
A: mhm yeah
B: and the boy is not crying now
A: no is mm with the mouth open and surprised looking at the at the
B: man of the glasses
A:hm hm sí
B: with
A: yeah
B: with the same as the other the other
A: and the father is angry?
B: yeah
A: is making something with his arms?
B: no his his arms are closed to her body
A: mhm
B: are close to his body and i don’t know and the the arms of
A: the boy are on the back (to the)
B: on his back?
A: on his back hm hm
B: what? the arm of the father seems to to to be in the back of his
A: son?
B: no
A: ah!
B: mm mm
A: the son has the the the arms close to
A: yeah
B: ah! like this?
A: like this
B: no
A: the boy
B: hm hm
A: mhm
B: mine seems to to be straight on with the arms normal at this side
of
A: uuhh
B: at his side mm?
A: at his side yeah
B: mhm
A: and eh
B: okay next
A: next one in the next in the next photograph eh it appears a the
man the father of the of the boy
B: mhm
A: and cry- eh crying
B: crying!?
A: no crying no eh tch eh
B: shouting?
A: eh! yeah shouting and and
B: mhm
A: the the the man of of the house it the eh he can’t believe that
his eh why the other father of the boy is shouting
B: hm hm
A: and appears with the with his
B: with his arms making what are you doing?
A: (xxx) yeah yeah
B: hm hm
A: and a expression of
B: surprise?
A: surprise on on an expression of his face?
B: sí is something like pss pero tio! heh heh heh
A: de qué vas? heh heh heh
B: and no the mine father the father of the son is doing nothing
exactly like before the same way and a stupid face
A: yeah
B: and your is angry still?
A: yeah he’s a big
B: is always still
A: yeah angry
B: is always angry
A: very angry (xxx)
B: mine is is always
A: he’s pointing to to the to the house
B: so the the o- psk the old the old man is doing what are you
doing?
A: (xx xx)
B: the other one is shouting
A: shouting and pointing to
B: the the boy shouting and pointing!?
A: pointing out
B: pointing
A: to to the to the back of the hou- of the the house
B: pointing and the boy is eh
A: is looking
B: like surprised?
A: yeah surprised with the open mouth
B: hm hm
A: mouth open and
B: the next one the next po- the next picture the the bald man is eh
looking looking forwards?
A: yeah
B: and sorry and the man is has still the father has still the
stupid face?
A: no in in my photograph is
B: is angry?
A: is angry with
B: is pointing?
A: with his his eh this arm
B: nodles?
A: yeah
B: nodles? son nudillos o kneckles?
A: yeah
B: no me acuerdo
A: i don’t know
B: buh! da igual
A: da igual
B: with his eh with his hand?
A: eh close to close to the body and
B: to his breast?
A: yeah
A: and the and the the the old man the old of of glasses eh
appears eh mm calling calling for something
B: who is calling?
A: the old- the old man the old man the
B: no mine is is is watching
A: is which with her watching of the back of the of the house
B: hm hm
A: and with the with her her hand in this side and eh calling for
for eh for something and
B: hm hm
A: i don’t know
B: eh! moment! so your picture the the father is .hhh with his hand
in in the breast?
A: yeah
B: eh then the father is still angry? the the old man with with his
hand making? shouting?
A: uuh
B: the the next picture were eh okay (xxx)
A: is the last it’s the one two three four five six seven eight nine
ten
B: the last one?
A: eleven!
B: one two three four five six seven eight nine ten eh in the eleven
yes now we are in the
A: mhm
B: on the eleven
A: right
B: eleventh
A: in this in this picture eh the the father of the boy eh appears
with eh the eh left arm eh
B: heh
A: rolled rolled up the the sleeve of of of the of the
B: like like saying
A: yeah yeah
B: i am going to push you heh heh heh
A: sí and then the the the boy the the man of the of the house eh
B: mm
A: have eh has an an expression of surprising surprise on on his
B: the the eh the son? has an expression of surprise
A: yeah and the and the man and the man too and the man of the of
B: and the?
A: of the house too
B: the old
A: with the
B: man
A: open open mouth
B: is surprised
A: the father is angry is still angry
B: hm hm
A: very angry because
B: (i don’t know) he’s angry and you must eh you have eh in your
picture a lot of eh mm flowers?
A: yeah it’s still
B: and in the
A: with with flowers sunflowers and the
B: the floor like
A: a chess floor
B: a chess floor
A: and
B: hm hm
A: i don’t know is lo demás es todo claro
B: and the
A: the last?
B: the old man is surprised
A: uuhh
B: the other one is rolling up his
A: yeah
B: sleeve
A: yeah
B: and the
A: ((sniff))
B: boy is surprised
A: the boy is surprised
B: mm
A: like in the two last pictures he was
B: there’s no no rised arms?
A: no
B: no
A: no
B: okay the last one
A: the last one
B: the last one my father
A: is
B: has not a stupid face has a surprised
A: yes surprised with a
B: face eh fear like he’s afraid he’s
A: the the father?
B: yeah
A: yeah the father eh surprise and and with with eh a surprise and
B: hm hm yeah
A: the boy is the
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811  B: huge heh heh (heh)is
812  A: with the head eh down
813  B: down yes with a
814  A: he’s looking at the floor
815  B: how (xx)? how do you say frickle? or no? frickle?
816  A: no lo sé
817  B: fringle! fringle or fringle cómo se dice?
818  A: no sé
819  B: a flequillo
820  A: ah!
821  B: flequillo cómo se
822  A: sí
823  B: dice fringe? frinkle?
824  A: no tengo ni idea
825  B: algo así
826  A: no sé
827  B: fringe creo que es no me acuerdo
828  A: mm no sé
829  B: tch buh
830  A: he’s looking at at the floor with eh sad eh expression
831  B: hm hm
832  A: in in his face
833  B: yeah
834  A: and
835  B: very furious
836  A: and the father of the house
837  B: is pointing at him
838  A: is pointing at at
839  B: laughing bueno not laughing but
840  A: laughing but eh happy
841  B: eh grinning
842  A: happy
843  B: grinning no? with a expres-
844  A: yeah yeah with a happy
845  B: a smile
846  A: expression in her face
847  B: yeah
848  A: in his face
849  B: now the father and the son are looking at the big boy?
850  A: the big boy
851  B: with a
852  A: is
853  B: surprise eh sur-
854  A: yeah
855  B: surprised face
856  A: the the the tall boy is eh angry
857  B: hm hm
858  A: and the
859  B: is doing something with his arms?
860  A: is eh close to her
861  B: father?
862  A: to her body to her body
863  B: uuh
864  A: hhh and he wears a a schoo- school
865  B: uniform?
866  A: uniform like the like the boy
867  B: hm hm
868  A: and
869  B: with a blade?
870  A: with a blade
871  B: or blazer no me acuerdo cómo se dice blade or blazer
872  A: yeah
873  B: (xxx)
874  A: and a and a and a hat bueno a hat gorra cómo se llama? se dice
875  gorra tch and he he has picks? on her face on his face (xxx)
876  B: what?
877  A: picks no sé si se llaman picks
878  B: picks?
879  A: eh
880  B: picks
881  A: como
882  B: spots?
883  A: no
884  B: eh pecas?
885  A: pecas sí
886  B: dots?
887  A: sí
888  B: dots?
889  A: hm
890  B: spots?
891  A: sí
892  B: cómo se decía ah! yo lo sabía
893  A: bueno tiene puntitos negros en la cara
894  B: hm hm mine not mine
895  A: heh
896  B: has voy a poner dots in his face
897  A: the tie
898  B: the huge boy
899  A: the tie is black and white
900  B: what? the tie?
901  A: yeah
902  B: the tie of the huge boy?
903  A: yeah
904  B: black and
905  A: white
906  B: black and white tie and?
907  A: and what else? well he wears a jacket and short trousers
908  B: mhm
909  A: and shoes and i don’t know
910  B: hm yo creo que ya está no?
911  A: yes sí i think so
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A: first picture eh i can see a little boy or a child hhh and a hand
   eh which is eh pushing him or
B: i- is an open hand? or a closed one?
A: closed one
B: closed?
A: mhm and the he has a short jacket and the short pants and the
   shoes and black hair short black hair and nothing else i think eh
   in the second one eh
B: and short legs?
A: yeah! short pants trousers
B: short trousers
A: mhm
B: mm .hhh tch what about his mouth? it’s an open one?
A: open open
B: yeah open one and
A: mhm he has open mouth and big nose
B: big nose too?
A: yeah
B: mhm it’s (obvious) you can only see the open hand and the arm no?
A: yeah and some some yeah only the open the closed hand (i don’t
   know) lines!
B: lines?
A: three lines
B: hm hm
A: heh heh and nothing else and in the second one eh he has a eh
   black eye and four stars over him
B: hm hm
A: tch and a a tie with lines and
B: with lines?
A: yeah the jacket is open
B: hm
A: and the
B: it’s a a short or a long (xx) jacket?
A: short
B: short?
A: mhm and the his hands are open and the nothing else no?
B: and what about his trousers?
A: short
B: short trousers
A: short trousers mhm
B: hm eh in my picture eh he looks like floating
A: yeah
B: yeah?
A: (xxx)
B: mhm is is he smiling?
A: no!
B: no!?
A: no! no he’s like eh exhausting or something
B: exhausting?
A: yeah the third one?
B: the third one
A: eh here eh here’s an old man not really old eh maybe his father
the father of the child and the he has a newspaper eh in his hand
B: which hand?
A: eh right
B: right?
A: mhm and the the childre- the child is crying and the eh he seems
to be running or something eh the the man is sleeping and the he
has a big moustache and the black black hair and black moustache
and the long pants a tie and the mm it is not a jacket but a
thing without eh the how is it called? i don’t remember the other
thing without the not a jacket but what what you
B: a shirt?
A: wear inside the jacket
B: ah! inside eh
A: mhm
B: eh i don’t know the name like a jacket without the?
A: yeah! you know (what i mean)?
B: yes
A: and a tie and the nothing else he’s sitted on a sofa
B: on a sofa
A: and sleeping and nothing else
B: mhm
A: the third one
B: and sorry eh has he got a pocket in his shirt?
A: two
B: two po- two pockets?
A: two pockets mhm
B: and he has got eh no lines? on his trousers? on his shirt?
A: on the shirt
B: on his?
A: on the shirt yes like a line over here
B: lines?
A: no just one no not lines
B: over? what part of the of the shirt?
A: over the the shirt? you mean? over the pocket
B: over the pocket?
A: yeah one line
B: one line?
A: hm hm
B: hm you can go on
A: tch eh well in the other one eh the child stills crying and the
newspaper is at the floor on the floor and the the man is looking
the the child and he has a eh his left hand is closed
B: mhm
A: the man’s hand
B: hm hm
A: and the the
B: what about the mouth of the boy? is open? is closed?
A: open open and also in in the other one
B: in the other one
A: in the third one picture
B: mhm and what about the the mouth of the men?
A: eh in the second one is open and now he’s not sleeping of course
B: in the fourth one is open? is it open?
A: yeah open like saying oh! heh
B: mhm has got any tears eh (over) the face?
A: yeah
B: the? the child?
A: yeah he’s crying mhm
B: he’s crying hm and what about the the hands and the arms? of the
B: of the boy
A: of the boy?
B: ca-
A: i cannot see
B: hm
A: his
B: hm
A: his left hand
B: mhm
A: and eh the other one eh is touching his hair his head!
B: ah!
A: not hair
B: so he has got a a hand touching his head?
A: yeah
B: the boy?
A: mhm
B: hm hm you can
A: yeah
B: heh (heh)go (heh) over the next one heh
A: eh the fifth one eh i see eh the man and the child and the man is
A: taking him anywhere eh
B: is taking him by the by the hand?
A: yeah by hand by the hand
B: hm hm
A: and eh he seems to be mad
B: mad!?
A: mad mhm
B: the boy or the gu- or the father
A: the father
B: hm
A: like mm not really happy and the boy’s still crying
B: mhm
A: he has tears and the what else? mm mm mm
B: what about the hands? and the arms of the body? of the boy?
A: of the boy? eh
B: can you see both of them?
A: yeah both of them
B: both of them?
A: and the i cannot see the fingers of the man’s eh left hand his
B: fingers i cannot see
A: fingers i cannot see
B: the left?
A: the fingers mhm
B: and in the? the right hand? can you see
A: mhm
B: all of?
A: all of them okay three (heh)three heh heh heh heh
B: (all)? mhm
A: what else?
B: eh they’re walking?
A: yeah
B: the first
A: both of them
B: is the man and behind the man is the boy?
A: no the first is the boy
B: the first is the boy!?
A: mhm and then the man heh heh heh
B: heh heh
A: heh heh surprise
B: mhm you can go on with the next one
A: eh in the next one eh they're in front of a door a which seems
seems to be a house or something and the they are just eh they
just stay in front of it
B: hhh and has the the door got eh any number?
A: no
B: no? there’s no number (on it)?
A: no number
B: is it open or closed?
A: closed
B: closed
A: mhm
B: and
A: it has something like a box like a mailbox
B: mailbox
A: and another thing a eh i don’t know what is that
B: can you see like bri-?
A: something like a ring
B: a ring!?
A: yeah no not a ring but a ring a ring
B: ring? to ding dong?
A: no no no no
B: heh heh heh
A: heh eh like a circle
B: circle?
A: yeah i don’t know what does what is maybe to call to knock
B: to knock?
A: yeah
B: and can you see like bricks? eh
A: yeah
B: (xxx) hm hm .hhh eh the man is eh tch the boy’s be- behind the?
A: the man seems to be looking at the bricks
B: looking at the bricks?
A: yeah looking eh to the right
B: to the right yes and the boy is behind the man?
A: yeah
B: mhm
A: the first is the boy and then the man
B: the first the boy? hm
A: hm hm
B: and the boy is still eh crying?
A: no
B: no what about his mouth?
A: his mouth is closed?
B: closed?
A: mhm
B: and so eh the man’s too the man’s mouth is it closed?
A: yeah closed
B: hm hm you can go on the next one?
A: eh in the other picture eh the o- the man is knocking at the door
B: knocking
A: yes and the boy eh has his hand eh on his head on his mouth? i can’t
B: ((sneezing))
A: salud!
B: sorry heh
A: pleasure heh heh
B: thank you heh heh mm what about the hands of the man?
A: eh i cannot see the other one the the right one is knocking at
the door
B: mhm
A: and the other one is eh i i cannot see it
B: at all?
A: straight straight down
B: but you can’t see it at all?
A: yeah i can see the (main) but not the fingers
B: part of it part of it
A: yeah
B: yeah mhm tch and
A: yeah
B: and the door has got like a a step?
A: yeah!
B: yeah mm
A: he’s not smiling he he has his eyes open and
B: hm hm
A: also the the little boy
B: mhm mm hm the (following one)
A: eh well in the other one eh the man eh is eh there’s another man
B: another man
A: that opened the door i think
B: hm
A: and the inside the house in eh on the step
B: on the step
A: and the the man is looking down because the other man is eh
B: shorter?
A: short small heh heh heh
B: heh heh
A: and the there’re flowers eh inside the house like in the wall on
the wall
B: on the wall too!?
A: yeah no ju- just on the wall like a paperwall
B: (just on) ah!
A: wallpaper
B: the new man has got glasses?
A: yeah
B: and is it bald? is he bald?
A: eh he’s smiling tha- that’s what you mean?
B: (but) has? has he got eh hair?
A: ah! heh heh heh(no) heh(no) heh(no)
B: no no is bald?
A: mhm
B: hm hm
A: heh heh heh
B: (heh)hm
A: big nose and the
B: yes
A: he’s smiling and he’s a little bit fat not really much like like
short and
B: hm hm
A: fat a little bit
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B: and has he got some flowers or lines or?
A: no
B: on his dress?
A: nothing
B: on his shirt or trousers? no?
A: no nothing
B: hm hm
A: flowers not just inside the house
B: mm mm the child has got his mm eh his mouth open?
A: yeah
B: yeah?
A: and the i cannot see eh his left hand i just see the other one
B: mm
A: just the fingers
B: hm
A: of the little kid
B: and what about eh the father hands?
A: eh i can see both
B: you can see both
A: yeah but eh i cannot see the fingers of his eh eh left hand
B: left hand mm .hhh he seems to be annoyed? i’m talking about the
A: the man the father
B: shouting?
A: yeah and the his finger is eh inside the house
B: his fin-? like pointing?
A: like yeah pointing inside the house the other man eh has an
expression like asking what happened or something
B: mm
A: what happened? and the he has his mouth open a little bit open
just a little bit
B: a little bit open?
A: yeah he has small mouth and at the floor eh of the house i see
B: sorry! can you repeat?
A: at at the floor
B: at the floor yeah
A: i can see like eh lines or
B: lines
A: not lines but eh how do you say? like eh
B: perhaps like a carpet? or
A: no no no no
B: no not a carpet?
A: no
B: mm
A: like a
B: wood?
A: cuadrados
B: ah!
A: how do you say it?
B: squares? no?
A: hm hm and the nothing else no? nothing more?
B: and what about the little boy?
A: the little boy has his bo- his mouth open
B: mm mm
A: and the mm he’s almost in the same position as in the other picture
B: (the others) mhm
A: eh in the next one eh the new one the the short man eh seems to eh to be calling eh for anybody
B: where’s this new person?
A: no there’s no new person
B: there’s no new person?
A: no you you mean the short the short man?
B: yeah
A: oh! he’s at the door on
B: he’s on the
A: on the
B: on the step?
A: on the step hm hm
B: hm
A: eh he seems also to be shouting
B: shouting?
A: yeah like calling
B: and he’s looking at the right? or at the left?
A: at the? left
B: left
A: yeah
B: left his left?
A: yeah his left
B: mhm mm has he got eh his mouth open?
A: yeah his mouth open and the eh his hand is near his mouth
B: near his mouth
A: yeah
B: and what about the father?
A: the father has his eh right hand eh closed and the like eh touching his tie or something or the jacket or the shirt or whatever you call it
B: uhuh
A: the boy has his
B: eh sorry and his mouth is closed?
A: closed
B: closed?
A: yes
B: hm hm and the boy?
A: the boy has eh is in the same position as the other one as the other picture almost the same
B: mhm wait eh his mouth is open
A: yeah
B: eh you can see his eh right
A: right hand
B: right hand
A: yeah the same
B: hm hm
A: i i think there’s no no difference
B: no difference another one
A: tch and the other one eh the short man see eh seems to be like eh i don’t know
B: like surprised?
A: yeah like surprised but mm not exactly
B: mm
A: like hhh i don’ know eh he has his mouth open
B: open?
A: yes eh he seems eh i- his expression is like if eh he’s waiting
for someone and the this person eh
B: doesn’t arrive?
A: doesn’t arrive yeah
B: hm hm
A: like i don’t know
B: mh mh is he looking at the father?
A: yes
B: mh mh .hhh you can see only his left hand?
A: tch eh
B: and arm?
A: and arm yes
B: yes not right one
A: no
B: no?
A: just the left one
B: mh mh and you can see only the right hand of the father?
A: no i can see both
B: no!? both of them
A: both of them yeah eh the left one is touching eh his arm
B: sorry can you repeat it?
A: he’s touching his arm with his left hand
B: hm hm we’re talking about the father?
A: yeah
B: hm hm and what about the boy?
A: the boy is in the same position but i cannot see his right hand
his right arm
B: mh mh
A: well yes i can see his arm but not the hand
B: hm hm the (heh)next (heh)one heh
A: eh in the next next one i can see a really big boy eh like a a
really tall and the fat
B: fat? hm hm
A: really fat and he’s wearing a hat and he’s he’s wearing the same
clothes as the the boy but (heh)bigger the same clothes
B: mh mh
A: the tie is the same and the jacket is the same and the short
pants and the also the shoes but
B: hm
A: (very) big of course
B: hm hm
A: and the the father eh is surprised
B: sorry! has he got brown hair? dark hair?
A: dark hair
B: dark hair?
A: mh mh
B: and has he got a big mouth?
A: eh no eh he has his mou- his mouth closed
B: closed but
A: it is big
B: big
A: big
B: but closed
A: yeah
B: hm hm
A: mh mh
B: and his nose is is big?
A: small
B: is small?
A: small and also his eyes are small
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B: his eyes hm hm
A: mhm
B: hm hm and his father
A: and his father is surprised
B: surprised?
A: yeah with eh his mouth open
B: hm hm but not smiling
A: no not smiling at all no no no no and the little boy is looking
down
B: but sorry eh the father of the of the bi- big child is eh
pointing at his eh his son
A: yeah
B: yeah hm hm
A: and smiling with his mouth open
B: yes
A: like saying this is my boy
B: this is my boy heh
A: heh heh heh
B: and what about the father of of the other boy? his eyes are like
surprised?
A: yeah that’s what i said before
B: ah! you were talking about the
A: yeah about the
B: the man the father
A: yeah
B: of the
A: of the little boy
B: little boy
A: yeah
B: ah! surprised hm hm yes and his mouth is very open?
A: not very open
B: no?
A: no like in the other ones
B: like in the other ones!?
A: like in the fourth one in the fourth picture
B: hm hm it’s like a point?
A: yeah
B: big point?
A: like a black point
B: black point hm hm mm
A: he’s surprised yeah
B: he’s surprised
A: the the other man is not surprised is happy
B: is happy?
A: smiling
B: hm hm eh
A: the little boy is looking down i i said
B: looking down!?
A: yeah looking down
B: is not looking at the big eh child
A: no no no no at the floor
B: at the floor?
A: yeah and the i can see his hand again
B: hm hm mm
A: the big one the big the big boy eh ha- has like points eh on his
face like little
B: disease (xxx)
A: yeah! like
B: si
A: you know? like
B: sí
A: the brown things! i don’t know the name
B: sí heh heh i don’t (heh)know eh mmh
A: i’m sure i know it but
B: (xxx) who’s taller? eh the father of the of the little child or
the the new kid?
A: the boy
B: the boy?
A: the new kid mmh he’s almost touching the top of the door almost
B: almost?
A: yeah and he’s something eh on his hat something painted on the
hat.
B: on the hat?
A: yeah something painted like a thing with a cross a triangle and a
cross inside
B: hm hm
A: and and eh he has eh that thing also eh on his jacket
B: that cross?
A: yeah that triangle with a cross inside and the the little boy
B: but sorry in all of the picture? in all the pictures or only in
this last one? the cross?
A: i’m talking about the big one the big boy
B: yes but mm tch eh you have told me that he has got a a triangle
with a
A: yeah
B: cross but in la- in this last picture? or on all of one? on all
of them?
A: i can i cannot see this boy in the other pictures just in the
last one
B: ah! yes
A: heh heh
B: you’re right heh heh hm hm
A: eh what what i said is that the little boy eh has also this thing
on the jacket in the first one the second one and the and the
nothing else in the first one and the second one
B: the ch- the little child
A: the little child
B: has got it?
A: has this thing on the jacket
B: too? ah!
A: uhuh in the first one and the second one this this thing painted
B: in the first and the second? hm hm what about the newspaper in
the second? and the third one?
A: mmh i was thinking about it eh i can see eh eh something painted
eh on the middle
B: on the middle?
A: yeah something like eh a thing to play chess or something like
that a a black thing
B: hm hm
A: and lines like
B: and lines?
A: yeah
B: you can see the in the top of the picture like a a title?
A: in the?
B: something written
A: yeah yeah mmh
B: hm hm a title
A: what else?
B: what about the hair of the the the child? the little one? is like in?
A: yeah
B: yeah
A: heh heh heh heh
B: heh heh
A: looking up
B: heh
A: heh
B: and the and his father has got like a? his eh like a line?
A: yeah like a line
B: in the middle?
A: in the middle of the head
B: of the head
A: yeah heh and the the big boy in the last one is behind his father
B: behind?
A: yeah the first is his father and then the little boy
B: hm and in the other ones are the opposite first the child and
then the the father
A: eh i i’m talking about the last one
B: yes
A: the big boy
B: yeah but in the others
A: i cannot see him in the others
B: ah! are you talking about the
A: the big the big boy
B: the big the big boy
A: yeah
B: mhm
A: the other eh the the small boy is eh in all the pictures eh
B: behind his father?
A: yeah behind his father the first
B: hm hm
A: that’s all?
B: i think so heh heh
A: i think so
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A: in the first vignette there’s a a little boy who’s dressed in
a a who’s dressed in shorts eh shoes and a jacket and he’s black
his hair is black and and there’s eh i can see a fist you know
what’s a fist?

B: hm hm

A: yeah and some i i suppose somebody’s hitting him and in the
second vignette the boy is going to

B: wait wait wait a moment in the first picture eh you see a fist?

A: yes

B: i mean the man the the hand

A: only a fist a hand a hand a hand closed

B: the hand is closed?

A: yes and no- and nothing more and in the second picture there’s a
a the same boy eh and he’s eh falling but he doesn’t fall and
he has an eye eh an eye eh ay! cómo se dice? injured! (xx) you
know? hhh and in the second vignette eh that boy is going to tell
his fa- i suppose he eh in is his his father that somebody has
hitten him on him? and and the father was reading the newspaper
the boy’s crying and the mm the boy’s wearing the same clothes
she was wearing before he was wearing before

B: the father is reading the newspaper?

A: yeah well he’s no not exactly reading the newspaper he’s like
sleeping and the newspaper is in his hand and the father has
black hair eh a moustache and he’s wearing a tie eh trousers
shoes and a jacket and she’s eh and he’s on a sofa and in the
second fi- eh mm in the fourth picture eh

B: wait a moment eh the first picture?

A: yeah

B: eh the father has the newspaper

A: in his hand

B: in his right hand?

A: (heh)yes heh

B: yeah?

A: yeah

B: and the boy’s crying?

A: yeah and wear a tie the boy and you know what’s a tie- a tie?

B: yeah

A: and the man and the father so as well

B: hhh hm hm

A: (i don’t know) is there any difference? no?

B: i only fou- found the one one difference mm

A: in the fourth picture the eh the boy is still crying and the
father is eh sleep no sleep no i mean he he has waken up and he’s
hearing what he’s eh listening to what he is his son is telling
him and he he seems very surprised the father
B: the father seems very surprised?
A: yes and they’re wearing the same clothes i think
B: the boy tha- that’s crying has his mouth opened?
A: yes
B: yeah?
A: and with with his tongue you know? heh in this (heh)way heh heh
heh and and nothing more in the fourth picture and in the fifth
the the the father is eh going i suppose he’s going to to
speak with the with the man with the boy who has beaten his his
child and eh they’re walking with the same clothes the father
seems very hungry angry sorry heh heh
B: heh
A: and eh the boy is still crying not so eh so deeply likes like as
before and i’m making many mistakes heh heh heh
B: heh
A: and tch they’re hand in hand you know? hand?
B: uuhh
A: yeah i don’t know and in the in the six sixth picture eh they’re
in front eh sorry
B: wait a moment please
A: heh
B: heh heh mm
A: in the sixth picture there there are the here are the the sorry
hhh eh they’re in front of a door and they’re very angry and
again wearing the same clothes and the father se- eh is going i
suppose to knock the door yes and nothing more
B: you suppose the the father is going to knock the door?
A: yes
B: the? mm?
A: his eh in his face you can see that eh he’s angry he’s angry and
the boy has eh stopping has stop eh stopped crying
B: hm
A: and eh
B: and mm is there any number on on the door?
A: no
B: no!?
A: no number only the door you can’t see the house only a fe- a a
little eh some bricks?
B: hm hm
A: but nothing more and a step but and the next eh like we we
supposed before eh the man is knocking at the door and tch still
with with a hun- with angry in in his still he’s angry still he’s
still angry heh
B: heh
A: heh heh and tch eh the boy is with his hand eh in in his chin
like wondering something
B: oh!
A: and tch the same door the same its the same only eh what happens
is that the the man is is knocking the door and the boy is with
his hand in in his chin hhh in the next picture eh the someone
open open the door eh opens not open heh the door and he yeah i
think it he’s a man and he and he’s a little man a a a short man
eh he’s bald with glasses and tch with trousers with eh he’s is
we- wearing slippers and and a shirt and the father of the boy is
looking at him like saying but it is one li- like won- wondering
if that man that eh psk little i mean short ma- he’s very he’s
not tall he’s eh if she if he could eh eh beat hi- beat his child
and they i suppose they start eh speaking about what happened and
and i don't know and the wall of the house you can see that it is
with paper and on the paper there’re the paper is eh tch i mean
hhh the the draw- drawings are flowers and i don't know what else
to say

B: about the bald man eh is he smiling?
A: mhm
B: yeah?
A: more or less i i don't think i don't know if if that’s is a smile
but can be he eh he’s not angry or not sad but tch smiling
smiling
B: in my picture he’s smiling
A: i don’t know in mine maybe (xxx) but i (heh)don’t (heh)know heh
yeah maybe yeah it can be (xxx)
B: .hhh eh what about the the boy? in the in the eight picture?
A: mm he’s with his hands back eh (on the) back in a side
B: and has he his mouth open?
A: yes
B: yeah?
A: and the eye is who has been injured or beaten is still is black
you know?
B: uhh
A: (xxx)
B: okay
A: and in the next picture the the father’s eh is is going to beat-
to to start a quarrel i think and
B: the father is still looking angry?
A: yes
B: yeah?
A: more angry well in the in the last picture i i told you eh he’s
sur- eh he’s surprised cause you know? what i said he seems
B: uhh
A: surprised cause eh she’s sh- he he expected a a big man or
someone very strong who who could beat his his child and in this
picture is he’s again angry and shouting i think he’s shouting
B: (xxx)? shouting?
A: yes
B: yeah?
A: and with his hand eh with his eh finger pointing i don’t know
wha- what he’s pointing but i think he’s pointing inside the
house but
B: mhm
A: i can’t see what he’s pointing and the little boy is still with
his or with his mouth (half) open and and
B: eh what about the the bald man? (xxx)
A: the bald man? he’s surprised he’s not he’s not smiling in this
case
B: hm hm
A: and tch he isn’t surpri- he’s surprised and he’s like trying to
say the father that there’s nobody nobody more in a there’s
nobody in the house
B: hm hm
A: and
B: and what about his hands?
A: tch they’re open oh in
B: yeah
A: like this like trying to explain that he’s the only one who lives
in that house
B: hm hm
A: I suppose that the father is trying to tell him that his child has been beaten for someone strong or someone who could who could.

B: You're still seeing the flowers inside the house?

A: Yes.

B: Yeah?

A: And the boy's looking at what his father and the other man doing continuo? Heh in the next picture eh the boy is still watching what the this these two men are doing and the father is without is angry with anger and with his eh with his hand eh closed in in a fit in a fist and the bald man is is calling someone or is shouting and looking back.

B: The is shouting?

A: Mm well not shouting but looking back.

B: Mhm.

A: Like calling someone.

B: But he has his mouth closed?

A: No he's the father has his eh hand closed.

B: But the bald man.

A: No open cause.

B: Opened?

A: Yeah and the same flowers on the walls? And.

B: Hm hm.

A: The bricks the step the the red- the clothes and everything is the same .hhh.

B: (xx)

A: And in the next picture eh the boy's still looking at his father and the other man and.

B: Sorry the boy has the same face since ough!

A: Yes.

B: Picture number.

A: Eh number.

B: Seven for example or something like that.

A: Yeah number eight.

B: Number eight.

A: The same face and the same position the same looking at what.

B: Uuh.

A: (xx) doing and in this in this (scene) eh they the the father is i don't know how to how to say it in english but he's if he has a tch a you know? She's heh putting it (heh) here heh.

B: Ah!

A: (heh) remangándose heh heh a like eh i don't know but he he's going to start he's going to.

B: A fight? Yeah.

A: St- to struggle for.

B: Hm.

A: His his child or something like that and the with a hun- with angry? With anger and the tch and the bald man is is surprised i think with his mouth o- mouth open and i don't know nothing more just the same.

B: Hm hm.

A: And then in the last scene eh the boy is not looking at them heh and he's looking down eh at he's looking at the floor at the floor and the and the father is heh more than surprised he's with big eyes with eh wi- wide open.

B: Hm hm.

A: And with the mouth o- open as well and and the bald man is with his eh with her thumb eh pointing eh back.

B: Back yeah.
and back there’s a mm a big man heh a policeman a policeman maybe
and he’s wearing a a tie and an uniform and with a with a cap on
his head and eh it’s very difficult to see the flowers cau- the
cause this man is very big and i suppose the father has changed
his mind and he’s not going to to struggle mm to fight eh to this
to this man and nothing more ya está

aquí hay unas viñetas que solamente tengo una pero
dime cuales y te las digo
la segunda tercera y cuarta?

ah! maybe in the in the second vignette the about the the head of
the boy there’s four stairs stairs you know?

the sky stairs sí when you in the cartoons when somebody so- eh
someone hit eh beat some eh other per- other per- people

you know? the stairs heh heh (xx xx) and that
but eh
with his
ah! he has
eh four legs four legs sorry (heh)four four fingers not five
yeah
and
but eh mm i don’t know if i understand you mm above the head of
the boy?
yeah there’s four stairs
there’re four?
stairs
stairs?
yeah not above but you know?
but i have stars
stairs
the stars of the sky
stars (heh)sorry heh heh heh heh heh
heh heh heh heh heh
it is my fault sorry heh heh heh
heh heh heh heh
jobá (xxxx) heh yes it’s that the difference?
no

i have i have them
tch i don’t know
the the differences that that i that i wrote on the paper is that
you said that the boy had? an eye?
yes a black e- eh the eye the eye is black
hm in my picture he has his eyes normal
normal?

yeah
yeah
in the in the third picture i don’t know maybe the boy
is mm with his eh with his arm eh pointing eh with with his
fingerprinting back and trying to
in the third picture the boy is with his finger pointing back?
si no this way heh
yeah?
yeah maybe that’s the difference
hm hm tch and i’m not sure you said that the father has?
moustache?
yeah
A: yeah and you
B: my father hasn’t (moustache) heh heh
A: ah! and in the fourth one eh tch ah! maybe the boy’s
pointing his eye because he eh his eye this way
B: in the picture number four?
A: yeah heh ah! and the father has eh throwing the newspaper or the
newspaper has fallen cause
B: mm
A: it it’s not (xx)
B: yo creo que ahora ya estará
A: ya está no?
B: sí
A: sí
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1 A: eh in the first picture it appears a boy
2 B: uuhh
3 A: who seems to have eh about nine years old and he has received a
4 punch?
5 B: uuhh
6 A: eh and i only can see the hand of the person who gives him the
7 punch
8 B: is the hand open? or closed?
9 A: closed
10 B: closed? ah! okay
11 A: and the boy seems to be flying
12 B: eh heh
13 A: heh
14 B: how is his hair
15 A: is brown he’s wearing a a a jacket a jacket which is proper of a
16 suit of a tch of an old man
17 B: uuhh okay
18 A: and shoes
19 B: yeah but it’s his hair standing straight up or is it flat on his
20 (head)?
21 A: eh can you repeat?
22 B: it’s it’s his hair standing standing up or is it flat?
23 A: standing up
24 B: standing up! oh okay heh heh heh
25 A: yes
26 B: heh heh
27 A: and he is wearing eh short trousers
28 B: okay he’s wearing short trousers
29 A: mm
30 B: and? what kind of expression does he have on his face?
31 A: eh he seems to be very frightened
32 B: ah is he? his mouth is open?
33 A: yes
34 B: okay mm
35 A: and he seems to be surprised
36 B: eh if somebody give me a punch i would be (heh) surprised (heh) too
37 heh heh heh heh heh oh okay well mm i am trying to figure out the
38 differences in the pictures here eh what does he have on his
39 feet?
40 A: eh
41 B: what kind of shoes is he wearing?
42 A: eh normal shoes with a socks
43 B: uuhh they’re not (snickers)? they’re not eh?
A:   eh no
B:   they're not (xxx)
A:   shoes
B:   okay well that’s what i have here too i think mm
A:   and in the jacket he has some kind of eh
B:   an emblem? a (letter)?
A:   like a button in a side i don’t know how to explain it
B:   eh say it again like a?
A:   eh like a button? i don’t know
B:   uhuh
A:   eh like is he was wearing a flower or (heh)something like this
B:   oh! okay okay that’s another one okay okay so he has a (xx)
button hole okay eh well that’s two differences heh heh heh heh
A:   let’s go to the next picture what do you have (in here)?
B:   uhuh
A:   in the next picture
B:   uhuh
A:   the boy appears with a black eye eye
B:   ah! black eye okay
A:   yes and eh there’re some stars around his
B:   oh!
A:   head
B:   how many stars does he have?
A:   four stars
B:   four okay yes four here too heh heh heh heh heh
A:   heh heh and eh he see- tch he’s not crying but i think that he’s
about to cry
B:   oh! okay he’s about to cry
A:   eh he’s wearing a a tie?
B:   uhuh
A:   and the jacket has two pockets
B:   mhm
A:   and .hhh
B:   how many buttons does the jacket have?
A:   buttons?
B:   buttons
A:   eh three
B:   okay i have three two
A:   and heh
B:   heh heh heh
A:   the boy only has four fingers heh heh
B:   oh okay yes heh
A:   heh heh heh
B:   mine here too heh heh heh oh how is his hair? is still standing
up?
A:   yes
B:   heh heh heh
A:   standing up
B:   heh heh heh mm let me see
A:   and his mouth is strange because it is like curly
B:   oh
A:   his mouth heh
B:   okay okay oh that’s how you know he’s about to cry! okay mm no i
don’t have a curly mouth here hhh(xx) a straight mouth heh heh
heh mm okay mm what do you have in the third picture?
A:   eh the boy appears crying
B:   okay
A:   and he seems to be eh he seems to begin no he’s (heh)going heh to
tell eh a person who seems to be his father
B:   uhuh
A:   eh what he has happened
B:   uuhh
A:   and the man eh is sitting in a sofa
B:   mhm
A:   and he’s sleeping
B:   mhm
A:   he takes a newspaper in his right hand
B:   mhm
A:   and he’s wearing eh a tie a a trouser
B:   mhm
A:   and tch something you put eh a ver heh
B:   what? (xxx)
A:   something you put eh under your jackets but over your your skirts
B:   oh! a vest?
A:   eh i
B:   is it a vest?
A:   i don’t (heh) know
B:   it’s got a vi collar like? has it got a vi collar?
A:   eh
B:   maybe not
A:   i don’t know
B:   heh heh heh heh heh but he has? does he have a jacket on? the man
in the chair?
A:   no no
B:   no
A:   he has no jacket
B:   okay (that) i’m not quite sure eh okay
A:   and the boy eh is pointing at eh at the other picture we have
just described
B:   oh! okay
A:   and eh he seems to be running
B:   this is still the third picture right?
A:   eh
B:   or is it the fourth picture?
A:   the thir- the third
B:   oh okay okay okay
A:   and
B:   and so he’s pointing at the second he’s pointing at the picture
with the stars on his head? right?
A:   yes
B:   okay
A:   and the his father or the person (who is)
B:   mhm
A:   has long hair and a mous- mousteech? moustache heh
B:   oh! oh! moustache oh! his father has a moustache
A:   yes
B:   okay because his father here doesn’t have a moustache
A:   and
B:   a moustache uuhh okay?
A:   you have? you got the difference?
B:   eh i have two i think there’s two heh heh heh heh heh
A:   heh
B:   yeah i found at least two okay? tch and hhh what about the the
fourth picture?
A:   eh now the boy eh still is still crying
B:   uuhh
A:   but now he’s not pointing at the other picture
B:   mhm
A:   he’s pointing at his black eye
B: okay heh
A: and the eh his father eh have eh eh is not sleeping
B: mhm mhm
A: and he’s hearing eh listening to his eh son
B: uuhuh
A: eh
B: what kind of?
A: he seems to be surprised
B: oh!
A: and he has his eyes very open
B: mhm (how) about his mouth?
A: eh how?
B: his mouth heh
A: eh is very open too
B: it’s very open? oh okay
A: yes eh eh now the newspaper is in the eh floor
B: ah! okay
A: and he has the hand were he takes the newspaper open
B: uuhuh
A: and the other hand eh very closed
B: okay well that’s a lot of differences heh heh heh
A: yes
B: okay but he’s still sitting down right?
A: yes
B: okay
A: he’s still sitting
B: right what about the fifth one?
A: eh eh the boy and the father
B: hm
A: eh are with her hands together heh
B: oh! okay they’re holding hands right?
A: yes heh
B: they’re holding hands okay
A: and eh the father seems to be very angry
B: uuhuh
A: eh he has his mouth closed
B: mhm
A: and his eyes very open
B: mhm
A: eh they’re walking to so- some place
B: they’re just walking right?
A: yes
B: okay mhm
A: and i don’t know
B: well i think that’s (about all)
A: the boy is still crying
B: oh! really? heh his eyes (xxx) wide open right?
A: yes eh is black his eye is black
B: oh! okay he still ha--? yeah okay he still has the black eye
A: yes
B: okay and
A: mm
B: right because in my pictures they’re not holding hands the
father doesn’t look angry at all heh heh heh
A: yes very angry
B: heh heh heh okay eh what about the sixth picture?
A: eh eh the boy and the father are eh
B: yes
A: are next to a door
B:  uhuh
A:  eh the door is
B:  they’re standing in front of the door
A:  yes
B:  uhuh
A:  the door is closed
B:  mhm
A:  and they’re looking eh at the door
B:  uhuh
A:  but eh there’s nobody eh next to the door apart from them
B:  okay what number is on the door?
A:  yes there’s no number
B:  oh okay
A:  there’s eh something like a something round?
B:  mhm
A:  eh that you use to to knock at the door
B:  oh! okay it’s a knocker okay
A:  and and eh something like a hole to eh where you can put the
letters
B:  oh! okay the letterbox
A:  yes
B:  uhuh okay
A:  and .hhh!
B:  mm what’s the expression on the father’s face?
A:  he’s still very angry
B:  oh! still very (heh)angry (heh)okay heh heh
A:  yes and the boy now seems to be a bit eh frightened
B:  oh!
A:  about what is going to happen
B:  okay so but he has stopped crying right?
A:  yes yes he’s not
B:  okay
A:  he’s not crying
B:  mm is there anything next to the door? like a wall or something?
A:  eh yes eh there’s no there’s no other door
B:  mhm
A:  but eh the wall is made with bricks
B:  okay okay that’s what i have too mhm
A:  okay
B:  mm (xxx) what about the picture next to (this)? the picture
seventh picture
A:  eh the picture is more or less the same
B:  uhuh
A:  but now eh the father is knocking at the door
B:  oh okay
A:  eh he has his eh hand closed
B:  uhuh
A:  and and there are eh some kind of of lines around eh it around
around his hand
B:  some kind of lines? i don’t see what you mean
A:  eh tch
B:  he’s knocking? is he using the door? is he using the knocker?
A:  yes like if if it was the sound that he was making
B:  oh! okay okay (xxx) uhuh
A:  and the boy eh has eh his hand eh under his mouth like is if he
was thinking
B:  like this?
A:  yes
B:  okay
A: heh heh heh heh heh
B: heh heh heh heh heh ok
A: mm and the expressions of their faces is the same
B: oh okay as in the picture before? right?
A: yes
B: okay mm okay okay now we (xx) the next picture is there anyone at
the door?
A: eh there’s a man eh somebody has opened the door
B: heh okay
A: and there’s a man now under the door
B: wh-?
A: in the door heh heh
B: in the door?
A: yes
B: uhh
A: eh the father still eh is starting to say something to him?
B: uhh
A: eh he now he’s smiling eh he’s bald
B: who is smiling? the man or the father?
A: eh the man
B: the man is smiling? okay
A: the man who opens the door
B: hm hm
A: eh is smiling at the father
B: uhh
A: and he’s eh very short
B: mhm
A: eh he’s wearing glasses and he’s bald
B: uhh
A: eh .hhh
B: tch let me see eh
A: he’s not wearing tch he’s wearing shoes but eh those one you u-
use only
B: hm
A: to be at home
B: oh! okay he’s using slippers right?
A: yes
B: okay what’s he wearing? is he wearing a shirt or a?
A: eh he’s wearing a skirt eh
B: he’s wearing a skirt!!
A: ay! no heh
B: heh heh heh heh heh
A: heh heh i don’t know espera a
B: ok okay what’s he wearing on the top? is he wearing?
A: heh sorry heh
B: a a tshirt?
A: no
B: a shirt? a jacket? a vest?
A: i don’t know (heh) how to tell it
B: or
A: i don’t know what’s called
B: describe it to me describe it to me
A: eh the same as the father eh
B: oh okay
A: eh those that thing you put eh with a tie
B: that thing you put with a tie!
A: heh heh
B: mm right? is that to hold the tie?
A: eh no
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339  B:  no
340  A:  eh
341  B:  (xxx)
342  A:  .hhh! heh
343  B:  i think (xxx)
344  A:  when you’re wearing a suit?
345  B:  uhuu a suit okay
346  A:  you eh under the jacket
347  B:  uhuu
348  A:  you’re wearing (heh)this it’s like a
349  B:  okay so we
350  A:  like a blouse in a woman heh
351  B:  oh! like a what?
352  A:  heh heh
353  B:  heh heh heh wait wait wait like okay for example you have the
354  shirt?
355  A:  yes
356  B:  you have the tie?
357  A:  yes
358  B:  you have this thing
359  A:  yes heh
360  B:  then you have the jacket?
361  A:  yes yes
362  B:  okay it’s a vest heh heh
363  A:  heh heh heh heh heh
364  B:  okay right
365  A:  eh and
366  B:  so
367  A:  and he’s wearing something tch eh eh that eh use to tch for that
368  is his trousers don’t goes down
369  B:  oh! he’s wearing a belt?
370  A:  eh heh
371  B:  oh! no! no! he’s wearing suspenders?
372  A:  yes heh
373  B:  this is the old the the small man who is waiting
374  A:  yeah the small man
375  B:  okay right
376  A:  heh
377  B:  let me get this down heh heh heh heh heh
378  A:  heh heh heh heh heh
379  B:  mm mm okay
380  A:  and i can see in the wall of the house eh
381  B:  uhuu
382  A:  pictures with flowers
383  B:  ah! okay there’s a picture on the wall (that’s) okay mm is there
384  anything else? that you can see in the house? other than the
385  picture
386  A:  i don’t know
387  B:  because i don’t have anything in the house heh heh
388  A:  heh the floor of the house is eh of black and white eh
389  B:  ah! okay
390  A:  plaquetts? heh well black and white
391  B:  okay it’s eh okay it’s checkered
392  A:  heh you understand me? heh heh heh
393  B:  okay heh heh heh heh no i understand i understand yeah okay mm
394  okay eh what about the next picture? (xx)?
395  A:  eh the father is eh shouting at the
396  B:  uhuu
397  A:  the short man
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398  B:  okay
399  A:  and the short man have a expression in his face and too with his
400     hands of don’t know what is happening
401  B:  oh! okay
402  A:  he’s surprised
403  B:  okay
404  A:  just very surprised
405  B:  uhuuu
406  A:  and the boy eh the child is has his mouth open
407  B:  uhuuu
408  A:  eh
409  B:  okay
410  A:  and the father is pointing into the house
411  B:  oh! okay pointing into the house he’s still angry?
412  A:  yes
413  B:  he still has an ex−?
414  A:  very hangry
415  B:  okay okay mm mm okay is okay is the old? is the s− is the old or
416     small man holding anything
417  A:  no
418  B:  no! he’s still bald he still has his glasses okay
419  A:  yeah heh heh heh heh heh
420  B:  heh heh heh heh all right what’s in the next picture after
421     that?
422  A:  eh now the father has eh one of his hands eh very closed
423  B:  closed in what way?
424  A:  eh tch closed
425  B:  it’s a fist?
426  A:  yes
427  B:  uhuuu?
428  A:  like if he was going to give a punch to the o−
429  B:  oh! okay okay
430  A:  to the short man
431  B:  okay
432  A:  and the the short man is eh seems to be calling somebody who is
433     in the house
434  B:  uhuuu uhuuu
435  A:  eh so he has eh his mouth very open
436  B:  uhuuu
437  A:  and he has eh tch his hand eh next to (xx) next to his mouth?
438  B:  uhuuu
439  A:  eh to shout
440  B:  okay
441  A:  eh very loudly
442  B:  like like this?
443  A:  yes
444  B:  (xxx) okay
445  A:  mm
446  B:  mm what’s the expression of the father’s face? still angry?
447  A:  yes
448  B:  what about the small boy
449  A:  eh he has still the mouth open
450  B:  uhuuu
451  A:  and now he seems a bit surprised
452  B:  okay but it’s more or less the same as?
453  A:  yes more or less the same
454  B:  the expression before right? okay what’s in the eleventh
455     picture? the (heh)penultimate picture?
456  A:  eh now the father of the boy
B: uhuh
458 A: is preparing to give eh the small man a punch
459 B: uhuh
460 A: because eh he’s eh preparing his cloth eh to to give him the
461 punch
462 B: he’s preparing? what? what do you mean?
463 A: eh
464 B: he has his hand (xx xx) like that?
465 A: yes and tch .hhh he is
466 B: where are you? i didn’t find heh
467 A: heh heh i don’t know how to explain it eh
468 B: (sorry) you’re trying to explain the father or the small man?
469 A: the father
470 B: the father
471 A: is he’s taking his cloth out of his
472 B: oh!
473 A: hand
474 B: uhuh
475 A: eh to give him a punch
476 B: he’s
477 A: eh like when you ha-
478 B: yeah
479 A: have a lot of hot you do it with the heh you (heh)do (heh)that
480 B: oh! he’s rolling up his sleeves!
481 A: yes
482 B: oh! okay okay okay he’s rolling up his sleeves okay uhuh?
483 A: eh
484 B: and what’s? what is the old the small man look like?
485 A: eh
486 B: what’s his?
487 A: now he’s looking at the father and eh he has his mouth open
488 B: uhuh
489 A: eh and he’s very surprised he seems eh don’t know what eh is
490 going to happen
491 B: mhm
492 A: or what he can do?
493 B: uhuh he’s like oh oh oh heh heh heh heh
494 A: .hhh!
495 B: okay eh well well
496 A: i don’t know
497 B: yeah one question what color is the father’s hair?
498 A: what?
499 B: what color is the father’s hair?
500 A: eh he’s bald
501 B: no the father
502 A: ah! the father
503 B: not this bald man
504 A: brown brown
505 B: brown it’s dark right? okay
506 A: yes
507 B: okay and okay and what’s in the last picture heh heh heh
508 A: eh .hhh espera behind the the small eh man
509 B: uhuh
510 A: it appears a very very very big child
511 B: mhm mhm
512 A: eh he seems eh very small according to to his age but he is eh
513 very big
514 B: okay
515 A: he’s eh wearing eh something like a baseball hat?
B: oh! okay
A: heh
B: baseball cap okay
A: and he’s wearing the same clothes eh as the small child is wearing
B: okay (xxx)?
A: eh and now the small man is pointing eh back to it’s son
B: mhm
A: to his son
B: mhm
A: and now is the the father of the small child eh the one who is very surprised
B: ah! okay heh heh
A: and now he’s not going to push eh to punch the the small man
B: uuh uuhh how were his hands?
A: eh the hands of the father are spread
B: uuh
A: but the hands of the new child are closed and he seems
B: ah!
A: to be very eh hangry
B: oh!
A: and tch he has eh his mouth closed and
B: who? who? the father or?
A: eh
B: or the big child?
A: the new child
B: oh! okay uuhh
A: and in his face he has eh something like eh points? or .hhh
B: dots? spots?
A: yes something like this
B: the?
A: yes
B: heh
A: eh the things that people who has eh orange hair use to have in his face eh something like points
B: on? what do you mean? can you say it again? people who have?
A: eh his hair orange
B: oh! okay okay ah! freckles
A: yes heh heh
B: freckles okay ah so this big child? has freckles on his face
A: yes
B: uuhh okay so the big
A: and he has brown hair
B: uuhh uuhh
A: mm
B: (here i’m not sure)
A: and now the small man is smiling
B: oh! sure he’s heh heh heh okay eh are there any eh colors on the clothes?
A: no
B: that he’s wearing no?
A: eh yes in the tie eh he has lines eh white and black
B: ah! on the tie of the big boy?
A: yes and in the tie of the small boy too
B: ah! okay striped tie mm what about the expression on the father of the small boy’s face?
A: eh he’s very surprised and he’s looking at the eh big child
B: mhm
A: and he has his eyes very open
575  B:  uhuh
576  A:  and his mouth a bit open too
577  B:  mhm
578  A:  and
579  B:  is there? is there like a eh round?
580  A:  eh yes
581  B:  okay okay that’s what i have too heh heh and well let me see what
582  else can we find out (you know maybe the new thing is) the the
583  big boy
584  A:  i don’t
585  B:  eh
586  A:  he has exactly the same clothes
587  B:  heh heh
588  A:  as the small child
589  B:  uhuh right
590  A:  and in the kind of hat he’s wearing?
591  B:  mhm
592  A:  he has the same picture eh that he had that eh the small child
593  has on his jackt jacket
594  B:  ah! okay
595  A:  and he has too the this picture in his jacket
596  B:  oh! okay
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A: mm well in this story eh the story starts eh in the first picture
tch there’s a a boy which is being hurt by tch well a hand but
B: mhm
A: of course is by other boy and in the second picture eh the boy
tch eh i i see the boy with a with hers eye very black
B: really? mm
A: mhm
B: heh
A: and in the third picture eh tch the boy is cri- eh is crying and
and says
B: but sorry eh what’s the boy wearing?
A: ah! he’s wearing a he’s wearing a an uniform of from a school
B: all right
A: eh with tch eh it’s a jacket a it has
B: is he wearing a tie as well?
A: yeah
B: all right
A: eh tch with s- strings? black and white
B: mm ah all right! like a a belt? is he wearing a belt? or?
A: no tch in the
B: no belt
A: in the tie? he has
B: oh! the tie?
A: black white black white
B: black and white stripes?
A: yeah heh
B: oh! all right i see
A: and a tch eh trousers but eh short trousers
B: right ((clearing throat))
A: eh and shoes also
B: mhm
A: and his hair is black
B: black okay
A: mhm
B: is it (sticking up)?
A: yeah
B: right
A: and well in the third picture he says her pa- tch he’s crying and
saying her parent that her father which is sit mm sat on an
armchair and reading the newspaper well tch he eh i think he’s
sleeping but with the newspa- newspaper in his hand
B: which hand?
A: eh right
B: his right hand? okay
A: heh heh
B: thanks
A: and and the boy is crying and is telling hi- him that a another
boy has hurt hi- him
B: ah! all right
A: the fa- the father has a big very big moustache?
B: right
A: black her her his hair is black
B: yeah
A: and is wearing a a jacket? no mm
B: is he wearing a tie as well?
A: no no
B: (well)
A: no it’s not a jacket it’s
B: ah! all right
A: tch i i think it’s a the that eh tch the thing you wear over your
blouse it’s
B: ah! (((clearing throat)))
A: with no un chaleco heh heh
B: un chaleco? ah all right heh
A: i i think
B: okay he’s not wearing a shirt?
A: yeah he has a shirt but
B: ah! (he has one)
A: over it he has a
B: a ja-?
A: un chaleco
B: eh a jacket (the probably thing) yeah i see
A: tch and then the father gets very angry and
B: (((clearing throat)))
A: and catch her boy oh! his tch son and go in eh to the house of
the boy who has who had hurt her him
B: yeah
A: and they’re in front of the door
B: mhm
A: tch they knock at a the door
B: sorry what’s?
A: well the
B: eh what’s the number on the door?
A: the number!?
B: has it got a number on the door
A: number!?
B: yeah like eh does it say the house number?
A: ah!
A: on the front of the door
B: no
A: it doesn’t say any number
B: it no it has a tch a well for knock it’s
A: ah! a- a doorknocker?
B: yeah
B: oh! i see now heh
A: and a a place for the letters but the the
B: okay
A: and the the father eh knock with hi- her hand his hand
B: oh i see yeah
A: don’t use the kno- bueno eso heh
B: okay heh heh
A: eh! on the for- in the forth picture eh tch eh tch in the third
the father has the newspaper on his right hand
B: okay
A: and when the boy eh tells that the newspaper falls
B: ah! all right mhm
A: well and again and in not bueno eh in the eighth picture eh
B: yeah
A: the bo- the f- tch the friend bueno the the boy who has hurt the
the the son? opens the door and
B: what does he look like?
A: eh
B: the man who opens the door?
A: he has he’s bald?
B: yeah
A: he’s wearing glasses and is smiling
B: mhm
A: and he has tch a very eh bueno tch he ha- he’s wearing a
trouser with a tch heh .hhh! eh the thing that you use to tch
B: oh! (yeah!) braces?
A: yeah
B: yeah okay
A: and a and a shirt
B: right
A: bueno eh and there’s eh in the mm
B: what color are his trousers? are they light or dark?
A: what?
B: eh what color are his trousers? are they light color or dark?
A: eh no it light
B: light? okay and his shoes?
A: eh it looks like eh tch no shoes eh tch shoes
B: mm
A: but for stay at home
B: oh! yes slippers
A: hm
B: all right and they’re light colored as well?
A: mhm
B: yeah okay
A: and the shirt as well
B: all right
A: and in the tch ay! when he opens the door in into the
house there’s a wall which has very ma- ma- many flowers painted
B: all right
A: and the floor the ground floor is in with tch mm eh is black and
white
B: black and white? is is that the color of the wall? black and
white?
A: no
B: no? all right sorry what did you say was black and white?
A: the groun- the
B: oh! the ground!
A: tch yeah (it’s the ground)
B: sorry okay
A: and the wall is with flowers
B: all right what expression has the boy got? on his face?
A: he’s smi- smiling
B: yeah
A: and the but the father looks very angry
B: right
A: and in the next tch picture the father gets very much angry
B: mhm
A: and the boy of the house eh has expression of asking why? why are you angry?
B: mhm ((clearing throat))
A: and it seems like the father asks tch eh is telling him tell your father to come and talk to me
B: okay what’s the man at the door doing? with his hands eh the man with the glasses what’s he doing with his hands can you see?
A: he’s he’s having an expression tch like asking why
B: ah! all right
A: and the father is is signing into the house
B: really?
A: yeah like asking for the his father
B: mhm
A: tch and in the next mm the boy asks eh calls in inside the house and the father looks very angry li- hhh eh well nothing
B: mhm what’s the expression on the little boy’s face is he still smiling?
A: no tch the which boy? the?
B: the one outside the door
A: outside!?
B: yeah
A: the son?
B: yeah
A: of the?
B: is he smiling or?
A: no but before i told you the the boy was smiling but was the boy who opened the door
B: oh! sorry i see
A: hm hm
B: okay
A: and the little the the son has always the same expression
B: ah all right what? what expression is that? how could you describe
A: heh heh
B: his expression? heh
A: eh tch eh just (heh)looking (heh)at what his father do
B: ah! all right
A: and in the next picture the tch it seems like the the boy inside the house is is saying again that
B: ((clearing throat))
A: tch he he doesn’t understand why is her father so is the father so angry he has a expression tch i don’t know between sad and and he doesn’t understand but the father is is tch he eh he has tch he whishes tch mm (xx) what she he do with his son? you understand? heh heh heh
B: i think so could you repeat that? if you don’t mind heh
A: tch yeah the father eh tch eh has a expression of revenge
B: ah all right
A: is is doing like tch sabes?
B: he’s rolling his sleeves up?
A: yeah heh
B: all right heh heh
A: and in the last picture eh the father of the well i think it’s the father but it could be the brother heh
B: heh
A: heh heh of the of the boy appears and it’s very it’s very big
B: huge heh heh
A: and is wearing a cap?
B: a cap? ah! all right
A: hm
B: heh
A: he has eh i think it’s the brother (i don’t know) heh
B: heh
A: he has eh eh you points marks points
B: mm spots or
A: no no s-
B: freckles?
A: yeah
B: ah all right
A: tch bueno
B: okay
A: and
B: ((clearing throat))
A: he’s is looking serious and he’s wearing a a jacket and a tie
B: mm hm and what color are the jacket and the tie?
A: the jacket is is light color and the tch tie is black and white
B: ah! all right
A: and shorts? and shoes
B: mm
A: and then and the expression of the father when saw the that that man is very hhh surprised and afraid and the the son as well and the the boy which was inside the house is tch looking eh is signing the brother and
B: mm
A: saying what are? what are you gonna do now? is smiling bueno
B: ah all right
A: and nothing else
B: okay eh there’s one or two that i’d like to talk about if we can if you don’t mind okay?
A: yeah
B: eh ((clearing throat)) all right then so in the first picture do you just see the hand?
A: mm
B: you don’t see who the hand belongs to
A: no
B: no? all right eh can you see any lines that show a movement of the hand?
A: eh tch eh yeah
B: right
A: in front of the hand?
B: eh yeah it
A: eh between the hand and the boy? there are lines which yes which indicates
B: oh yeah
A: yeah tch eh movement?
B: movement
A: you mean that?
B: yeah as if maybe the hand’s just going like that or like that or something
A: mm
B: mm okay where? where were the lines? did you say they’re between the hand and the boy?
A: and the face of the boy
B: oh! they’re not underneath the hand
A: under--?
B: they’re not on the (xx)? (xx) the hands they’re they’re not there are they?
A: no
B: the- they’re sort of here
A: yeah well eh eh here is one but
B: mm
A: is not tch
B: and it’s just two lines with movement
A: eh there are tch two but there’s one which is not very per-
B: okay heh
A: heh heh
B: all right eh what else is there? okay in the second picture?
A: mhm
B: eh how many stars is there above the boy?
A: four
B: four stars?
A: hm
B: and how many buttons does he have on his jacket? en su chaleco?
A: eh three
B: three and
A: and he has a si- a sign here like tch of the the name of the
school or something and has two pockets
B: uuhu right it’s got two pockets? and a badge to say wh- where the
school is that
A: hm hm
B: he goes okay now and
A: and heh he has only four fingers on each hand
B: okay heh
A: heh heh heh
B: heh heh poor boy and okay in the third picture has his father got
a pocket in his shirt?
A: hm
B: yeah he’s got a pocket just there on his chest
A: mm oh no here on
B: oh (further down)? but there there’s nothing on his shirt like a
 pocket?
A: no
B: i see right
A: and has one button
B: but it’s it’s (xx) is it? it’s a it’s not next to his tie? you
understand? it’s just eh i thought maybe he had a pocket next to
his tie
A: the father has no tie i think
B: ah!
A: ah! sí sí
B: ah! all right
A: eh could you repeat please?
B: yes sure
A: ah! ah! he has one near his tie and another here
B: ah
A: at the end of the
B: (xxx) okay and it’s actually on his shirt? not his trousers?
A: ah! no
B: okay so he’s got one on his shirt and one on his trousers maybe
A: .hhh!
B: sorry heh
A: he has two buttons one here and
B: oh!
A: one here and he has two pockets
B: yeah
A: eh on the chaleco and the trousers no
B: oh all right okay all right and
A: and in the newspaper there’s a photo- a photograph
B: ((clearing throat)) okay hhh and what else? in pictures three and
four how many fingers does the father got? has he got four as
well?
A: heh
B: as far as you can see
A: one is is (xx) and the other hand has four
B: okay
A: but in the other picture it has he has five and the other is here
((xxx))
B: hm hm okay what’s the expression in the father’s face in picture
four? does he seem annoyed or does he seem surprised?
A: tch surprised
B: surprised?
A: si eh tch eh he started being annoyed in picture five
B: picture five okay and then ((clearing throat)) in picture fourth
is the father’s mouth open or closed
A: tch it’s open
B: it’s open
A: and
B: okay what else? and in picture five can you just see the father
and the son? with nothing else in the background
A: yeah nothing else
B: okay just the two people
A: two
B: right and is the father still wearing a jacket?
A: hm
B: okay
A: and in picture seven when he’s knocking he eh there are lines
which eh tch a- around the hand
B: ah all right
A: which indicates he he is knocking
B: knocking that’s (xxx) all right okay okay and what’s the boy
doing in picture sixth? and seventh? is he? what’s the expression
on his face? is is he opened mouth or?
A: mm
B: is his mouth (shut)?
A: eh
B: does he seem surprised?
A: in picture six he is looking at the door waiting not he he’s just
looking at the door and in picture seven tch he is touching hi-
the
B: his chin?
A: si
B: okay
A: in and in picture eight he he has his mouth open
B: ah! all right
A: and mm
B: so in picture six and seven is the son eh smiling? or does he
look just indifferent eh
A: in in six indifferent and in seven
B: okay
A: perhaps a little tch annoyed but
B: mhm
A: right
B: and then did you say that the father’s expression changes between
pictures six and seven? or does he look exactly the same in
picture six and seven? the father
A:  hm in fourth fiveth sixth seven and si- six and seven are the
   same
B:  all right
A:  no four no tch five six seven eight
B:  okay heh and then is the father still wearing the jacket? even in
   picture eight
A:  yes
B:  no
A:  and in picture ele- eleven the when ah! no nothing nothing no no
B:  okay heh right eh when the boy or the man comes to the door is he
   standing on the step? is he eh is he standing inside the doorway?
   or is he actually on the step?
A:  ah! on the step
B:  he’s on the step?
A:  hm
B:  okay and and did you say he’s smiling in picture eight? right?
A:  hm hm
B:  and he’s not carrying anything
A:  no
B:  no? mm did you say the father looks like he’s being aggressive in
   picture eight? when he’s talking to the man at the door is he
   does he look like he’s being violent?
A:  in eight?
B:  yeah
A:  it looks more in nine
B:  more in nine
A:  when he’s when he’s shouting
B:  oh! he’s shouting in nine? he’s shouting?
A:  yeah it
B:  oh!
A:  and signing inside the the house
B:  mhm
A:  and i see he’s
B:  ((clearing throat))
A:  shouting because of tch because of the he has three lines which
   tch
B:  ah
A:  and tch sabes? bueno heh
B:  heh heh so in picture nine? the father’s got three lines that
   show that he’s shouting?
A:  hm hm
B:  that he’s maybe getting angry? okay heh eh (xxx) mm and
   ((clearing throat)) does the father get closer to the door? when
   he’s shouting does he move closer towards the man? who he’s
   shouting at? you get it? eh because maybe if he’s shouting he
   moves towards the the man at the door
A:  the legs no just tch
B:  just? just?
A:  just a (heh)little heh
B:  okay heh he just leans forward a little bit
A:  hm hm
B:  just just his body not his leg
A:  mhm
B:  okay and in picture nine then are his his legs together? or can
   you see one leg in front of the other leg?
A:  mm
B:  (as he’s leaning)?
A:  yes one in front of the other
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B: okay
A: ((clearing throat))
B: right eh and in picture ten is the man at the door or the boy at
the door is he looking inside looking towards inside (xx)
A: hm and is and is calling some- someone inside he's so looking
inside
B: ah all right is his hand actually like that?
A: mm
B: all right and is his mouth open as well
A: mm
B: okay
A: and in mm and the mouth of the son in pictures eight nine and ten
and eleven are is open
B: right
A: of the (xxx)
B: okay whereas in six and seven is not?
A: hm
B: his mouth is shut
A: mhm
B: right? okay and okay and in picture eleven did you say that his
father is rolling his sleeves up? ready for a fight or whatever
A: mhm
B: and what are the other two doing? while he’s rolling his sleeves
up like the the man at the door is is he eh? does he look (xx)?
or
A: the the man inside?
B: yeah
A: tch i don’t know eh how to he ha- his mouth is a little open
B: ah all right
A: i don’t know if he’s angry or surprised mm
B: mm .hhh and what about the little boy? eh the son do- does he
look exactly the same as in nine and ten?
A: hm
B: ah all right so he doesn’t change then?
A: no
B: okay and in picture eleven eh the boy in the doorway does is he
still looking at the man? the father? is he looking at the
father? or is he looking indoors? like in picture
A: at the at the father
B: he’s looking at the father
A: hm hm
B: okay and then in picture twelve when the the big man comes eh is
his hair dark or (xx)?
A: dark
B: dark?
A: hm
B: and does he seem to have a a parting here? you you get what i
mean?
A: eh
B: does does he comb his hair like that? so with a parting down here
A: mm he’s wearing a cap
B: ah all right so you can’t tell what color what kind of hair he’s
got
A: mhm
B: all right so he’s wearing a cap mm and then does the bi- the big
man look pleased? or does he look menacing? does he look
threatening?
A: heh
B: does the big man look happy or?
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516  A: no eh indifferent but
517  B: indifferent?
518  A: yeah well tch not a- annoyed not happy
519  B: not happy
520  A: heh heh
521  B: heh ((cough))
522  A: but he has tch well the hands so i th- i think
523  B: okay and did you say he's wearing shorts as well
524  A: hm
525  B: okay mm tch what else can i ask you? okay going back to picture
526  one if you don't mind
527  A: heh
528  B: heh heh is there nothing else at all? just the boy and the hand?
529  and there's there's no backgrounds? there's no
530  A: no
531  B: scenery? anything like that? okay
532  A: and and nor in picture two
533  B: all right
534  A: just the boy and the stars
535  B: okay mm and you said that there’s lines between the hand and the
536  face? of the boy
537  A: hm
538  B: okay and they’re definitely between? like the hand is there? and
539  the face is there? and the lines are there? right?
540  A: hori- horizont horizontales
541  B: okay (xxx) heh okay hm in picture two does the boy seem like he’s
542  smiling? even though he may not be happy is he (xx) smiling a
543  little bit? (what did) you say?
544  A: eh eh no
545  B: he’s not smiling?
546  A: no in picture two!?
547  B: yeah
548  A: heh no
549  B: not at all heh
550  A: heh
551  B: okay mm in picture five ((clearing throat)) where is his father’s
552  hands? has he got his hands loose or in his pockets?
553  A: eh he’s having tch he is catching the hand of her so- of his son
554  and the other
555  B: ah! all right and is the boy still crying in picture five? has he
556  still go tears going down his face?
557  A: mhm two two tears are falling yeah
558  B: all right so he’s still crying a bit hm tch i can’t think of
559  anything else heh
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A: okay tch there is a hand eh that is fitting a a boy and the boy has eh black hair and she’s open his mouth because of the (heh)fitting and she’s she’s having she’s she’s dressing a short eh short trouser and a jacket with a eh i i don’t know something in in the right in the left sides of the jacket

B: like what?
A: eh .hhh! like a like a paint or like
B: a what?
A: a
B: a flower?
A: like a mm yes like a flower
B: on the? on the? on the lapel? on the left of the jacket?
A: yeah because you cannot see the right side of the jacket
B: right but you can see the left side? the co- the collar of the jacket? the lapel?
A: the color!?
B: the lapel?
A: yes you can see it
B: and but you can’t see the lapel on the right?
A: no! you cannot
B: is there anything on the lapel? on the left?
A: yes there is a a like a flower
B: like a flower?
A: yeah
B: right in mine there isn’t so that’s that’s a difference
A: eh the jacket the jacket has three buttons i think because there is three points
B: three?
A: yeah
B: no i can’t see three mm maybe one but it di- there’re not three that are clear
A: okay in mine is three and a pocket
B: right just one yeah?
A: and yes just one and i think she is she is eh wearing a tie he sorry
B: yeah yeah it looks like it’s not it’s not you
A: it’s not
B: you can only see
A: yeah
B: the top of the tie
A: yeah and what you can se- eh what? and well he’s wearing as well shoes?
B: socks?
A: and socks well you can see the turn of the socks
B: right next near the shoes at his ankles? yeah?
A: uhuh
B: right
A: mm poof! and
B: what about? what about the hand?
A: eh well is a hand a a close hand
B: ah it’s closed!?
A: yeah
B: ah mine is open
A: it’s a when you fight it’s like that
B: right mine’s open
A: and it’s in the hand eh moves because you can see the
B: right it’s moving
A: uhuh and what .hhh! eh his hair is like a .hhh heh it’s i don’t
B: like a punk?
A: yeah like as like a punk
B: right so his hair his hair is sticking up?
A: hm hm
B: okay
A: hhh
B: well we’ve got three we’ve got three for the first one
A: okay and i think it’s okay i don’t know well the jacket is is eh
B: right
A: mhmm
B: every-? everything?
A: everything is white
B: everything there’s nothing black?
A: no
B: right okay try the second one
A: tch in the second one you can see the the this boy eh who is eh
B: having a black eh eyes because
A: he’s got a black eye? he’s got?
B: yes because of the fight
A: no
B: and she’s seeing heh sky the (heh)shey (heh)(xxx) she’s when you
A: in the comic when you fight somebody then you you se- you see the
B: oh oh things that you can see in the sky
A: ah! the stars?
B: yeah the stars!
A: ah! he’s seeing he’s seeing stars right
B: yeah
A: because he’s been hit yes yes yes how many?
A: eh four
B: right! okay
A: four stars and he’s having a tie a a (xxx) but (heh)i (heh)don’t
A: remember hhh the with i don’t i don’t know with eh hhh well ties
B: can see with only one color or what with
A: ah! with stripes!
B: with stripes okay
A: with stripes okay
B: ah! he’s got he’s got a tie with stripes?
A: yeah
B: no
A: black and
B: no
A: and white
B: i’ve got a plain tie
A: you can see now that there’s three three bot- three buttons? no
B: three buttons?
A: in the jacket
B: yeah
A: bottons? is it?
B: bu- buttons
A: okay
B: yeah
A: eh well and the three hhh you the open
B: buttonholes?
A: okay heh and you can see the flower in the jacket in the (again)
B: but not in the other side not in the right side of the jacket
A: right! okay but that’s just the difference in the first picture
B: isn’t it?
A: so we won’t won’t count that one okay?
B: two pockets?
A: yes two pockets
B: right
A: and the his his face is more he’s like oh! oh my god! or i don’t
B: know he’s
A: shocked?
B: mm yeah shocked? surprised?
A: no not surprised but .hhh
B: has he got? has he got his eyebrows?
A: yeah
B: oh
A: one one is black and the the other is
B: right because it’s as if the eye the he’s got he’s got a black
A: eye and that’s different
B: shocked?
A: yeah shocked
B: mm yeah shocked? surprised?
A: no not surprised but .hhh
B: has he got? has he got his eyebrows?
A: yeah
B: two
A: well i
B: try the next one
A: okay
B: yeah
A: tch she’s cry- he’s crying and he’s going to to to say it to her
B: father well i think it it is her father
A: mhmm
B: he’s her father his father heh and well he’s crying with the with
A: his eh his mouth is open and well and crying and he is eh i don’t
B: know telling something for example and sign sign something that
A: is eh besides him (i mean)
B: he’s pointing?
A: yeah
B: no
A: she’s pointing with her right hand
B: no
A: but with the other one eh it’s like if he puts the other one in
B: her pocket
A: her pocket
B: no
A: in his pocket
B: no
A: and her his father is sleeping
B: mhmm
A: eh he has a big eh .hhh oh my god i forgot (heh)everything (heh)today the moustache?
B: a moustache?
A: yeah yeah a big
B: no
A: one
B: no
A: and he’s sleeping and he has in his hand a newspaper
B: right
A: and well he is in a sofa
B: a sofa?
A: yeah
B: or an armchair?
A: no a sofa
B: for more than one person?
A: no one person
B: for one person okay
A: it’s (xx) it’s an?
B: armchair
A: armchair okay and mm what?
B: ((cough))
A: the father is wearing as well a tie but a white one
B: a plain
A: well everything
B: a plain tie?
A: plaint?
B: plain no no stripes
A: yes
B: hm
A: and white and her father has as well eh black hair but not like a punk
B: right
A: mm
B: is there a pocket in the shirt?
A: if there is a pocket where?
B: in in in on his shirt
A: eh i i cannot see the shirt because he’s wearing a shirt but as well a like a pullover but without eh the arm
B: sleeveless?
A: mhmm
B: uhhuh!
A: with two pockets and two buttons
B: right so one difference (he’s) got a sleeveless jumper
A: and he has in a hand the newspaper getting a the newspaper and in the other one eh he has the the hand closed
B: on the ((clearing throat)) on the chair
A: yes
B: right okay shoes? what color are his shoes?
A: what?
B: what color are his shoes?
A: what color!?
B: what color are his shoes?
A: ah! black eh white
B: right
A: everything is white
B: okay
A: except of the except of the apart of her of his hair
B: we’ve got four differences for that one try try try the next one
A: eh the next one well the boy is crying again and he’s pointing eh his eyes and well you can see the the that he’s crying because you can see the

B: the tears?

A: and in the other the other one as well

B: right okay but (where) was this? he’s he’s pointing his eyes?

A: one eyes only the one who has black and father suddenly gets up and

B: in this picture?

A: yeah

B: the fa- the fa- is is the father standing up? or

A: no

B: is the fa- or is father sitting down?

A: sitting down but is when somebody is crying and tell you something and you

B: i i’m (xx) is he is he is he in the process of getting up? or is he?

A: no no he’s sitting do-

B: is sitting down? right

A: sitting down but open his eyes

B: wha- what’s what’s he looking at?

A: to to the boy

B: he’s looking at the boy? right

A: yeah

B: okay (clearing throat))

A: and well he he’s not getting now the newspaper because the newspaper is in the in the floor on the floor

B: ah! right! in mine it’s not

A: tch and she’s loo- she looks eh surprised or like eh tch shocked

B: because? wh-? wh-?

A: i think that because of the of the boy because she’s

B: right but becau- because of his eyes or because of his mouth or

A: ah! the mouth and the eyes because mouth is like is open (xxx)

B: is open?!

A: yeah

B: right mine is not

A: and eyes and are like eh that

B: very open?

A: yeah

B: right okay (xxx)

A: and well boy is crying and with open with the mouth open as well

B: and well and pointing

B: and his jacket?

A: ((clearing throat))

B: the boy’s jacket

A: which one? the boy’s jacket?

B: the boy’s jacket

A: is open

B: it’s open?

A: yeah

B: right tch eh

A: more or less the the it’s the same (xx) as before

B: okay but that is one two three there’re three differences you want to try another one? next one

A: tch eh the father and the boy are together she is eh he’s getting her her boy with eh his hand they are

B: he’s holding? he’s holding the boy’s hand?

A: he’s holding yeah

B: no
A: and they are walking and fa- the father looks very angry
B: mm again eh why?
A: because of her his eyes and mouth is is closed like
B: really? and (why) eh his eyes? because in mine his eyes are he
doesn’t look angry
A: no no
B: because his eyes his mouth is closed but his eyes are quite wide
open
A: no it’s like
B: right
A: that hhh well and boy as well is is with the again is with the
black eyes and is crying
B: hm hm
A: it is crying and tch well
B: they (wait) he’s holding the boy with his right hand?
A: yeah
B: the boy’s left
A: yeah
B: (i mean) his right hand? i’m sorry and his left?
A: is in the in the in the pocket
B: in his pocket?
A: yeah
B: right i think that’s (xxx)
A: eh .hhh!
B: how many? how many buttons? under the tie of the father
A: two
B: two right okay
A: yeah and one pocket you can see only one pocket
B: right eh where?
A: whe- where?
B: yeah ah!
A: in the
B: on the? on the shirt?
A: yeah no not on the shirt because i i cannot see
B: he’s still wearing the jumper?
A: yeah
B: right but where? where is this pocket?
A: tch in the right sides of the of the pullover well of the this
kind of pullover
B: of the trou-? of the trousers? or the pullo-? the pullover?
A: the pullover yeah
B: right the jumper okay right
A: the jumper okay hhh and
B: has he got eh wha-? what about his hair? his hair is black yeah?
A: yeah it’s black with a line in the middle of the of the head
B: okay eh what about the next one?
A: tch well they are in f- in front of a door?
B: mhm
A: eh fa- the father is looking at eh her right sides?
B: yeah
A: and the boy is looking at his front eh
B: at the? at the door?
A: at the door yeah
B: right
A: and the father is not holding now eh boy’s hand
B: yeah where? where are his hands?
A: eh one is in well in .hhh heh (i think) in the heh
B: it’s not in his pocket?
A: yeah
B: he’s not holding anything?
A: no
B: which one? the left or the right
A: the right one
B: right okay
A: and the left one it seems that it is in his pocket
B: mhm okay
A: but i’m not sure
B: you (can’t see) it’s not clear
A: no
B: (xx)
A: and
B: (what about) the number on the door?
A: not there’s not any number
B: right here’s number se-
A: you can only see the eh the thing where you can mm you can use to
to to ring well not to ring to to knock
B: uhh! right okay mine is just ni- number seventeen it hasn’t got
any knocker on it
A: okay
B: so yours hasn’t got a number?
A: no and there’s a knock
B: and there’s a knocker
A: knocker okay
B: right
A: and there’s a a place where you can put the letters
B: there’s a letterbox!?
A: yeah
B: three differences!
A: well and you can see the door and then you can see well that it
seems like eh
B: brick
A: heh no idea things that you use to to build to to build a a house
B: bricks
A: yeah okay hhh
B: and how many? how many steps?
A: one
B: one? right
A: mhm
B: i think
A: .hhh!
B: what about eh what about the expression on the boy’s face?
A: mm
B: and the boy’s
A: is no
B: the boy’s hands
A: boy’s hands eh he’s not holding no- nothing he’s not eh using hi-
his pockets
B: okay
A: their po- his pockets and well nothing and now the expression is
i don’t know is normal it’s not amazing and it’s not shocked it’s
nothing
B: okay alright try the next one
A: tch eh next one father is knocking in the door but not using the
knocker he’s not using the knocker
B: using his hand?
A: he’s using his hand yes
B: (ah!) mine is not
A: and you can see that he’s knocking becau- because in the comic
you you know they use
B: (right)
A: hm hm and now the boy is like thinking because eh you can see
B: that’s different
A: tch the right one
B: mm and is the ma- is the man? the same as the previous picture?
A: (is) yes he’s the same
B: like the? is the expression on his face? the way he’s standing?
A: mm yeah
B: the hands?
A: yes
B: and everything like that?
A: the only difference is that eh his hand his right hand now is up
because he’s knocking
B: okay
A: and everything is the same
B: okay next one
A: except for that eh next one somebody well a- another boy eh has
opened eh the door
B: it’s a boy
A: yeah
B: not? not?
A: well is eh first time that i saw him i thought that it was a a
man but know that i have seen everything all the comic you can
see that it’s a boy another boy
B: eh describe him
A: well he has no no hair?
B: right
A: and he’s wearing a he’s wearing glasses
B: mhm
A: he’s smiling
B: mm
A: he looks like eh do you know the these comics eh can i say
something in spanish?
B: heh heh
A: mortadelo y filemon?
B: yes
A: well he looks like mortadelo but eh a a little one
B: right
A: heh a little (heh)mortadelo
B: uhh
A: and well you can see that eh there’s lot of flowers in the hhh in
this house because eh open is the the door is opened so you can
see the the house
B: flowers!?
A: flowers
B: what else can you see inside the house?
A: sorry?
B: what else can you see inside the house?
A: the floor there’s a (xxx) heh like a i don’t know the
B: the design?
A: yeah the design of of the of the floor is is like that
B: so the floor isn’t white?
A: no it’s white and black
B: mhm
A: now the father is looking at eh this boy?
B: hm
A: who is wearing trousers and and a shirt
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B: mhm
A: she’s he’s wearing the shirt eh like that in the middle of the
of his
B: ah! right! his sleeves are rolled up
A: of his arms yeah and he’s wearing these things that you can use
when you you wear eh short eh trousers and
B: ah! so that your trousers don’t fall down?
A: yes
B: braces
A: braces?
B: right
A: and
B: or if you’re american suspenders
A: hm hm well i’m not american not english heh heh heh
B: no i’m not either braces heh heh heh
A: eh well the father is looking at him tch and their hands are well
you can only see well you can see the left one but not not very
clearly and the right one well it’s no- it’s doing nothing
B: right okay
A: tch eh the boy is now with the o- with hi- his mouth open
B: mm
A: again eh
B: clothes? the clothes are the same? he looks surprised the boy
yeah?
A: no eh i didn’t tell you in the other one but now boy is eh with
the his jacket is closed
B: right okay i don’t it looks it looks if it’s just the position of
it if he goes like that it looks like i don’t
A: who? who?
B: i don’t the boy i don’t think the boy has buttoned up his jacket
A: mm
B: has he butto-? has he closed it using the buttons? has he
fastened it?
A: mm no i thi- i don’t think so
B: okay well (xx) i mean we’ve got one two there’s four there
A: okay
B: okay next one?
A: eh well the father is is telling something angrily he’s very
angry he’s telling something to well he’s telling mm perhaps he’s
telling something like eh call your father or something like that
because he’s pointing inside of the of the of the room well
B: ah!
A: of the house
B: right okay now does he look angry?
A: tch eh yes i think so
B: mm because?
A: he looks like if he was eh talking loud
B: because of the position of his mouth?
A: yes
B: his mouth is open?
A: is open and you can see the and the boy is like before in the
same position i mean
B: hm
A: with the his open mouth and everything
B: okay
A: the other one the boy who o- who has opened the door is now is
like .hhh i don’t know i don’t have anything to say you the he’s
using he’s using his hand to tell something
B: right
A: and he he looks now because of eh his expression like bored no
not bored eh afraid
B: okay alright
A: hm?
B: yeah
A: before he was smiling and now he’s like bored
B: right he’s surprised?
A: yeah
B: right
A: and perhaps (cough) perhaps surprised
B: okay try try the next one
A: tch eh now the boy the other boy is eh looking at at looking
beside him and he’s calling for somebody he’s using his eh life
left hand to to tell something like hey
B: uhh
A: and well his mouth is open because he’s telling something and the
father now is with his hand closed he has his hand closed hhh eh
but not like that it’s like that .hhh
B: mm right so does? does he look as if he’s going to hit him?
A: no! is
B: but he’s he’s got it in this position?
A: yeah in this position
B: okay
A: tch and he looks angry again
B: but he he looked angry?
A: but but he’s
B: did he look angry in the previous one?
A: yes but in the previous one he was telling something so he has
his mouth open
B: yeah
A: and now he’s he’s not telling nothing anything but he he looks
angry again
B: right okay
A: hhh next one? next one or not?
B: yeah yeah
A: eh oh! well i didn’t tell not this one the other one that we w-
we were before
B: number ten?
A: yes number ten
B: yeah
A: i didn’t tell the other one but well i told you now i tell you
now eh the floor the design of the floor is not the same as the
number eight
B: mm what’s it like now?
A: eh .hhh! heh before you can see the the the design like that
B: yeah
A: and now you can see like that
B: so the floor design (is changed) i mean it’s different again it’s
just it’s the same all the way through for me there’s no design
A: uhh okay
B: okay
A: tch well eh number eleven
B: okay
A: eh now the father is eh doing this with her his skirt
B: right rolling up his sleeves
A: (in order) to fight somebody
B: uhh
A: eh he’s doing that with his left hand tch and well the boy is in
the same position as before and the other one
B: he looks surprised yeah?
A: yeah
B: right okay
A: he looks surprised but mm his his (boy) i mean not the other one
B: yeah yeah
A: and the other one looks afraid
B: tch mm afraid? how?
A: like .hhh
B: okay i’m not sure if that i’m not sure if that’s the
A: (yeah)
B: what about the position of the mouth? is the?
A: like when
B: is his mou-?
A: when you
B: is his mouth open?
A: yes when you
B: the man in the door!?
A: the what?
B: the the boy in the door?
A: yes
B: his mouth is open?
A: yeah it’s like when you when you tell something to a boy and well
B: mm something bad and he’s like
A: mm but the mouth is
B: like a like if he was if he was if he is psk if he’s going to cry
A: it’s the same
B: uuhh but but the mouth is definitely open?
A: yeah
B: okay okay eh try the last one
A: and the last one eh now the boy who is in the door is smiling and
B: he’s pointing beside him
A: yeah
B: and beside him just be- beside beside him it is a there’s a well
A: i think it can be .hhh i don’t know who but it it’s a big big man
B: right
A: really big
B: okay
A: it’s like a door it’s like the door so
B: right
A: hhh he’s wearing a a hat!
B: a hat?
A: well it’s not a hat it’s
B: a cap?
A: yeah a cap
B: right
A: with something in the front of the cap
B: right
A: eh he looks angry as well because of the mouth position
B: eh is wh- what kind of position is that? is the mouth open?
A: no
B: it’s closed
A: it’s closed and but
B: but it’s not smiling?
A: no
B: right it looks very serious?
A: yeah
B: all right
A: worse than serious
B: heh heh
A: i think
B: okay
A: and it seem it seems like a (big) child
B: right yeah
A: because eh he has eh or like a pizzerò heh heh heh
B: freckles?
A: yeah and he has a tie mm a strepes? (it was)?
B: stripes
A: stripes!
B: right
A: tie and what? and now the boy
B: is he we-? is he wearing shorts?
A: yeah
B: all right
A: and in the jacket you can see that sh- eh he’s wearing a shirt a
skirt sorry a tie and then the jacket
B: ah!
A: and in the jacket in his left sides
B: hm
A: you can see the same symbol as in the cap
B: mm
A: eh their hands his hands sorry are closed
B: mhm
A: but in the in in this position
B: right
A: hhh and well now the father father looks eh surprised with the
his mouth open and and now he has his hands like that
B: right
A: and the boy is is looking at the floor
B: looking at the floor!?
A: yeah tch and the father is looking a eh up
B: he’s looking up at the sky?
A: no not the sky the o- the other?
B: looking at?
A: the other
B: at the at the big thing in the door?
A: yeah heh because in the oth- in the last in the last one father
was looking the the other boy and he was looking down
B: right
A: he was like mm i am going to fitting you
B: right
A: but now he’s like heh and i don’t know
B: okay well that’s five one two three four that’s five for that
picture
A: so
B: okay
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1 B: all right picture one then?  
2 A: yeah eh somebody somebody gives  
3 B: (hits)  
4 A: a a punch to a boy school  
5 B: is his hand? is the hand open or closed?  
6 A: no it’s closed  
7 B: all right so there’s difference here  
8 A: (okay)  
9 B: what color is the boy’s hair?  
10 A: eh he has eh short dark hair  
11 B: yeah  
12 A: and he also has a jacket and a mm and a short trousers  
13 B: yeah  
14 A: and  
15 B: what color’s the jacket?  
16 A: the jacket!? heh i don’t know (heh)white  
17 B: oh! all right  
18 A: probably  
19 B: yeah  
20 A: brown  
21 B: heh  
22 A: or maybe blue i (heh)don’t (heh)know heh and  
23 B: next one  
24 A: (xx) okay he has a big nose heh  
25 B: big nose yeah  
26 A: heh heh heh and second picture?  
27 B: yeah  
28 A: yeah tch okay there are four stars heh  
29 B: yeah  
30 A: heh heh heh above his head and probably because he’s unconscious  
31 B: are his eyes  
32 A: heh heh  
33 B: eh open or closed?  
34 A: mm eh one of one of his eyes is open and the other is dark and closed  
35 B: ah all right  
36 A: and she’s  
37 B: so (he’s got) black eye  
38 A: she’s falling down and he’s falling down  
39 B: yeah  
40 A: heh heh (heh)sorry  
41 B: is he on the floor or in the air?  
42 A: eh heh in the middle heh
B: in the in the middle yeah?
A: she’s falling he’s falling
B: (he’s falling) yeah
A: yeah eh
B: what color is his tie?
A: and his tie? eh mm heh heh hhh
B: just white isn’t it?
A: yeah eh white and and black
B: what? with black stripes?
A: mm lines
B: lines?
A: just crossed
B: yeah
A: heh heh
B: ah! all right
A: heh heh
B: you said that the tie is different picture three?
A: eh tch eh he’s crying and he goes he goes to tell what had what
B: had happened to him to his to his father
A: just crying
B: yeah
A: who is eh sleeping heh
B: yeah
A: and
B: what color is his hair?
A: mm? eh the hair of the father?
B: yeah the father’s hair
A: dark
B: dark (okay)
A: and he also has a moustache
B: oh! all right a moustache oh!
A: mm
B: and what ab-? his tie? and shirt?
A: his tie? tch eh his father’s tie is white
B: hm
A: hm? and he has a he has a newspaper in his right hand
B: yeah
A: and
B: his trousers?
A: his trousers okay eh long trousers white trousers
B: yeah
A: like (it all)
B: and shoes and
A: and shoes white shoes also
B: yeah is his mouth open or closed?
A: yeah a little bit open
B: yeah and the chair? what color is the chair?
A: mm heh probably it could be probably white or
B: yeah
A: black or heh
B: heh
A: i don’t (heh)know heh
B: it’s heh transparent
A: yeah heh heh heh i don’t think so heh heh
B: and the boy’s crying? yeah?
A: yeah he’s crying and with with with his mouth open
B: yes
A: and probably he’s running
B: yeah
A: towards her fa- towards his father
B: mm next picture?
A: eh ((cough)) ((clearing throat)) tch eh the boy shows his eye to
her father to his father
B: yeah (xxx) yeah
A: and she he’s he’s still crying and
B: why is his eye? is he? oh yeah! go on (boy) still crying
A: and his father is eh i don’t know how to say it heh
B: awake? heh
A: (xxx) i don’t know frightened or something like that
B: surprised?
A: yeah surprised heh and he has
B: his mouth open or?
A: and his mouth is open and
B: uhh
A: his eyes very heh are very open heh tch
B: yeah
A: and the newspaper has has fallen down
B: all right
A: (to the floor)
B: yeah that’s different the yeah next picture yeah?
A: hm eh tch the father takes takes his hand’s boy
B: ah! all right
A: and
B: it’s different in this one
A: and he seems very very very angry
B: (not here) not particularly angry in this yeah so there’s
A: and the boy
B: angry
A: the boy’s still crying heh
B: yeah
A: yeah? and the the father is going is going to talk to to someone
else
B: yeah
A: the the guilty (heh)probably heh
B: so (here)
A: mm
B: yeah
A: then
B: picture six is it now?
A: yeah then they arrive to a house which door is closed heh
B: yeah what’s the number? what’s?
A: the number? there’s no number
B: ah! all right! there’s a number on mine
A: there’s a box mail or something like that in the door
B: all right! yeah mailbox yeah
A: eh
B: letterbox
A: there’re short of squares around the door i think lines i don’t
know
B: yeah bricks
A: yeah and then tch
B: is there a handle on the door?
A: yeah is a hangle
B: a handle? yeah?
A: and no! a
B: oh! a knocker?
A: al yeah heh
B: a knocker yeah
A: hhh eh i don’t know how to say this heh the father kno- knocks
knocks and
B: all right! oh! he’s knocking is it?
A: (the father) yeah he’s knocking on the door
B: was this pi-? is this six or seven?
A: eh seven
B: seven?
A: picture number seven
B: right yeah so he’s not happy father knocking yeah yeah?
A: and the boy eh the boy has has his hand in in the mouth
B: ah! all right! it’s not on mine yeah?
A: and the ne- no and then the next the next picture eh tch a man eh
B: a small men a
A: yeah?
B: yeah with a i don’t know how to say bald?
A: yeah bald yeah
B: (is it bald)? heh heh and probably with glasses i think
A: yeah
B: and psk open the door
A: he has isn’t a belt he has a
B: oh! braces!
A: yeah heh heh heh
B: braces yeah
A: and the the small man seems seems to be very happy heh
B: yeah (good) heh
A: and
B: what? what about the shoes? are they white as well?
A: eh?
B: is he wearing shoes? slippers?
A: ah! slippers
B: are they white or?
A: hm yes transparent! heh
B: yeah heh plastic yeah
A: yeah heh the floor the floor of the house is black and
B: oh! that’s different yeah
A: and and
B: and white with with sk- with squares
A: all right
B: and
A: yeah?
B: and and there’s a cortain i think with flowers
A: and a carpet yeah
B: ah! a carpet yeah!
A: a carpet sorry heh carpet with flowers
B: yeah
A: and and i suppose they’re speaking about the about what had
B: mmh is the father’s mouth open or closed?
A: no it is closed
B: it’s closed?
A: yeah and and the little boy seems seems eh surprised
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B: yeah
A: he has his mouth open
B: yeah the same with this one
A: then the next picture? number nine?
B: yeah
A: and eh father’s boy is screaming? yeah screaming with with the
small man and
B: he’s? who’s screaming? the boy? yeah?
A: yeah no he’s screaming with the psk with the
B: the man
A: with the man with the other man
B: the bald man?
A: yeah with the bald man heh
B: ah all right! he (xxx) heh the father
A: and
B: shouting
A: heh
B: yeah?
A: and i think that eh this small man doesn’t know what has happened
B: no (he doesn’t) does he?
A: because he has his his arms open
B: yeah
A: and probably he seems a little bit upset or something like that
B: or surprised? or
A: yeah
B: is his mouth open? hm?
A: the small man? the bald man?
B: hm
A: yeah a little bit heh
B: yeah
A: the small mouth heh
B: the small mouth yeah
A: yeah
B: i think that’s it yeah? is it? ah all right in the next picture
yeah?
A: yeah and psk the bald man is calling for someone for someone else
and the father’s boy is is waiting for for someone heh
B: yeah
A: and
B: is the boy still surprised or?
A: yeah
B: yeah?
A: and and the next picture?
B: yeah next picture
A: eh tch the father eh puts his sleeves back?
B: yeah
A: and and i think he’s going to he’s going to hit
B: yeah
A: heh
B: heh heh
A: the the bald man and the boy’s still surprised with with his
mouth open
B: yeah
A: and the bald man is also surprised with
B: is his mouth open as well? is the bald man’s mouth open or?
A: yeah and the eyes of the bald man are not round the you know
round?
B: yeah what? they’re closed?
A: mm no eh there’s two lines in in his eyes heh i don’t know
something (heh)strange heh heh heh
B: what a cross? crosses?
A: yeah i think yeah
B: uhh
A: si heh yeah
B: what? oh! like a clown or something?
A: yeah heh and finally heh heh who is who is surprised
B: the (heh)father's (heh)surprised!
A: it’s the father heh eh with with his eyes very very open and his
mouth too
B: mhm
A: mm the boy seems to be angry and he’s looking down he’s looking
to the floor
B: yeah the big one? yeah the big boy?
A: no the
B: the little one?
A: the little boy
B: ah! (all right)
A: and and also the big boy’s looking is looking to the little boy
B: yeah?
A: and he’s really tall heh
B: heh heh
A: he has eh the big boy has a a hat?
B: oh! all right
A: (xxx) and he also has a tie
B: yeah what color is the tie?
A: yeah eh white and black
B: yeah
A: and it is (crossed) also
B: yeah
A: and he has a jacket and short short trousers trousers
B: yeah
A: and it is the same the same cloth
B: uniform yeah?
A: yeah uniform and
B: what about the shoes?
A: i think i think he has frickles or
tie
B: frickles?
A: frickles
B: oh! all right yeah
A: and he’s also he also seems to be angry
B: yeah he looks angry yeah
A: yeah and and the the bald man probably is his father
B: yeah
A: the father of the big man and
B: is he pointing or?
A: yeah yes it’s pointing
B: yeah
A: yeah and the bald man looks very happy
B: yeah he does
A: mm i think that’s all heh heh
B: what color are the boy’s shoes?
A: shoes? mm transparent heh white
B: what else? mm is his hand’s open or closed?
A: no no eh his hands are closed
B: yeah (xxx) right
A: mm and i think
B: does he have a? an emblem? on his
A: yeah!
339  B: jacket? yeah!?
340  A: yeah in the left left side
341  B: ah! all right! this one’s no emblem yeah
342  A: and also in the hat on the hat
343  B: right right yeah that’s it i think
344  A: i think there’s no heh
345  B: no
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REFERENT: to punch/fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-14):
1 A: he’s going to:::, (1.2) to be given {a punch. (1.4) °given a
2 (A’s RH mimics punching x4)
3 4 A: punch, ° (1.6) on the face.)
5 (0.5)
6 B: {mhm}
7 {B nods}
8 A: a:n::d e:::h (0.8) let’s see, well, (0.4) his face is of
9 {surprise.} (1.0) you know when you are going to receive
10 {A opens eyes and raises eyebrows}
11 A: {{a punch}} you, (1.2) {you react, (0.7) this way,}
12 ((A’s LH mimics punching})
13 {A opens her HH and AA}
14 (0.5)
15 B: (xx[x] )
16 A: {{[a punch,]}} when someone e:::h tch (0.8) {hits you? (0.5)
17 (A’s RH mimics punching)
18 } (A’s LH mimics
19 punching)
20 A: on the face, } {with: his hand,}
21 (A’s LH grabs her closed RH)
22 B: in my picture, {the hand is open,}
23 {B opens and raises her RH}
24 A: oh the hand is open! {oh mine is:: a punch?
25 } (A closes and raises her RH)
26 B: no.}
27 (1.2)
28 A: okay
29 (0.8)
30 B: {mhm}
31 {B nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20-21):
1 A: mm:: (0.8) well, you see the same kid, (2.4) but, (0.6) he has
2 already, (0.8) {been given a punch,}
3 {A nods, B is not looking}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o chaval está esperando o sea eso un puñetazo e solamente se ve unha manga sabes? unha manga? cunha man pero cerrada e o rapaz eso a cara que pos cando che van dar un puñetazo? de reflejo?
B: mm aquí tamén ten cara de surprendido e o que está esperando é un
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (4-14):
I: falas sempre de a punch a punch e en ningún momento quixeches dixir ó mellor cando ela che di que ten a man aberta pois e a túa estaba cerrada ou que tiña o puño ou a fist ou
A: non máis adiante dixen closed pero non sei

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
hand is opened

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-14):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘punch’: the learner knows the TL item but the addressee does not recognize it, i.e. the TL item is not shared between learner and addressee.
- 16-21: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 22-23: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 24: A accepts B’s acceptance by repeating B’s words. Agreement on meaning is reached. A repeats her previous presentation but substituting the CS with the intended TL item ‘punch’, i.e. refashions her presentation in 16-21 to make it native-like. She utters this presentation with rising intonation, i.e. checking B’s comprehension.
- 26: B understands and indicates acceptance of this new presentation providing a relevant next utterance.
- 28: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20-21):
- The ‘TL item ‘punch’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20-23):
1 A: mm:: (0.8) well, you see the same kid, (2.4) but, (0.6) he has already, (0.8) {been given a punch,} (1.2) a:n::d (1.0) and (A nods, B is not looking)
2 A: his right, (0.8) {right eye, (0.8)} {is:: completely black.} (A’s LI points to her eye)
3 (A waves her LH palm down)
4 (4.4)
5 B: in my picture, (1.8) he: (1.2) he’s smiling heh heh heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (94-97):
1 A: a:n::d agai:n, (1.8) the kid’s eye, (0.8) {the le- the the (A’s RH points to her eye, A holds the gesture, B is not looking)
2 A: right eye, (0.8) of the kid is:: e::h} (1.0) {is black.} (A opens her RH in front of her eye, B is not looking)
3 (3.4)
4 B: well, (0.7) in my picture, (1.4) the eye, (2.0) doesn’t have, (0.5) well, any- anything special.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (106-107):
1 A: a:n::d well, the kid, (0.6) again, (0.4) with his e::ye black.
2 (0.8) and then (0.5) mm the man is standing

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

A: e e o ollo o seu ollo dereito es- teno morado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o rapaz sigue igual co ollo morado bueno ti nono tes morao

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (20-23):
A: non sei como se di morado ... si viao negro e dixen pois negro
I: e ti sabes como se di morado?
B: no
I: pero cando ela che di que esta black
B: entendinlle si

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20-23):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 4-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (94-97):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-10: A repeats a successful previous combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 12-13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (106-107):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.9.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1: A repeats a successful previous circumlocution strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.

REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (34-38):
1 A: he's wearing::, a:: {a tie?}
   (0.7)
2 B: {hm hm=}
3 {B nods}
4 A: =and it’s a::: {striped (/'stript/). (1.0)} {black and white}
5 {A’s RI draws lines in the air xn}
6 (A waves her RH xn)
7 9 A: stripes (/'strips/), {and e::h}
8 (B shakes her head, A is not looking)
9 (1.2)
10 12 B: in my picture, the::, (1.0) the tie is: completely white.
11 13 A: (white.) (1.2) a:n:d striped.
14 (AB nod)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten unha corbata a raias así oblicuas blancas e negras
B: aquí a corbata é toda blanca non non ten debuxo ningún

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (34-38):
I: aquí por exemplo cando logo falo en galego as raias da corbata
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

A: dixen que eran oblicuas ... porque en realidade esto non son raias non sei como se di diriao se soubese a palabra oblicua en inglés diria que son raias oblicuas ...
A: se eu soubese dicir liñas oblicuas houbera dito si porque era o que eu tiña na mente e logo recorrín a simplemente dicir que era de raias a raias

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tie

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (34-38):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘slanting’, ‘oblique’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (59-67):
1 A: the man on the sofa is weari:ng a:, (2.7) (a: shirt.) (1.3)
   {A’s RH points to her chest, AB look down}
5 A: (a waistcoat.)
6 {A’s HH outline the shape of a vest on her body, A looks down}
7 (2.5)
8 B: in my picture, he::, (1.2) he doesn’t, he wears::, only::,
9 (0.6) a {tie.}
10 {B’s LH outlines the shape of a tie on her body}
11 A: hm hm
12 (1.3)
13 B: a:n::d (2.5) a shirt.
14 (1.1)
15 A: mhm
16 (1.8)
17 B: but not a coat, (3.4) a:n:d, (3.2) not a jacket,
18 (2.2)
19 A: mi-, well, it’s not a jacket, it’s::, {you know? this::,}
20 {A’s HH outline the shape of a vest on her body}
21
23 A: (1.4) (with no:::,=
24 {A’s RH draws an armhole on her LA shoulder}
25 B: =ah!} (1.2) {in my picture,} (1.0) he doesn’t.
26 {B shakes her head}
27 A: {uhuh}
28 {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e ten un chaleco o chaleco ten dous botóns e dous bolsillos

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (59-67):
I: it’s not a jacket it’s a with no e sinalas como que querías dicir with no sleeves o
A: mangas non sabía dicir manga
I: eh mhm e ti cando ela che di decatácheste de que
B: hm de que quería dicir chaleco ...
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

I: ti saberías dicir manga?
B: no

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

---

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (59-67):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'waistcoat': the learner realizes the addressee has misunderstood the TL item ‘waistcoat’ and uses a CS to compensate for the fact that this TL item is not shared between learner and addressee.
- 19-24: A presents an approximation ‘not a jacket’, followed by an appeal for assistance ‘you know?’ and a circumlocution working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 25-26: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (59-67):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'sleeves': while trying to develop a circumlocution to compensate for the TL item ‘waistcoat’ the learner encounters a second communicative problem, the lack of the TL item ‘sleeves’. A CS episode embedded in the previous CS episode is then initiated.
- 23-24: A presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 25-26: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance. B is accepting A’s previous presentation, i.e. the strategic presentation for ‘waistcoat’ and the embedded strategic presentation for ‘sleeves’.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father drops newspaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (83-88):
1 A: and then the man has: {e::h, (2.8) mm::} has let fall down,
2 (A’s RH fingers pound on the table)
3 A: (the the newspaper is::) {on the floor.} (1.5) is not in his
4 (A opens her RH to mimic dropping something, B is not looking)
5 (A’s RI points down)
6 A: [hand, any more,]
7 B: {{in my picture,}} (1.2) it is:: still i:n his hand.=
8 (B shakes her head)
9 A: {{=in his hand?}} o[kay,] (1.8) in this one, (0.7)
10 (A nods)
11 B: [yeah]
12 A: (the: newspaper is on) the floor
13 (A’s RI pounds on the table, B is not looking)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e e o home deixou caer o periódico ó chan soltouno vaia
B: aquí non aquí aínda o ten na man

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (83-88):
A: ai quería dicir que deixara caer o periódico no chan pero non non sei como se dí
I: mm como drop ou algo así?
A: uuhh si sí

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the newspaper
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (83-88):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to drop’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7-8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-93):
1 A: tch e:::h (5.2) the man, (1.8) is holding, (0.8) e:::h the kid’s hand.
2 3
4 B: in my picture, (1.4) e:::h {he doesn’t.}
5 {B shakes her head, B looks down}
6
7 A: {he doesn’t?}
8 {A nods, AB look down}
9
10 B: yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: van da man o pai está levando da man ó rapaz o pai vai diante e ten cara de enfado
B: aquí ten cara de máis que de enfado de non sabeo que pasa e o neno non vai da man do pai

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (90-93):
A: the man and the kid leva da man leva o crío da man pois si non sabía como dicilo eu amañeime dicindo que
I: hold the hand dixeches non?
A: mhm ... como aquí temos non é o mesmo estalle agarrando a man que levalo da man que levalo da man implica movimento non? máis que agarralo da man que parece que están quietas ...
B: no soou o sea entendidile ben ... me soou sooume ben

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
hands

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-93):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1-2: A presents an approximation strategy. The approximate term used is actually the originally intended TL lexical item, but the learner is not aware of this.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (107-111):
1 A: the man is::: (1.5) standing. (1.3) a:nd is not with the:,
2 (2.8) >he’s (not going to knock) the door,< (0.4) already,
3 {A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

4 A: (1.4) and the: (1.5) the door (has like,) (2.3) (like a::
6 {A’s RH mimics grabbing a
knocker, AB look down} (A’s RI
8 draws a
circle in the
9 air, A looks
down}
11
12 A: (0.5)) (like a hand?) (1.5) (you know? to knock. (10.)
13 {A’s RH mimics grabbing a knocker}
14 {A’s RH mimics knocking}
16
17 B: hm (xxx) here, (1.3) in my door only: have a number,
18 seventeen,
19 A: (i don’t have any number,) (0.6) on my door,
20 {A shakes her head}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten bueno a típica asa sabes? o chamador
B: ah! aquí no

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (107-111):
A: como se chama o o o chamador? quería dicir
I: o chamador?
A: si
...
B: non me din conta de que me quería dicir que tiña chamador
I: non?
B: eu como despois explicou o do o do buzón pois pensei que
A: que era iso
B: que se refería xa nese momento ó do buzón e despois xa cando mo
dixo en galego pois entereime de que
A: claro
B: habías dúas cousas na porta
I: e ti decatácheste de que no no entendera?
A: no para nada
I: pareceuche que si que ela te entendera
A: si si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
number

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (107-111):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 4-6: A presents a circumlocution ‘like a hand? (1.5) you know? to knock.’ involving an
approximation ‘like a hand?’ and an appeal for assistance ‘you know?’, working in combination with
a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B does not understand, but indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next
utterance, i.e. feigns understanding
- A accepts B’s acceptance.
- Unsuccessful communication: A believes her message has been successfully communicated, but B
knows it has not.
- B will get deceived in the next turns. In 113-120 she gets to believe the message A tried to
communicate here was ‘mailbox’, but in fact it was ‘knocker’.
REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (113-120):
1 A: and in my door, (1.2) {in the middle (0.6) in the middle of
2 (A waves her RH at mid level to indicate
3 the slot of the door, AB look down)
4 A: the door,} {we can see::,} (1.5) {like a quadra-
5 {A’s HH draw a quadrangle in the air, AB look
6 down}
7 (A’s RH mimics dropping mail
8 in a mailbox)
9 A: quadra:ngular: (1.3) a hole you know?
10 (0.8)
11 B: {yeah}
12 (B nods)
13 A: fo:r:: (0.8) for the mail.
14 (2.0)
15 B: {oh} i::n (0.6) my picture (0.4) he doesn’t (xxx)
16 (B nods, AB look down)
17 A: well i i can’t see any:: any sign, (1.4) on it, (0.5) °but,
18 (2.4) it’s just like a, (0.8) (quadrangular;) hole,*
19 (A’s HH draw a quadrangle in
20 the air, AB look down)
21 (1.3)
22 B: mm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e ten como unha especie así de buzón home non pon letras pero eu
supoño que será na mitad da porta
B: aquí tampouco ten

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (113-120):
A: non sei como se lle di sabes a?
I: o buzón?
A: a ranura si o buzón que se (xxx) nas portas
I: pero ti sí que entendiches o que ela quería dicir?
B: hm sí
I: e ti sabes dicir? como se di buzón en inglés?
B: e que non estaba segura
I: e como dirías ti?
B: e que na nas películas cando cando aparece (xxx) entón foi o que
apuntei pero non sei como se chama
I: mhm
A: e que mailbox pois si que che sona agora cando cando o poñen na
porta séguese chamando igual? non?
I: mailbox si mailbox
A: mhm

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

mail

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (113-120):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-13: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy. The circumlocution is
  presented in two installments: 4-9 and 13.
- 11-12: B understands and indicates acceptance of the first installment providing an acknowledgment.
- 15-16: B understands and indicates acceptance of the second installment and of the whole overall
  presentation providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- 17-20: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding
  and repeats the previous combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 22: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** father knocks at the door

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (121-140):**

1. A: in the next one the man is knocking, (2.7) knocking on the door.
2. B: here, (0.5) in the next one is, (0.5) identical, with the other (3.0) picture, (2.2) >with the previous.<
3. A: the previous one? is identical?
4. B: yeah,
5. A: the previous one? is identical?
6. B: yeah,
7. A: no, no, i’ve [changed,]
8. B: [in the ] new?
9. A: yeah
10. B: {in [in the]}
11. A: {in the previous one? (0.6) now he’s standing. (0.6) with his arms=
12. B: =that’s no in the new::?
13. A: {in the new one?}
14. B: {in the new one,} {he’s knocking.}
15. A: {yeah}
16. B: {yeah}
17. A: and here the new one is:: similar to the::
18. B: ah! to the previous one?
19. A: oh! no! (1.4) here the man is:: you know? with his::
20. A: (arm, (0.5)) up? (3.4) (he’s knocking on the door,} (.) and
21. A: (A raises her RH clenched in a fist, B looks down)
22. (A moves her head from left to right
23. A: you can {see the signs of,} (2.7) {of knocking.} (1.2) on the
24. A: (A’s II draw lines in the air, B is not looking)
25. A: (A moves her head from left
26. A: looking)
27. A: door.

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: bueno o pai o pai está chamando na porta xa
B: aquí no aqui e que é idêntica á anterior
A: mhm pois o pai aqui está chamando e o rapaz ten a man no queixo? mirando pa arriba pa porta será e o home está chamando

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (121-140):**
A: aí bueno como se refleja nas viñetas pois un sonido con estas raias por exemplo que non sei como se di
I: mhm vale ti decatácheste o que te quería decir? o das raias estas?
B: si de que estas raias
...
A: esto non estou segura de si o entendeu
I: o do que
A: porque non és fácil de describir se non sabes se non sabes a palabra en inglés é difícil de describir estas marcas non sei
I: o das raias esas na porta?
A: claro son como onomatopeas ó falar pero nun dibuo

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the man is not knocking

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (121-140):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘lines (illustrating the noise)’.
- I: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- B’s evidence of understanding is not clear enough for A. However, A does not try to negotiate for further evidence and continues with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B has understood A’s originally intended message, but A has not realized this understanding, she believes B has not understood her.

REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (182-191):
1 A: and he’s wearing:: trousers, {and a (2.6)} tch i don’t know
   (A’s II draw suspenders on her body, A looks down x2)
4 A: {what you do you call (1.6) mm) you know? (1.0) like the:
   (A’s II draw suspenders on her body)
6 A: (4.6) you know:: (0.6) fraga? (1.6) {[he’s] always wearing
   (A’s II draw suspenders on her body x3)
9 B: [heh ]
10 A: this: (1.3) kind of heh heh yeah heh (0.5) this kind of) you
11 know? to:: mm:: (2.5) {to prevent to your trousers from (.)
   [A’s HH move downwards x2]
13 A: falling down} (1.4) { {{you wear} (i think) this}} (2.0) mm?
   (B nods)
15 {(A’s II draw suspenders on her body})
16 A: (2.8) and then:: [his trousers and]
17 B: [in this picture ] (0.5) he (0.5) doesn’t
   wear (2.0) {the:: heh) heh heh=
   {B’s II draw suspenders on her body}
20 A: = okay
21 (1.0)
22 B: tirantes (‘suspenders’) heh heh mm
23 A: {okay}
24 (A nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten tirantes unha camisa está remangado
B: aquí non está remangado e tampouco ten tirantes

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (182-191):
A: os tirantes si
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

I: e ti can- cando te decataches de que te? dende o primeiro momento? decatâcheste de que eran tirantes?
B: non ca mimica que fixo
A: cando dixen fraga?
B: no despois diso
I: despois?
B: non porque fraga
A: e que bueno como se soe dicir verdade? véuseme a mente era o primeiro que se me veu a mente dixen bueno

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tirantes?

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (182-191):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-16: A presents an appeal for assistance followed by a circumlocution, they work in combination with a nonverbal strategy
- 9 and 14: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates she understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 17-19: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance. Agreement on meaning is reached.
- 18-19: B refashions the previous strategic utterance and provides a nonverbal strategy.
- 20: A accepts B’s refashioning providing an acknowledgment.
- 22: B tries to refashion the previous strategic utterance and provides a code switching strategy.
- 23-24 A accepts B’s presentation of a code switching strategy providing an acknowledgment.
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (174-182):
1  B: a:n::id what about? (1.0) his clothes?
2       (1.4)
3  A: his clothes? he’s wearing:::, a shirt?
4       (1.4)
5  B: {hm}
6       {B nods, AB look down}
7       (1.6)
8  A: with: a: {(2.8) mm (1.5) i don’t know, (2.6) ¨how do you call
9       {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve}
10 A: (0.7) this:, (3.0) you know?° (1.5) he has:, (1.5) his shirt,}
11      {this way.}
12      {A’s LI points to RA rolled up sleeve}
13      (2.0)
14 B: mm:: heh (2.4) in this picture, (1.0) {he:: has the shirt}
15      {B’s RH moves around her
16      LA wrist}
17      (1.4)
18 A: (in the normal position?)
19      {A waves her HH palms down}
20 B: {{in the normal position.}}
21      {{B nods}}
22 A: =yeah, heh heh okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten tirantes unha camisa está remangado
B: aqui non está remangado e tampouco ten tirantes
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (174-182):
A: quería dicir remangada e non sabía como dicilo
I: hm e ti entendiches
B: hm co xesto que facia
I: uhuh pola mímica e ti saberías dicir remangado?
B: no
...  
I: entón aquí entonces cando dis o de in the normal position
B: heh heh heh
I: e porque non
B: (coa camisa) estirado

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
shirt

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (174-182):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.15.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 8-12: A presents an appeal for assistance followed by an all-purpose expression, ‘this way.’, working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 14: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (174-182):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.15.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘unrolled’.
- 14-16: B presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 18: A is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. She refashions B’s initial CS substituting it with a circumlocution uttered with rising intonation, i.e. checking for B’s confirmation.
- 20-21: B confirms the correctness of A’s understanding and accepts her refashion by repeating her circumlocution with falling intonation and providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (210-215):
1 A: and then:: (4.0) it seems like _paper, in the {on the wall,
2 (A waves her RH
3 palm outwards
4 ×2, A holds the
5 gesture)
6 A: (4.4)} you can see the wall? m[m:: ]
7 B: {[yeah,]} inside the house.=
8 (B nods, B looks down)
9 A: =yeah in- inside the house, (1.7) mine is (2.2) e::h covered
10 with, (1.4) {flowers.}
11 (A opens her HH palms outward)
12 (3.0)
13 B: mine is completely white,
14 (0.8)
15 A: {white?} {mine has flowers,}
16 (B nods)
17 (A shakes her head)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

A: e a parede da casa parece como papel e os dibujos son e como de flores?
B: aquí nada todo é blanco

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (210-215):
A: ai non estaba segura de se se di aquí o papel de parede se se di igual pois papel de parede literalmente
I: cando dis paper in the wall
A: describo o que me parece que é si
I: e ti o papel de parede o papel de empapelar en inglés?
B: wallpaper
I: wallpaper e ti sabialo? por exemplo entendes que ela que é iso o que quere dicir?
B: si heh heh
I: pero sen embargo ti sabela palabra que ela non sabe e que está tratando de tal pero non lla?
B: como xa lle entendín heh heh heh heh heh
A: heh heh heh heh heh
B: e que pensei que non era porque non soubera a palabra porque por darlle máis voltas por non sei por explicalo doutra forma
I: pero ti cando dis o the paper on the wall é porque nese momento
A: non sei wallpaper hm

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (210-215):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wallpaper’.
- 1-5: A presents a circumlocution involving an approximation and working in combination with a nonverbal strategy
- 6: A pauses waiting for B’s acceptance, but B provides no indication of acceptance.
- 6 and 9-11: A refashions the previous strategy and initiates a new circumlocution that is uttered in two installments: 6 and 9-11.
- 7-8: B understands and indicates acceptance of the first installment providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- 13: B understands and indicates acceptance of the second installment and of the whole overall presentation providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- 15: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and repeats the previous circumlocution.
- B understands and accepts A’s presentation by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (205-210):
1 A: and the:: (2.1) you see the floor? of of the::, (1.4) of the
2 house.
3 B: yeah
4 A: inside the house. (2.2) mine is like {with e::h,} (7.4) tch is
5 (A’s II draw a square
6 in the air, A looks
7 down)
8 A: black and white.
9 (2.4)
10 B: mine is {only black,} (2.6) {only white,} heh heh [heh ]
11 {B shakes her head}
12 {B shakes her head}
13 A: [mine]
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

14 {is black and white,} again with: (2.0) quadrangles, >°or
15 {A nods, A looks down}
16 something like that°<

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o chao da que se ve na porta pois ten rombos blancos e negros
B: aquí nada é blanco todo

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (205-210):
A: quería dicir a cadros ... non nin se me pasou o sea quería dicir
A cadros e logo como máis fácil branco e negro e o dela como era
dun color seguido pois heh
...
I: entón ti aí que entendes?
B: pois nin
A: de calquera forma
B: que era branco e negro pero non sabía de que forma nin
...
I: ai non entendín moi ben o que dixeches quadrangles ou?
A: si porque o sea igual que ... mm en forma de cadrados ... si
seguro que da palabra cuadrangular saquei quadrangle inventei a
palabra xa literalmente
I: porque nese momento non
A: non
I: non sabías dicir cadrados?
A: si
...
I: pero sabes como se di cadrado
A: mm
B: squares
A: squares e que tiña na mente o a forma sabes? cando describes
alguna forma cua- cuadrada
...
A: non sabía dicir rombo e dixen cadrado que non e o mesmo

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (205-210):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘checkered’.
- 4-8: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 10-12: B interprets the strategic utterance literally and misunderstands the learner’s original meaning.
- B indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 13-16: A realizes that B may have misunderstood her original message and refashions her initial
strategy substituting it with a word coinage.
- B provides no evidence of her understanding of A’s original message. A does not know whether her
message has been understood or not, but does not try to negotiate for an agreement on meaning.
- Unsuccessful communication. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (266-274):
1 A: a:nd the (3.7) and the {tall man. (2.5) has a::, the right,
2 {A raises her RH clenched in a fist}
3 A: (3.3) the right, his right arm, (2.8) is: like this?
4 (3.0)
5 B: yeah, (1.5) {{hm=}}}
6 {{B nods}}
7 A: (=like a punch,) that

- 202 -
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

8       {A’s LH grabs her RH clenched in a fist}
9       (1.6)
10  B:   here it’s: (0.7) again (1.4) {(that way)=}
11       {B opens her RH}
12  A:   {=open?}
13  (A opens her LH)
14  B:   {(yes)}
15       {(B nods)}
16  A:   mine is closed, a:n::d the::
17  B:   in the same way that, (1.2) °the other picture,°

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   e o pai ten o brazo dobrado levantado? en forma de puño
B:   aquí ca man aberta
A:   ah! pois aqui co puño

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (266-274):
A:   non sabía dicir ter o brazo dobrado
...  
I:   e o do puño así cerrado? si sabías?
A:   si creo non sei si é aquí cando digo closed
...  
A:   quería dicir puño
I:   puño?
A:   en forma de puño
I:   cando dis like a punch o sea convencida de que se di así?
A:   si
I:   si
A:   é que eu penso que se di así

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (266-274):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘fist’.
- The learner makes a mistake. She believes that when she is using ‘punch’ she is using the correct TL lexical item for ‘puño’. Therefore there is no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (266-274):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘bent’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (277-279):
1  A:   the tall man, (1.8) is {like, (1.6) preparing, (1.0) himself,}
2       {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve, B is not looking}
3  
4  A:   {(2.4) to give mm::} (2.4) the other man, (1.5) a punch. (4.2)
5       {A holds the gesture, B is not looking}
6  A:   you know? {when:: when someone (2.3) e:::h (1.8) does
7       {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve}
8  A:   this::,} {°to give someone a punch°}
9       {A’s RH mimics punching}
10  B:   and the boy?

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (298-308):
1  B:   but in my:: picture, (1.7) the:: the tall man, (3.4) e:::h he’s
2       not preparing {to give the punch,} heh [heh ] to the: no,
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

3 {B’s RH mimics hitting someone, B is not looking}
4 [no!]?
5 A: =in mine he is, mm::
6 (1.4)
7 B: he’s going this:: (2.8) in the same way, (1.2) in the same way
8 as in the other: picture, (0.4) in the previous one,
9 A: (uhuh)
10 (A nods, AB look down)
11 (2.5)
12 B: and the boy, (1.8) he doesn’t [(xxx)]
13 (1.4) but in my picture, (1.0) (he’s gonna give him a
14 (B nods)
15 (A nods, AB look down)
16 (1.4)
17 A: punch.}
18 B: {(a punch)}
19 (B nods, AB look down)
20 A: he’s preparing himself,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai estase remangando e ten o puño cerrado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: está remangado o pai

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (277-282):
I: estaste referindo xa o de que se está remangando?
A: si
I: si?
A: si
... I: cando dis o de preparing himself to give the other man a punch
... eso xa o dis porque non sabes dicir o de que se está remangando
A: no o sea quería dicir que se está preparando
I: e aparte que se está remangando eso é depois non?
A: eu creo que se soubera a palabra de remangarse diría que se está preparando porque non me refería ó xesto de remangarse senón ó xesto este típico sabes? que a xente fai así algo así para
I: son dúas cousas separadas?
A: si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the tall man is talking, to the other man

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (277-279):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-9: A presents a nonverbal strategy, lines 2-3, 5 and 7, and an all-purpose expression ‘does this’ working in combination with the nonverbal strategy.
- B provides no evidence of her understanding of A’s original message. A does not know whether her message has been understood or not, but does not try to negotiate for an agreement on meaning.
- Unsuccessful communication. Agreement on meaning is not reached.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (298-308):
- There is no evidence of an intention to communicate the meaning ‘to roll up’ and therefore no CS.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-ADV LT

PARTICIPANT A: Luisa, female, 22, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 2 months in England

PARTICIPANT B: Toñi, female, 21, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 4 years in U.S.A.

REFERENT: to punch/fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-14):

1. A: e:h there is a: (0.8) a child, (0.5) a little boy, (0.8) who
   is (1.5) e:h (1.2) receiving (a:: blow?) (0.5) or (0.8)
   {A makes a fist with her LH,
   B is not looking}
2. A: something like that, (1.3) e:h she (0.7) he wears {a uniform,}
   {A’s LH
   points to
   her body}
3. A: (1.8) e::h (0.8) an::d (0.6) short (. ) trousers, (2.2) e::h in
   the second one, e:[h ]
4. B: [wai-] wait a minute, (0.5) okay, (1.2) so
5. A: e::h (2.8) tch he: is there a hand?
6. (2.4)
7. A: e::h
8. B: yeah, with? that is giving the blow?
10. (1.5)
11. B: and how many fingers does it have?
12. (2.2)
14. (1.6)
15. B: okay,
16. A: but {it’s not open, (1.0) it’s
   {A makes a fist with her LH}
17. B: it’s closed!?)
18. (1.5)
19. A: yeah=
20. B: =okay, mine is open. (1.0) heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (45-46):

1. A: e:::h (2.6) he:: sees (0.5) four stars, (2.0) e::h because of
   the blow, (1.5) and he has a:: black eye. (1.0) e::h his arms
   are open,
2. NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: hay bueno aparece un puño y un niño y y eso el puño como
   pegándole al niño
B: pero tiene la mano abierta y en la tuya cerrada
A: y en la mía tiene eso el puño
B: mm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (1-21):
I: cuando dices a blow? a lo mejor querías ser más específica y
decir puñetazo?
A: un puñetazo sí quería decir puñetazo
I: cuando ella dice lo de a blow tú que le entiendes?
B: es que no se no lo tomé por un puñetazo al principio
I: tú le entendías simplemente un golpe?
B: sí
A: sí sí yo ahí es que no sabía
I: ... tú cuando te diste cuenta de que le había dado un puñetazo? luego cuando lo de la mano cerrada?
B: sí porque claro el mío es un cachete no es un heh heh
A: bueno otra cosa cuando hablamos de la mano abierta mano cerrada es por no saber decir puño tb
I: entonces lo que haces es que describes como está la mano?
A: claro
I: y tú sabrías decir puño?
B: no o sea no en estos momentos

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (45-46):
I: antes dijiste lo de blow porque no te salía punch y aquí
A: no es que no sabía como se decía

REFERENT:
badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (25-30):
1 A: and the uniform, (.5) has a:: (.) kind of:: symbol.  (1.8)
2 {A’s RH points to where the badge
3 would be on her chest}
4 B: where?
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

6 A: e::h (2.6) he:: sees (0.5) four stars, (2.0) e::h because of
7 the blow, (1.5) and he has a:: black eye. (1.0) e::h his arms
8 are open,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (97-99):
1 A: and his son is: (0.5) pointing at his:: (1.0) i think at his::
2 (1.6) black eye?
3 (2.4)
4 B: okay in mine (1.0) the boy is not pointing at anything,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (120-122):
1 A: a::nd (2.8) a::nd (0.5) i can:: see only: (1.4) her black eye.
2 (2.2) only (0.5) that part of the face.=
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

3  B:  =well, eh in mine he didn’t have a black eye, (1.3) heh so.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  eh con un ojo morado
B:  en el mio no tiene ojo morado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  con un ojo morado
B:  el niño sigue llorando con el ojo morado

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (45-46):
I:  lo de black eye eso lo conocías?
A:  lo de black eye? lo conocía? no o sea fue
I:  cuando dices lo de black eye?
A:  el ojo morado no sé si se dice así
I:  entonces por qué dijiste black eye?
A:  pues también por el dibujo tiene un ojo eso normal y el otro negro
B:  lo de black eye sí que lo había oído
I:  tú le entendiste que se refería a morado?
B:  sí
I:  y aparte conocías?
B:  sí la expresión

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (97-99):
I:  y ahí vuelves a utilizar lo de black eye otra vez?
A:  claro como antes como antes funcionó heh heh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eye

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (45-46):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 2: A presents a circumlocution. She is unaware that this circumlocution is actually the intended TL lexical expression.
- 4: B understands the message and does not recognize A’s communicative problem. She indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (97-99):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 2: A presents a previously successful circumlocution strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (120-122):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’. // 1: A presents a previously successful circumlocution strategy. // 3: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-62):
1  A:  e::h he wears a:: (1.0) tie, also, (2.4) and a:: (4.8) >i
2  1 don’t know,< (0.7) the boy (. ) enters, crying,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-95):
1  A:  but (1.0) he:: (3.6) but no, i think mine (2.0) wears a:: heh
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

2       heh (3.4) pullover {without::t (2.8) e::h
3       {A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve
4       along her arm}
5       (1.2)
6 B:   without arms?
7 A:   {{arms}}
8       {{A nods}}
9       (2.0)
10 B:   oh! {{[mine] is just a shirt,}} (2.4) no pullover, (5.7) okay,
11       {{B shakes her head}}
12 A:         [mm  ]
13 B:   i think that’s it.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   tiene un chaleco en el tuyo sólo una camisa no?
B:   sí tiene una camisa

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (61-62):
B:   and a ahí no sabías o chaleco non?
A:   el chaleco ... yo estaba todo ya antes de la corbata yo le
quería decir tiene un chaleco heh pero dije bueno pues vamos por
el resto primero heh

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (90-95):
A:   ahí pues bueno ya dije veía los botones pero ya dije pues debe
haber algo
I:   si porque dice in the bottom of the tie tú no ves el bottom
realmente
A:   claro claro ahí ya dije
B:   es que claro yo ahí no sabía ni imaginé que podía llevar chaleco
o sea yo es que yo sabía que algo tenía que tener porque vamos
A:   ahí (xxx) sí ... y ella cuando cuando me di- o sea porque dijo
bueno seguro que no tiene chaleco ya lo estaba pensando ya desde
el principio pero cuando me dijo lo del bolsillo de la camisa
pues ya
...
A:   y ahí también no me salía mangas en ese momento y después sí
...
B:   el chaleco yo es que sabía a lo que se refería pero en ese
momento no es que son cosas que no ... cómo se dice chaleco?

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no pullover

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-62):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s
identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-95):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.17.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution, which includes an approximation ‘pullover’, and
a nonverbal strategy.
- 10: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance. She uses in her
presentation A’s previous approximation strategy.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (90-95):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.17.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘sleeve’: while trying to develop a circumlocution to compensate for the TL item ‘vest’ the learner encounters a second communicative problem, the lack of the TL item ‘sleeves’. A CS episode embedded in the previous CS episode is then initiated.
- 2-4: A presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance offering an approximation strategy that completes A’s presentation. She presents this strategy with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7-8: A confirms B’s understanding repeating the approximation B has just offered and providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father drops newspaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (101-105):
1  A:  e:::h (4.0) the newspaper of (3.7) the newspaper, (0.5) that
2       the father (0.8) the father has, (1.8) is on the floor now.
3 (1.5)
4  B:  okay, mine has it in his hands.
5 (2.2)
6  A:  a::nd {his hand (.) is open.}
7             {A opens RH, B is not looking}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  y abre la mano y se le cae el periódico al suelo
B:  en la mía tiene el periódico agarro

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (101-105):
A:  ahí quise decir que el periódico que se le cayó de las manos
I:  mhm como drop the newspaper o algo así?
A:  sí al abrir la mano que se le cayó
I:  y tú ahí qué entendiste?
B:  que estaba tirado

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
newspaper in his hands

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (101-105):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to drop’.
- 1-2: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (143-145):
1  B:  is there a number on the door?
2  A:  (no)
3  (A shakes her head)
4  B:  yes, mine has a number sixteen.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  tiene sólo bueno para llamar
B:  ah la mía no tiene para llamar
A:  ah heh heh
B:  aldaba heh heh

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (143-145):
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (143-145):
1 B: is there a number on the door?
2 A: {no}
3 {A shakes her head}
4 B: yes, mine has a number sixteen.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y como la como un una especie de buzón en la puerta o al- bueno
B: tampoco tiene (aquí)
A: de ranura
B: mecachis heh heh

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (143-145):
B: y ahí yo pensé bueno el mío tiene número el de ella no pues no
hay más fallos en la puerta
A: y yo pasé de eso porque no sabía cómo se decía el buzón ni ni la
aidaba
B: y claro después yo estaba intentado claro pues algún fallo tiene
que haber más yo estaba pensando bueno pues

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
falta buzón

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (143-145):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (185-189):
1 A: e::h and the child (/ˈtʃild/) the child now is:: (1.8) e::h
touching {his:: (0.5) well this part of the (heh)face, heh
{A’s RH touches her chin}
4 A: (2.5) [like this, ]
5 B: [is touching] the:? (1.2) okay.
6 A: his chin.) (1.5) e::h
7 (1.5)
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

8 B: in mine {he’s not touching his chin} at all, (2.0) at all,
9 {B shakes her head}
10 B: (9.0) okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y el niño eso así como pensativo no? tocándose la barbilla

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (185-189):
B: his chin
A: ahí luego me salió chin
I: claro dices this part of the face y tú cuando te diste cuenta de
que se refería a la barbilla?
B: con el gesto
A: con la mímica
I: y tú ahí sabes decir barbilla?
B: si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
not touching his chin

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (185-189):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 6: A is now able to present the previously unavailable TL lexical item chin.
- 8: B understands and accepts providing a relevant next utterance where she incorporates the TL item.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (232-239):
1 A: e::h (3.8) and he has e::h=
2 B: =he’s stan- he’s standing on the step? right?
3 A: {yeah=}
4 {A nods}
5 B: =or i- he’s inside the house? on the step.
6 (1.5)
7 A: and instead (0.5) of wearing:: a belt, {he has:: (1.5) ºi
8 (A’s LH outlines the
9 shape of a suspender
10 on her body)
11 A: don’t know°
12 B: ah!} mine has no belt, {and no::
13 {B’s HH outlines the shape of the
14 suspenders on her body}
15 A: heh heh
16 B: like steve urkel, (1.0) heh heh
17 (0.7)
18 A: e::h in the: (0.5) in the next picture,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: y el padre del niño grande no lleva los tirantes

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el de los tirantes

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh después el padre eh bueno eso el de los tirantes

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (232-239):
I: ahi ya ibas a decir a lo mejor lo de los tirantes?
A: si si ahi ya lo estaba pensando cómo digo los tirantes?
...  
I: tú ahí ya te diste cuenta a qué se refería?  
B: sí me di cuenta de lo que se refería pero es que no me acordaba de la palabra entonces bueno como steve urkel  
I: cuando te das cuenta? cuando ella hace la mímica a lo mejor?  
B: si no antes he has no no belt so he y cuan- sabía que ella no (xxx) y después hizo la mímica y ya

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:  
no belt or___?

ANALYSIS:  
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (232-239):  
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.  
- 1: A initiates the presentation of the meaning ‘suspenders’ but is interrupted by B.  
- 7-11: A presents an approximation and a complete omission strategy in combination with a nonverbal strategy.  
- 12: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance in which she repeats the previous combination of strategies used by A.  
- 16: B offers an alternative circumlocution strategy.  
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper  
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (201-202):  
1 A: a::n:d behi::n:d him, (1.8) there’s a:: wall, (1.4) e::h  
2 decorated with (. ) flowers, or  
3 B: {mine is plain.}  
4 {B shakes her head}  
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:  
A: eh hay se ve como una pared eso con  
B: si  
A: estampada de flores  
B: en la mia no tiene ni flores ni tiene el suelo con  
SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (201-202):  
I: ahí por ejemplo en lo de a wall decorated with flowers? ... no pensaste que fuera empapelada?  
A: quise decir un no sabía otra forma de decirlo  
I: entonces cuando dices lo de decorada te refieres a  
A: eso  
I: empapelado?  
A: o con flores pintadas  
I: y tú qué entiendes? simplemente?  
B: eh con flores pues empapelada o sea pero sí con  
A: bueno es porque es papel heh  
B: bueno pues ya encontramos la diferencia y punto o sea no  
I: y tú sabrías decir empapelado?  
B: eh papered o algo así?  
I: wall wallpaper  
B: wallpaper  
RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:  
wall decorated with flowers

ANALYSIS:  
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (201-202):  
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.7.  
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘painted’.
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- 1-2: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 3-4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (203-207):
1 A:   and the:: (1.8) the floor, (1.5) inside the house, has:: black
2       and white (1.0) squares?
3
4 B:   black and white tiles? (mine has no) tiles, heh heh=
5       {B shakes her head)
6 A:   (=squares no)
7       {A’s RI draws a square on the table}
8 B:   {(yeah, tiles, squares,)}
9       {(A’s RH draws a square in the air)}
10 A:   ah! (0.5) tiles.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:   en la mía no tiene ni flores ni tiene el suelo con
A:   y el suelo eso como un ajedrez

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (203-207):
I:   cuando dices cuadrados blancos y negros intentaste decir a lo
mejor baldosas?
A:   no quise decir eso porque tampoco sabía otra forma de decirlo
luego en español cuando lo describimos dije así como suelo de
ajedrez
I:   pero en inglés no se te ocurrió?
A:   no se me ocurrió
I:   y azulejos o sea las losetas estas? y ella te dice tiles y tú ahí
qué es lo que le entiendes?
A:   no a mi me recordaba a tejas o algo así por eso
I:   entonces no reconociste que tiles se refería a
A:   no luego ya cuando lo repitió

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black and white tiles

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (203-207):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘tiles’: B uses the TL item ‘tiles’, but A does not recognize it, i.e. the TL
item is not shared between learner and addressee.
- 4: B presents the item ‘tiles’.
- 6-7: A does not recognize this item. She believes B has misunderstood her previous message so she
refashions it repeating the previously used item ‘squares’ with a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-9: B recognizes A’s problem and repeats the item ‘tiles’ followed by a descriptive combination of
an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 10: A recognizes now the meaning of ‘tiles’ and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment
and repeating this item.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
communication of the original message are reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-273):
1 A: the father is not e::h pointing:: inside the house, he::’s (0.7) with his:: (2.5) [hand closed, as if]
2 [A clenches her RH in a fist, B is not looking]
3 (2.0)
4 B: eh but can you see both arms? and both [hands?]
5 A: only::: [no ] only one,
6 (1.0)
7 B: a::nd (1.0) [does]
8 A: [the ] right one.
9 B: and it has has it has got it closed or open?=
10 A: =closed
11 B: in mine is open.
12 (1.7)
13 A: closed.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y el otro cierra el puño no? ya como
B: sí en el mío no no

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (265-273):
A: lo del puño
I: utilizas otra vez lo de closed por puño?
A: sí

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father hand open father seems indifferent

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-273):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘fist’.
- 1-4: A presents a previously successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B ignores temporarily this part of A’s presentation
- 12: B asks for clarification
- 13: A repeats part of the previous circumlocution
- 14: B understands now and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 16: A repeats the previous circumlocution to assure understanding and both interlocutors indicate acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (299-302):
1 A: an::d (0.7) now i can see both (. ) arms of the father.
2 B: eh no, i can only see one.
3 A: e::h one, (1.5) [is folding his:: sleeve like (2.6) e::h (2.3)
4 [A’s LH grabs RA sleeve, B is not looking]
5 A: as if he::: (1.5) were going to::: (2.8) to hit someone.)
6 (5.4)
7 B: mine {he:::’s not, } he doesn’t intend to hit.
8 {B shakes her head}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (378-380):
1 A: and he’s {still with the sleeve e::h (2.5) upwards?}
2 (2.0)
3 (A’s LH points to RA sleeve over her elbow)
4 B: ah! okay, mine has no sleeve upwards, but as it the is it as
5  it’s the same so it’s not (2.8) i think that’s all

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  eh después en el siguiente eh ya se está remangando la manga de la camiseta
B:  no el mío so- aparte que sólo se le ve está en la misma actitud que en la en la vez anterior y sólo se le ve ese brazo

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (298-302):
A:  y ahí claro remangando pues no sabía
I:  ... y tú qué entiendes ahí?
B:  holding his sleeve eh así como no le voy a pegar no le voy a pegar porque sí no
I:  ah! entonces no entendiste lo de que se estaba remangando?
B:  no
I:  como que estaba agarrando su brazo?
B:  sí es que
I:  y tú te diste cuenta de que ella no te entendió o te pareció que sí que te estaba entendiendo?
A:  no no sé no sé porque luego creo que también te digo que tenía la manga como subida entonces no sé

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (298-302):
A:  ahí ella no sé si me entendió o no
B:  sí le entendi que tenía la manga subida
I:  mhm remangada?
B:  sí
I:  sin embargo no lo apuntaste aquí
B:  no pero sí ... es que hay cosas por ejemplo the badge que me preguntaste al principio si me acordaba o no y no me dijiste la palabra pero después ahora ahora me acordé y claro es badge

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
only one arm
not holding his sleeve

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (298-302):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 3-5: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7-8: B believes she has correctly understood the message and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance. According to the retrospective comments she has in fact misunderstood the message.
- A does not recognize the misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- B misunderstands A and A has no evidence of B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (378-380):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.8.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4-5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and a relevant next utterance that incorporates the approximation strategy just presented by A.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (341-343):
1 B: an::d (1.5) does this uniform have the: same? eh e:::h (2.7)
2 "well" (1.5) {the symbol?}
3 {B’s RI points to where the badge would be on her
4 chest}
5 A: {yeah.}
6 {A nods}
7 (2.0)
8 B: this one doesn’t have.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (366-370):
1 A: a:n::d (1.5) {the:: (2.0) the hat, he wears,} e:::h (1.7) has
2 {A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her
3 head and moves in circles}
4 A: the same symbol as the uniform.
5 (4.4)
6 B: okay, i don’t have well it’s not a hat. well i don’t have no
7 hat, no (heh)symbol, [and heh] heh
8 A: [heh heh]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: el mío ni tiene visera ni tiene la insignia de la visera ni nada
en la chaqueta

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (341-343):
I: ahí con lo de symbol vuelve a ser io de la insignia
B: si

... I: utilizáis symbol todo el rato porque con eso os entendéis?
A: claro
I: pero no porque penséis que esa es la palabra?
A: no no no
B: es badge! o algo así
I: badge si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no symbol on the big boy’s uniform

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (341-343):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-4: B presents a combination of a previously successful approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-6: A understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 8: A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (366-370):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-4: A presents a previously successful combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6-7: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance in which she includes a repetition of the approximation strategy.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-ADV MM

PARTICIPANT A: María, female, 23, Spanish L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 2 weeks in U.S.A., regular contact with English native speakers

PARTICIPANT B: Mónica, female, 22, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, Erasmus student during 1 year in England

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (128-137):

1. A: e:h (.) oh! {the jacket has?} (0.8) in the first too, has a [A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her chest, AB look down]
2. A: (0.5) [a::: (1.4)], no not a sword. (.) {the thing (you) go [A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest and draws circles, AB look down]
3. A: (0.5) {a::: (1.4)}, no not a sword. (.) {the thing (you) go [A’s RH mimics stabbing a sword on her chest, A looks down}
4. A: with a sword.) (1.0) a {a shield. e::h like a college shield [A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest}
5. A: (.) on it.
6. B: on the first one?
8. B: ye:ah. (0.8) okay.
10. B: [okay]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

A: eh la chaqueta tiene un escudo supuestamente el escudo del colegio

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (128-137):

B: ai shield eu súbemo porque me fixo así que eu non sabía que shield era escudo

I: ah pola mímica? no por?

A: es que yo ...

B: como cando onde levas dixo cando levas a espada ou algo así díxeches?

A: sí sí heh not a sword the thing you go with a sword ... lo primero que me salía era espada y entonces era como la cosa que llevas con la espada es

I: el escudo y por ejemplo cuando utilizas shield ahí para la para el escudo ese para la insignia? quiero decir

A: no tengo ni idea de cómo se dice escudo de insignia en inglés ...

I: pero entón ti entérate non polo shield senón?
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

B: non fíxome así e o saber que era un uniforme pois supuxen que seria o

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

jacket (shield)

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (128-137):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-14: A presents a circumlocution, ‘no not a sword. (. ) the thing (you) go with a sword.’, a literal translation, ‘a a shield.’, and a circumlocution involving a literal translation, ‘like a college shield’, working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 15: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 16: A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (191-198):
1 A: and he’s wearing a:: (0.8) psk (1.3) a:: he’s wearing a sh- a  
2 long shirt long (0.3) sleeve shirt, (0.8) (a::n:d)  
{A’s RH points to  
her neck, AB look  
down} 
3  
6 (0.8)  
7 B: tie?  
8 A: a tie. (0.5) >how how do you call the word again?< (0.6)  
9 {this part heh heh) (0.5) it’s a (0.3) not belt, (.) it is not  
10 (A’s RH grabs her pullover)  
11 A: belt, it’s (. ) like belt? (0.5) no but that’s, (0.8) no that’s  
12 not it. heh [heh heh ]  
13 B: [okay like] a pocket?  
14 (2.6)  
15 A: yeah, {no two two of them,}  
16 {A holds up two fingers}  

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (207-211):
1 A: e::h it seems (. ) that that (0.5) mm::: cloth, (. ) i:::s (0.4)  
2 too tight for him because (. ) over the: (1.0) the: (. ) near  
3 the (. ) {second button of the, (0.5) that [cloth] whatever it  
4 (A’s RI points to where the button would be on her  
belly} 
5  
6 B: [yeah ]  
7 A: is), hhh e:::h there are two lines  

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (354-358):
1 A: e:::h i can see the (. ) two (xx) of the: (1.4) {vest!} (. ) is  
2 {A waves her  
RH} 
4 A: that the word? (1.2) {vest?=}  
5 {A’s HH point to her chest} 
6 B: ={i don’t know} no no idea.  
7 {A moves her RH to the forehead and looks down like thinking}  
8 (0.6)  
9 A: mm:::) (heh)okay. heh heh  
10 B: heh heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (408-414):
1 A: {and the at at the end of the vest? (1.6)} *(yeah it’s vest,  
2 {A’s II point to where the buttons would be on her belly)
A holds up her RI

A: like live life vest.º) hhh (heh)yeah. hhh e::h=
B: =heh heh [heh]
A: [heh] heh heh heh hhh (.) yeah you see: (.)
B: =he’s not wearing a vest. (.)} [no: (.) no: ]
A: [he’s not wea]ring a vest!!

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (435):
1 A: well well he’s wearing a vest. (.) heh heh heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (448-450):
1 B: it had a vertical line, (0.5) that was [the vest, ]
2 A: [MAYBE, (.)] maybe, (0.3) it’s just (.) maybe that’s it. (1.4) he’s wearing a
3 (0.3) vest.
4 (1.0)
5 B: yeah heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (480-482):
1 A: eh >the the the::< the vest? (0.4) i- is no {he’s not
2 A opens her AA}
3 A: (heh)wearing (heh)a (heh)vest so, (.) nothing [at] (heh)all.}
4 B: {{no}}
5 (B shakes her
6 head)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (676-678):
1 A: you see the the two? the (0.5) no, (0.5) of course you don’t.
2 (1.0) you don’t (heh)see (xxx) the vest, heh you can’t see
3 [heh ] heh
4 B: [no! heh]
5 A: heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA: A: tiene un chaleco

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (191):
A: sí sí estaba descaradamente pensando en el chaleco y me di el
tiempo de decir todas las prendas antes de decir el chaleco

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (194-197):
A: es porque
B: eu aí pensei que me estabas dicindo bolsillo que o bolsillo da
camisa tiña algún nome especifico entonces estabas intentando
buscar o nombre do bolsillo
A: no era
B: é dicir que
A: era
B: aquí aquí eu dicialle eu dicía pero pretenderá buscar o nome do bolsillo
A: no yo es que era
B: dixéchesme two two despois dixéchesme dos dos e eu pois nada era
o nome do bolsillo
A: no es que yo decía
B: eh despois cando xa me dis
A: chaleco y dije el chaleco para acordarme de chaleco me tengo que
acordarme de chaleco salvavidas entonces sólo me salía cinturón
de seguridad es que no había otra cosa y yo pero no es cinturón
no es cinturón hasta no me salió hasta muchísimo más abajo
I: e ti cando te decatas de que? de que leva distinta roupa? de que
B: puf!
I: ata que non?
B: uy! mogollón aí por aquí eu penso
I: ti aí todo todo ese tempo pensabas que el que o outro señor que
levaba unha camisa que simplemente que a camisa os bolsillos
B: que o tío que levaba camisa claro que tiña dous bolsillos en lugar de un

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (207-211):**
A: esa prenda porque no tengo ni idea heh
I: esa prenda por e e ti que lle entendiches?
B: ah! nada
A: si jo yo es que hice lo que pude pero es que no me salía la palabra
B: eu convencidísima de que tiña algún nome específico o bolsillo da camisa

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (408-419):**
A: estaba toda orgullosa eh de que me hubiera salido

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
vest

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (191-211):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- Message abandonment used as a postponement strategy

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (191-198):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 8-12: A presents an appeal for assistance and an approximation ‘not belt’, working in combination with an all-purpose expression and a pointing nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 14: A confirms B’s understanding, even though it is wrong, and continues with the conversation building on what B has just presented. A accepts B’s indication of understanding even though it reveals a misunderstanding.
- Unsuccessful communication. B has misunderstood A’s originally intended message. A recognizes this misunderstanding but does not indicate it to B and does not try to negotiate for meaning. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (191-211):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 35: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 37: A repeats the previous approximation strategy.
- B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A has no evidence of B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (354-358):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-5: A uses what she believes may be the intended TL lexical item with rising intonation, i.e. checking for B’s confirmation.
- 6: B does not know the TL lexical item. She does not understand A’s intended meaning and cannot confirm the form provided by A.
- 9: A decides to continue with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. No agreement on form and no agreement on meaning are reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (408-414):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-4: A presents the intended TL lexical item and a circumlocution strategy.
- 5: B accepts A’s presentation with an acknowledgment.
- 6: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and presents an approximation strategy followed by the intended TL lexical item ‘vest’.
- 8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance including the intended TL lexical item provided by A.
10: A accepts B’s acceptance providing a relevant next utterance which includes also the intended TL lexical item.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (435):
- The TL lexical item ‘vest’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (448-450):
- The TL lexical item ‘vest’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (480-482):
- The TL lexical item ‘vest’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (676-678):
- The TL lexical item ‘vest’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT:
father drops newspaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (242-244):
1 A: as the father realizes that the guy is coming crying, he:: (.)
2 mm (.). leaves the newspaper, so it goes to the floor.
3 (1.2)
4 B: ah!

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (304-308):
1 A: well the e::h {the the hand (0.5) that left the: paper fall
2 {A waves her HH
3 A: down, it has} {five fingers.}
4 {A raises her LH and closes and opens it}
5 (2.0)
6 B: mm::

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: y el padre tiene todavía el periódico en la mano
A: ah! no el periódico está en el suelo

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: aquí claro porque han dejado caer el periódico
A: han dejado caer el periódico

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (242-244):
A: no me salía caerse heh mira que soy tonta
I: ah! entonces
A: se va al suelo directamente heh ... hubiera dicho the newspaper falls pero es que de repente no no se me ocurrió
B: eu entendinlle igual eh heh heh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
newspaper-floor

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (242-244):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to fall down’
- 2: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgement.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (304-308):
-
- The previously unavailable TL item ‘to fall down’ is now available and used, therefore there is no need for a CS.

**REFERENT:** father’s angry/father looks angry/father is frowning

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (337-338):**

1. A: the father seems to be very angry.
2. (1.0)
3. B: yeah,

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (359-361):**

1. A: e:::h (1.8) tch (0.7) {the the eyebrows of the father see-
2. {A’s II draw a vi on her eyebrows ×n}
3. A: mm:: show] that he is: (0.5) that he’s angry, like, (0.8)
4. {going up down and down up.] =
5. {A’s RI draws a line up and a line down on her eyebrows}
6. B: =ah no!

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (474-475):**

1. A: heh heh heh e:::h he is (.). he’s also angry, {the the::: (0.5)
2. {A’s II draw a vi
3. on her eyebrows
4. ×n}
5. A: eyebrows go the same.)
6. (1.2)
7. B: no.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (658):**

1. A: he seems to be very angry now,

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: lleva la está enfadado no sé si en la tuya estaba enfadado
B: aquí es que se ve una raya muy pequeña sólo
A: una!?
B: y y las cejas normales y corrientes
A: bueno yo no veo la boca porque veo un bigote enorme
B: claro
A: pero las cejas están así
B: no aquí no o sea normales muy pequeñas
A: hm

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: y sigue enfadado
B: sí con cara de

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (359-361):**

A: no sé como se dice fruncido
B: entendin que as cellas eu pensei que as cellas estaban así en
A: era fruncido
B: en pico
A: upside down downside up
B: como claro e eu entendinche que eran así as dúas un triángulo
A: si
B: po caso
I: y ti saberías dicir co ceño fruncido?
B: non así que como no dixera tampouco o ía entender heh

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
eyebrows

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (337-338):**

- There is no intention to communicate the meaning ‘frowning’ and therefore no CS.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (359-361):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘frowning’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment ‘ah’ and a relevant next utterance ‘no!’, indicating that this is different in her version of the pictures.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (474-475):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘frowning’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance ‘no’, indicating that this is different in her version of the pictures.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (658):
- There is no intention to communicate the meaning ‘frowning’ and therefore no CS

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (377-380):
1 B: (no handle?)
2 {B’s RH mimics grabbing a door handle and opening a door}
3 (0.6)
4 A: (no there’s,) (0.5) the (0.3) [kind] of thing you use to
5 {A’s RH mimics grabbing a knocker and knocking}
6 B: [okay]
7 A: knock?} (0.6) a::n:d the::

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (457-459):
1 B: number, (. ) on the door:. (. ) handle, (. ) no handle. (0.5) we-
2 well you had, (0.5) (like a, (0.8) something to knock?
3 {B’s RH mimics knocking on a door}
4 (0.4)
5 A: >yeah yeah yeah<}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (489-490):
1 A: ah! (0.5) (he’s knocking. (1.6) but not using the handle like
2 {A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking}
3 A: toc toc toc.) (0.5 ) and the:: the guy is: (0.8) like
4 caressing his chin.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: la manilla
A: es redonda y eso y
B: aquí nada

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (377-380):
A: no sé cómo se dice llamador
I: mhm vale y primero utilizas handle o algo así no?
B: no eso díxenllo eu se tiña a manilla porque se non ten nada
...
A: la cosa con la que se usa para llamar
B: para chamar
A: es que ni siquiera cómo se dice en español?

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (458-460):
A: es porque este no tiene nada
B: no que non ten di- di- que non ten manilla e dixen bueno ti
díxeches que tiña chamador o sea en vez de manilla ten chamador

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (489-490):
I: y aquí he’s knocking but not using the handle entonces que estás diciendo handle por knocker?
A: porque lo había dicho ella
I: pero
A: si si no lo hubiera dicho no usando el aparato para llamar sino haciendo toc toc toc
I: cuando usas handle lo usas pensando que así se dice llamador? o conscientemente de que no?
A: no pensando que así piensa ella que se dice llamador heh porque yo no tengo ni idea
I: vale
B: no eu chamador supuxen que é knocker pero tampouco
A: así le iba a quedar claro

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
handle

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (377-380):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 4-7: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance by moving on to the next topic.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (457-459):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 2-3: B repeats a successful previous combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: A understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (489-490):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1: A presents an approximation.
- B understands and acceptance allowing A to continue.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-381):
1 A: a:n:id {the:: (0.4) that hole} {for the letters. (0.6) the
2 {A’s HH draw a rectangle in the air}
3 {A’s RH mimics dropping mail in
4 a mailbox ×n}
5 A: ma::il? (1.2) box} “or whatever”,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (460-462):
1 B: and the mailbox.
2 (1.5)
3 A: you don’t have a mailbox?
4 B: (no.)
5 (B shakes her head)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y la la típica ranura para meter cartas
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-381):
A: y lo mismo para el agujero del correo
I: hm
A: es el agujero del correo o la caja del correo heh
I: y luego le vas a decir mailbox creo? o
A: si la caja del correo
B: si si eu apuntei mailbox si
I: y cuando dices mailbox? mm a ver lo dices convencida de que se dice así? o a lo mejor tú lo conoces para otras cosas y lo aplicas aquí?
A: no para mí para mí mailbox es la
B: é un buzón eu pensei que era buzón
A: eso que es como una casita de pajaritos sabes?
B: eu imaxinei un buzón un buzón si un buzón como na parede
A: ah!
B: pero no non sabía que era a ranura da

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
mailbox

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-381):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy, followed by an approximation. The approximate term used is actually the originally intended TL lexical item, but the learner is not aware of this.
- B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning because she has interpreted the CS literally.
- A does not realize B’s misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstand B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (460-462):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1: B presents ‘mailbox’.
- 3: A interprets ‘mailbox’ as an approximation strategy, but it is not.
- Unsuccessful communication. No agreement on meaning is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (523-530):
1 A: {ah! mm mm (1.0) how are these things called?} {the things
2 (A’s HH outlines the shape of suspenders on her body, A looks
3 down)}
4 {A’s HH mimics
5 pulling up her
6 pants, A looks
7 down}
8 A: you, (1.4) you: pick your trousers} {with?}
9 {A’s HH outlines the shape
10 of suspenders on her
11 body, A looks down}
12 (0.8)
13 B: ah! (1.5) yeah,
14 A: heh heh
15 B: (xxx)=
16 A: =tights! heh [heh ] hhh heh heh
17 B: [yeah]
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

18 (1.5)
19 B: tirantes (‘suspenders’)?
20 A: (yeah. heh heh) heh
21 (A nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: si los tirantes?
A: tirantes

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (523-530):
A: ahi me monté una película yo sola
B: como se di tirantes?
I: mhm braces
B: eu ai tirei- entendino porque fixo mímica
A: y tú dijiste tirantes después
... 
A: si pero es que no sé si se dice así lo traduje directamente
B: ah! eso es de tirante tight
I: heh heh heh
B: non me parara a pensalo para nada
A: ves yo traduzco mujer yo cuando no sé hacerlo yo traduzco
B: ah! pues es que no no sabía porque decias tights no porque
A: claro cuando algo está tirante está tight heh se dice así en
inglés americano

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tirantes

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (523-530):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-11: A presents an appeal for assistance and a circumlocution working in combination with a
  nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 14: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment. Agreement on meaning is reached.
- 16: A refashions her initial presentation, substituting the previous strategies with a literal translation.
- 17: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer.
- 19: B refashions A’s presentation, substituting the previous strategies with a code switching.
- 20-21: A accepts B’s presentation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
  reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (553-561):
1 A: the {the sleeves are:, (2.2) like rounded to the to
2     (A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve)
3 A: take them ] up.=
4 B: [the what?]
5 B: =the? 
6 A: the sleeves of the:: [shirt,] the::,} the small man shirt.
7 B: [ah! ] 
8 A: (2.4) {like, (1.2) when you (0.8) pull them [up?]}} (0.5)
9     (A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve)
10 B: [up?]
11 A: rolling them?
12 (0.5)
13 B: yeah

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (701-703):
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1 A: well (0.3) you know at the: the {the sleeves were ro::lled up?  

2 {\text{A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve}}
3  
4 (0.5)
5 B: yeah.
6 (0.5)
7 A: for the small man}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: las mangas de la camisa

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (553-561):
A: no sé como se dice remangarse rolled up?
I: sí to roll up o sí e ti entendiches non?
B: si
I: polo que te dicía? ou pola mímica? polas dúas cosas?
A: yo creo que fue una combinación heh
B: eu pen- si
I: e ti sabes dicir que as mangas remangadas
B: rolled up non? o sea eu non sei se hai outra forma de

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
rolled sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (553-561):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’
- 1-3: A presents a circumlocution strategy, ‘like rounded to the to take them up.’, involving an approximation ‘rounded’ and working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 4-5: B does not understand A’s presentation well enough for the current purposes and asks for clarification.
- 8-11: A refashions the previous presentation. In line 6 she adds the information requested by B, which is accepted by means of a continuer in 7. In lines 8-9 she presents a new circumlocution and repeats the previous nonverbal strategy.
- 10: B is still unsure of her understanding and asks for confirmation.
- 11: A refashions her initial presentation and presents a new approximation strategy, ‘rolling’.
- 13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (701-703):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.4.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’
- 1-3: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy. The approximate term used is actually the originally intended TL lexical item, but the learner is not aware of this.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (657-658):
1 A: he is li:::ke {threatening:, with his e:::h closed} (0.8) hand
2 {A clenches her RH in a fist to imitate the father}
3  
4 A: (2.2) like if he was going to punch somebody, (0.5)
5 A: (hm!) (2.0) he seems to be very angry now,
6 (A clenches her RH in a fist to imitate the father)
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:   sí y el otro amenazante
A:   hm sí

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (657-658):
A:   fist es porque no me salía fist dije closed hand porque no me salía

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
threatening

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (657-658):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'fist'.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father 2 calling someone/ turns round and calls his son

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (641-650):
1  B:   in the next one the small::: (0.5) man is looking inside,
2       (1.0)
3  A:   shouting? (0.5) like?= 
4  B:   =shouting? 
5  A:   yeah she he’s calling somebody. 
6       (2.5)
7  B: he is (.). just (.). looking,= 
8  A:   =he is e:h in fact, (1.2) he i:::s e:::h, (0.8) {he has moved 
9       (A opens her RH 
10        and takes it 
11        to her mouth 
12        imitating the 
13        small man ×3} 
14  A:   his hand to hi- near his (0.8) face mouth (0.8) li:ke,} (1.5) 
15       (well [to make the echo:::,]) 
16       (A waves her HH) 
17  B: 
18  A:   =yeah. 
19  B:   yeah okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:   aquí era que estaba
A:   llamando hacia adentro
B:   y remangándose la camisa
A:   ah no no no estamos hablando de la diez
B:   de la diez
A:   cuatro y cuatro ocho
B:   ah! sí gritando
A:   para adentro está llamando a alguien
B:   si

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (641-650):
A:   ah! no si sí es que no lo que yo quería dar a entender era otra cosa era que se ponía como para hacer altavoz ... pero no me salía porque no es como speaker heh entonces entonces pues quando haces eco pues también lo haces entonces pues recurrió a la segunda opción
...
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

B: cando dixo que levantara a mao dixen que supuña que era parte de de que estaba
A: gritando si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
shouting

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (641-650):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘loudspeaker’.
- 8-16: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 17: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance. This is initiated as soon as B realizes she has understood A’s intended meaning, even before A has actually finished her presentation.
- 18: A accepts B’s acceptance continuing on with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (701-711):
1 A: well (0.3) you know at the: the {the sleeves were ro::lled up?
2    {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve}
3 (0.5)
4 B: yeah.
5 (0.5)
6 7 A: for the small man?)
8 B: yeah=
9 A: =the the the:: big man is doing the same. ((1.2) he is, (2.2)
10    {A’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve, B is not looking}
11 (1.5)
12 B: yeah
13 14 A: doing it now.) (3.0) now i see (maybe) he wants to punch
15 somebody, (1.5) you see it?
16 (1.5)
17 B: yeah
18 19 A: o[kay]
20 21 B: [no ] i don’t have it here but (. ) you said it before, (0.8)
22 he’s threa[tening.
23 24 A: [ah! it’s,] maybe it’s the same thing maybe it’s not
25 (0.5)
26 (0.5)
27 B: yeah, okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: aquí era que estaba
A: llamando hacia adentro
B: y remangándose la camisa

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: en la once es cuando se se remanga la camisa
A: si se esta remangando la camisa eh y sigue enfadado

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
rolling up the sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (701-711):
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’
- 1-3: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy. The approximate term used is actually the originally intended TL lexical item, but the learner is not aware of this.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (701-711):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 9-15: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression ‘doing the same.’ and ‘doing it now.’, and a nonverbal strategy. After the CS A pauses but B offers no response. A checks for B’s comprehension ‘you see it?’
- 17: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 18: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: cap

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (750-757):
1 A: and well he’s wearing a (1.2) {a: cap? like a baseball cap?}
2 (A’s RH points to where the cap would be on her head)
4 A: (1.8) {with the::, (2.0) tch the the shield i told you,) (1.5)
5 (A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest and draws circles)
7 A: {the::, (1.0) the shield,) he the [bo- ] the small man (0.5)
8 (A’s HH point to where the badge would be on her chest and draw circles)
10 B: [yeah]
11 A: well he has the, (0.5) the shield on the:, (on the cap)
12 (A’s RH points to where the cap visor would be on her forehead)
14 15
16 A: {and on the jacket. (1.5) you know a c d c!? (1.5) the}
17 (A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest)
18 A: [band?]} {eh heh [heh heh]) heh heh
19 B: [yeah ]
20 21 B: [A nods]
[heh heh]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: aquí no tiene gorra
A: habría que ver a la madre heh
B: tiene el pelo como si fuese gorra pero es pelo
A: no aquí tiene una gorra

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (750-757):
A: no no es que no sé si cap era sólo gorra o puede ser otro tipo de cubrimiento cabecero heh entonces pero tampoco era una baseball cap porque era de un de colegio no era de entonces pues like a baseball cap

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
cup

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (750-757):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘cap’.
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1-3: A presents an approximation ‘cap?’, followed by a circumlocution involving the previous approximation ‘like a baseball cap?’. These strategies work in combination with a nonverbal strategy.

- B understands and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue.

- A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.

- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (750-757):**

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘cap’.

- A presents a combination of the previous approximation and a nonverbal strategy.

- B indicates acceptance allowing A to continue.

- B understands and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue.

- A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.

- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** freckles

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (758-766):**

1  A: e:::h (1.2) he {has e::h, (1.2) dots.} ah! how is this?
2       {A’s RI draws dots on her cheek}
3    (1.0)
4  B: the mm nada (‘nothing’).
5  A: (how how do you call e:h?
6       {A’s RI points to her cheek}
7    (1.8)
8  B: I don’t know the name.)
9    (1.5)
10 A: cool heh heh heh=
11 B: ={little brown dots!}
12       {B’s LI draws dots on her cheek}
13    (0.5)
14 A: {little brown dots.}
15       {A nods}
16 B: okay)
17 A: heh heh

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

B: las pecas?
A: pecas

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (758-766):**

A: pecas
B: nin idea
A: cómo se dice?
I: freckles
A: freckles?

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**

pecas

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (758-766):**

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.

- 1-2: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy, followed by an appeal for assistance.

- 4: B understands and tries to provide a native like form but is unable to do it.

- 5-6: A presents a combination of an appeal for assistance and a nonverbal strategy.

- 8: B understands and indicates acceptance of meaning providing a relevant next utterance. Agreement on meaning is reached.
- 11-12: B refashions A’s previous CS substituting them with a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 14-15: A understands and indicates acceptance of meaning and form by repeating B’s CS.
- 16: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (750-757):

1 A: and well he’s wearing a (1.2) {a: cap? like a baseball cap?}
   (A’s RH points to where the cap would be on her head)
2 A: (1.8) {with the::, (2.0) tch the the shield i told you,} (1.5)
   (A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest
   and draws circles)
3 A: {the::, (1.0) the shield,} he the [bo- ] the small man (0.5)
4 A: {A’s HH point to where the badge would be on her chest and
draw circles}
5 (A’s RH points to where the cap visor would be on her forehead)
6 A: (and on the jacket. (1.5) you know a c d c!? (1.5) the
7 A: (A’s RH points to
8 where the cap visor would be on
9 her forehead)
10 A: (and on the jacket. (1.5) you know a c d c!? (1.5) the
11 A: (A’s RH points to
12 where the cap visor would be on
13 her forehead)
14 A: [band?]} {eh heh [heh heh]} heh heh
15 A: [band?]} {eh heh [heh heh]} heh heh
16 B: [yeah]
17 A: well he has the, (0.5) the shield on the:, {on the cap}
18 (A’s RH points to
19 where the cap visor would be on
20 her forehead)
21 A: [band?]} {eh heh [heh heh]} heh heh
22 B: [yeah ]
23 A: [heh heh]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: heh eh lo del escudo
B: sin bolsillo ni bueno era era un escudo? era no?
A: es un escudo sí y

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (750-757):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 4-9: A presents a combination of a previously successful literal translation and a nonverbal strategy.
  After the CS A pauses but B offers no response. A repeats the previous combination of a literal translation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 10: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer and allowing A to continue with the conversation. Agreement on meaning and successful communication of the original message is reached.
- 11: A repeats the literal translation strategy
- B understands and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue with the conversation.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
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DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-ADV SO

PARTICIPANT A: Silvia, female, 22, Spanish L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 1 month in England, 5 months in U.S.A.

PARTICIPANT B: Ovidio, female, 22, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 1 year in U.S.A., regular contact with English native speakers

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (21-23):
1  A:  e:::h there’s a: the same boy, heh (1.4) e::h wi::th:, the:,
2       with a black eye, heh heh
3       (2.7)
4  B:  yeah

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (33-34):
1  B:  the: he has a::, a black eye? now?
2       (0.6)
3  A:  yes

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  hay un niño pues que ya con la con el golpe en el ojo con el ojo morao

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (21-23):
A:  sí quería decir ojo morado pero no sé decirlo
I:  ah! entonces cuando dices lo de black eye es por ojo morado? no?
A:  sí ... tú me entendiste lo que quería decir?
B:  perfectamente

...  
B:  sí si si eu sabía que se refería a eso
I:  y tú sabías que ojo morado se decía black eye?
A:  se dice black eye ojo morado?
I:  sí
A:  ah! mira que bien!
B:  si eu a min sóame heh
A:  heh
B:  non con certeza pero si

...  
A:  no yo lo decía o sea quería decir ojo morado pero como no sabía decir ojo morado cómo era exactamente pues dije ojo morado o sea ojo negro

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK: no black eye

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (21-23):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'black eye'.
- 1-2: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing on the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (33-34):**
- B knows and uses the TL item ‘black eye’. There is no need for a CS.

---

**REFERENT:** painful face/painful expression/curved mouth

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (28-39):**

1  A:  a:n::d (2.6) mm mm, (2.6) e:::h (2.8) he’s like (0.5) mm::,
2       (4.2) “i don’t know”
3       (3.2)
4  B:  he is:
5       (1.8)
6  A:  he has his face as mm,
7       (2.4)
8  B:  where is the:?  
9       (1.2)
10 A:  eh?
11      (0.6)
12 B:  the: he has a::, a black eye? now?
13      (0.6)
14 A:  yes
15      (2.8)
16 B:  the:: (0.5) is:: his mouth open? heh
17 A:  no
18      (0.5)
19 B:  no?
20 A:  it’s closed.
21      (1.3)
22 B:  it’s, he’s like? (2.8) of course he is, (0.5) heh heh

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A:  eh parece que está un poco noqueado heh

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (28-39):**
A:  ah! porque no me salía la palabra para decir lo de que estaba que tenía así la cara porque es que tampoco sé decirlo en español o sea no no me sale así un adjetivo
I:  como que tiene
A:  está noqueado
...  
I:  e ti que pensas? que a súa cara é como a túa ou?
B:  ... si si porque cando non apuntei nada é que ...
A:  si yo lo de noqueado yo quería decir aquí que el al niño le pasaba algo pero aquí no me salía
...  
A:  lo de aquí lo de la expresión de la cara que no sabía decirlo

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
---

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (28-39):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘shocked’.
- 1-2: A presents a message abandonment strategy.
- 6: A presents a message abandonment strategy.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (58-62):
1 A: e::h (0.4) he has two buttons, e:h in bueno ('well'), (1.3)
2   {e::h he wears a:::} {a waistcoat? (4.4)} (and he has two
3     {A’s RI points to her shoulder ×2, A holds the gesture}
4     {A’s RI outlines an armhole on her LA
5     shoulder ×2, A holds the gesture}
6     where the buttons
7     would be on her
8     chest ×2 }
9
10 A: buttons, on it,) (2.6) a:n::d mm
11 (1.2)
12 B: a waistcoat!? (0.6) what’s that?
13 A: heh heh heh °chaleco ('vest')° heh
14 B: ah! (1.0) (heh) okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (71-74):
1 B: does he have a::? (2.2) {a little pocket} in the::?
2   {B’s RI points to where the pocket
3     would be on her chest, A is not
4     looking}
5   (1.4)
6 A: two. (0.6) [two ] little, pockets, and the: boy too.
7 B: [two?]

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (114-118):
1 B: and he’s wearing a::?
2 (1.2)
3 A: the same clothes,
4 (0.5)
5 B: okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (370-373):
1 A: and he has pockets. (0.5) {two. on the: waistcoat.
2   {A’s HH point to where the buttons
3     would be on her belly, B is not
4     looking}
5   (4.6)
6 B: okay but the chi-, (1.6) your child is wearing a: waistcoat?}
7 A: no! [the father, ] the father,
8 B: [in all the pictures?]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: mm un chaleco con dos botones
B: hm
A: eh tiene dos bolsillos también en el chaleco

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (58-62):
A: estaba casi segura ... pero como me puso cara de ... hombre yo yo
   es que lo dije así toda la vida pero no
B: no porque é que eu non sabía como se dicía como se di chaleco en
   inglés
I: mm entón cando ela di que di waistcoat ti que pensaches que era?
B: eu o primeiro que pensei supuxen que que seria un un chaleco
   porque coat waistcoat
I: heh
B: saqueino más ou menos polas súas palabras e tal pero eso ó final
   acabamos dicindo a palabra en gale- en castellano
A: sí en castellano
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... 

B: eu non me acordaba de nada

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK: 
no 'chaleco' 

ANALYSIS: 
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (58-62):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.12. 
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘waistcoat’: the learner knows the TL item but the addressee does not recognize it, i.e. the TL item is not shared between learner and addressee. 
- 13: A presents a code switching strategy. 
- 14: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments. 
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on. 
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached. 

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (71-74):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘waistcoat’. 
- 1-4: B presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy. 
- 6: A understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance. 
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on. 
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached. 

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (114-118):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘waistcoat’. 
- 1: B presents a complete omission strategy. 
- 3: A understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance. 
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on. 
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached. 

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (370-373):
- A and B share now the TL item ‘waistcoat’. This item is used by A in line 1 and by B in line 6. There is therefore no need for a CS. 

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand 

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (127-129):
1 A: e::h (2.3) the father, {e::::h} (1.8) is taking the hand of the 
     (A raises her RH, B is not looking) 
2 A: boy, (2.2) {>or the boy’s hand.<} 
3 {A closes and raises her RH to mimic holding hands, 
4 B is not looking} 
5 (1.5) 
6 7 B: uhuh 

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA: 
A: el padre lo coge de la mano 

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (127-129):
A: sí pero yo quería hablarlo dicho de otra forma más lo que pasa que 
en ese momento no me salía 

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK: 
no hand 

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (127-129):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’. 
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy. 
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- A accepts B’s acceptance allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (144-146):
1 A: and {the door has a: handle?
2 {A’s RH mimics knocking ×2, B is not looking}
3 (1.3)
4 B: oh!} (1.0) okay
5 (1.2)
6 A: e:h {on the top.}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: están delante de una puerta con un buzón y con un no sé como se llama sigo sin saberlo
B: heh
A: bueno el otro sí que lo sabía
B: con un pomo en la puerta
A: sí con un pomo en la puerta de esos de llamar antiguos
B: hm

SENDERS AND RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (144-146): 
A: sí porque no sabía cómo se decía
I: entonces dices handle porque no sabías la palabra concreta para llamador
A: claro
I: e ti que lle entendiches?
B: no
I: que tiña un
B: un pomo

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no handle

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (144-146):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.25.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 6: A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-149):
1 A: and a:::, {i don’t know::,} how to say it, (1.2) e::h the
2 {A’s II draw a rectangle in the air}
3 A: {place where you: introduce the:: (1.2) the: letters,}
4 {A opens her RH and mimics dropping mail in the mailbox ×4}
5 (1.8)
6 B: oh! the letters! {(the letterbox)}
7 {A opens her AA, B is not looking}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: están delante de una puerta con un buzón

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (146-149):**

A: the letterbox porque no me salía
B: eu puxen mailbox

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**

no mailbox

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-149):**
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.11.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-4: A presents an appeal for assistance followed by a circumlocution, both working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL item.
- A accepts B’s acceptance allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

**REFERENT:** (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (182-184):**

1  A: e::h the child {is::, (0.5) touching hi:::s:, mm mm (1.3) tch
2                      {A’s RH touches her chin ×n}
3  A: the pla[ce be]hind the mouth, heh heh} his chin,
4  B: [chin?]
5  A: (heh)si (‘yes’), yes,

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: el hijo se rasca la barbilla

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (182-184):**

A: claro no me salía barbilla
I: ti lle entendes cando che di place behind the mouth? que? que entendes?
B: si porque ademais fixoo con mimica ... si porque como estabas coa man si que che entendin

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**

child not touching his chin

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (182-184):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. She provides this item while A is still on her turn.
- 3 and 5: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance repeating the TL item provided by B and providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

**REFERENT:** suspenders

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-214):**

1  A: a:n:d eh (1.3) he {we::ar, (1.3) e::h what you put}
2                      {A’s II draw suspenders on her body ×3, B is not looking}
3  A: {e:h to::, (1.0) tch (2.8) mm (3.2) tch} {°well°} (0.8) e::h
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5 (A’s HH mimic pulling up her pants ×2, B is not looking)
6 (A waves her RH outwards)
7 A: he wears trousers, a:n::d a shirt, {e:h with the: sleeves:::
8 (A’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve)
9 10 A: (1.2) e:::h
11 (1.5)
12 B: rolled up. (1.0) or some[thing]
13 A: [yes] (1.8) and he wea::rs, (1.4)
14 he we:ars, e:::h (1.4) i don’t know, [hhh how ] to say that,
15 B: [slippers?]
16 (1.8)
17 B: he has slippers in:? (1.5) the {feet.}
18 (B’s RI points down to the floor)
19 20 (2.5)
21 22 A: (e:::h (1.5) he ha:s,) (0.4) i don’t know,
23 (A’s II draw suspenders on her body, A holds the gesture)
24 (1.2)
25 B: "tirantes ('suspenders')?"
26 A: yeah=
27 B: =heh heh (0.4) (heh)okay heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: hay un hombre que está calvo con gafas con tirantes

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (204-214):
A: es que no sabía decir tirantes de verdad?
B: ah! eu tampouco
A: y yo me volvía loca

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no ‘tirantes’

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-214):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’
- 1-7: A initiates the presentation of a circumlocution combined with a nonverbal strategy, but abandons before completing the presentation and communication of the intended message.
- A makes use of a message abandonment, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-214):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’
- 15: A presents an appeal for assistance strategy
- 16-20: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. In fact, she has misunderstood A’s intended message.
- 22-23: A refashions her initial CS and presents an appeal for assistance in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 25: B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. She refashions A’s initial CS substituting it with a code switching uttered with rising intonation, i.e. checking for A’s confirmation.
- 26: A accepts B’s presentation providing an acknowledgment.
- 27: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-207):
1 A: he wears trousers, a shirt, (e:h with the:)
2 (A’s RH mimics rolling
3 up her LA sleeve)
4 A: sleeves:, (1.2) e:::h
3       (1.5)
4 B: rolled up. (1.0) or some[thing ]
5 A: [ yes]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: hay un hombre que está calvo con gafas con tirantes con una

camisa

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (204-207):
A: si no sabía decir remangado
I: y no sabías cómo decirlo? ti si que sabías non?
B: rolled up pero non sei soábame creo que se di así
I: si si
B: heh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
long sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-214):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.5a.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’
- 1-2: A presents a complete omission strategy
- 4: B provides what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. checking for
A’s confirmation.
- 5: A accepts B’s presentation providing an acknowledgment.
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (193-197):
1 A: there are (2.0) diamonds? (on the floor, (1.5)
2
3 (A waves her RH palm
down ×n)
4 A: some black and some white,)
5
6 B: diamonds?
7
8 A: yeah, (0.7) e:::h (0.4) {°rombos (‘rhombuses’).° heh=}
9
10 (A’s RI draws a rhombus shape in the
11 air)
12 B: =oh! (2.2) diamonds, sí (‘yes’).

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el suelo pues tiene rombos unos blancos y otros negros

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (193-197):
B: eu ai entendín que había diamantes e dixen onde están os
diamantes porque nonos vía hai diamantes de verdade? e despois
claro fixeime dinme de conta da forma
...
I: mhm y diamond lo dices?
A: como rombo pude decir cuadrados pero me salió eso heh
I: cuando ella no te entiende lo de diamonds
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A: pude haberle dicho otra cosa lo dije en español porque no porque no lo pensé no sé

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
nothing painted in the floor

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (193-197):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.13.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rhombus’.
- 1: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 6: B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation repeating A’s CS with rising intonation.
- 9: A refashions her previous CS. She presents a combination of a code switching and a nonverbal strategy.
- 10: B indicates acceptance repeating A’s initial CS and providing an acknowledgment
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-267):
1 A: hhh a:n:d the father: {has his:, (1.7) his hand clo- bueno
2 [A clenches her RH in a fist]
3 A: (‘well’), his fingers closed.
4 B: mm
5 (1.5)
6 A: hhh a:n::d he::, (4.5) °i don’t know,” (3.0) bueno (‘well’),
7 he has his hand near {his: breast?
8 [A clenches her RH in a fist and brings it to her body]
9
10 (1.7)
11 B: okay)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre tiene doblado que no me acordaba cómo se decía doblado el brazo heh
B: sí así ca man cerrada e (xxx)
A: si con la mano cerrada

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (264-267):
A: ahi tuve problemas con lo que lo de doblar ...
B: e eu puxen cerca do corazón
I: mhm e ti entendiches que tiña o brazo dobrado?
B: si (xxx)
A: si porque como yo le dije que tenía la mano al lado del pecho ...

I: his fingers closed? querías decir que tenía el puño cerrado?
A: claro que tenía el puño cerrado pero no no sabía decirlo

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father → closed hand, hand near his heart

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-267):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘fist’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
6: A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-267):
- Intended TL lexical item: “bent”.
- 6-9: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 11 B indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (281-286):
1 A: a:n::d the man {is rolling up his shirt.}
2 {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve, B is not looking}
3 (2.2)
4 B: he’s? {rolling? his, okay=
5 {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve, B is not looking}
6 (2.2) a::n:d (3.2) eh eh (0.6) the child,
7 (0.4) is in the same position,
8 (1.5)
9 11 B: heh
10 12 A: a::nd mm::, (2.3) tch well {he’s rolling up the shirt wi:th
11 {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA
12 sleeve, A holds the gesture}
13 14 A: =yes, the shirt.} (2.2) a::n:d (3.2) eh eh (0.6) the child,
15 (0.4) is in the same position,
16 (1.5)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y y el padre pues se remanga la la camisa como para meterle una torta

REFERENT: cap

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (306-314):
1 A: the boy has a hat. (1.4) wears a [hat, ]
2 B: [which] one? heh heh
3 one? heh=
4 A: (=the big one,)
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5  {A nods}
6  B:  heh heh
7  A:  {(sorry,)} heh
8  {A nods, B is not looking}
9  B:  heh [heh]
10 A:  [ on] the door, heh a:n::d he has a:: a badge?
11  (on the: hat?
12  {A's RI draws a circle in the air, A holds the gesture, B is
13  not looking}
14  (4.0)
15 B:  a badge!?
16 A:  hm}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  tiene un sombrero con una insignia bueno un sombrero una visera
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  eh tiene una insignia también en la chaqueta la misma insignia
que en la visera

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (306-314):
A:  si es por lo que te dije antes que todo lo que hay en la cabeza
es un sombrero heh
I:  e ti por exemplo que é o que entendes? que ten?
B:  si una gorra ... e que ó tratarse dun rapaz pequeno pois un unha
gorra

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no hat

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (306-314):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'cap'.
- 1: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 2-3: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 4: A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (306-314):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'cap'.
- 11: A repeats a previously successful approximation strategy.
- 15: B accepts by continuing with the conversation.
- A accepts by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.

REFERENT: freckles
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (314-328):
1  A:  a:n::d (4.0) he has, sprinkles? {(1.3) °i think,° (4.7) e::h=}
2  {A’s RI draws freckles on her
3  cheek ×n, A holds the
gesture, B’s LI draws
4  freckles on her cheek, B
5  holds the gesture}
6  B:  =i understand what you say, (heh)but i don’t know,
7  (2.4)
8  A:  mm:::, (2.4) °well i don’t know° hhh
9  B:  pimples?
10  (1.0)
11
12 A:  eh? ah!
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13 B: pimples?
14 A: (yes!
15 {A’s RI points to her cheek ×n, A holds the gesture}
16 (1.2)
17 B: {((xxx) hhh)}
18 {(B’s LI points to her cheek})
19 A: no=
20 B: =no!
21 (0.5)
22 A: e::h he has,} e::h
23 (0.5)
24 B: °lunas (‘spots’)?° (0.5) heh
25 A: mm::
26 (2.7)
27 B: reckles? (1.8) °reckles?°
28 A: (i don’t know) (0.6) heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: un niño muy grande que tiene pecas

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (314-328):
A: es porque no me salía la palabra
I: te suena sprinkles?
A: y sabía que sonaba algo parecido y cómo no sabía lo dije por si acaso ella sabía decírmelo de otra forma heh a ve si me entendía
I: o sea tú sabías que que sonaba parecido no?
A: claro
I: vale y tú lo entiendes pero tampoco sabes como decirlo
B: si eu dixen reckles pero era freckles ... pimples? eu
A: no porque era (xxx)
B: claro eu entendía que principio non sabía digho eu pode ser pecas lunares bueno ó principio non pensei pecas lunares ... e e claro digho lunares? no no e eu pois pimples que é o a a palabra que sei eu para granos pero despois xa me ven a cabeza algo parecido a reckles ou algo así
I: e cando te das conta de que son pecas? de que non son lunares nin?
B: pois ó eliminar as outras dúas se non son graos nin lunares
I: y ai que dis breckles
B: reckles sen efe porque me soaba

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
freckles? pecas

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-14):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.
- 1-6: A presents an approximation (because of phonological, not grammatical proximity) followed by a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance. She indicates her understanding but also her impossibility to provide the intended TL item.
- 10-24: failed guessings from B
- 27: confirmation check from B. B infers meaning but is unable to provide TL form
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-NS BS

PARTICIPANT A: Bárbara, female, 23, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 1st year graduate student, 2 months in England

PARTICIPANT B: Sean, male, 21, British English L1, intermediate Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 3 months

REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (23-26):
1  A:   an::d one of he: eh one of his: e::h left (0.5) eye, (0.5)
2  A:   {is a::, (2.8) °black you know? as [in?°]
3       (A’s RH mimics punching her eye)
4  B:                                      [a   ] black eye?
5  A:   {{yeah}} }
6       {{(A nods)}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   con un ojo morado
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (23-26):
I:   y ahí por ejemplo dices que his left eye is black entonces cuando
dices que el eye is black
A:   ((laugh)) es que no me sabía la expresión del black eye ...
I:   entonces por ejemplo cuando dices the eye is black es porque
estás describiendo como está el ojo ahí no porque
A:   claro ... no no sabía lo del black eye entonces el ojo
I:   y luego dices black eye cuando él te dice black eye te das
cuenta?
A:   me ayuda claro y digo sí
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (23-26):
B:   black eye
I:   you understood that didn’t you?
B:   yeah
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
eye → black
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (23-26):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’
- 1: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 4: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 5-6: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: boy pointing to his black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (55-57):
1 A: e:h the boy is crying an:d he’s e:h, hhh well the tears
2 again an::d his: mouth is: (.hhh) open, heh (0.7) a::n:d
3 (A opens her HH and AA, B is not
4 looking)
5 A: the::, (1.0) {he’s with his finger like ((sobbing))},) (1.2)
6 (A’s RI scratches her eye to imitate the child)
7 A: a:n::d the the:: the man,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: vemos al niño que está señalando a su ojo morado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (55-57):
A: ahi es que yo no veía el ojo negro no me acordaba que esto era un
ojazo negazo si hubiese estado más grande sabría que estaba
señalando el ojo pero pensé que estaba llorando como haciendo el
típico gesto de llorar que no se como se dice por eso dije gesto
de
I: vale como que se estaba frotando el ojo
A: sí como cuando lloras y luego te frotas
I: y eso no sabías decirlo
A: no sabía decirlo

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (55-57):
B: yeah the yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
finger

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (55-57):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘scratching the eye’, ‘rubbing the eye’.
- 5-6: A presents a combination of complete omission and two simultaneous nonverbal strategies,
gesture and onomatopoeia.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (64-66):
1 A: and the: the:: (0.4) the man {is: (0.7) mm:: (2.0) taking the
2 (A closes her RH to mimic
3 holding)
4 A: boy? (0.6) in:::) {mm [like]
5 (A’s RH holds her LH to mimic holding hands}
6 B: [(hol]ding hands?)
7 A: holding {the hand,} with the boy,
8 {B nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: vemos al padre que coge al niño de la mano

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (64-66):
I: y ahí taking the boy que hiciste ahi como una
A: ei el gesto porque no sabia decir esto no tenia ni idea

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (64-66):
I: they’re holding hands?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
holding hands
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (64-66):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 4: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 5-6: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance repeating the TL expression he provided.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (70-78):
1  A:  a::nd eh in the door, (1.2) there’s a::: {(2.5) ºa handle? >i
2          } (A’s RH mimics
3          grabbing a knocker)
4  A:  don’t knowº<) (0.5) {just to knock on the door?} (1.2)
5          (A’s RH mimics knocking on a door, B is not
6          looking)
7  B:  {uhuh}
8          (B nods)
9  A:  {(you know? small,)} (2.2) a::nd {the the place where you::
10      {(A’s II outline the shape of a knocker in the air, B is not
11      looking)}
12          (A’s RH mimics dropping mail
13          in the mailbox, B is not
14          looking)
15  A:  e:h leave the} letters, (0.5) {the: (1.2) the pos- the:=
16          (A’s HH draw a rectangle in
17          the air)
18  B:  {(=the letterbox?)} }
19          {(B nods)}
20  A:  yeah (.). hhh=
21  B:  =is there (a) number? (0.6) [(xx)?]
22  A:  [mm no] number. (0.8) just the
23  door. (.). e:h with (.). those two things
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  tiene el no sé cómo se llama en español tampoco el éste de llamar
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (70-78):
A:  no sabía como se decía tampoco lo sé en español el...
I:  y entonces dijiste handle o algo así no?
A:  hm
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (70-78):
I:  and here there’s a knocker and a mailbox?
B:  yeah yeah a door handle letterbox no number
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
door handle

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (70-78):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-6: A presents a circumlocution, ‘a handle? >i don’t knowº< (0.5) just to knock on the door?’ involving an approximation, ‘a handle?’ and an appeal for assistance ‘>i don’t knowº<’, and working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
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- 7-8: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning as a ‘door handle’.
- 9-11: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding. A presents a new nonverbal strategy while asking for further evidence of B’s understanding, i.e. checks for comprehension.
- B ignores A’s comprehension check. A does not know whether her message has been understood or not, but does not try to negotiate for an agreement on meaning.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A has no evidence of B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (73-78):
1 A: a::nd {the the place where you:: e:h leave the} letters, (0.5)
   {A’s RH mimics dropping mail in the mailbox, B is not looking}
2 A: {the: (1.2) the pos- the:=
   {A’s HH draw a rectangle in the air}
3 B: {{=the letterbox?}} }
4 B: {{B nods}}
5 A: yeah (.). hhh=
6 B: =is there (a) number? (0.6) [(xx)?]
7 A: [mm no] number. (0.8) just the door. (.).
8 _ with (.). those two things

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: tiene el no sé cómo se llama en español tampoco el éste de llamar y el buzón éste de las cartas.

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (73-78):
A: sí se lo describí ... porque vale el el buzón normal el típico americanito que está fuera de la casa y eso sí pero el de la puerta.
I: hm
A: no sabía que también se decía letterbox

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (73-78):
I: and here there’s a knocker and a mailbox?
B: yeah yeah a door handle letterbox no number

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
letterbox

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (73-78):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 6-7: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 8: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-101):
1 A: and there’s a:::, (0.8) a small man, (1.2) is bald, (1.0) e:h
   is wearing glasses, (1.6) e::h (1.8) (he’s wearing:::,
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3 (A’s HH point to where
4 the suspenders would be
5 on her body)

6 A: {{hhh}} e:h
7 ((A’s HH mimic stretching the suspenders))
8 B: braces?
9 A: {{yeah!}} heh [heh heh] heh
10 ((A nods))
11 B: [heh heh]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (98-101):
A: no sabía cómo se decía

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (98-101):
B: the braces

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
braces

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-101):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.19.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘braces’
- 3-5 and 7: A presents a nonverbal strategy
- 8: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
  his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 9-10: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an
  acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
  communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: father is shouting

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (119-123):
1 A: and the the ma:n, the father, (0.8) e:h is crying, a:n:d
2 [a:n:d]
3 B: [ the] man is crying?
4 A: ye::ah well {sh-} mm shouting? well (he’s saying)
5 {A opens her HH and AA }
6 (B nods)
7 (1.2)
8 B: shouting?
9 A: yeah, (0.4) shouting,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: comienza a gritarle señalando dentro de la casa al al hombre

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (119-123):
A: y a lo mejor lo del señor éste que hubiese dicho que le está
ehetching la bronca a alguien y que no sabía a quien
1: hm en vez de que dijiste que está gritando o algo
A: hm que estaba gritando
1: hm hm

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
shouting
ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (119-123):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘reproving’, ‘yelling’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (140-143):
1 A: and the father (is e:nh (1.5) mm:, (1.3) doing this, (A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve)
3 A: (0.7)) (just to:
4 (A’s LH holds the previous gesture, A’s RH mimics punching)
6 B: uuhh)
7 (2.2)
8 A: to hit him, (1.0) e:h and the boy is again observing

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre es el que se levanta la manga como para pegarle

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (140-143):
A: y luego aquí fue cuando vi que estaba haciendo el gesto del (xxx) y no sabía como decirlo y

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (140-143):
I: rolling up his sleeve?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
rolling up sleeves

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (140-143):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression, ‘doing this’, and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing A to continue and providing an acknowledgment at the end of the presentation, i.e. this acknowledgment is used to accept the CS as well as the rest of the content presented in A’s first turn.
- 3-5 and 8: A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father 2 is surprised

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (139-140):
1 A: tch e:h (2.2) the: the: (1.0) the man inside the house seem to be: (0.5) scared, (0.4) about what’s going to happen,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el el señor es el que está asustado el que está dentro de casa

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (139-140):
A: no no me salía la expresión de decir estaba abraiado

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
bigger boy scared
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (139-140):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘surprised/astonished/shocked’.
- 2: A presents an approximation strategy.
- B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance by allowing A to continue. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning because he has interpreted it literally.
- A does not know whether her message has been understood or not, but does not try to negotiate for an agreement on meaning.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A has no evidence of the B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: (boy’s head bent/turned)/ little boy looks dejected

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (163-168):
1  A:   well the: boy is e::h {looking at the} at the on the floor,  
2      {A lowers her head down imitating the  
3      child, B is not looking}  
4  A:   {looking} (0.6) yeah? {{ loo}king down,} with his: head down,  
5      {B nods}  
6  A:   {looking down,} with his: head down,  
7      {B nods}  
8  B:   [yeah]  
9  B:   (that’s) the the little boy?  
10 A:   {yeah,} the little boy,  
11   {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   y y el niño pequeño pues aparece mirando al suelo como diciendo  
      pues vámonos de aquí que no tenemos nada que hacer

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (163-168):
A:   lo del niño lo de bajar la cabeza el gesto de bajar la cabeza no  
      sabía cómo decirlo
I:   en en español cómo lo habrías dicho?  
A:   mm que bajó la cabeza  
I:   que bajó la cabeza?  
A:   mira al suelo si el niño está mirando al suelo con la cabeza baja

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (163-168):
I:   and this boy is looking down? with the head bent?  
B:   uuhh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:  
little boy looking down

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (163-168):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘head bent’.
- 1-7: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates she understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 9: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-NS CS

PARTICIPANT A: Carmen, female, 26, Galician L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year graduate student, Erasmus student during 1 year in England, regular contact with English native speakers

PARTICIPANT B: Stuart, male, 27, British English L1, intermediate Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 3 months

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (9-12):
1 A: a:n::id (0.5) e::h tch i think that he see:::ms to have the
2 uniform of the school because of {the::, symbol} that he has
3 {A’s LH points to where the
4 badge would be on her chest,
5 AB look down}
6 A: on one of of the: of the flaps?
7 B: mm::

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (51-53):
1 A: e::h i can confirm now that he has his e:h the the uniform of
2 a school not only because of the symbol bu- but because of
3 the:, of the tie,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten o ten o uniforme da escola cun véxolle un símbolo e a a
chaqueta

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (9-12):
I: si souberas dicir insignia ou escudo?
A: si diríao si pero foi o único que se me ocorreu
I: cando utilizas symbol paréceche que el che entende o que ti lle
queres dicir
A: si eu creo que si porque se falas de uniforme e aparte na solapa
funile indicando que non sei exactamente pero bueno eso
...
I: ah! por certo como dixeches solapa
A: flap non sei si se de pero sooume así ... non sei é que esto non
sei si no será solapa pero doutra cousa eh
I: pero cando ti utilizas a palabra xa non estabas moi segura
A: a verdade é que cando a utilicei estaba convencida pero é que
agora heh heh

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (9-12):
B: yeah
I: how would you say this in english?
B: badge a badge

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
symbol on blazer

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (9-12):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- 2-5: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (51-53):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 2: A repeats a previously successful approximation strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing A to continue.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (43-45):
1 A: mm::: now i can see that, this boy has been kick because he:
2 kicked because he has the::, psk e:::h (0.7) psk {a bruise} in
3 \{A’s LH points
to her eye,
5 AB look down\}
6 A: his: ri- (. ) right (. ) eye, he seems to be e:::h feeling sick
7 as well

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (99-101):
1 A: he seems to be pointing, he’s pointing actually to:, to his:
2 \{eye\} that is: bruised, and he’s still crying
3 \{A’s RH points to her eye, AB look down\}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (165-166):
1 A: e:::h i can see his, {his:} (0.7) eye still completely black,
2 \{A’s LH points to her eye, AB look down\}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten o o ollo completamente amoratado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: apúntalle ó ó ollo que ten que ten amoratado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (43-45):
A: porque non sei como se di amoratado ... a verdade é que pensei en
black eye pero dixen jo nos temos amoratado seguro que teñen algo
e e sabía que me ia entender co de black eye pero pareceume mais
non sei como sabía dicir o de bruise que non sei se é moratón en
realidade?
I: si
A: si pero pensei no de no de no de black eye pero dixen seguro que
non se di igual e vou dicir entende porque é bastante icónico
pero vou dicir o de bruise porque é si
I: pareceuche que se entendia mellor?
A: si sí sí

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (99-101):
A: vamos a ver supoño que o digo porque antes ó dicir que o tiña
bruise el asentiu e entendeume entón dixen bueno entón sigo con
eso convencida de que
I: convencida de que el che entende? ou convencida de que el che
entende e que ademais se di así?
A: convencida de que me entende e de que ó mellor de que si estou
convencida de que habería unha expresión propia para eso máis
adeuada pero que a alternativa que non estaba mal quero dicir o
feito de que el me asentira non sabes? e da dâche máis confianza
ou deume máis confianza
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SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (165-166):
I: queres describir que o ollo está negro no debuxo? ou dis que o ollo está negro porque sabes que iso significa que o ollo está morao?
A: aquí digo máis que nada porque é moi evidente no no no debuxo ... é moi evidente aquí que está que está negro ... é máis que nada por eso non por dicir tanto que está amoratado senón como que está negro porque é negro aquí ... ó mellor un pouco por eh non ser eh repetir non sabes? por evitar tanta monotonía tanta repetición

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (43-45):
B: i did understand
I: how would you say this in english?
B: black eye

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eye

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (43-45):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 2-5: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (99-101):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-3: A repeats a previously successful combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (165-166):
- Learner uses intended TL lexis. There is no need of CS use.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (86-88):
1 A: he has a:: trousers and one of these e::h tch e::h
2 {jerseys but without} sleeves, a [heh]
3 {A’s HH draw an armhole on her shoulders, B is not looking}
4 B: [ah!] [hm hm]
5 {B nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (116-127):
1 B: does he have a pocket? on his shirt,
2 A: ah! ah ye::s one (actually) he has on the shirt? or
3 {on the::, (0.5) jersey without sleeves?=
4 {A’s HH draw an armhole on her shoulders}
5 B: =a::h!
6 A: well i don’t know if it is a:: {a jacket of a jer- or a
7 {A’s LH points to her chest}
8 A: jersey} [without] sleeves, and yes, he has two pockets.
9 B: {[mm ]}
10 {B nods, B looks down}
11 B: mm
12 A: {and it’s e::h completely (0.5) e:h buttoned,) and i say that
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

13   {A’s LH points to where the buttons would be on her chest, B is not looking}
14 A: (. ) it’s a:, {a jersey without} sleeves becau-, sleeves,
15   {B’s LH points to her chest}
16 A:   because it has only two: two buttons.
17 B:   {right,} (1.0) very good very good
18   {B nods, B looks down}
19   INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-147):
1  A:   and the: (1.0) tch {the:,} this jersey without the: the:
2   {A’s LH points to her RA shoulder, AB look down}
3 A:   (1.2) sleeves has a:, (0.5) one pocket.
4   NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
5 A:   e ten uns pantalóns e un chaleco e debaixo do chaleco unha camisa
SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (86-88):
6 A:   si chaleco hm
7 I:   e ti pensaches que el che entendera?
8 A:   a verdade que si si ademais cando lle expliquei que tiña solo
dous botóns e digo que é un xersei sen mangas porque solo ten
dous botóns
SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (116-127):
9 A:   pensei que me entendera o de chaleco porque ademais houbo un
momento... un momento que me veu o de waistcoat á cabeza e nono
dixen porque estava convencida de que me de que me entendera
RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (86-88):
10 B:   waistcoat! waistcoat! ah!
11 I:   what did you think it was?
12 B:   because i thought mm a shirt but with no sleeves manga corta
because i thought like this you know? like in summer
RECEIVERS REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
without sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (86-88):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-6: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. He has in
  fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding,
  i.e. misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (116-127):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 3-4: A presents a repetition of what she believes to be a previously successful combination of a
  circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. He has in
  fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding,
  i.e. misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (116-127):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 15: A presents a repetition of what she believes to be a previously successful circumlocution strategy.
- B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-147):**
- 1-4: A presents a repetition of what she believes to be a previously successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B accepts by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding, i.e. misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

**REFERENT:** father’s angry/father looks angry/father is frowning

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (140-143):**
1 A: now the: (0.5) the father, seems to be very very very angry,
2 e:h his s- his face, says that he actually is very very: (0.5)
3 very angry, (say) like mm: e::h (0.7) tch eh closing his
4 teeth, and pushing, one against the: the:: the other,

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (171-176):**
1 B: and what about his expression? is he angry? or: [sad?]
2 A: [yeah] he see-
3 he see- he seems to be angry. (0.7) i can see his:: (0.5) his
4 eyes are completely open, his ey:ebrows a:re, you know? (0.5)
5 eh this e::.h psk face of surprise [or some]thing like that,
6 B: 
7 {mm::}
8 A: and his: mouth is closed, completely closed,

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (223-224):**
1 A: the father that now seems to be hhh even angrier than before,

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A: o pai está bueno moi enfadado e toma a iniciativa parece que vai
apurado tirando do rapaz cara á casa do do outro rapaz supoño
enfadado ca e os ollos din que está enfadado a boca pechada

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A: e o pai ta- e ten a mesma expresión que na na viñeta anterior así
enfado

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (140-143):**
I: closing his teeth and pushing?
A: ah! quería dicir que está así moi moi enfadado de feito repetín
moi moi enfadado ... e cando cando apretas así os dentes non
sabes? era o que quería dicir
I: apretando os dentes?
A: si si si

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (171-176):**
I: aí o que querías dicir é que tiña as cellas así pois ó mellor
como
A: si si si apuntando para arriba ou algo así
I: que tiña o ceño fruncido?
A: si si algo así si que non tiña nin idea como se dícia si quería
vamos a ver reflejar si esta si ou apuntado cara arriba ou o ceño
fruncido o así pero non pareceume relevante porque quero dicir
foi unha das primeiras coisas que vin e que me chocou con
respecto a outras pero non non me saí

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:**
No relevant data available

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
face is not angry

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (140-143):
- Learner uses intended TL lexis. There is no CS.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (171-176):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘frowning’.
- 4: A initiates the presentation of a circumlocution but abandons before completing it
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (223-224):
- Learner uses intended TL lexis. There is no CS.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (151-155):
1 B: what’s? what’s he doing with his hands?
2 (0.7)
3 A: with his hands? well he has a yeah, he has e::h (1.2) psk eh
4 one of his ha- his hands, with the: hand of (this) his child,
5 they go together.
6 B: mm::
7 A: yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai colle ó rapaz de pola man
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: xa non están agarrados da man

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (151-155):
A: aí dixen que está agarrando non sei dicir está lévao da man

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (163):
I: e pareceuche que el entendicahe sen problemas
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (151-155):
I: did you take note of this?
B: yeah yeah
I: how would you say it in english?
B: he’s holding his hands

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
hand in hand

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (151-155):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 3-5: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (181-184):
1 A: a:n:d (.) sort of e::h (.) bell, but well not exactly a bell
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

2 A: (but, e:h sort) (a ring, so as to: [to:] knock], knock in the
(A’s LI draws circles in the air, B is not looking)
4 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)
5 B: [mm: mm ]
6 A: door

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (197-199):
1 A: i can see the man, knocking, knocking on the:, on the:, on the door. he has not used this: ring, that i suppose that it
2 A: is (to bell)
4 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e un e bueno algo .hhh un chamador hm eh en forma de de anilla pa petar na na porta e na na siguiente viñeta pode ver que o pai está está chamando á á porta pero en vez de utilizar esta anilla chama co co puño pechado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (181-184):
A: chamador si ... aí quería dicir un timbre pero en forma de aro
I: e cando dis o de ring refíreste ó timbre ou?
A: non ó aro forma de aro forma de aro si si si e de feito non me din conta de que
I: e pensaches que el che entendera?
A: si si si

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (197-199):
I: aí cando falas do ring refíreste ó aro tamén?
A: si si si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (181-184):
B: i understood everything but this because a ring is ring ring

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
ring

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (181-184):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-4 and 6: A presents an approximation, ‘bell’, followed by a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding, i.e. misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (197-199):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-4: A presents a repetition of what she believes to be a previously successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance allowing A to continue. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding, i.e. misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (178-180):
1 A: mm::: (1.5) e::h there sees to be, there seems to be one,
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2. (0.5) well, this hole to put the::, the letters on
3. B: mm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten eh un buzón que non sobresae está eh eh un buzón que que é cara dentro que non non sobresae na na porta solo se pode ver a ranura pa pa meter as cartas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (178-180):
1: e que non che saía o de letterbox ó mellor? ou mailbox? ou a palabra?
A: non non me saíu pero tampouco sei se o diría polo tipo de buzón que é ó estar así superficial non sabes? ... si sobresaíra ó mellor me saía o de box pero é que así tampouco tampouco ... e de feito pensei que que non se dicía da mesma maneira que había algún tipo de distinción

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (178-180):
1: did you imagine something like this?
B: yeah yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
letterbox

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (178-180):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 4-2: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 3: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (227-235):
1 A: he has (0.4) trousers with::, yeah he, the this trousers, e:h
2 (0.5) tch has not a belt but {has so:me,} (0.5) e::h (0.7)
3 {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body, B is not looking}
4
5 A: well so:me, (1.3) tch e::h (0.8) well, similar to a belt but
6 you you do not put it {e::h (0.5) round your} waist but, (.)
7 (A’s HH moves around her waist)
8
9 A: (round your back,} (1.2) [a::nd ] {two stri-} stripes well,
10 (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
11 B: [ah! yeah]
12
13 A: i don’t know how to [{xxx}]}
14 B: {{  i i} can’t remember,} hm.
15 (B shakes her head, B looks down)
16
17
18 A: okay well, i hope you (heh)understand me,
19 B: yeah heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten uns pantalóns eh con con tirantes
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (227-235):
A: non sabía dicir tirantes
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (227-235):
B: oh! yeah but i couldn’t remember the
I: braces?
B: braces braces yeah
I: but did you understand what she was talking about?
B: yeah yeah

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
straps

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (227-235):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-15: A presents a circumlocution, involving an approximation, ‘belt’, working in combination with a nonverbal strategy, and followed by an appeal for assistance.
- 11: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates she understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 16: B understands and indicates acceptance of meaning, but indicates also the impossibility to retrieve the intended TL lexical item.
- 18: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and asks for further evidence of his understanding.
- 19: B confirms his understanding and acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (236-242):
1 A: and he has a shirt, and the sleeve of his shirt is e:h
2 (1.0) tch is e:h eh it’s a long sleeve, but it is, e:h
3 brought back because probably it is hot, [and] i can see ha-,
4 e:h half eh (0.5)
5 B: [hm ]
6 A: half of his, e:h half part of his, (0.5) of the front part of his (. ) arm, until the: the:, up to the elbow,
8 B: good
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: leva unha camisa completamente abrochada e remangada e hasta o medio do brazo
SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (236-242):
A: aqui o de remangado que non sabia e dixen pulled ou brought back ...
... busquei algo que se entendera
I: parece che entendia
A: si
RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (236-242):
B: yeah i think i wrote it down yeah
RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
rolled up sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (236-242):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 1-7: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 5: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates he understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 8: B understands and indicates acceptance by providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
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REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (246-249):
1  A:   e:h well the the::, (0.5) the house with the i can see only::,
2       a part of the house, very funny because the: the walls are
3       (0.8) painted or decorated with e::h flowers?
4  B:   mm:
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   e a casa está ten tch eh as paredes están empapeladas con ou ou
    pintadas vamos con eh flores margaritas parece que son margaritas
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (246-249):
A:   cando dixen painted painted porque podía ser pintada cando dixen
    o de decorated referíame máis ben a empapeladas empapeladas ... 
    wallpaper porque non me saía wallpapered ... pensaba en
    empapeladas
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (246-249):
I:   did you imagine something like this?
B:   yeah yeah and also the floor like chess yeah
I:   how would you describe this?
B:   yeah flowery wallpaper
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
walls are painted
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (246-249):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wallpapered’.
- 1-3: A presents a sequence of two approximation strategies.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (250-254):
1  A:   tch a:nd the:::, (1.0) the:: the floor, is with e:h the bricks
2       are black and white black and white, (0.7) [li]ke a::, (0.5) a
3       [mm]
4  A:   chess e:h board,
5  B:   {mm}
6       {B nods, AB look down}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   e o tch o chan é ten baldosas brancas e negras como un tableiro 
    de axedrez ou de damas
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (250-254):
A:   e que non sei como se di baldosa se soubera baldosa non sei se
    fan unha distinción e como non sei ... pensar pensei no de
    baldosa pero como non estaba segura de si existía unha distinción 
    dixen bricks ... non negaba que non existira pero non era
    consciente e non estaba segura
I:   e pareceueque que el che te entendía
A:   si si
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (250-254):
B:   yeah yeah perfect like chess yeah
RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
floor black and white

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (250-254):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘tiles’.
- 1: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 4: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates she understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 6-7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (300-309):
1 A: his right hand is bent, and with the: with the:::, (0.6) e:h
the (hand) is closed, an:d (1.2) psk in his: in his: e::h
3 (1.4) (well, in front of) hi::s stomach, probably, or or
(‘A’s RH points to her stomach, AB look down}
4 A: (well, (1.2) in front of) hi::s body anyway, h[hh ]
6 (‘A’s RH points to her stomach, AB look down}
7 B: [but] this is the
8 father?
9 A: yeah the [ fa]ther yeah, with [(his)]
10 B: [yeah] [and ] his his hand [is in
11 [B raises
12 her LH
13 clenched
14 in a
15 fist, B
16 is not
17 looking}
18 front) of his stomach?
19 (0.7)
20 A: ye::ah, more or less more or less, yeah.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: preparándose porque vexo na na na viñeta eh (siguiente) ten o
brazo dobrado que tiña apoiado no no no peito

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (300-309):
A: si si si si
I: querías dicir que a man estaba pechada non quixeches dicir ó
mellor o do puño?
A: no no quería dicir a man si si si e quería dicir peito e non me
saiu peito
I: e ai penas que el che entendeu que estaba no peito ou
A: si é que no tch dixen bah estómago non é diante de estómago pero
dixen bueno diante do corpo porque

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (300-309):
- Intended TLlexical item: ‘chest’.
- 3-4: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-6: A refashions the previous approximation and repeats the nonverbal strategy.
- 7-8: B is uncertain of his understanding and asks for clarification.
- 9: A initiates a repetition of her previous presentation.
- 10-18: B interrupts A to indicate his understanding and acceptance repeating A’s words.
- 20: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (325-331):
1 A: e::h the father seems to be:::, (1.4) tch well the father (.)
2 wants to: (0.4) talk to the:, not only to talk, probably to
3 talk to the father of the:, of the boy, but only to: have a
4 fight with him, because he seems to:::, (0.6) to {be pulling
5 {A’s LH rolls
6 up her RA
7 sleeve, B is
8 not looking}
9 A: his sleeve, the sleeve of the right hand,) (0.7) e::h (1.0)
10 e::h back, (0.8) typical fight e::h heh (0.6) fight e::h
11 [scene, ] yes, (0.6) yes,
12 B: [gesture]

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (389-392):
1 B: what about {his hands?} does he::?
2 {B raises and opens her RH, AB look down}
3 A: =his hands? e::h his hands are, his sleeve is still (0.8)
4 {e:h pulled,} pul[led back,]
5 {A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve, AB look down}
6 B: [rolled up]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai xa está remangándose preparándose para para que pelexar

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: xa ten os brazos remangados (xxx) non está remangado xa o ten
remangado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (325-331):
A: remangando
I: o de have a fight e todo iso?
A: si

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (389-392):
A: remangado xa remangado ... 
I: utilizas pulled back porque che funcionou antes? ou porque
pensaras que esa era a palabra?
A: non porque antes funcionárame

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (325-331):
I: how would you say it? can you say pull up?
B: no it would be rolled up

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
pulling sleeve

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (325-331):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 4-10: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (389-392):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 3-5: A presents a repetition of a previously successful combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL lexical item.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** badge/school badge/emblem

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (356-359):**

1. A: and i see, i can see the:: symbol of the:, (0.7) of the:: the school, {in the one one (0.5) e:h side of the:,} (0.7) of the
2. {A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her
3. chest, AB look down}
4. A: jacket,
5. B: mm::=
6. A: =a::nd he has a: a cap, with the symbol as well,
7. B: mm

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: deben ir na mesma escola porque teñen os dous o o uniforme

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (356-359):**

A: aquí volvín a dicir symbol porque el entendeume e dache confianza non sabes? non necesito buscar outra alternativa

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:**

No relevant data available

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:** sign on big boy’s blazer

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (356-359):**

- See also Chapter Five, example 5.2.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1: A presents a repetition of a previously successful approximation strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing A to continue.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (356-359):**

- See also Chapter Five, example 5.2.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 7: A presents a repetition of a previously successful approximation strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing A to continue.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
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DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-NS IM

PARTICIPANT A: Isabel, female, 22, Spanish L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, Erasmus student during 1 year in England, regular contact with English native speakers

PARTICIPANT B: Mary, female, 20, British English L1, intermediate Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 7 months

REFERENT: to punch/fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-10):
1 A: there’s a little boy, (1.5) e:h and someone {has punched A’s RH mimics punching, B is not looking}
2 {A makes a fist with her RH}
3
4
5 A: him.) (0.8) you can see that (0.5) the a- (. ) e:h (0.4) half of the arm and {the: hand}
6
7
8
9 B: {{is his hand like that?}} }
10 {(B opens her RH)}
11 A: {oh! closed.}
12 {A raises her RH clenched in a fist}
13 B: is a fist?}
14
15 A: yeah.
16
17 B: (heh)okay heh
18 A: “it’s his fist”. (1.9)
19
20 B: ye:ah,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: hay un niño al que le están pegando un puñetazo y se ve parte de una manga de una camisa o una chaqueta y un puño y unas líneas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (1-10):
A: esto no lo sabía decir o sea lo sé pero no me acordaba y por eso le dije la mano está cerrada y todo el tiempo le dije tiene la mano cerrada ... quería decir puño pero no me acordaba

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (1-10):
I: when she said that someone was punching him did you understand it was a fist?
B: yeah that’s why i asked

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

fist

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-10):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘fist’.
- 11: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 15: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 17: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment. Agreement on meaning and form has been reached.
- 18: A refashions her initial presentation and substitutes the previous CS with the TL item provided by B. As a result of the previous negotiation of meaning and form, A is now able to present her originally intended message using the originally intended TL lexical item.
- 20: B accepts A’s refashion providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (95-103):

A: he he’s wearing long trousers and a jacket with two buttons and underneath you can see a white shirt and a white tie
B: he’s wearing a jacket!?
A: yeah it’s like a jacket
B: cause mine looks like a shirt with a tie
A: no he’s wearing a jacket on on the shirt the jacket it’s very similar to the one the kid’s wearing with two pockets on each side
B: no mine is not

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-318):

1 A: e:h you can see:: (1.2) like a semicircle? at the back of 2 his:: neck? (2.0) it’s it’s it’s a line of the: jacket, 3 (3.3) 4 B: i have the thing is that i haven’t got a jacket, so= 5 A: =a:::h! it’s not a jacket, (0.4) heh heh heh (.). it’s not a 6 jacket, {it’s one of these things (/’zigz/) things you wear in 7 (A’s II point to her chest) 8 A: in=: 9 B: =braces?} 10 (0.7) 11 A: {it’s like ja- jacket without the:, the arms?} {().} 12 (A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her LA ×2) 13 {A’s II point 14 to her chest} 15 A: y[ou over, ] (0.5) no. (.). you {you wear it in: 16 B: [it’s a waistcoat?]} 17 (A’s HH outline the 18 shape of a vest on 19 her body) 20 A: under:: a shirt. (.). like that.) (1.3) (you bri-, >i don’t 21 (A mimics putting on a 22 vest) 23 A: know how you call it?< 24 B: a waistcoat.) 25 A: a waistcoat?= 26 B: =it’s like {a jacket without any: sleeves?} 27 (B’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her 28 LA) 29 (0.4) 30 A: yeah. 31 (0.5)
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32 B:  (like) a waiter might wear?=
33 (A nods)
34 A:  (=yeah! {like a waiter.}) (.) that’s what he’s wearing!
35 (A nods and waves her RH to indicate confirmation)
36 {{B nods}}
37 A:  (0.6) “now i can see it.”
38 (0.8)
39 B:  “so he’s wea[ring]”
40 A:  {{[that’s]} (.) that’s why: it has that semicircle at
41 (A’s HH draw a semicircle at the back of her neck)
42 A:  the back, because
43 (0.5)
44 B:  he’s wearing} {a waist{{coat.}}
45 {A nods}
46              {{B nods}}
47 A:              {[ye:]ah.} (0.8)
49 B:   so [(xxx)]
50 A:   [it’s ] a waistcoat. (0.6) mm
51 (1.5)
52 B:   “wearing a waistcoat.”
53 (0.6)
54 A:   hhh e:::h {his eyebrows are still the same, (5.0)} {you can
55  (A’s II draw a vi on her forehead, B is not looking)
56 (A’s RI
57draws a
58line in
59the air
60×2, B is
61not
62looking}
63 A:   see two lines} {at on his back,
64              {A’s HH touch her}
65 (2.2)
66 B:   two lines on his back?=)
67 A:  (=well a line. (1.5) vertical line,) it’s made by his
68 (A’s RH draws a vertical line in the air)
69 A:  waist::coat i think.
70 (1.8)
71 B:  a:::h! (2.5) on the father?
72 A:   yeah is it’s like a bit also a wrinkle °on the waistcoat,°
73 (1.5) you can see two buttons and a pocket,
74 (2.3)
75 B:   eh w- well that’s the waist-
76 A:   mm

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (489-492):
1 A:  you can only see:: one button on the::, (0.7) the father. (.)
2 (the father:::,) (1.0) thing. heh
3 (A’s RH points to her chest, AB look down)
4 B:   so? so in picture eleven now, all there’s is the boy? the man?
5 (0.4) with {the man rolling his sleeve up?}
6 (B’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  lleva unos pantalones una camisa una corbata y un chaleco

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (95-103):
A:  pensé que era una chaqueta aquí ya me di cuenta pensé que eran
las rayas de la chaqueta aquí ya me di cuenta que no era una
chaqueta

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (291):
I: ahí por ejemplo cuando te dice braces preguntándote tú no?
A: no sabía lo que me decía eso qué es
I: braces son los tirantes
A: ah

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (292):
A: si en vez de sleeves ... sé que es sleeves pero ... creo que es la primera palabra que me salió inconscientemente

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (293):
I: y luego también cuando estás describiendo el chaleco dices
A: ella me dijo la palabra chaleco? waistcoat?
I: sí
A: me sonaba a raincoat o algo así y dije no no
I: sí sí y luego te la vuelve a decir creo
A: y luego le dije ya vi que había entendido lo que decía y dije ya vale

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (489-492):
A: father’s thing creo que dije
I: que era para referirte al al chaleco?
A: al chaleco heh que no me acordaba

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (95-103):
B: well first first it was a jacket like a jacket but when then she said it was a waistcoat i changed it
I: but when she was trying to explain it did you understand her from the beginning or did you?
B: i understood it as jacket
I: but when you arrived to picture number six?
B: yeah i understood yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father wearing jacket waistcoat

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (95-103):
- Learner uses the intended TL lexical item ‘jacket’. There is no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-318):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.7a.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 6-8: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. In fact, she has misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- 11-15 and 17-23: A does not understand B’s confirmation check. A presents a new circumlocution and an appeal for assistance working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 16: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. But A ignores B’s presentation.
- 24: B presents for the second time what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. But A ignores B’s presentation.
- 25: A does not understand B’s message and asks for clarification.
- 26-28: B presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy to compensate for the fact that the TL item ‘waistcoat’ is not shared with the learner.
- 30: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 32: B seems not to consider A’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and presents a new circumlocution strategy.
- 34: A understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and repeating part of B’s presentation. Agreement on meaning and form is established.
- 39, 44 and 46: B refashions A’s initial presentation and substitutes the CS with the TL item. As a result of the previous negotiation of meaning and form, B is now able to present the originally intended message using the originally intended TL lexical item.
- 45 and 47: A accepts B’s refashion providing an acknowledgment.
- 50: A is now able to refashion her initial presentation and present her originally intended message using the originally intended TL lexical item.
- 52: B repeats the intended TL lexical item once more, but it seems to be inner speech since it is uttered with a low voice.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-318):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.7a.
- The TL lexical item ‘vest’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (489-492):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.7b.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of an all-purpose word and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on, providing a next utterance that initiates a new topic.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father’s angry/father looks angry/father is frowning

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (200-207):
1 A: the: father has a:: an upset face, (0.8) because (0.5)
   his eyebrows are
   {A’s II outline the shape of frowning eyebrows on her face,
   B is not looking}
2 B: what do you mean (heh)upset?}
   (0.7)
3 A: he’s upset. (0.6) like, (.) that. (1.2) {his eyebrows are
   (A’s II outline the
   shape of frowning
eyebrows on her face
   ×2}
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 A: going like that, (. ) you know?
13 B: {{(heh)completely like that? }}
14 {{B’s RI draws a downwards line in the air, B holds the
15 gesture}}
16 (0.5)
17 A: {yeah,
18 {A’s II form a vi over her eyebrows}
19 B: {{his eyebrows are like (heh)that?=}}
20 {{B’s HH form a vi in the air}}
21 A: =yeah.} (0.5) like when you’re (0.4) upset.
22 B: yeah

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309):
1 A: e:::h {his eyebrows are still the same.} (0.5) you can see two
2 lines at on his back
3 A: {A’s II draw a vi on her forehead, B is not looking}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (383):
1 A: he has the same face, (0.4) ºangry faceº,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre anda enfadado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: sigue teniendo cara de enfadado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (200-207):
A: claro es que quería o sea decir tiene cara de upset o no? heh
A: para decir el ceño fruncido como no no sabía decir fruncido ceño fruncido tampoco

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father: eyebrows, mouth

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (200-210):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.21.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘frowning’.
- 1-9: A presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B is not able to understand and asks for clarification.
- 9-14: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 15-17: B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. She presents a nonverbal strategy and refashions A’s previous circumlocution uttering it with rising intonation, i.e. checking for A’s confirmation.
- 19: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and accepts her presentation providing an acknowledgment and presenting an additional nonverbal strategy.
- 21-22: B seems not to consider A’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual acceptance and repeats A’s last nonverbal strategy and the previous circumlocution uttering it again with rising intonation.
- 23: A confirms again the correctness of B’s understanding and accepts her presentation providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘frowning’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (383):
- Learner uses intended TL lexis. There is no CS.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (259-264):
1 A: (3.3) there’s a:::, (2.4) there {‘s:: also a circle on the
2 (A’s RI draws a circle in
the air, B is not looking)
3 4 A: top,) {to:: (. ) knock at the door?)
5 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)
6 0.8)
7 B: heh {heh heh i don’t (heh)know that. heh heh [heh]
8 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)
9 A: [ li]ke
10 (0.8)
11 B: a door knock?
12 (0.5)
13 A: door knock, okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: una puerta en la que hay una un pomo una especie de no sé como se llama esto en castellano heh cómo se llama?
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (259-264):
A: no no conocía la palabra

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no door knock

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (259-264):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’
- 1-5 and 8: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7 and 11: B indicates understanding of meaning, but does not accept form. B presents a word coinage strategy to substitute the learner’s previous strategy.
- 13: A accepts B’s presentation providing an acknowledgment and repeating her word coinage.
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (254-259):
1  A: there’s just {a:: letter:: hole?} (0.9) in the center, (.)
  2   (A’s RI draw a rectangle in the air, B is not looking)
  3
  4  A: {it’s like a rectangle, (0.8) with a line,}
  5    (A’s RI draws a rectangle with a line in the middle in the air, A holds the gesture)
  6
  7 B: hhh let- (.) a letterbox? (0.5) i haven’t got a
  8    {{letterbox.}} }
  9   {{A nods, B is not looking}}
  10   (1.3)
  11 12 A: tch okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: bueno y un como un agujero para echar las cartas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (254-259):
A: es que yo conozco la palabra letterbox y me imaginaba que era el que hay fuera no no sólo si no sí es sólo un agujero
I: mhm o sea pensabas eso que letterbox era más para lo que es
A: dije letterhole
I: y lo de letterhole? hiciste tú esa palabra o?
A: sí heh me la inventé heh

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
letterbox

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (254-259):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘letterbox’
- 1-6: A presents a word coinage strategy followed by a circumlocution, both work in combination with a nonverbal strategy
- 8-9: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item, first with rising intonation, i.e. asking for A’s confirmation of her understanding, and secondly with falling intonation
- 10 and 12: A accepts B’s presentation providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.
REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (322-325):

1 A: mm:::, (6.2) the little boy’s: (.). touching his:: {e:::h (0.5)
2 (A’s RH
3 touches
4 her chin}
5 A: how do you call this?=
6 B: =chin.
7 A: {(chin? yeah.}) with his right hand. (1.4) {like if he was
8 {(A nods)}
9 (A moves her RH
10 around her chin,
11 B is not looking)
12 A: (. wondering,) heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y el niño pequeño se está tocando la barbilla con la mano derecha

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (322-325):
A: no me acordaba no me acordaba esa palabra barbilla

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
little boy touching chin

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (322-325):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’.
- 1-5: A presents a nonverbal strategy and an appeal for assistance
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL item.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance repeating the TL item followed by an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (378-381):

1 A: an:::d, (0.6) he has a:: shirt with, (.). >°one two three°<
2 five buttons. an:::d (0.3) trou- (.). big trousers. (0.5) an:::d
3 {something to::} (hold the trousers?)
4 {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body}
5 (A’s HH mimic pulling up her pants)
6 B: {braces.}
7 {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body}
8 (0.5)
9 A: {mhm.}
10 {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y lleva unos pantalones una camisa y como unos tirantes que le
aguantan los pantalones

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (378-381):
A: tirantes
I: y cuando ella te dijo braces te diste cuenta de que era tirantes?
A: no lo había oído nunca pero como vi que ella se había entendido
supuse
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
short man wearing braces

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (378-381):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 3-5 and 7: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL item.
- 9-10: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (381-385):
1 A: (0.8) and his shirt (.). is::, (.). >i don’t know how to say
2 this< (0.4) (like this?
3 ([A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve]
4 (1.2)
5 B: rolled up.
6 (0.5)
7 A: ‘rolled.’ (2.8))

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una manga la izquierda que es la única que se ve remangada de la camisa

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (381-385):
A: sí no sabía decir remangada

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
shirt sleeves rolled up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (381-385):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 1-3: A presents an appeal for assistance followed by a combination of an all-purpose expression and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL item.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance repeating the TL item.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (375-376):
1 A: (0.9) hhh and the: tiles (/’teiz/)? (0.9) °tiles?° e::h
2 (of the floor) a:re, (.). black and white, squares, he’s
3 ([A’s waves her RH palm down, AB look down]
4 A: wearing slippers

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y las baldosas son blancas y negras son cuadradas blancas y negras

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (375-376):
A: sí dije tails y luego me di cuenta de que era tiles ... no sé me salió y luego dije no lo he dicho mal y lo volví a repetir
I: o sea que fue para corregirte?
A: sí
...
A: hm bueno no sé cómo se dice a cuadros ... por eso no lo he dicho porque no sabía cómo se decía

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black + white floor tiles

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (375-376):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘checkered’.
- 3: A presents an approximation strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (444-446):
1 A: "okay,º (2.4) tch the father is::, (0.6) has his [hand closed
2 [A clenches
3 her RH in a
4 fist on her
5 chest]
6 A: like that.
7 (0.5)
8 B: the fist?
9 A: fist,) like he, he was gonna hit someone, (0.6)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre tiene un brazo encogido y el puño cerrado como si fuese a pegar a alguien

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (444-446):
A: no me acordaba de fist
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father’s hand in fist

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (444-446):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘fist’.
- 1-6: A repeats a previously successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. asking for A’s confirmation of her understanding.
- 9: A accepts B’s presentation by repeating the TL item provided.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.
REFERENT: to roll up / father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (469-472):
1  A:  e:::h (1.0) now the fa- the the old the: father, heh (0.5)
2        (is: doing that thing. (. ) now.
3        {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve, A holds the gesture}
4        (0.6)
5  B:  the father’s rolling his:: [sleeves up?]
6  A:                             {{rolling    } his shirt.
7        {A nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (491-493):
1  B:   the boy? the man? (0.4) with {the man rolling his sleeve up?}
2        {B’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve}
3  A:   mhm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  el el padre se está remangando la camisa el la manga derecha de la camisa

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father rolling sleeve up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (469-472):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’
- 1-6: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression ‘doing that thing’ and a nonverbal strategy
- 5: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. asking for A’s confirmation of her understanding
- 6-7: A accepts B’s presentation by repeating the TL item and providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (491-493):
- B knows and uses the desired TL item ‘rolled up’. This is recognized and understood by A, therefore there is no need for a CS.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: ADV-NS RA

PARTICIPANT A: Raquel, female, 21, Spanish L1, advanced English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 1 month in England

PARTICIPANT B: Anne, female, 20, American English L1, intermediate Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 7 months

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (10-22):
1 A:  he’s wearing:: a:: (0.7) a jacket. (1.8) e:::h (1.2) a jacket, (with a:: (1.4) tch in the:: left side of her jacket, there is
2  (A’s RH points to her chest and draws circles)
3 A:  a kind o::f (1.3) of sign, (1.3) mm (1.5) or flag, or little
4 flag, or something) (0.8) something like that.
5 B:  maybe a handkerchief?
6 A:  no no=
7 B:  (=no not a hand)kerchief?
8 (B shakes her head)
9  A:  no.
10 B:  because that
11 A:  e:::h (2.5) a:::nd {a sign, (1.0) as it was a sign of a country,
12  (A waves her RH)
13 A:  or of a:: flag,) [(how) do you? well,) tch e:::h (1.5) have
14 B:  {{okay}}
15  (B nods)
16 A:  you found the differences?
17 B:  i think it’s (.). the flag, in his lapel pocket.=
18 A:  {=okay}
19 B:  {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  eh lleva una chaqueta que tiene un un escudo en el lado izquierdo

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (10-22):
A:  un escudo quería decir ... si la insignia o eso

I:  tú ahí qué entendiste que te decía ella? entendiste que te había entendido lo de insignia o?
A:  sí lo de insignia yo entendí que me entendiera lo de insignia que dice la diferencia de la bandera esta pues y le entendí que sí que la suya que no la tenía

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (10-22):
I:  because you asked her about the lapel pocket did you think?
B:  i thought there was something but i didn’t really know what

B:  this and the badge or the emblem on the suit that was the only thing i didn’t understand

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
A flag in his lapel pocket
ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (10-22):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.24.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 2-5: A presents a nonverbal strategy and two approximations ‘sign’ and ‘flag’.
- 6: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7: A realizes B’s misunderstanding and indicates it to her.
- 12-14: A refashions her previous presentation. She presents now a circumlocution strategy.
- 15-16: B believes she has understood A’s message and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments. She has in fact misunderstand A because she has interpreted the CS literally.
- 14 and 17: A checks for comprehension.
- 18: B indicates understanding and acceptance repeating what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item ‘flag’.
- 19-20: A accepts B’s acceptance. A believes B has understood her message, but in fact she has not, she is using ‘flag’ in its literal meaning, not as an approximate term.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (36-39):
1 A: he has (. ) {on::e (2.3) one eye in black,} (1.7) eh it ha- it
2 {A’s RH covers her right eye}
3 A: seems that it’s the harmed (0.5) eye, or:: the wounded,
4 wounded eye,=
5 B: {=okay,} he [has a black eye.]
6 {B nods}
7 A: [it it is ] his:: his:: (1.5) his right
8 (1.5) eye,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (107-114):
1 A: and i suppose that also (1.8) e::h shows him {her: her hand,
2 {A’s RI points to eye, imitating the child}
3
4
5 A: (0.5) in (the) eye, her:: (2.5) tch how how he has (. ) her
6 eye.} (2.2) i know you know? tch
7 (1.3)
8 B: his black eye? [he’s] showing his father
9 A: [his ]
10 A: {yes}
11 {A nods}
12 B: his black eye.
13 A: his black eye.
14 B: okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (143-144):
1 A: he has (his) we i can see: (. ) his black eye.
2 {A’s LI points to her left eye}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (36-39):
A: no el ojo dañado o el ojo herido o morado morado más bien no
... 
I: ¿y por qué no dices ojo morado?
A: porque no sé
... 
I: después ella te dice black eye no sé si tú reconoces que esa es
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la palabra que
A: reconozco sí que después lo de ojo dañado morado lo que yo entiendo que es black eye eso sí no lo entiendo como la pintura o sea como la diferencia gráfica eso después sí ya que es el ojo que está sí
I: te das cuenta que cuando dice the black eye se refiere al ojo morado
A: sí
I: y eso no lo sabías antes?
A: no que black no pero al decírmelo pues sí

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (107-114):
A: lo del black eye

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (36-39):
B: no black eye was right but she said a harmed eye or something but i understood her

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eye

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (36-39):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-4: a presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy followed by two approximations ‘harmed’ and ‘wounded’.
- 5-6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL item.
- 7-8: A accepts B’s acceptance providing a relevant next utterance that continues with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (143-144):
- The TL lexical item is now available and used by the learner. There is therefore no CS.

REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (27-33):
1 A: and he’s wearing also {a: tie, (0.5)} {[with ] diago- (1.0)
2 {A’s RH points to her neck}
3 {A’s RI draws diagonal stripes on
4 her chest}
5 6 B: {{[hm hm]}}
7 {{B nods}}
8 A: diagonal (/’diagona/ mm: stripes!) black and white stripes.
9 B: that
10 A: tch e:[h]
11 B: {{that]t’s] the difference
12 {B nods}
13 A: okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una corbata de rayas blancas y negras en diagonal

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (27-33):
I: esa palabra la conoces en inglés?
A: no diagonal por heh no sé por el español
I: dices diagonal pero con acento ingles?
A: sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (27-33):
I: when she said that the stripes are diagonal did you understand?
B: uuhuh yes
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tie with black and white stripes

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (27-33):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘diagonal’.
- 1-5, 8 and 10: A presents a foreignizing strategy and a nonverbal strategy. The foreignizing strategy results in correct TL lexis, but A is not aware.
- 11-12: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 13: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (138-143):
1 A: both: (1.5) both men (1.5) are {(3.2) e:::h tch are (2.4) with
2 {A’s RH holds LH}
3 A: her hands ti-, a:re (1.5) are going} (by hand.
4 {A closes RH and mimics
5 grabbing a hand}
6 B: they’re holding hands?}
7 A: (holding hands=)
8 {A nods}
9 B: =okay
10 A: yes.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (160-163):
B: i only found one difference,
A: one difference=
B: =the that they were holding hands.
A: e::h (0.5) they’re holding hands, okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre coge al niño de la mano

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (138-143):
A: eso es que no me salía ... lo de ir de la mano sí
I: cuando dices by hand?
A: de la mano quería eso de la mano
I: pero lo dices ya ... lo dices para salir del paso o convencida de
que se dice así
A: no no pa salir del paso
I: y piensas que ella te entendió
A: pienso que ella me entendió

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (138-143):
B: they were holding hands ... i understood her

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
holding hands

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (138-143):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a literal translation strategy and nonverbal strategies.
- 6: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7-8: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the TL form provided by B.
- 9: B accepts A’s acceptance with an acknowledgment.
- 10: A confirms with another acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (160-163):**
- The ‘TL lexical expression ‘holding hands’ has been grounded and is now used and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

**REFERENT:** knocker/doorknocker

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (166-182):**

```plaintext
1 A: and it has (0.7) a kind of (1.6) you know (to: (2.7) to::
    (A’s RH mimics knocking)
2 A: (1.4) to call (.) at a door, (.) you have a:: (1.4) tch a
    (A’s RI draws a circle in the air)
3 A: handle? or i don’t know how
4 B: (uhuh)
5 (B nods)
6 A: a handle. an::d (1.5) e::h (1.7) (down the handle,) there’s
7 (A’s RI points downwards)
8 A: a:: (hole, a:: (.)) rectangular hole, (1.0) a hole. (1.3)
9 (A’s RH draw a rectangle in the air, B is not looking)
10 A: where e::h letters and mail (. ) is supposed to be:: (0.5) put,
11 there, (1.5) tch
12 B: on the door?
13 A: on the door.
14 B: okay=
15 A: =yes, [on the door.]
16 B: [so there’s ] {a knocker?}
17 (B’s RH mimics knocking)
18 A: yes
19 B: {and a place to put mail.}
20 (B’s HH draws a rectangle in the air)
21 (2.0)
22 A: there’s=
23 B: (=is it a slot) (that you put mail through?
24 (B’s RH draws a rectangle in the air)
25 (B mimics introducing a letter in a slot)
26 A: yes)
27 B: okay
28 (0.5)
29 A: yes (0.5) up on the:: (1.0) knocker.
30 B: {a knocker?}
31 A: (0.5)
```

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (223-224):**

```plaintext
1 A: now, the father (is knocking at the door. ) (1.5) but not
2 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)
3 A: (with the knocker,) (but (1.5) instead with his: hand)
4 (A’s RI draws a circle in the air, B is not looking)
5 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)
```

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: tiene un como para lla- el un cómo se dice? un llamador eso tiene un llamador

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (166-182):**

I: por ejemplo ella hay un momento en que te dice como se dice en inglés el llamador
A: knocker?
I: mhmm te diste cuenta?
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (166-182):
I: and the knocker?
B: mhm

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no knocker on door

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (166-182):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-7: A presents a circumlocution including an approximation, ‘handle’, and working in combination with nonverbal strategies.
- 8-9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 10: A accepts B’s acceptance providing a relevant next utterance and using again the approximate term ‘handle to compensate for knocker.
- 20: B checks for confirmation of her understanding. She uses the intended TL lexical item ‘knocker’ with rising intonation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 22: A recognizes the item ‘knocker’ as the previously desired but unavailable TL lexical item. A confirms B’s understanding and indicates acceptance of the TL item with an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (166-182):
- 33: The TL lexical item ‘knocker’ is now available and used by A. There is therefore no need for a CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (223-224):
- 3: The TL lexical item ‘knocker’ is now available and used by A. There is therefore no need for a CS.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (169-182):
1  A: there’s a:: {hole, a:: (. ) rectangular hole, (1.0) a hole.}
2                 {A’s HH draw a rectangle in the air, B is not
3        looking}
4  A: (1.3) where e::h letters and mail (.) is supposed to be::
5       (0.5) put, there, (1.5) tch
6  B: on the door?
7  A: on the door.
8  B: okay=
9  A: =yes, [on the door.]
10 B: [so there’s ] {a knocker?}
11      {B’s RH mimics knocking)
12 A: yes
13 B: {a:nd a place to put mail.}
14      {B’s RH draws a rectangle in the air}
15     (2.0)
16 A: there’s=
17 B: (=is it a slot) {that you put mail through?
18     {B’s RH draws a rectangle in the air}
19       (B mimics introducing a letter in a slot)
20 A: yes)
21 B: okay
22     (0.5)
23 A: yes (0.5) up on the:: (1.0) knocker.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: tiene el como un buzón bueno la si como un buzón para echar las
cartas pero justo en la puerta

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (169-182):
A: rectangular igual que diagonal heh heh bueno eso se dice así no en inglés yo creo.
I: hm pero lo sabías o
A: sí esa sí lo de diagonal no pero el ese rectangular sí sí...
I: y ahí por ejemplo quieres decir que hay un agujero en la puerta o que hay un buzón?
A: que hay un buzón...
A: es que no estaba segura si decir lo de mailbox no sé por qué porque no estaba segura o sea sé que es algo del correo y tal pero no estaba segura de decir lo de mailbox es que
I: a lo mejor lo conocías pero para otro tipo de buzón?
A: el típico buzón de fuera porque ese sí que es el mail- o sea el de eso pero el de el de la puerta no sabía si era mailbox.

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (169-182):
I: and the mailbox?
B: right it’s called a mail slot but i understood after after when i figured out that it wasn’t something you put the mail in you put it through i i understood her

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
mail slot

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (169-182):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-5: A presents a circumlocution including an approximation and working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance by providing a relevant next utterance.
- 13-14 and 17-19: B checks for confirmation of her understanding. She refashions A’s previous strategy and presents two new circumlocutions in combination with nonverbal strategies.
- 20: A confirms B’s understanding and accepts her refashioning of the initial presentation providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (254-262):
1 A: e::h he has:: (1.5) he’s wearing:: (1.5) tch trousers, (2.0) an::d (0.8) he supports, or he::: (2.6) tch (1.3) e:h {he’s wearing also (1.0) i don’t know how to say, (1.0) hm:}
4 (A’s HH point to her chest)
5 B: suspenders?
6 A: suspenders. {yes.} (0.5) [he’s] [A nods] 7
8 B: {[the ] thing?}
9 {B’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her chest}
11 A: {yes yes=}
12 {A nods}
13 B: =okay.
14 A: he’s wearing suspenders,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (254-262):
I: ahi supongo que es porque no sabías decir tirantes?
A: sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
suspenders

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (254-262):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.1.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 2-4: A presents an appeal for assistance and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 6: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance repeating the TL item provided by B and providing acknowledgments.
- 8-10: B checks for confirmation providing a new nonverbal strategy.
- 11-12 and 14: A confirms the correctness of B’s comprehension providing acknowledgments and refashioning her initial presentation to use now the desired TL lexical item ‘suspenders’.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (262-263):
A: he’s wearing suspenders, and a:: shirt. (0.7) he’s wearing a:: shirt,
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva la camisa remangada

SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (262-263):
I: el señor lleva las mangas remangadas
A: ah! aquí es que no no sabía cómo decirlo eh
I: pero te fijaste entonces?
A: sí sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (262-263):
I: here the man had the sleeves rolled up but she didn’t mention it
B: okay

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (262-263):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.22.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (272-275):
1 A: {e::h (0.5) the floor of {{the flat,}} (1.5) e::h it’s (0.5)
2 (A moves her RH palm down horizontally)
3 } {e::h rectangulars? or::}
4 A: e:h it’s made of mm::: tch (2.0) e:::h (2.5) mm black and
5 white, (0.7)) {e:::h rectangulars? or::}
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6 {A’s RI draws a rectangle on the table}
7 B: black and white tiles?
8 A: (bla-) black and white tiles, okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el suelo con con cuadrados o con baldosas blancas y negras

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (272-275):
I: ahí qué querías decir?
A: baldosas
I: y luego ella te lo dice?
A: tiles me dice
I: y qué dijiste?
A: rectángulos creo

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (272-275):
I: the black and white tiles?
B: mhm

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black and white tile

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (272-275):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘tiles’.
- 5-6: A intends to present an approximation strategy ‘rectangles’ for ‘tiles’. She makes a mistake and uses ‘rectangles’ instead. She presents also a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 8: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and refashioning her initial presentation to use the desired TL item ‘tiles’.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (353-362):
1 A: the fat man, is:: e::h (1.0) is making a gesture, {with: the:
2 {A’s LH
3 outlines
4 the shape
5 of a sleeve
6 along RA}
7 A: sleeves} {of his:: (2.2) tch of his tshirt,} he’s (1.5) i
8 {A’s LH grabs her right sleeve}
9 A: don’t know, e::h=
10 B: =like he’s getting ready to fight or something?
11 A: i don’t know, e::h he’s e::h (1.5) tch (1.5) {rising::?}
12 {B nods}
13 A: {{[his sleeves]}
14 { A’s LH grabs her right sleeve }
15 B: [that’s what] (0.7) {that’s what people do when they’re
16 {A’s RH rolls up left sleeve and A’s LH
17 rolls up right sleeve}
18 B: getting ready [to fight]) they start {{(to put)] up there
19 A: [okay ]
20 A: [yes ]
21 A: yes
22 B: okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (375-377):
1 A: i think that (0.5) the new:: difference of the other picture
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2 is that {of the::} (1.7) of the: arm. tch=
3 {A’s LH mimics rolling up her right sleeve, B is not
4 looking}
5 B: {=okay}
6 {B nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (406-408):
1 A: he remains with the:: tch {with the:: (0.5) sleeve (0.5) of
2 A’s LH mimics rolling up her right
3 sleeve}
4 A: the tshirt (1.8) up?
5 B: {{uhuh}} }
6 {{B nods}}
7 A: a::nd an:nd now the man with glasses, (0.5) seems to be very:
8 happy

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre empieza a a remangarse en plan como si no sale pues que
le va a pegar o que le quiere pegar

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: la manga remangada también el pa- el padre el de bigote

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (353-362):
I: ahi querías decir que se estaba?
A: remangando

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (406-408):
I: aqui?
A: remangada si es que no no sabía como decirlo

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
raising up the sleeves of his shirt

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (353-362):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-9: A presents a circumlocution, an appeal for assistance and nonverbal strategies.
- 10: B is uncertain of her understanding and asks for clarification.
- 11-14: A refashions her initial presentation offering a new circumlocution and a new nonverbal
strategy.
- 15-18: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance and a nonverbal
strategy.
- 19-21: A accepts B’s acceptance providing backchannel continuers and acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (375-377):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-4: A presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (406-408):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.1.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 1-4: A presents an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.
REFERENT: striped tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (395-396):
A: he’s wearing also a tie, with (0.5) black and white stripes,
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (395-396):
I: y ahí por ejemplo ya no mencionas que las líneas eran diagonales
A: no porque como no estaba muy segura dije heh pues así
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (395-396):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘diagonal’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (384-394):
1 A: {in front of e::h the:: (1.0) yes, in front of the cap,
2   {A’s RH touches her forehead, B is not looking}
3 A: there’s a::} (0.5) the same as before the o- (0.5) the same
4   sign {that the [other] boy wear on:: the jacket} he
5   {A’s RH points to her chest}
6 B: [okay ]
7 A: {he wears here.=
8   {A’s RH touches her forehead}
9 B: =tch it must} be the sign of their {private school,}
10   {B nods}
11 A: {yes! probably.}
12 A nods
13 B: okay
14 A: i think probably. hhh and (. ) he also wears {the same} the
15   {A waves her RH}
16 A: sam::e (suit) than the little boy.
17   {A waves her RH}
18 B: {right.}
19   {B nods}
20 A: because {i can see that (0.5) it also has the same sign.}
21   {A’s RI points to her chest and draws a circle}
22 A: tch e::h sí (‘yes’) yes i think it’s the same, because he’s
23   wearing also a tie
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una gorra con con el mismo escudo que el otro niño
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (384-394):
A: la insignia otra vez
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (384-394):
B: finally i understood because it it’s like an emblem for for a
private school but I didn’t really understand until I realized that this was their student uniform

I: okay so until the last picture you didn’t understand?
B: right

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (384-394):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-8: A presents a previously successful approximation ‘sign’ and nonverbal strategies.
- 6: B understands and accepts providing a backchannel continuer.
- 9: B understands and accepts providing a relevant next utterance which includes the approximate term ‘sign’
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (384-394):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 20: A presents a previously successful approximation
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-INT CL

PARTICIPANT A: Carla, female, 22, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student

PARTICIPANT B: Lola, female, 20, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 2nd year undergraduate student, 1 month in England

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20):
1 A:  a::n:d he::: (0.6) wears a::: (0.4) a jacket, {(0.5)} a:::
2 (B nods, A is not looking)
3 4 A: short trousers, {(0.6)} an::d shoes?
5 (B nods, A is not looking)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (35-50):
1 A:  e::h in his::: mm jacket,
2 (1.2)
3 B:  hm hm
4 (2.2)
5 A:  he has:: a::: tch
6 (3.8)
7 B:  poc[ket?]
8 A:  {{[like a emble-?] i don’t know the: the name,
9 (A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her chest)
10 (1.3) when you::] (1.4) for example in in
11 (A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her chest)
12 A:  the:::, (1.6) psk {when you: have a::, (2.5) a shirt, of the::
13 (A’s RH points to where the badge would be
14 on her chest and draws circles)
15 >for example of one university which puts (. ) for example
16 university of {{santiago,}} (. ) you know what i mean?<}
17 {{B nods})
18 B:  {yes=}
19 {{B nods}
20 A:  =and he has: {this.} (1.6) i don’t know if it’s a::
21 (A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her
22 chest)
23 (2.4)
24 B:  uhh
25 (3.0)
26 A:  {like a picture! here!
27 (A’s HH point to where the badge would be on her chest }
28 B:  {{yes=})
29 {{(B nods})
30 A:  =you know what [i mean?])
31 B:  {{hm hm ]] (1.4) yes=
32 {{(B nods})
33 A: =okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (170-173):
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

1  A: and! {e:h he:: has,} in the: in the:: [jacket? ]
2  B: {A’s RI points to where the badge would be on her chest} [the same] thing
3     ((that in the:)?)
4  A: {A’s RI points to where the badge would be on her chest}
5  B: =okay °(xxx)° (0.7) okay
6     {(that in the:)?}
7  A: {(yeah=)}
8  B: ((A’s RI points to where the badge would be on her chest))

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-314):
1  A: and the:: tie is again (0.5) with lines?
2  B: hm,
3  A: (heh)the:::
4     (2.5)
5  B: {the::,} (0.5) yes {the emblem!} that [he ] had on his? (1.6)
6  A: {B’s LH points to where the badge would be on her chest, A is not looking}
7  B: =okay °(xxx)° (0.7) okay
8     (B’s RH points to where the badge would be on her chest, A is not looking)
9  A: [yeah]
10 B: jacket,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: con la insignia y todo esto igual

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (35-50):
I: no dices lo de la insignia la primera vez que describes la ropa?
A: ah! no sé no lo sé no sé si es que no me fijé o como aquí sólo veíamos lo del ojo negro ...
B: creo que no me lo decías después cuando dije yo tiene un bolsillo me dijiste si después tiene tiene algo más
A: no porque como no veíamos ningún error dije tendría que haber algún o sea me empecé a fijar
I: entonces la primera vez que no lo mencionas es porque no te pareció un detalle importante
A: claro no me di cuenta pensé que pues eso sería lo de
I: cuando dices emblem?
A: es que quería decir escudo y no me salía pero yo sé la palabra pero no me sale
I: te diste cuenta de lo que era?
B: sí
I: al principio te dice como un emblema y luego te dice lo de la universidad no sé qué como un dibujo ... tú cuando te dice lo del emblema qué pensaste qué era?
B: si una insignia

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
insignia: something like a picture

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (20):
- There is no intention to communicate the meaning ‘badge’ and therefore no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (35-50):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 8-16: A presents an approximation ‘emblem’, an appeal for assistance and a circumlocution, working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 17-19: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 20-22 and 26-27: A refashions the previous CS presenting now a new approximation ‘picture’ in combination with the previous nonverbal strategy.
- 28-29: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 30: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and checks for comprehension.
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- 31-32: B has understood and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgements
- 33: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (170-173):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-2: A presents a nonverbal strategy
- 3-8: B interrupts A and completes her presentation offering a combination of an all-purpose expression and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9-10: A accepts with an acknowledgment and a repetition of the previous nonverbal strategy.
- 11: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-314):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 3-7 and 9: B presents a combination of a previously successful approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: A understands and indicates acceptance with a back channel continuer.
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (125-137):
1 B: a::n::d his eyes look (1.5) e:h [as ]
2 A: [both] (.) of them?
3 B: both of them=
4 A: =no, in mine there’s only one {the other is black, (0.4)
5 \ A’s LI points to her eye x2}
6 A: completely black,)
7 B: {no the both of them are open.} (1.6) the::, [the eyes,]
8 {B nods}
9 A: [{ so is] one
10 {A nods}
11 A: difference–)
12 B: {=uhuh} (2.4) a::n::d
13 {B nods}
14 (1.6)
15 A: so::, you::?
16 (1.4)
17 B: mhm
18 A: okay=
19 B: =yes so e::h (1.0) “there’s one black,”
20 (5.6)
21 A: the right one.
22 (0.7)
23 B: mhm, (0.5) the right, (4.2) okay,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (384-391):
1 A: and the boy: {eh has: {{the::, the ey:::e, (1.3) the right
2 \ A’s RI points to her right eye}
3 {{A’s LI points to her left eye})
4 A: eye, (0.5) e::h black.
5 (0.5)
6 B: i just can see {{one eye,
7 \ {{B holds up one finger}})
8 (1.5)
9 A: yes and how}}) [is this black? ]}) } no i only, i can see
10 B: {{you can see both?}}
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11  {B holds up two fingers}
12 A: only one [black]
13 B: { [the right one?] (0.5) and it’s: black?}
14 {B’s RI points forwards}
15 A: {yeah!}
16 {A nods}
17 B: okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (454-463):
1  A: but the::: the eye (1.5) one eye the re- the:: (0.4) i mean=
2  B: =right?
3  A: yeah (2.6) {it’s [black]}
4  {A shakes her head}
5  B: [ is o]pen or closed? eh {is still
6  A: [ it’s black,] so i [suppose] that i don’t know if (.) it’s
7  B: [ okay]
8  A: closed [or::] open
9  B: [okay]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: bueno pues el ojo a ver el ojo tú le veías uno negro
A: el mío estaba ne- eh morado
B: un ojo negro o sí morado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: y el ojo morado vamos
A: el niño sigue llorando con el ojo morado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el niño sigue con su ojo negro?

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (125-137):
I: y ahí cuando dices que el ojo está negro qué es lo que quieres
decir?
B: morado
I: morado?
B: supongo no sé
A: bueno o sea no sé se supone que es morado claro aunque lo que ahí
veo es negro
I: no sabes decir ojo morado en inglés?
A: no

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
ojos: there is one black (right one)

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (125-137):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 4-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7-8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (125-137):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 19: B repeats the previously successful circumlocution strategy
- 21: A understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (384-391):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-4: A presents a previously successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 9: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and repeats the previous circumlocution.
- 13: B understands and checks for confirmation repeating A’s previous circumlocution with rising intonation.
- 15-16: A confirms B’s understanding providing acknowledgments.
- 17: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment. Agreement on meaning and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (454-463):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-3: A presents a previously successful circumlocution.
- 5-7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance which includes the previous CS.
- 8: A accepts B’s acceptance providing a relevant next utterance, i.e. a response to B’s questions which includes a repetition of the previously successful circumlocution.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (139-144):
1 B: one tie?
2 (1.5)
3 A: yeah
4 B: {in his neck,} hhh [e:h]
5 (B’s RH points to her neck with a pencil)
6 A: [ah o]kay! {e:h st- with straps? i think,
7 (A’s RI draws tie stripes on her
8 chest)
9 A: (0.8) that (. ) [is])
10 B: {{no}} without stra-, {without: t=}
11 {B waves her RI indicating negation}
12 (B’s RH draws tie stripes
13 in the air)
14 A: =ah okay, {mine has is is with:, with straps,}
15 (A’s RI draws tie stripes on her chest)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (201-206):
1 A: a:n:::d (1.5) he:: has again the:: {the tie?
2 (A’s LI points to her neck)
3 (1.2)
4 B: {{yes=}}
5 {{B nods}}
6 A: {{={e:h with::, you know?))) }} (1.0) like like
7 ((A’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest))
8 A: [the o ]ther one, yes, {with lines,=}
9 B: {{{(with) lines?}}
10 (B’s RH draws lines in the air with a pencil)
11 (A’s RH draws tie stripes on
12 her chest)
13 B: =okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-310):
1 A: an:id the tie is again {with lines?}
2 (A’s LH points to her neck and draws
3 tie stripes)
4 B: hm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: eh lleva la ahora se le ve la corbata antes también la llevaba
pero no se le veía muy bien
A: mhm
B: eh no tiene rayas en el tuyo parecía que sí

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (139-144):**
I: tú ahí la entendiste
B: sí también
...
A: sabía que era algo así pero que no
I: por eso luego pasais a decir lines?
A: sí lines sonaba mejor

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (201-206):**
B: no no sabía como lo de las rayas no me salía pues dije líneas

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
tie: con/sin rayas

**ANALYSIS:**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (139-144):**
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.10a.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘striped’.
- 6-8: A presents a combination of an appeal for assistance and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9-10: B understands and refashions A’s presentation offering an approximation strategy with rising intonation, i.e. checking for A’s confirmation, and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8 and 11-12: A confirms B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the CS offered by B in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (201-206):**
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.10b.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘striped’.
- 6-8: A presents a combination of an appeal for assistance and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9-10: B understands and refashions A’s presentation offering an approximation strategy with rising intonation, i.e. checking for A’s confirmation, and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8 and 11-12: A confirms B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the CS offered by B in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-310):**
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.10c.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘striped’.
- 1-3: A repeats a previous successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** vest/sleeveless jumper

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-262):**
1 A: he has a::: (2.7) shirt? (1.4) [and] then he has {a::,} ah! >i
2 B: [hm ]
3 A’s HH point to her chest
4 A’s HH point to her chest
5 A’s HH point to her chest
6 A: don’t remember the name,< {a::} okay, (1.2) like a::: (3.4) mm
7 A’s HH point to her chest
8 A: mm mm tch {heh (0.8) (yes)} tch e::h, he has (2.2) long
9 A’s HH point to her chest, A looks down
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10 A: trousers?
11 (1.2)
12 B: {yes,}
13 (B nods)
14 (1.4)
15 A: e::h normal shoes, {i think,} (1.7) a::n:d the::: (2.6) he has
16 (B nods)
17 A: (0.5) e::h a::: (2.3) >i don’t remember the name,< sorry, e:h
18 your your father has only the:::?
19 B: the:::
20 (1.5)
21 A: (wi[without ]
22 B: [(you mean)] the the shirt?
23 (0.6)
24 A: yeah=
25 B: =yes he has, and there is a pocket in the shirt,
26 (1.2)
27 A: {{no.}} (1.5) be[cause (0.5) no
28 (A shakes her head)
29 B: [so (0.5) (heh)there] (heh)is
30 (heh)something, hhh who is (. ) difference, (0.5) okay.=
31 A: =no i i i’m going to explain, e:h he has like a:::
32 (2.6)
33 B: jumper?=  
34 A: (=like a sweater,} {or jumper,} yes, {but without?=
35 (A’s RH points to her chest)
36 (B nods)
37 (A’s RI draws an
38 armhole around her LA
39 shoulder x2)
40 B: =okay)
41 A: [sleeves, (0.5)] i [think,] (1.3) >i don’t remember the
42 (A’s RH grabs her LA sleeve)
43 B: [uhuh ]
44 A: name,< (1.5) and in: {he has, two pockets?}
45 (B nods)
46 (A’s HH point to where the pockets
47 would be on her belly)
48 (1.4)
49 B: =yes
50 A: but okay i think that is just the difference [the::]
51 B: (i think,}
52 (B nods)
53 B: (heh) (. ) okay,
54 (B nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y tiene un chaleco tch
B: ahí está el chaleco
A: era el chaleco el que no me acordaba cómo se decía

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: no tenía el chaleco

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: eh en el tuyo llevaba el chaleco y todo esto

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (238-262):
I: tú te diste cuenta de que era un chaleco
B: si cuando dijo es un jersey sin mangas
...
I: hasta ahí no sabías lo que era?
B: no podía ser yo que sé una chaqueta no sé no tenía ni idea de lo
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
chaleco (bolsillos)

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-262):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-8: A makes use of a message abandonment strategy.
- Unsuccessful communication.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-262):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 17: A makes use of a message abandonment strategy.
- Unsuccessful communication.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-262):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 31: A initiates the presentation of an approximation strategy.
- 33: B interrupts A’s presentation offering an approximation strategy.
- 34-35, 37-39, 41-42 and 44: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 36, 40, 43 and 45: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and backchannel continuers.
- 44: A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (396-399):
1 A: >and his father {is< handing with:, (0.5) with,} e::h the ha-
2 AAA’s LH grabs her RH
3 A: is handing the: the boy. (1.3) {i mean, (2.3) you know?}
4 AAA closes her RH to mimic
5 holding
6 A: {[he’s] handing the boy,} (0.5) okay
7 AAA’s RH holds her LA
8 B: [yes ]
9 B: okay e:h (0.6) in my picture the man i- has: both hands
10 {in the pockets,} (0.7) in the trousers [pockets]
11 {B’s HH point down to mimic hands in pockets, A is not
12 looking)
13 A: [ ah!] no.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: está agarrando al niño
B: lo llevaba sí justo
A: o sea lo agarra de la mano

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (396-399):
I: cuando dices ahí que ‘the father is handing the boy’ quieres
decir que lo lleva de la mano?
A: sí ... sí igual que coger un periódico
I: pero quiero decir sabes que se utiliza esa palabra? o conoces esa
palabra en otro contexto y lo aplicas aquí?
A: no claro si supongo que se podrá entender pero no creo que sea
correcto

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father’s hand: hanging the boy
ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (396-399):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1-7: B presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer, an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (475-479):
1 A: in my door there’re like, e:::h a thing::, when you have to::, (2.0) {in the old houses, when you:::, instead of the:::,} [A’s RH mimics grabbing a knocker]
2 A: {the bell.} (1.7) {you have to::, (1.4) you [know? ]}
3 (B nods)
4 [A’s RH mimics knocking] (°knock°)
5 B: a::h okay! (0.5) {uhuh}
6 (B nods)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (628-629):
1 B: you: you still watching the:, (1.2) {the:: thing to knock.
2 } [A shakes her head]
3 B: (1.0) on the door?=)
4 A: (=no!) because the door is completely open,
5 (A shakes her head)
6 NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: está simplemente para llamar a la puerta el bueno no sé el el éste pa llamar a la puerta heh

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (475-479):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-4, 6 and 7-8: A presents a combination of a circumlocution, including an approximation ‘bell’, and a nonverbal strategy.
- 11-12: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (628-629):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.6.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
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- 1-4: B presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-7: A understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (480-486):

1  A: and then there’s also e:::h, (0.8) mm:: (2.0) {like a hole?
2              (A’s HH draw a
3       rectangle in
4       the air, A
5       holds the
6       gesture, B
7       looks down)
8  A:   (2.4) when you::, (2.3)} {for example when the postman? (1.4)
9                                {
10    A’s RH mimics dropping mail in a
11       mailbox, A holds the gesture)
12 A:   put the:: the:[ ]
13 B:     {{[the] letters?}}
14   {((B’s HH mimic dropping mail in a mailbox)}}
15 A:   {{(yeah,)}}
16   {(A nods)}
17 B:   {so there is the: [the: ]} the: mailbox? (0.8) okay
18     {B draws a rectangle in the air)
19 A:                   {{(yeah,)}}
20                  {(A nods)}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (520-521):

1  A:   and {the::: thing:} {[to: ]} (xxx).=
2     {A’s HH draw a rectangle in the air}
3       (A’s RH mimics dropping mail in a
4       mailbox)
5  B:   [yeah]
6  B:   =okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   y se ve lo de lo de para meter las cartas
B:   lo de las cartas
A:   de bueno que aquí no lo suele haber pero que allá sí
B:   el buzón vamos el buzón?

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
mail box in the picture

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (480-486):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.16.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-11: A presents an approximation and a circumlocution, working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 12-13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance that completes A’s presentation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 14-15: A accepts B’s acceptance and completion with acknowledgments. Agreement on meaning is reached.
- 17-18: B presents what she believes to be A’s indented TL lexical item, ‘mailbox’ with rising intonation, i.e. checking for A’s confirmation.
- 19-20: A accepts B’s presentation providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (520-521):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination an all-purpose expression, ‘the thing’ and nonverbal strategies.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer.
- 6: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father knocks at the door

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (498-502):
1 A:   now {the father is::, e:::h (4.8)} {how do you say? {mm}}
2           {A raises her RH clenched in a fist, B is not looking}
3                                          {A’s RH knocks on the
table}
4 5 A:   [heh   ]
6 B:   [knocking?] (1.0) {uhuh}
7                      {B nods}
6       (0.5)
7  A:   mm yes, sorry, {he’s knocking} on the:, on the door.
8                      {A’s RH knocks on the table}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (511):
1 B:   the man mm was knocking

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   mm el padre está de espaldas esperando para llamar a la puerta

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   en el otro es que está llamando a la puerta
B:   ya está llamando si el mío no estaba llamando

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (498-502):
A:   ahí es que me sabía la palabra pero no me salía cuando me dice
knocking digo sí sí knocking

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
knocking (father) right

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (498-502):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to knock’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of an appeal for assistance and nonverbal strategies.
- 6-7: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7-8: A refashions her initial presentation and substitutes the previous CS with the TL item provided by B. As a result of the previous negotiation of meaning and form, A is now able to present her originally intended message using the originally intended TL lexical item.
- B accepts A’s refashion by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
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REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (605-610):

1  A: {i mean, the thing that you put to:::} {sustain the trousers?}
2       {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her chest}
3 4       {A’s HH mimics pulling up her
5       pants, A holds the
6       gesture}
7 8       {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her chest}
9 10     {A’s HH mimics pulling up her
11     pants, A holds the
12     gesture}
13 14     {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her chest}
15     {A’s HH mimics pulling up her
16     pants, A holds the
17     gesture}
18 19     {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her chest}
20     {A’s HH mimics pulling up her
21     pants, A holds the
22     gesture}
23
24 7 B: heh heh
25 8 A: heh
26 9 B: heh heh heh
27 10     (1.4)
28 11 A: you know [what] i mean?=
29 12 B: [heh ]
30 13 B: =(heh)yes, {{{(heh)yes}}} i think, (0.7) {{{yes.}}}
31     {{{B nods}}}
32     {{{B nods}}}
33 14     (0.5)
34 15 A: {{{yes?}}} (0.4) okay=}
35 16     {{{A nods}}}
36 17 B: =hm hm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (605-610):

I: tú le entendiste?
B: yo ahí no me fijé para nada ... no no no para nada
I: y tú creíste que ella te había entendido?
A: yo sí
B: ay!
A: como me dijo creo que me dijo yes o algo así pues dije yo pues me
entendió
B: ay dios! qué fallo!

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (605-610):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 11: A checks for comprehension.
- 13-15: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 17-18: A accepts B’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (876-897):

1  A: and he has as well the:::, {(1.5) the left?} (0.5) e:::h
2       {A’s LH touches her RA, A looks
3       down}
4 5       {A’s LH touches her RA, A looks down}
6       {A’s LH rolls up
7       her RA sleeve}
8 9       {A’s LH rolls up
10       her RA sleeve}
11
12 8 A: in this way.
13 9     (2.6)
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10 B: the the: new: man?  
11 A: yeah)  
12 (0.6)  
13 B: well the the:: (1.0) tch the boy? the very big boy? or [the:]  
14 A: [no! ]  
15 B: for his father?  
16 A: =the other, [the::, the,] {his father,}  
17 B: [his father?]  
18 {A nods}  
19 (1.2)  
20 B: is doing the same that the::? (0.5) [the first father?]  
21 A: {[ no no is] he’s  
22 {A waves her RH palm  
23 outward to indicate  
24 negation ×n, A looks down}  
25 A: not} doing the same, {he just has the::,  
26 {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve}  
27 (2.8)}  
28 B: {he’s not {{do[ing that?] he has that? (1.3) in that}} [way?]}  
29 {B’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve}  
30 {{A’s LH points to her RA}}  
31 A: [the shirt]  
32 { [no]  
33 {A’s LH  
34 rolls  
35 up her  
36 RA  
37 sleeve}  
38 A: he’s he just (1.3) has the:::, (2.2) the shirt?  
39 B: mhm  
40 A: in this way. (0.7)) but he’s not doing like the other which  
41 (1.5)  
42 B: {which was doing that.) heh heh before, okay, so he has  
43 {B’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve, B nods}  
44 A: yeah at the same time {he has as well the::: ] (2.8) the  
45 {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve, A holds  
46 the gesture}  
47 B: [uhuh]  
48 A: skirt in that way, (3.8) i don’t know if?  
49 (1.2)  
50 B: {{yes i kn-,}} ) [i know] it  
51 (B nods)  
52 {{okay }}  
53 (A nods)  

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:  
B: el padre se supone o sea el padre del se- del chico este grandote  
ya está remangado?  
A: sí pero está remangado desde el principio es que no sé si se me  
olvidó de decírtelo  
B: sí es que claro  
A: tiene como la camisa remangada simplemente pero que no  
B: no el otro o sea en el mío está siempre con la cholla estirada  
A: ah  
B: con la camisa estirada  

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (876-897):  
A: que aquí no me di cuenta de decirle lo de la camisa y me di  
cuenta luego cuando ya supuse que sería otro error en un  
principio supuse que como ya habíamos visto en ésta bastantes  
eroores no le dije  
B: cómo se dice remangado?
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I: rolled up
A: ah!

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (876-897):
- See the analysis for the TL lexical item ‘to roll up’

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (631-654):
1 A: i see {the::, (2.5) the hall.} (2.3) of the::=
2 {A opens her AA to outline the shape of something
3 round}
4 B: =what can you [see? ]
5 A: [i mean] the hall, only the:: {the wall.}
6 {A waves her RH
7 vertically ×2}
8 (1.4)
9 B: the wall? (0.7) (or the door)?
10 (0.7)
11 A: which is e::h with flowers.
12 (1.8)
13 B: {okay so heh} you can see [the wall,]
14 {B nods}
15 A: {[and ] with e::h, (1.4) on the
16 {A waves her HH palm down
17 horizontally ×n}
18 floor?
19 (1.4)
20 B: hm hm)
21 (0.8)
22 A: e::h it’s black and white.
23 (1.8)
24 B: {((sniff)) okay
25 (9.6)
26 B: e::h is there anything? you ca-? e:h can you see anything more
27 in the?: (0.5) [in] the: wall? (1.5) e:h [there’s]
28 A: {[no]}
29 {A shakes her head, A looks down}
30 A: [no just] the:::, 31 A: {the:::,
32 {A’s RI draws flowers in the air}
33 B: =the flowers?
34 (0.5)
35 A: the flowers. (0.7) li[ke ] (0.5) if it was decorated with
36 B: {([yes])}
37 {([B nods])}
38 A: flowers, you know?)
39 B: {([yes])}
40 {([B nods])}
41 A: =a::nd {on the floor,} what i::
42 {A waves her RH palm down horizontally ×n}
43 (1.3)
44 B: the white and black, is there any carpet or: something?
45 A: yeah it ca-, it seems that’s the carpet i suppose,
46  (0.6)
47  B:  okay

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
A:  y abajo pues parece como que es una alfombra de
B:  a cuadros blancos y negros
A:  a cuadros blancos y negros sí

**SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (631-654):**
I:  y tú por ejemplo cuando hablas del suelo qué te pareció una
A:  no en un principio me pareció eso el suelo pero cuando ella me
dice la alfombra digo ah! claro! será la alfombra porque después
digo no creo que el suelo sea así pero en un principio pensé que
era el suelo
I:  y simplemente le dices que es blanco y negro no le dices ni que
es en baldosas blancas y negras? ni que es a cuadros? ni nada de
eso simplemente no se te ocurrió o?
...  A:  como antes ya habíamos tenido el problema de las líneas y aquí no
eran líneas porque en la corbata sí eran líneas pero es que aquí
no podía usar líneas porque no son líneas entonces dije no voy a
decir otra vez straight porque no estoy segura dije pues blanco y
negro me entenderá como eso ya era una diferencia no era tampoco
era relevante si era me di cuenta que simplemente era importante
B:  que tuviera blanco y negro
A:  si era diferente del tuyo vamos
I:  pero si hubieras sabido decir que era a cuadros o describir el
dibujo lo habrías hecho?
A:  si al principio sí luego ya vi que no era importante

**RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
floor white/black (carpet)

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (631-654):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘checkered’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s
  identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

**REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (781-786):**
1  A:  the::: the::: the father of the: of the little boy, (1.2) is
2    e:::h (0.8) {i don’t know how do you say} {with, with one,
3    (A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve)
4    (A’s LH grabs her
5    RA)
6  A:  with his hand,) {is like doing this.
7    (A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve)
8  (2.2)
9  B:  oh my god! heh heh heh okay)
10 A:  you know? {like, [i’m going (heh)to:     ]
11    (A’s LH mimics punching}
12 B:  [(heh)hm (heh)hm heh heh] heh {to:} () hit
13    (B nods)
14 B:  you, okay

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (876-897):**
1  A:  and he has as well the:::, {(1.5) the left?} (0.5) e:::h
2    {A’s LH touches her RA, A looks
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3 down)
4 A: ha:n::d? (2.2) with: e::h {arm! sorry, e::h} {i mean, (1.2)
5     {A’s LH touches her RA, A looks down}
6     {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve}

7     {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve}
8 A: in this way.
9 (2.6)
10 B: the the: new: man?
11 A: yeah)
12 (0.6)
13 B: well the the:: (1.0) tch the boy? the very big boy? or [the:]
14 A: [no! ]
15 B: for his father?=
16 A: =the other, [the::, the,] {his father,}
17 B: [his father?]
18 (A nods)
19 (1.2)
20 B: is doing the same that the::? (0.5) [the first father?]
21 A: [(] no no is] he’s
22 {A waves her RH palm
23 outward to indicate
24 negation x:n, A looks down}
25 A: not) doing the same, {he just has the::,
26     {A’s LH rolls up her RA sleeve
27 (2.8))}
28 B: {he’s not {{do[ing that?] he has that? (1.3) in that}} [way?]}
29 {B’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve}
30     {{A’s LH points to her sleeve}}
31 A: [the shirt]
32     {[ no]
33     {A’s LH
34 rolls
35 up her
36 RA
37 sleeve}
38 A: he’s he just (1.3) has the:::, (2.2) the shirt?
39 B: mhm
40 A: in this way. (0.7)) but he’s not doing like the other which
41 (1.5)
42 B: {which was doing that.} heh heh before, okay, so he has
43 {B’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve, B nods}
44 A: yeah at the same time {he has as well the:[::, ] (2.8) the
45     {A’s RH rolls up her LA sleeve, A holds
46     the gesture}
47 B: [uhuh]
48 A: skirt in that way, (3.8) i don’t know if?
49 (1.2)
50 B: {{yes i kn-,}} ) [i kno]w it
51 (B nods)
52 {{A nods})

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: se está remangando? el padre ya para
A: sí
B: para pelearse con el otro

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (781-786):
A: lo que ya dijimos antes de la camisa remangada ah no aquí se lo digo no sé como se lo explico
B: que se está remangando he’s doing he’s doing

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the father ... is remangándose

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (781-786):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-8: A presents an appeal for assistance and an all-purpose expression ‘doing this’ in combination with nonverbal strategies.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 10-11: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding.
- 12-14: B understands and indicates acceptance completing A’s previous presentation and providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (876-897):
- Intended TL lexical items: ‘rolled up’ and ‘to roll’.
- 4-8: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression ‘in this way’ and a nonverbal strategy to compensate for the lack of the TL lexical item ‘rolled up’.
- 10: B asks for clarification.
- 20: B misunderstands A’s message ‘rolled up’ and believes she is trying to convey the message ‘to roll up’. B checks for confirmation of her understanding presenting an all-purpose expression ‘doing the same’ to compensate for her ignorance of the lexical item ‘to roll up’.
- 21-26: A understands B’s strategy and realizes B’s misunderstanding of her communicative intention. A refashions her previous presentation. She presents an all purpose expression ‘doing the same’ to compensate for the unavailable expression ‘to roll up’ and a nonverbal strategy to compensate for ‘rolled up’.
- 28-29: B understands now A’s original message and checks for confirmation. She uses a combination of an all-purpose expression ‘not doing that’ and a nonverbal strategy to compensate for ‘to roll up’ and an all purpose expression ‘in that way’ to compensate for ‘rolled up’.
- 31-39: A confirms B’s understanding repeating B’s previous strategies.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (876-897):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 43-47: A tries to convey again the meaning ‘rolled up’, but now to describe a different character. She repeats the previously successful combination of an all-purpose expression and a nonverbal strategy.
- 49-50: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 51-52: A accepts B’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: freckles
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (865-866):

1 A: (and he has like? (2.4) you know? i don’t know, A’s RI points to her cheek ×n)
2 (1.0)
3
4 B: {(yes! (0.5) mm: (0.5) hm hm) }
5 {(B nods)}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: eh con pecas
A: tch sí
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**B: el mío no tiene pecas**

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (865-866):**
A: lo de las pecas que no me acordaba cómo se decía
I: pero tú te diste cuenta
B: sí cuando me dijo así ti ti ti ti sí pecas

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
pecas

**ANALYSIS:**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (865-866):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.
- 1-2: A presents an appeal for assistance and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4-5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** striped tie

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (823-827):**
1 B: e:::h (1.4) mm::: the new man has a? (0.5) a tie?
2 (1.2)
3 A: yeah
4 (1.0)
5 B: {with [lines!? ]}
6 (B’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest, A is not looking)
7 A: [with ] lines yes=
8 B: =yes (ah) okay

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
B: sí con la o sea con las rayas

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
B: que en la mia no tenía la las rayas

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:**
No relevant data available

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
lines (tie)

**ANALYSIS:**
**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (823-827):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘striped’.
- 5-6: B presents a combination of a previously successful approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: A understands and indicates acceptance repeating B’s CS and providing an acknowledgment.
- 8: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** badge/school badge/emblem

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (820-823):**
1 A: {he has a cap?
2 (A’s LH mimics putting on a cap)
3 (1.6)
4 B: mm:::} {yes,}
5 (B nods)
6 (1.4)
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7 A: (with an? °emblem? ° i heh no} (heh)i don’t (heh)know=
8 (A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her head)
9 B: =yeah, (yes.)
10 (B nods)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (828-832):
1 A: and again (the:: the thing that the little boy:, (1.3) had.
2 (A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her
3 chest)
4 A: (2.8) the:[:: ]
5 B: [the] same or well more or less} [yeah] {the same
6 A: {{yeah}}
7 (A nods)
8 {B nods)
9 B: thing} okay, (2.4) in on:: his jacket?
10 (1.8)
11 A: ye:ah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: que en la mia no tenía la las rayas la insignia la misma?
A: hm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
insignia on his jacket
cap (insignia)

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (820-823):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 7-8: A presents a combination of a previously successful approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9-10: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (828-832)
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression ‘the thing’ and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-9: B understands and indicates acceptance repeating A’s CS and providing an acknowledgment.
- 11: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
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DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-INT FC

PARTICIPANT A: Fernando, male, 25, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 3 months in England

PARTICIPANT B: Cristina, female, 24, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 3 months in England

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (13-20):

1  A:   and a:: (1.3) {and a jacket,} a:nd with [a:: ] {a kind of
2 A's HH point to his chest}
3 B:    {[[hm hm]]}
4     {B nods}
5     {A's LH points to where the
6     badge would
7     be on his
8     chest}
9
10 A:   e::h (0.8) of painting in::
11     (0.5)
12 B:   painting!?=
13 A:   =a:: bah! painting (0.5) e::h=
14 B:    {=a blade?}
15     {(B's RH points to her chest})
16 A:   eso ('right')!} a blade.}) (1.0) a blade.=
17 B:    =yes

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (149-151):

1  B:   there's a bla-? a a:: {a blade} in:?
2     {B's RH points to left side of her
3     chest}
4 A:    {yeah,} in the in her jacket, yeah=
5     {A nods}
6 B:    =mm::: (2.6) (me not.) (1.3) mm::: not.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:   tú ya tienes el escudito?
A:   sí con escudito

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (13-20):
I:    aquí cuando dices a (a kind of) painting?
A:   no sabía cómo se decía escudo no sé no sabía
I:    y tú sabías
B:    bade o blazer o no sé
I:    a badge

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
a blade

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (13-20):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.11a.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
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- 1-10: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 12: B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 13: A repeats his initial presentation and tries to refashion it, but is interrupted by B who is going to complete this refashion.
- 14: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a simultaneous nonverbal strategy, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. She has understood A’s message but the term she is proposing does not convey this meaning, i.e. she is making a mistake.
- 16: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the TL item provided by B. A believes the TL item provided by B is the originally desired but unavailable term ‘badge’, he is therefore in an error.

SUCCESSFUL AGREEMENT ON MEANING, BUT FAILED ATTEMPT TO CREATE CORRECT AND APPROPRIATE TL LEXIS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (149-151):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.11b.
- The TL lexical item ‘blade’ has been grounded and is now used to refer to the ‘badge’, and understood by all the participants. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (82-97):
1  B: he seems to be:: flowing,
2  A: yeah
3  B: in the earth.
4       (1.3)
5  A: he has [a:: ]
6  B: [in the] air.
7       (1.5)
8  A: her right eye is (0.8) black.
9  B: mm!? (1.3) what?
10      (1.0)
11 A: her her his (3.2) his right eh eye (1.5) is black.
12      (3.5)
13 B: his right?
14      (1.4)
15 A: eye.
16      (1.0)
17 B: eye is black?
18 A: yeah
19      (1.5)
20 B: {mine no,} (2.0) mine not.
21      (B shakes her head)
22 A: full black.
23      (1.0)
24 B: {no,} (1.2) mine is normal, (0.8) e::h a black eye? (1.4)
25      (B shakes her head)
26 B: [no?  ]
27 A: {[yeah.]} (2.5) black eye.
28      (A nods)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (306):
1  A: and the boy:: is pointing (out) the the: yeah the the:: black
2  eye,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (324-325):
1  A: i i i can- i only can see a:: (0.8) a black (0.5) a black eye.
2  B: {mm hm} claro (‘of course’).
3      (B nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: aparece como un ojo todo morado
B: con un ojo morado hm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (82-97):
I: y luego cuando hablais del ojo morado sabiais que ojo morado se dice black eye?
A: sí es que no me salía pero luego ya me lo dijo ella
B: si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eyed

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (82-97):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 8: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 9: B asks for clarification.
- 11: A repeats the previous circumlocution strategy.
- 13 and 17: B checks for confirmation repeating the strategy used by A with rising intonation.
- 18: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding.
- 24: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item.
- 27-28: A recognizes and accepts it providing acknowledgments and repeating the item presented by B.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (306):
- The TL lexical item ‘black eye’ has been grounded and is now used by A. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (324-325):
- The TL lexical item ‘black eye’ has been grounded and is now used by A. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (214):
1 A: he has a:: (2.2) a:: white (0.7) a white e::h (1.5) a white
2       jacket, and a:: (1.5) a white tie,
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (222-240):
1 A: mm::: no, no in the shirt but in the:: in the: in the jacket,
2       (1.8)
3 B: in the jacket!? 
4 A: it’s a:: {ºespecie de chaleco ('kind of a vest')º.}
5       {A's HH outline the shape of a vest on his body}
6       (1.5)
7 B: ah! not, (1.5) {no no no,} (1.2) mine is a:: a shirt wi:th
8       {B shakes her head}
9 B: (1.4) {with a:: (1.2) a:: joder ('fuck')!} (2.2) cómo se dice
10      {B's HH point to where the pocket would be on her chest}
11 B: bolsillo ('how do you say pocket')? (4.3) {wi:th a::?}
12      {B's HH point to where the pocket would be on her chest}
13 A: vale. ('okay') heh heh (2.0) he has a: (2.0) [a jacket with]
14 B: [eh you-     ]
15 your man hasn’t e::h?
16 (0.7)
17 A: no=
18 B: (=hasn’t a::) [bolsillo ('pocket')?]
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19  (B's RH points to where the pocket would be on her chest)
20 A:   ([no no no             ] no no [no no])
21  (A shakes her head)
22 B:   [uhuh ] and has
23  [a:: an over:: (1.5)] jacket (without e:::h (1.2))
24  (B's HH outline the shape of a vest
25     around her body, A's not looking)
26  (B's RH outlines an armhole
27     around her left shoulder)
28 B:   (arms? (1.0) mm?=)
29  (B's LH outlines an armhole around her right shoulder)
30 A:   (=yeah (0.5) yeah} (0.5) a:::nd he e:::h it ha- it has a:: two
31  (A nods)
32 A:   button two buttons two buttons or: (0.7) ºbotones
33  (‘buttons’)º.
34 B:   si (‘yes’) buttons.
35 A:   (buttons.) (1.0) [a:::nd     ] (2.4) and (two places to:: to
36  (A nods)
37 B:   [two buttons]
38  (A's HH point to
39 where the bolsillos
40 would be on his
41 body)
42 A:   wear things, e:::h two bolsillos ('pockets').)
43  (3.0)
44 B:   in the:::? in the:: chaleco ('vest')?
45 A:   (yeah)
46  (A nods)
47  (0.5)
48 B:   (mhm)
49  (B nods)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-287):
1  B:   he still has the:: (chaleco ('vest')?)
2  (B’s RH points to chest
3     (1.2)
4  A:   yeah.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (607-608):
1  B:   a:::nd he's still (with the:: chaleco: ('vest')?=)
2  (B’s HH point to chest
3  A:   (=yeah yeah)
4  (B nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (222-240):
I:   aquí también con el chaleco y tal es que la primera vez que te
    habla tú simplemente le dices que lleva a jacket
A:   mhm
B:   hm hm
I:   y ahí o sea tú ya eras consciente de que no es un jacket de que
    es un chaleco aunque no se lo especificas
A:   no porque no no sabía cómo se decía chaleco tampoco
I:   mhm
B:   cómo se dice?
I:   waistcoat
A:   es verdad
B:   waistcoat?
...
I:   y también en algún momento dijiste over jacket without arms
    entonces ahí no sé si usaste arms conscientemente o quiero decir
si lo utilizaste por sleeves o si simplemente fue porque en ese momento te salió
B: sí a mi me salió arms
I: o fue porque a lo mejor no te salía la palabra sleeve?
B: no heh yo es que hablo fatal tanto en castellano como en inglés además tengo un una pequeña un pequeño grado de dislexia y confundo muchas palabras constantemente
I: o sea que fue la confusión del momento
B: sí

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no chaleco

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (214):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message ‘vest’. H substitutes this message with an alternative one ‘jacket’.
- Unsuccessful communication.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (222-240):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 4-5: A presents a code switching strategy and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 22-29: B refashions A’s initial presentation offering a circumlocution strategy and nonverbal strategies.
- 30-33: A indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and continuing with the conversation, i.e. providing a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (222-240):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 44: B presents a previously successful code switching strategy.
- 45: A understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance, i.e. a response to B’s question.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-287):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-2: B presents a previously successful code switching strategy and a nonverbal strategy. → there is rising intonation, but it is a try marker, we do not consider it a question: there is no interrogative structure
- 4: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (607-608):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-2: B presents a previously successful code switching strategy and a nonverbal strategy. → there is rising intonation, but it is a try marker, we do not consider it a question: there is no interrogative structure
- 3: A understands and indicates acceptance providing and acknowledgment
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (355-367):

1  A:  the:: right, (0.7) the arm, (0.5) is: (2.6) e:\[::h]
2  B:  
3  (1.0) [to something?]
4  A:  {is:::} van de la mano (‘they are holding
5  {A’s LH mimics holding someone else’s hand}
6  A:  hands’).
7  (1.5)
8  B:  a:::h!
9  (2.6)
10 A:  le agarra de [la mano (‘he holds his hand’),]
11 B:  [a:::h!] (2.0) no no no.
12 A:  {(hm)}
13 {(B waves RI to say no)}
14 (1.5)
15 B:  mine,) (2.0) not. (3.0) my pi[cture]
16 A:  [ the] father holds the::
17 (2.5)
18 B:  hm hm
19 (1.5)
20 A:  the hand of [the boy.]
21 B:  [ the fa:]ther (2.8) holds: (1.4) the hand
22 A:  hm
23 (2.0)
24 B:  o:f (1.5) hi::s son.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B:  hm lo lleva de la mano a casa del otro
A:  (xxx) lo lleva de la mano hhh

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (355-367):
I:  por ejemplo para lo de que lo llevaba de la mano
A:  cómo?
I:  en la siguiente que lo llevaba de la mano
B:  creo que lo dijo en castellano
I:  es que se lo dijiste en castellano ... fue porque no no sabías
   cómo decirlo en inglés
A:  porque te dije cómo te dije después? hold?
B:  sí
A:  hold es que no sabía como y
B:  ay! cómo es holding his
A:  his hands
B:  his son’s hand
I:  si primero dijiste the hand is is is y luego dijiste van de la
   mano
A:  sí

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the father holds the hand of his son

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (355-367):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1: A initiates the presentation of the message ‘holding hands’ and encounters a communicative
  problem, before being able to develop an alternative means of expression to compensate for this
  problem, he is interrupted by B.
- 2-3: B interrupts A in order to complete his presentation and offer what she believes to be the TL
  lexical item A is having problems with. Her guess is however erroneous.
- 4-6: A presents a code switch strategy in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 10: A completes his previous presentation with a new code switch.
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- 11: B understands and indicates acceptance with an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- 16 and 20: A is now able to retrieve and use the previously unavailable TL expression ‘holding the hand’.
- 21 and 24: B understands and indicates acceptance repeating part of A’s previous presentation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (390-399):
1 A: it has {a:: (0.5) a sp- a:: kind of (1.7) circle,} (2.5) in
2 {A’s RI draws a circle on the table, B is not looking}
3 A: the:: (2.0) in the:: e::h (1.4) bueno (‘well’), (1.4) tch
4 (2.0) {a:: circle,} {in::}
5 {A’s RI draws a circle in the air}
6 {A’s RI point upwards}
7 (1.8)
8 B: (xxx)?
9 A: no! in the: in the door.
10 (2.0)
11 B: ah! a circle in the door. ah! mirilla (‘door peephole’).
12 A: (=a kind of a:: a kind of (0.8) knocker.
13 {A’s RH mimics knocking}
14 B: a:::h!} {yes yes} yes [yes yes] (1.4) {to knock?
15 {B nods}
16 A: 
17 } {B’s RH mimics knocking}
18 A: yeah.)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (417-418):
1 B: tch a:::nd (0.5) something to knock?
2 (1.4)
3 A: yeah something:: to kn- to knock.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (469-474):
1 B: a::nd the::: (2.4) {the knock?} e:h {the thing to knock, is
2 (B’s II draw a circle in the air)
3 {B’s LH mimics knocking}
4 B: still in the door?
5 (0.8)
6 A: yeah, it is still in the door.=
7 B: =mhm (2.3) mm
8 (2.8)
9 A: but the father (.). {uses her::=}
10 {A’s RH mimics knocking}
11 B: (=hm)
12 {B nods}
13 A: her hand to:: to knock, (0.8) not the:

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (390-399):
B: y tampoco sabíamos decir esto
I: el knocker
B: ah! se dice knocker!
I: si
A: knocker
I: que tú en un momento llegaste a decir knocker
B: si!
A: si pero no no sabía
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I: tu dijiste knocker pero como no
B: sí sí
A: dije knocker
B: sí lo dijiste
I: pero como como ya no tal pues entonces volvisteis a entonces no sé tú cuando le oiste decir knocker
B: yo decía sí
I: o sea lo de knocker tú lo reconociste?
B: si supo que estaba diciendo pero digo no sé si será yo si
I: o sea no sabías si era la palabra o sí
B: claro no sabía sí se lo había inventado o si cuadraba realmente
A: uhh! es que me lo había inventado knocker knocking knocker heh heh
B: heh heh heh
A: está bien

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

to knock, the thing to knock

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (390-399):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.27.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B seems to ask for clarification.
- 11: B believes she has understood A’s intended message and refashions A’s presentation offering a code switch strategy. B has in fact misunderstood A’s communicative intention
- 12-14: A recognizes B’s misunderstanding and offers a word coinage strategy and a nonverbal strategy. A is not aware that this word coinage strategy has in fact resulted in correct TL lexis.
- 15-16: B believes she has understood A’s message, but she is uncertain so she checks for confirmation: ‘to knock?” and a nonverbal strategy.
- 19: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (417-418):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.5.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1: B presents a combination.
- 3: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating B’s previous circumlocution strategy.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (469-474):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-4: A presents a word coinage strategy, i.e. using a known verb ‘knock’ as a noun, a circumlocution and nonverbal strategies.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance, i.e. a response to A’s question.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (469-474):
- 13: complete omission strategy
- B indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (399-416):
1 A: and in the:: (1.0) in the center of the door, (1.4)
2 (there’s a:: (1.2) a rectangle to::) i (1.4) i imagine
3 (A’s RH draws a rectangle in the air, B is not looking)
4 A: (to:: (1.2) introduce) e:::h the po- e::h the post, (2.2) i
5 (A’s RH mimics introducing a letter in a mailbox)
6 A: think.
7 (1.5)
8 B: hm hm (1.5) o sea una:: ('i mean a’) (1.7) post? (0.8)
9 postbox?
10 A: (si ('yes')=
11 (A’s RH draws a rectangle in the air, B is not looking)
12 B: =o: boxpost,
13 A: es como::) ('it’s like’) (0.5) it’s like a:: (4.5)
14 (a rectangle) in the in the: in the door.
15 (A’s RH draws a rectangle in the air, B is not looking)
16 (4.5)
17 B: a:::
18 A: =no sé si me explico ('i don’t know if i am clear enough')?
19 (1.3)
20 B: a triangle?
21 (1.0)
22 A: (no a rectangle.
23 (A’s RH draws a rectangle in the air)
24 (1.2)
25 B: (rectangle?
26 (B nods)
27 A: rectangle.=)
28 B: =yes))
29 A: ((sniff)) (2.5) well (0.7) there’s a::=
30 B: (=on the door?
31 A: yeah.) (0.5) on the door.
32 (1.8)
33 B: hm hm (1.2) (ah claro ('of course’)!} ((clearing the throat))
34 (B nods)
35 B: (la rejilla esa) ('that kind of grille’).
36 (B’s LH mimics introducing a letter in a slot)
37 A: ((eso ('that’s it’).))
38 (A nods)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (475-478):
1 B: and the::? {(1.0) mm rectangle} of the: (0.5) [the ] postbox=
2 (B’s HH draw a rectangle in the air)
3 A: (yeah})
4 (A nods)
5 A: =it’s still there, (1.2) yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (399-416):
A: y esto como se llama? por donde se meten las cartas?
I: mailbox
A: mailbox? pero no pero no es el?
B: pues yo puse post box
A: se dice igual que la? que la cajita?
I: si
B: yo yo puse post postbox
A: mhm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (475-478):
B: luego la la el rectángulo este
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A: mailbox

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
post box

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (399-416):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-9 and 12: B believes she has understood the message but she checks for confirmation presenting an alternative word coinage strategy with rising intonation.
- 10-11 and 13-15: A confirms B’s understanding providing an acknowledgment, a nonverbal strategy and a new combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 20: B has misunderstood part of the circumlocution.
- 22: A recognizes this misunderstanding and repeats the relevant part of his previous presentation.
- 25: B understands now
- 33-36: B understands now A’s original intended message. She indicates it providing acknowledgments and a combination of a code switch and a nonverbal strategy.
- 37-38: A confirms B’s understanding and indicates acceptance with acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (475-478):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-2: B presents a previously successful approximation for ‘slot’ and a previously successful word coinage for ‘mailbox’ in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 3: A understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (570-574):

1 A: he {we- e::h he wears e::h (1.5) tirantes (‘suspenders’),
2 (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
3 A: como:: esto: (‘like this’) (0.8) tirantes (‘suspenders’).
4 (0.8))
5 B: a::h! tirantes (‘suspenders’),=
6 A: (=sí (‘yes’).)
7 (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
8 (1.5)
9 B: sí, no sé cómo se dicen tirantes, (‘yes i don’t know how to
10 say suspenders’)
11 A: (ni idea (no idea))
12 (A shakes his head)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (570-574):

I: bueno y lo de los tirantes que dijisteis
B: ah! es verdad dónde está?
A: sí los los tirantes del este
B: como se dice tirantes
I: braces o suspenders
A: yo no sabía no sabía cómo se decía

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
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ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (570-574):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a code switching and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance repeating A’s CS.
- 6-7: A confirms B’s understanding with an acknowledgment and a nonverbal strategy.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (547-564):

```
1  A: he wears:, he wears, he wears a:: (1.8) a:: (1.3) {a shirt,}
    {B nods}
2  A: with: e::h=                
3  B: =one two three four five six, maybe, 
    (0.7)
4  A: one [two three four five.]
5  B: [uno dos tres cuatro cinco ('one two three four five'),]
6  A: [cinco ('five')!] (1.6) five. (0.8) [buttons.]
7  B: {cinco ('five')!} (1.6) five. (0.8) [buttons.]
8  B: {cinco ('five')!} (1.6) five. (0.8) [buttons.]
9  B: {cinco ('five')!} (1.6) five. (0.8) [buttons.]
10 A: [e::h = ] one two three
11  four five, (0.5) five. (1.2) a::nd {the:: (0.7) the
12  {A’s LH holds left sleeve}
13  [cómo se llama esto ('what is its name')?]
14 B: {[without:: bolsillos ('pockets')?]
15  {B’s RH points to where the pocket would be on her chest}
16  (1.5)
17 A: las:: [: (.) de\] la ('of the') shirt,} {(0.5) [están ('are')?]} 
18 B: [ah! e::h ]
19  {A’s LH holds up right
20  sleeve}
21 B: [no ]                
22  sleeves. (0.7) sleeves. (0.5) {mangas ('sleeves').}
23  {A’s RH holds left sleeve}
24 A: eso ('right'), {están::: ('they are')
25  {A’s LH holds up left sleeve}
26  (1.5)
27 B: uhuh e::h [rolled?]
28 A: [reman- ] remangadas ('rolled up')=
29 B: =rolled up
30 A: rolled [up? ]
31 B: [puede] ser ('it may be')
32 A: rolled up?=
33 B: =rolled up (2.0) e::h
```

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (547-564):
I: y lo de las mangas remangadas tampoco ... lo de las mangas remangadas que yo no me acuerdo como le dices
B: sleeves rolled up
A: rolled up rolled up
I: si eso lo dices tú después
A: sí
I: pero tú al principio
A: yo le digo yo le hago el gesto le hago el gesto
B: claro
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I: y tú sabías que se decía rolled up? te sonaba? no estabas segura?
B: sí roll es enrollar y roll up sería subir hacia arriba enrolla
     hacía arriba no?
A: hm sí

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the sleeves rolled up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (547-564):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.6a.
- Intended TL lexical items: ‘sleeves’ and ‘rolled up’.
- 1-3: A initiates the presentation of his message ‘rolled up sleeves’ but is interrupted by B before
     finishing his presentation
- 17-20: A presents his message rolled up sleeves. He lacks the TL item ‘sleeves’ and the item ‘rolled
     up’. He uses a complete omission strategy to compensate for ‘sleeves’ and a nonverbal strategy to
     compensate for ‘rolled up’.
- 21-23: A understands the strategy for ‘sleeves’ and indicates acceptance presenting the intended TL
     item with a nonverbal strategy.
- 24: A accepts B’s acceptance and the TL item provided with an acknowledgment. A presents a
     combination of a complete omission and a repetition of the previous nonverbal strategy to
     compensate for ‘rolled up’.
- 27: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure
     of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 28: A is unsure of B’s understanding and refashions her initial presentation with a code switching
     strategy.
- 29: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL lexical item.
- 30: A checks for confirmation.
- 32: A checks for confirmation again.
- 33: B confirms ‘rolled up’ as the intended TL lexical item.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
  communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (521-530):
1  A: in the: in the floor, (1.2) there’s like a::
   (1.0)
2  B: carpet?
3  (2.2)
4  A: mm::: no it’s a:: (0.5) the floor is e::h (1.5) there are e::h
   (0.7)
5  B: draws in the floor?
6  (0.7)
7  A: cube, {e::h like a::: (. ) chess, (xxx) a::=
   (A’s HH draw a square in the air)
8  B: {=yes yes} [yes] yes ] yes
9  (B nods)
10 A: [you know?]
11 A: mhm
12 B: yes

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (773-776):
1  A: and the:=
2  B: the:: floor li[ke]
3  A: [a ] chess floor.
4  B: a chess floor.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
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No relevant data available

**SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (517-530):**

A: bueno el suelo dije que era como un tablero de ajedrez o algo así no?
B: si
A: mhm a cuadros
I: ... ahí estás como pensando... no sé si es que a lo mejor estabas pensando
A: si estaba pensando en todo azulejos o cuadraditos o
B: si yo también estaba pensando como se diría baldosa brick me salió
A: si o baldosa
B: pero baldosa cómo se dice baldosa
I: tile
B: es verdad! como teja
A: hm

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
the floor is like a chess board

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (521-530):**
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.20.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘checkered’.
- 1: A initiates his presentation of the message ‘tiles’ and ‘checkered’ but is interrupted by B before completing his presentation.
- 3: B presents what she believes to be A’s intended TL lexical item. But she fails in her guessing.
- 5: A initiates again the presentation but is again interrupted by B
- 7: B presents what she believes to be A’s intended TL lexical item. But she fails again in her guessing.
- 9-10: A presents an approximation ‘cube’, a circumlocution ‘like a chess’ and a nonverbal strategy to compensate for ‘checkered’
- 11-12: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 13: A checks for comprehension.
- 14: B confirms she has understood the message with an acknowledgment.
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (773-776):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘checkered’.
- 2: B initiates the presentation of the meaning ‘checkered’ but is interrupted by A.
- 3: A has understood B’s intention and completes her presentation with a circumlocution strategy.
- 4: B confirms A’s understanding repeating his CS.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (713-716):**
1  B:   with hi:s: e::h (2.6) with his: hand?
2  A:   {eh close to: (0.7) close to the body, a:[n:d]}  
3       {A bends RA on his chest, imitating the picture}
4  B:                                            [to ] his breast?
5  A:   yeah

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (728-729):**
1  B:   the the father is .hhh (with his hand in:: (0.5) in the
2  (B bends RA on her chest)
3  B:   breast?
4  A:   yeah
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NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (713-716):
A: breast que no me salía pero me lo dijo ella

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the hand in the breast

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (713-716):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘breast’.
- 2-3: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 5: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (728-729):
- The TL lexical item ‘breast’ has been grounded and is now used by B and understood by A. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (745-752):
1 A: e::h (1.4) the: (0.8) the father of the boy, (1.8) e::h
2 appears with e::h (1.5) {the: (1.0) e::h left (1.0) arm} (1.6)
3 {A’s RH mimics rolling up left sleeve)
4 A: e::h rolled rolled up the: the sleeve of of of the::
5 B: [heh]
6 A: of the=
7 B: =like like saying {i’m going to: [push] you,} [heh heh
8 {B mimics punching}
9 A: [yeah]
10 A: [si ('yes') heh]
11 heh heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (784-787):
1 B: the other one is: {rolling up} hi[s:: ] sleeve.
2 {B’s RH rolls up left sleeve}
3 A: [yeah]
4 A: yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
the father is rolling his sleeves up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (745-752):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.6b.
- The TL lexical item ‘rolled up’ has been grounded and is now used by A. See analysis of excerpt (547-564) above. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (784-787):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.6b.
- The TL lexical item ‘rolled up’ has been grounded and is now used by B and understood by A. See analysis of excerpt (547-564) above. There is no need for CS use.
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REFERENT: cap
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (874-875):
1 A: {and a:: (1.5) and a:: (2.3) and a hat. bueno ('well') a hat
2 {A’s LH mimics putting on and off a cap}
3 A: (0.7) *gorra ('cap') (0.7) cómo se llama ('how is it called')?
4 se dice gorra ('do you say gorra')?* (6.3) tch
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (874-875):
B: ah! tenía una gorra!
A: te lo dije te lo dije
B: sí!
... B: luego el chavalito que no no tenía ni idea de que tenía gorrita
A: pues te dije que que tenía
B: ah! claro claro por eso ah pues yo te entendí que tenía otra cosa
por eso te dije lo del fringe que tenía flequillo pues mira el
mio como lo tiene
A: si hm no te dije que tenía como un hat cómo es gorra? es que no
sabía pero te dije un hat
B: gorra? cap
A: mm pues te dije que tenía como un hat en la cabeza o sea
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (874-875):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'cap'.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy followed by a code
switching and an appeal for assistance.
- B does not indicate acceptance, in fact she has not paid attention to A’s message.
- Unsuccessful communication

REFERENT: freckles
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (875-897):
1 A: a:nd {he has picks? (1.4) on her face.) (2.0) on his face.
2 {A’s LI points to her cheek drawing freckles ×n}
3 (2.7) (xxx)=
4 B: =what?
5 A: picks. {(2.4) no sé si se llaman ('i don’t know if they are
6 {A’s LI points to her cheek drawing freckles ×n}
7 A: called’) picks.}
8 B: picks?
9 A: e::h
10 B: picks
11 A: como ‘like’
12 B: spots?
13 (1.6)
14 A: no::=
15 B: =e::h pecas ('freckles’)?
16 A: pecas ('freckles’), (sí ('yes’).)
17 (A nods)
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18 B: dots?
19 A: sí (‘yes’)
20 B: dots?
21 A: hm
22 B: spots?
23 A: sí (‘yes’)
24 B: (cómo se decía (‘how was it said’)?) ah! yo lo sabía (‘i knew
(B’s RH on the chin, like thinking)
26 B: it’).
27
(4.0)
28 A: bueno,) tiene puntuítos negros en la cara (‘well he has little
29 black dots in the face’).
30
(1.3)
31 B: (hm hm) mine not, mine has (2.0) voy a poner (‘i am gonna
32 (B nods)
33 B: write’) dots, in his: (1.7) face.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (875-897):
I: y lo de las pecas también
A: las pecas
B: mhm freckles no?
A: freckles no sé por que dije picks

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (875-897):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.
- 1-3: B uses what he believes to be the TL item for ‘freckles’, but he is making a mistake and this item
is not recognized by B.
- 4: B asks for clarification.
- 5-7: A repeats his previous presentation.
- 8-10: B checks for confirmation.
- 11: A imitates a refashioning of his initial presentation but is interrupted by B.
- 12: B offers what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item, but fails in her guessing.
- 15: B believes she had understood the message and checks for confirmation using a code switching
strategy with rising intonation.
- 16-17: A confirms B’s understanding.
- 18, 20, 22: B offers two approximation strategies to substitute the previous code switching strategy.
- 33: the approximate term ‘dots’ is agreed as an alternative term of reference for ‘freckles’
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (869-872):
1 B: {with a blade?
2       {B’s RH points to her chest
3       (1.0)
4 A: {{with a [blade.}}}
5       {{A nods}}
6 B: [or:: ] blazer, no me acuerdo cómo se dice (‘i don’t
7 remember how do you say it’). (2.3) (blade or blazer.=)
8       {B’s RH points to chest
9       and draws circles ×n)
8
A: =yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
a blade

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (869-872):
- The TL lexical item ‘blade’ has been grounded as a term of reference for ‘badge’ and is now used and understood by all the participants. See analysis of excerpt (13-20) above. They, however, agree now that they are not sure of the appropriateness of this term. There is no need for CS use.
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DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-INT SC

PARTICIPANT A: Sofía, female, 23, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student, 4 months in U.S.A.

PARTICIPANT B: Concha, female, 35, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 1st year undergraduate student, 1 month in England

REFERENT: to punch/fist

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-6):
1 A: first picture e:h i can see a: little: boy, (0.8) or a
   child, hhh and a (0.5) a hand, (1.2) e:h which is: e:h
2 pushing him (0.6) [or]
3 B: [i-] is an (open: hand?) or (a closed
4 (B opens her LH)
5 {B makes a fist
6 with her LH}
7
8 B: [one? ]}
9 A: [closed] one.
10 B: [closed?=]
11 {B makes a fist with her LH}
12 A: {{=mhm}}
13 {{A nods}}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (19-25):
1 B: you:: can only see {the open hand?} {and the arm no?
2 (B opens her LH)
3 {B’s RH points to her LA}
4 A: yeah, {{and some some,} (1.0))} yeah only the open (0.7) the
5 {{A’s RH draws lines in the air}}
6 A: closed (0.5) hand >°(i don’t know)°< (2.2) {lines!
7 (A’s RH draws
8 lines in the air}
9
10 A: [mhm]
11 (0.5)
12 B: {{lines?}}
13 {{B nods}}
14 (0.7)
15 A: three lines.)
16 B: hm hm
17 A: heh heh (1.2) and, (.) nothing else,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh y una mano cerrada que le está dando un golpe
B: hm hm
A: dándole un golpe

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (1-6):
A: si empujándolo porque no se me ocurrió cómo decir pegándole
I: tú le preguntaste si la mano estaba abierta por qué?
B: porque aquí la vi abierta ... y era para ver si esto era una
diferencia o no

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
close one; the lines
ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-6):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to hit’.
- 2-3: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 4-8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (19-25):
- According to the retrospective comments learner uses intended TL lexis. There is no CS.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (60-69):

1. A: mm it is not a jacket but, (0.5) a thing {without (0.8)} e::h
2. \( (A’s \ HH \ point \ to \ her \ shoulder) \)
3. A: the::) (1.4) °how is it called? (1.0) i don’t remember,° (1.2)
4. \( \{ \)the other thing, (0.4) without\} \{the: (1.2)\} \{not a jacket
5. \( A’s \ HH \ point \ to \ her \ shoulder} \)
6. \( (A’s \ HH \ grab \ her \ sleeves) \)
7. \( (A’s \ HH \ point \ to \ her \ chest) \)
8. A: but (0.4) what [what ] you wear inside the jacket.}
9. B: {\{[a shirt?]\}}
10. \( (B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ her \ chest \ with \ a \ pencil})\)
11. B: ah! inside e:h=
12. A: =mhm
13. \( (2.0) \)
14. B: e::h i don’t know the name, (0.7) {like a jacket without)
15. \( B’s \ HH \ point \ to \ her \ chest} \)
16. A: \{[the:::?]\}
17. \( B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ her \ LA \ sleeve)\)
18. B: {\{[yeah! ]\}} you know {what i mean)?} } 
19. \{(A nods)\)
20. B: yes

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-91):

1. B: and sorry (0.8) eh has he got {a: pocket in his: shirt?
2. \( B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ where \ the \ shirt \ pocket \ would \ be \ on \ her \ chest) \)
3. 
4. \( (1.2) \)
5. 6. B: two po- \{two [pockets?]} \)
6. \( A’s \ RH \ points \ to \ where \ the \ vest \ pockets \ would \ be \ on \ her \ belly)\)
7. \( A’s \ HH \ point \ to \ her \ belly} \)
8. \( A \{two poc\}kets, \{mhm\}
9. \( A \{nod\}s\)
10. \( (11.5) \)
11. B: \( and \ he \ has \ got \ e:h \ no \ lines? (1.2) \{on \ his \ trousers?\} \) on his:
12. \( B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ her \ pants} \)
13. \( B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ her \ shirt)\)
14. 15. B: \{shirt?\}
16. \( B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ her \ shirt)\)
17. \( B’s \ RH \ points \ to \ her \ shirt} \)
18. A: {\{(on the shirt,)\}}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

((A nods))
(1.2)
B: on his?
A: =on the: shirt yes {like a line [over ] here,} (0.8) no just
{A’s RH points to where the vest lines
would be on her belly}
B: {{[lines?]}}
{{{B’s RH draws lines on her
chest with a pencil}}}
A: one. no not lines.=
B: =over::?) (1.2) what part of the of the shirt?
(1.5)
A: over the::: the shirt? (. you mean? (. over the::: pocket.
{A’s LH points to
where the vest
pockets would be on
her belly}
B: (1.5)
A: over the pocket?)
B’s RH points to where the shirt pocket would be on her
chest
A: yeah, (0.5) one line,
B: one line?
A: hm hm
(5.2)
B: (hm) (2.0) you can, (. go on.)
(5.2)
A: (B nods)
B waves her RH in circles to indicate
go on
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh lleva un chaleco que esa palabra no la sabía en inglés
B: hm hm pero lo describiste
A: perfectamente heh heh heh
B: heh heh heh

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (60-69):
A: ahi no sabía cómo se decía claramente chaleco
I: tú te diste cuenta de que era?
B: un chaleco sí heh

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (60-69):
A: tampoco sé la palabra mangas
B: mm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (75-91):
I: habláis del
A: del chaleco como shirt
I: tú entendiste que te decía el chaleco como shirt
A: claro porque como tuviera que volver a explicarme todo heh heh
heh
I: pero tú en realidad te referías a la?
B: a la blusa a la camisa
A: ah! claro que en la tuya no tenía chaleco
B: claro yo le estaba preguntando del bolsillo si tenía un bolsillo
ella me decía que dos pero yo realmente lo estaba interpretando
I: ... tú piensas que ella te está entendiendo el bolsillo de la
camisa?
B: si
I: y tú piensas que te está entendiendo los bolsillos del chaleco
A: heh curioso! claro y yo empecé a referirme al chaleco como shirt
al oírle a ella decir shirt dije bueno pues lo llamamos así para
no tener que explicar otra vez todo el rollo heh heh heh
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

B: sí heh
A: entonces claro ella como no tenía tal pues
B: claro no pero que conste que yo te entendí que tenía chaleco
A: claro
B: pero después después
A: luego te descoloqué entonces?
B: no fue culpa mia no sé yo vi chaleco pero después yo me refería a la blusa a la camisa se me olvidó del chaleco y yo todas las referencias que hacía era a la camisa
A: claro y a mí se me olvidó que el tuyo no tenía chaleco
B: no tenía
A: heh
B: pero es sí que te entendí que tenías chaleco

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
two pockets
one (xx) over the pocket

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (60-69):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-10: A presents an approximation ‘not a jacket’, followed by a circumlocution, an appeal for assistance, a repetition of the first circumlocution and the first approximation, and a new circumlocution. She combines these oral strategies with nonverbal strategies.
- 11: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. In fact, her interpretation is erroneous.
- 13: B realizes her previous misunderstanding. B understands now A’s message and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating A’s last words.
- 14: A accepts B’s acceptance. Agreement on meaning is reached.
- 17-20: Agreement on meaning has been reached, but not on form. B indicates to A that she has understood her message but she does not know the intended TL lexical item. B refashions the previous strategic utterance and provides a circumlocution working in combination with a nonverbal strategy. This is presented with rising intonation, i.e. asking for A’s explicit acceptance.
- 21-22: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. A is accepting B’s previous presentation, i.e. the strategic presentation for ‘waistcoat’ and the embedded strategic presentation for ‘sleeves’.
- 23: B confirms her understanding and acceptance with an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (60-69):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘sleeves’: while trying to develop a circumlocution to compensate for the TL item ‘vest’ the learner encounters a second communicative problem, the lack of the TL item ‘sleeves’. A CS episode embedded in the previous CS episode is then initiated.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- There is no evidence of B’s state of understanding.
- 17-20: B presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 21-22: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. A is accepting B’s previous presentation, i.e. the strategic presentation for ‘waistcoat’ and the embedded strategic presentation for ‘sleeves’.
- B accepts A’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-91):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1, 16 and 29: B presents the TL item ‘shirt’ in its literal meaning, but A interprets it as an approximation for the unavailable TL item ‘vest’.
- Unsuccessful communication.
- 18: A presents ‘shirt’ as an approximate term for ‘vest’.
- 21: B asks for clarification.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- 22: A repeats the previous approximation strategy.
- B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning because she has interpreted the CS literally, she has not realized A’s strategic attempt to compensate for an unavailable TL lexical item.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.
- 31: A repeats a previous approximation strategy.
- B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning because she has interpreted the CS literally, she has not realized A’s strategic attempt to compensate for an unavailable TL lexical item.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (131-134):

1. A: e::h (0.5) i see:: e::h (0.4) the man and the child, (1.0)
2. (and the:: man (. ) is (. ) taking: him: (0.6) anywhere, (1.5)
3. {A closes her LH}
4. A: e::h=}
5. B: {is taking him by the by the [hand?]}
6. {B’s RH mimics holding someone’s hand}
7. A: {{[yeah,] by hand,}} (. ) by the
8. {{A nods}}
9. A: hand,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

A: en la siguiente el padre está llevando el niño a así a algún
sitio no sé lo agarra
B: de la mano?
A: de la mano
B: en esta no no tiene la no lo agarra de la mano va primero el
padre y después el niño

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

B: tiene las manos en los bolsillos?
A: tch no
B: no?
A: no porque una está agarrando al niño

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (131-134):

A: porque no sabía cómo expresarlo
I: y tú te diste cuenta de que lo lleva de la mano por el supongo
que por la mímica
A: por el gesto
B: sí el gesto

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

llevando niño mano
2 brazos niño mano

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (131-134):

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’
- 2-3: A presents a nonverbal strategy
- 5-6: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL expression with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. The TL expression is supported by her gesture.
- 7-9: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the TL expression proposed by B.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (185-197):
1 A: and another thing, a e::h, (3.0) °i don’t know what is that,° (2.2)
2 B: can you see {li:ke [bri-?]} (B’s HH draw a rectangle in the air)
3 A: {[[some ]thing like a ring.}
4 B: {([A’s LH thumb and index outline the shape of a circle])}
5 A: (1.2)
6 B: a ring!? (0.5) no not a ring, (0.5) but a ring. (1.4) (a ring.)
7 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
8 B: {like a circle,}
9 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
10 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
11 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
12 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
13 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
14 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
15 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
16 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
17 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
18 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
19 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
20 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
21 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
22 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
23 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
24 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
25 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
26 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
27 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
28 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
29 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
30 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
31 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
32 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
33 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
34 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
35 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
36 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
37 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
38 B: {ring? to ding dong?}
39 A: {{[some ]thing like a ring.}
40 B: {ring? to ding dong?}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: y la argolla esa que habías comentado
A: y una cosa redonda sí
B: no
A: tampoco?
B: no tiene

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (185-197):
I: tú al principio pensaste que era?
B: un timbre
A: un timbre
I: y luego ya te diste cuenta
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
circles

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (185-197):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1: A presents an all-purpose expression ‘another thing’ and an appeal for assistance.
- 4: B misunderstands A’s message. B tries to present what she believes to be the intended TL item ‘bricks’. She is unable to retrieve it and makes use of a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-7: A realizes B’s misunderstanding of her communicative intention. A refashions her previous presentation using now a combination of an approximation ‘something like a ring’ and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B interprets the approximation literally and therefore misunderstands A’s intended message. B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation repeating what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation.
- 10-15: A initially believes B has correctly understood her and indicates acceptance by means of an acknowledgment. She then realizes B’s misunderstanding and refashions her previous presentation, combining the previous approximation with a nonverbal strategy.
- 17-18: B is not able to understand A. She misunderstands her again. B presents a nonverbal strategy and what she believes to be the intended TL item followed by an onomatopoeic strategy uttered with rising intonation.
- 19: A realizes B’s misunderstanding and indicates this to B.
- A refashions again her presentation. She presents a circumlocution strategy, ‘a circle to knock’ involving an approximation ‘circle’. She divides her presentation in two installments ‘a circle’ and ‘to knock’.
- 22: A presents the first installment in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 25: B is unsure of understanding. She repeats the approximation with rising intonation and combined with a nonverbal strategy, i.e. she checks for confirmation
- 29: A confirms B’s misunderstanding of the approximation strategy, i.e. the first installment of the circumlocution strategy.
- 29-34: A presents the second installment
- 37: B is unsure of her understanding and repeats A’s words with rising intonation, i.e. checking for confirmation
- 39-40: A confirms B’s understanding of the second installment and therefore of the all-encompassing presentation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (304-305):
1 A: hhh the:: (2.2) the: the new man? e:h has (long, (0.4) long
2 (A’s LH points to
3 her pants)
4 A: pants,) (1.4) and the: {a: shirt,}
5 (A’s LH points to her chest)
7 (2.2)
8 B: {hm hm}
9 (B nods)
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (304-305):
A: no sé cómo se dice o sea sí lo sé pero no me acuerdo algo así
   como straights o
I: suspenders o braces
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B: no no lo sabía
A: no lo sabía qué va

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (304-305):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (257-262):

1 A: and there’s flowers, (1.2) everywhere inside the house.
2 (1.7) like in the wall, (1.2) on the wall, (0.)
3 {[° (on the wall)°]}
4 {A nods}
5 B: [on the wall ] too!?
6 A: yeah (0.7) no just on the wall, [like a ] paperwall.
7 B: [° (just on)°]
8 (1.0)
9 B: [a::h!=]
10 {B nods}
11 A: {=[wallpaper,]}
12 {[A nods]}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-288):

1 A: flowers not (0.4) just, (0.4) inside the house.
2 B: mhm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
B: y la habías dicho la pared? que veías?
A: la pared tiene flores
B: flores? en esta no es lisa
A: en como un papel
B: hm

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (257-262):

I: al principio dices que hay flores dentro en la pared tú al principio qué le entiendes?
B: no lo interpretaba como papel pintado sino que había flores
A: dentro de la casa
B: dentro de la casa
A: mhm y cuando te diste cuenta de que era papel pintado de que era o sea sí empapelado
B: después porque ella no sé como no recuerdo cómo lo dice
A: digo wallpaper
I: hm
B: on the wall ... like a paperwall
I: tú no hablas de no dices wallpaper hasta ahí porque al principio no te salía o?
A: no me salía hm
I: porque al principio también dices paperwall
A: y luego digo wallpaper

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
flowers on the wall
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (257-262):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wallpaper’.
- 1-4: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 5: B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 6: A initially confirms B’s understanding with an acknowledgment. A realizes B’s misunderstanding and refashions her previous presentation. She presents now what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item, although she makes a mistake and uses ‘paperwall’ instead of ‘wallpaper’.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance by means of an acknowledgment.
- 11: A is now able to refashion the presentation and provide the intended TL item ‘wallpaper’.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (286-288)
- There is no intention to communicate the meaning ‘wallpaper’ and therefore no CS.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (317-335):
1  A:   and .(.) at the floor, (1.0) e::h of the: house, (1.5) i
2       [see: like]
3  B:  [sorry!  ] (0.5) can you repeat=?
4  A:   =at at the floor,
5  B:    at the floor yeah
6  A:   i can see like e:::h {lines, [or: ]} (1.3) not lines but e::h
7     {A’s LI draws lines in the air}
8  B:    [lines]
9  A:   (1.5) “how do you say? (1.5) like e:h° (4.8) [mm ]
10  B:     [per]haps
11  {like a carpet? (0.5) or:=}
12  (B waves her RH)
13  A:   =no [no no no no]
14  B:    [no not ] a carpet?
15  A:    no
16  (1.5)
17  B:     mm::
18    (4.5)
19  A:   like a:
20      {(0.4)
21     {A’s LI draws a square in the air}
22  B:     {(wood?)}
23     {B waves her RH})
24  A:    cuadrados {‘squares’})
25  B:     ah!
26  A:   how do you say it?
27    (0.7)
28  B:    squares? no?
29  A:   {hm hm}
30    {A nods}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   y en el suelo hay como
B:    porque habías dicho (xx)?
A:    como cuadraditos
B:    no aquí no había cuadraditos
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (317-335):
A:   cuadrados tampoco sabia como se decía cuadrados
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
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ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (317-335):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘squares’.
- 6-9: A presents a combination of an approximation and nonverbal strategy, followed by an appeal for assistance.
- 10-12: B tries to guess A’s intended message and presents what she believes may be the intended TL lexical item, ‘carpet’. She fails in her guessing.
- 13: A rejects A’s guessing as incorrect.
- 19-21: A presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 22-23: B tries to guess A’s intended message and presents what she believes may be the intended TL lexical item, ‘wood’. She fails again in her guessing.
- 24: A presents a code switching strategy.
- 25: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 26: A tries to negotiate for a more TL like form. She presents an appeal for assistance strategy.
- 28: B presents the intended TL lexical item with rising intonation, i.e. asking for A’s explicit confirmation.
- 29: A accepts providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: father pointing inside/father points to the house

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-311):
1 A: and the:, (2.5) his finger is:: e::h {inside the house?} 
2 {A’s RI mimics pointing} 
3 (1.5) 
4 B: his fin-? {like [pointing?]}
5 {B’s RA mimics pointing} 
6 A: [like] {yeah} pointing (0.7) inside the
7 {A nods} 
8 A: house

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: con la mano hacia adentro de la casa como que señala
B: aquí la tiene baja

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y la otra también está señalando
B: ah! es verdad en ésta no no está señalando porque no se le ve
A: ah! vale

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (309-311):
A: ahí no sabía cómo se decía señalar no no me acordaba
I: pero me parece que te lo dijo ella
A: sí después

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
pointing the house

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (309-311):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.4.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘pointing’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 6-7: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the TL item provided by B.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.
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REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (416-419):

1 A: e::h the left one is touchi:ng e::h (his arm,) A’s LH points to her RA, AB look down)
2
3 (3.2)
4
5 B: sorry, can you repeat it?
6 A: {he’s touching: his: arm} with: {his left} hand,
7 {A’s LH points to her RA, B is not looking}
8 (A’s LH points to her RA, B is not looking)
9
10 B: hm hm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

A: en la siguiente está el padre como como remangándose la camisa? tocándose el brazo?
B: no aquí tiene el brazo derecho extendido y el izquierdo apenas se le ve

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (416-419):

I: entonces ahí era cuando ibas a decir
A: remangar
I: y tú llegaste a saber que se estaba remangando la camisa?
A: yo creo que no
B: no

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

---

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (416-419):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B does not understand and asks for clarification.
- 6-9: A repeats the previous combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 10: B does not understand, but indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment, i.e. feigns understanding.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue. B’s evidence of understanding is not clear enough for A. However, A does not try to negotiate for further evidence and continues with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B has not understood A’s originally intended message, and A has no evidence to know about B’s state of understanding.

---

REFERENT: freckles

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (511-520):

1 A: the big one, the big the big boy, e::h ha- has like
2 {points, e::h on his::: face,} (1.0) {like little}
3 {A’s RH draws dots in the air}
4 (A’s LH draws dots in the air)
5
6 (1.2)
7 B: {disease (xxx)}
8 {B’s RH draws dots in the air with a pencil}
9 A: yeah!} like=
10 B: =sí (‘yes’)
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11 (0.6)
12 A: you know? like=
13 B: =si (‘yes’)
14 A: {the brown things!} i don’t [know ] the name,
15 {A’s LH draws dots in the air}
16 B: [si (‘yes’)]
17 (0.6)
18 B: heh heh i don’t (heh) know e:h (6.8) mhm
19 (2.8)
20 A: >°i’m sure i know it, but°<

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (511-520):  
A: pecas! eso ... quería decir pecas
B: yo le entendía que tenía varicela viruela por ejemplo pero se lo dije
A: yo creí que me estabas entendiendo que tenia granos por eso dije
the brown things las cosas marrones
B: yo le pregunté like a disease?
A: claro
B: una enfermedad?
A: si después yo me quedé pensando y digo no ... que tiene granos y
yo no sabia cómo explicarte no granos no son

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (511-520):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’
- 1: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy
- 4: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: A accepts B’s presentation with an acknowledgment
- 12: A seems to be unsure of B’s correct understanding and checks for comprehension.
- 13: B confirms her understanding
- 14: A seems to be still unsure of B’s correct understanding and refashions her initial presentation.
She presents a circumlocution strategy followed by an appeal for assistance and working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 16: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer
- 18: B indicates acceptance of the meaning and that she does not know the intended TL item
- 20: A indicates acceptance of B’s acceptance and also her inability to find a TL like item.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
1 A: and he’s {something (0.8) e::h (1.2) on his hat. (2.0)
2 (A’s RH points to where the badge would be on her head)
3 4 A: something painted, (1.6) on the hat.)
4 (0.8)
5 6 B: on the hat?
7 A: yeah, (0.4) something painted, (6.8) like {a: thing with a
8 (A’s HH draw a
9 circle in the air
10 and a cross inside,
11 B is not looking)
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12 A: cross,} (3.2) {a triangle, and a cross. (0.8) {{inside,}} }
13 (A’s HH draw a triangle in the air and a
14 cross inside, B is not looking)
15 ((B nods})
16 (1.3)
17 B: hm hm
18 (7.0)
19 A: and an::d eh he has: e::h that thing, (1.2) also e::h on his
20 jacket.
21 (4.0)
22 B: {that cross?=}
23 (B’s RH draws a cross in the air)
24 A: =yeah, (0.4) {that (.), triangle with a cross, (0.4) inside,}
25 (A’s LI points to where the badge would be on her
26 chest and draws a triangle with a cross inside}
27 A: (0.5) and the::; (1.2) the littl::e boy,
28 B: but sorry, (0.8) in all of the picture? in all the pictures or
29 only in this last one? (1.6) [the cross?]
30 A: [ i’m tal]king about {the big
31 (A’s LH
32 points
33 up)
34 A: one,} the big [boy,]
35 B: {[yes ] (.),] but mm:: tch e::h you have told me,
36 that he has got a: a triangle with a::=
37 A: =yeah
38 B: cross. but in la- in this last picture? or on all of one?
39 (0.4) on [all of them?]
40 A: [i can ] i cannot see this boy in the other
41 pictures, (0.5) just in the last one,=
42 B: =a::h! yes, (0.4) you[‘re right.] (0.6) heh heh (3.4) [hm hm]
43 A: ([heh heh ]}
44 (A nods}
45 A: what what i said is that (.), the little boy, (0.4) {e::h has
46 (A’s LH
47 draws
48 circles on
49 her chest)
50 A: also this: thing (..) on the jacket.) (1.6) in the first one,
51 the second one, (0.4) and the; (2.4) and the;::, nothing else.
52 (2.6) in the first one and the {second one],
53 B: [the ch-] [the little [child]}
54 (B nods)
55 A: [ the] little child,
56 B: has [got it?]
57 A: {[has ] this thing on:: the jacket.)
58 (A’s LI points to where the badge would be on her chest and
59 draws circles}
60 (1.2)
61 B: too? (0.5) a::h!=
62 A: =uhuh in the first one and the second one, (1.5)
63 (this [this] thing painted]
64 (A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her chest}
65 B: [in the first and } the second?

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh con un gorro y un dibujito en el gorro así como un triangulito
y una cruz
B: hm aquí no tenía gorro
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NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y en la chaqueta el niño también tiene el dibujito ese
B: el dibujito
A: y el el niño pequeño también lo tenía en las otras fotos
B: no aquí no tiene ninguno

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (527-558):
A: y ahí viene lo de la insignia me parece que no sabía cómo se decía
I: cuando te dice que tiene algo pintado en el sombrero como una cruz y tal y algo igual en la chaqueta tú que crees que es eso?
B: yo no lo interpretaba como una insignia lo interpreté como un dibujo
A: dibujo
B: un dibujo de la gorra un estampado o algo así raro porque una (xxx) una cruz pero no sé

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
something printing on his hat, triángulo

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-4: A presents an all-purpose word, ‘something’, followed by a circumlocution involving the all-purpose word, ‘something painted, (1.6) on the hat’, and working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B asks for clarification.
- 7-14: A repeats the previous circumlocution and expands it adding for information. This circumlocution works in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 17: B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. She has in fact misunderstood because she has interpreted A’s circumlocution literally.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Unsuccessful communication. A and B believe they have reached an agreement on meaning, but they have actually misunderstood each other.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 19: A presents an all-purpose word.
- 22: B checks for confirmation of her understanding.
- 24-26: A confirms what she believes to be B’s correct understanding of her message providing an acknowledgment and repeating what she believes to be a previously successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- Unsuccessful communication. A and B believe they have reached an agreement on meaning, but they have actually misunderstood each other.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 29: B presents a TL lexical item ‘cross’.
- A interprets it as an approximation for ‘badge’.
- Unsuccessful communication

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 36-38: B presents a TL lexical item ‘cross’.
- A interprets it as an approximation for ‘badge’.
- Unsuccessful communication

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 51: A presents an all-purpose word.
- B believes she has correctly understood A’s message and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Unsuccessful communication. A and B believe they have reached an agreement on meaning, but they have actually misunderstood each other.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 58: A presents an all-purpose word.
- 62: B believes she has correctly understood A’s message and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- Unsuccessful communication. A and B believe they have reached an agreement on meaning, but they have actually misunderstood each other.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (527-558):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 64: A presents an all-purpose word.
- 66: B believes she has correctly understood A’s message and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- Unsuccessful communication. A and B believe they have reached an agreement on meaning, but they have actually misunderstood each other.
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DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-INT VM

PARTICIPANT A: Victoria, female, 19, Galician L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 1st year undergraduate student, 1 month in England

PARTICIPANT B: Maruja, female, 18, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 1st year undergraduate student

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-3):
1 A: there’s a:: a little boy who’s dressed in a:: (0.8) a: who’s
dressed in shorts, e:::h shoes, an:::d (0.6) a jacket. a:n:::d
(0.5) he’s black his hair is black.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (1-3):
A: non iso nono comentei ... porque queria rematar pronto non porque
porque ia dicir shield o que pasa é que dixen no sabía nin como
se dicía en español entón dixen shield escudo pero escudo é máis
como como un escudo destes entón ... pensei dixen bah! no vou
dicir shield porque vai pensar que estou que está cun escudo así
e está no e por iso
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (1-3):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'badge'.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: black eye
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (14-18):
1 A: an::d he has {an eye} (0.4) eh an ey:e, (.). {e:::h (0.7) ay!}
2 (A half opens her LH in front of her eye, A looks
down)
3
4
5
6
7
8 A: cómo se di- ('how do you say')? injured! (1.5) °(xx) (0.8)
you know?° (1.2) hhh and in the second vignette e:::h that boy
9 is going to tell his fa- i suppose he e:::h (0.6) in (0.4) is
10 (0.6) his his father that somebody has hiten, him, (0.8) o:n
11 (2.2) °him?°
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (122-124):
A: and {the eye is:}, (0.4) who has been injured (. or beaten,
(A half opens her LH in front of her eye ×6)
A: (0.8) is:: still} {(1.2) is black. (1.0) you know?
(A holds the previous gesture)
(1.6)
B: uuh)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-267):
1 B: the the differences that that i: (.) that i wrote on the paper
is that you said that the boy had? (1.0) {an eye:?
(B's RI points to her
eye and draws
circles ×2, B holds
the gesture)
(1.0)
8 A: {{yes.}} (0.6) {{a black e- eh the eye the eye is black.}}
(A nods)
(1.0)
10 {{(A half opens her RH in front of her eye ×2)}}
(0.6)
12 B: hm} (0.6) in my picture, {(1.5)} he has, (0.5) {his eyes,}
13 {B waves her RH}
(1.0) {B’s RH points
to her eye}
16 B: (1.0) {normal=}
17 {B waves RH palm down}
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: con un ojo golpeado
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (14-18):
A: non quería dicir que pensei en morado e pensei en dicir swollen
pero era de chorar entón dixen injured porque damages é para
coisas e
...
I: imaxinábalo así? negro coma aí?
B: si supuxen que sería morado porque como me dixera que lle deran
como un puñetazo claro no momento de injured non me din conta
pero vamos supúxeno así como dicindo si é un puñetazo pois terá o
ollo terao morado claro
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (264-267):
I: olio morado seria black eye
A: black!? bueno dixeno más tarde pero no sentido de que estaba
negro non con ese significado
...
B: claro é que non non sabía como se dicía iso morado
A: eu tampouco eu dixen black porque como o debuxo era branco e
negro estaba negro pero tampouco non sabía que era morado
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tiene un ojo morado en el otro dibujo
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (14-18):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- I: A presents a nonverbal strategy, an appeal for assistance and an approximation followed by a
comprehension check.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Successful agreement on meaning, but failed attempt to create correct and appropriate TL lexis.
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (122-124):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-4: A repeats the previously successful approximation strategy followed by a circumlocution and a
comprehension check, both working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance by providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-270):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.10.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-6: B presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-10: A understands and indicates acceptance by providing acknowledgments and repeating the successful combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy in 122-124, i.e., she refashions the CS presented by B.
- 11: B understands and indicates acceptance of the refashion by providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: moustache

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (23-24):

\begin{verbatim}
1 A:   the father has {black hair,} (0.4) e::h {a moustache, an::d
2     {A’s LH points to her hair, A looks down}
3     (A’s LH points over
4     her upper lip, A
5     looks down)}
6 A:   (0.6) he’s wearing: (.} {a tie,}
7     {A’s LH points to her neck, AB look down}
\end{verbatim}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (277-282):

\begin{verbatim}
1 B:   tch and (0.5) i’m not sure you said that the father has:?
2     (1.2)
3     {B’s RI points over her upper lip and draws a moustache}
4 A:   a moustache?}
5     (1.0)
6 B:   {yeah=}
7     {B nods}
8 A:   =yeah (1.7) {and you::}
9     {A’s RI points to B}
10     (0.6)
11 B:   my father (.} {{hasn’t (.} {[moustache]} heh heh
12     (E waves her RH palm down ×n)
13 A:   [ah! ]
\end{verbatim}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (23-24):

I:   e por exemplo ti o de moustache entendiches ben quero dicir
porque logo preguntaslle
B:   si si é que claro como dixo asi varias cousas seguidas eu
apuntaba e tampouco estaba moi segura de si tal e por iso logo
volvin preguntar para asegurarme pero si eu escoticarao por
exemplo o de jacket escapóuseme non cando estaba escribindo non
nono pillei

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (277-282):

I:   porque non te lembraches nese momento do bigote?
B:   si é que no si ela antes dixérame moustache pero eu tampouco
esta mo segura de si era non non me lembraba entón por iso
dixen asi e ela repetiueme a palabra outra vez

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
el padre tiene bigote en la otra viñeta

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (23-24):
- Learner uses the intended TL lexical item ‘moustache’ and the addressee understands it. There is no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (277-282):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘moustache’.
- 1-3: B presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: A presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 6-7: B confirms the correctness of A’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 8: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (277-282):
- 11: The TL lexical item previously provided by A is now known used by B. There is therefore no need for a CS.

REFERENT: father drops newspaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (285-288):
1 A: ah! and the father has e::h (0.7) {throwing} the newspaper,
2 {A opens her RH, B looks down}
3 4 A: (1.2) or the newspaper {has fallen,} (1.5) [cause] it it’s not
5 {A opens her RH} [mm:: ]
6 B: 
7 A: (xx)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o periódico xa caeu

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (285-288):
I: a primeira vez non comentaches que o rapaz está sinalando o ollo?
A: non
I: nin que o pai se sorprende? nin que se lle cae o periódico
A: non
I: iso dilo logo cando volves
B: si despois
I: por que nono dixeches?
A: mm pois no sei o do ollo eh no me fixei o do periódico tampouco
despois dinme conta que caera o periódico e dixen oh! caeuselle o periódico
... 
A: si pero aí eu non sei si é thrown si si é non é tirou
I: era esa a palabra que querías dicir?
A: bueno thrown é é máis arroxar pero máis ben caeuselle ...
I: cando utilizas throw e fall ... non era esa a palabra que querías utilizar?
A: non pensei por non dicir saber dicer caeuselle

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
el padre ya arrojó el periódico

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (285-288):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.3.
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- Intended TL lexical item: ‘dropped’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy, followed by a combination of a circumlocution and a repetition of the previous nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer and allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-63):
1 A: a::nd (0.6) tch {they’re hand in hand (0.5) you know?} (0.8)
2 {A closes and raises her RH and then closes
3 and raises her LH, B is not looking }
4 A: {hand?}
5 {A raises and closes her LH to mimic holding someone’s hand}
6 (0.5)
7 B: {uhuh=}
8 {B nods}
9 A: =yeah (0.4) °i don’t know°

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai colleu ó fillo pola man

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (61-63):
A: eh ía dicir que que estaban collidos da man e utilizei a
expresión hand in hand pero non non estava segura pero despois
dixen más tarde eh the boy is eh no non sei ía dicir que lle
estaba collendo da man pero dixen eh
I: e ti entendiches cando che dixo o de hand in hand
B: si que ían agarrados da man

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
van agarrados de la mano

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-63):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy followed by a comprehension check.
- 7-8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 9: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment and indicating also that she does not know the TL lexical expression to communicate the intended message.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-69):
1 A: there (0.5) there are the::, (0.8) here are the (0.4) the::
2 A: (0.4) sorry, hhh e:h they’re in front of a door,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (79-85):
1 B: and (0.8) mm::, (1.0) is there any number on on the door?=
2 A: (=no.)
3 {A shakes her head}
4 (0.5)
5 B: no!?
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6 A: no number. (2.5) only the door you can’t see the house, (1.0)
7 (only a: fe- a: a little e::h} {some bricks?}
8 (A’s RI outlines the shape of the bricks in the air)
9 (A’s LI outlines the shape of the bricks in the air)
10
11 (0.7)
12 B: hm hm=
13 A: but nothing more, (3.5) and a step but,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (68-69):
A: esto non sabía ... isto non non sabía como dicilo ía dicir como
un ring pero non non sabía ía dicir a ring e sabes esto con pero
non ... e despois isto pois iso ía explicar e dixen non! paso e
pasei de todo
I: e ai incluso cando ela che pregunta
A: se hai un número si aí é cando pensei en dicirlle eu isto pero
dixen non sei como se di nono digo

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
en su dibujo no hay un número en la puerta (en el mio el 17)

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-69):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.23.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (79-85):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-69):
1 A: there (0.5) there are the::, (0.8) here are the (0.4) the::
2 A: (0.4) sorry, hhh e:h they’re in front of a door,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (79-85):
1 B: and (0.8) mm::, (1.0) is there any number on on the door?= 
2 A: (=no.)
3 (A shakes her head)
4 (0.5)
5 B: no!? 
6 A: no number. (2.5) only the door you can’t see the house, (1.0)
7 (only a: fe- a: a little e::h} {some bricks?}
8 (A’s RI outlines the shape of the bricks in the air)
9 (A’s LI outlines the shape of the bricks in the air)
10
11 (0.7)
12 B: hm hm=
13 A: but nothing more, (3.5) and a step but,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (68-69):
I: na túa porta aparece un chamador e aparece pois como un buzón e
non mencionas ningunha destas dúas cousas?
A: esto non sabía e buzón non buzón tampouco podería dicir como the place where you can put the letters inside pero dixen bah! mellor ... porque isto ía dicir así algo como mm letterbox pero non era letterbox exactamente e entón mm pois non sabía

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
en su dibujo no hay un número en la puerta (en el mio el 17)

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-69):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'mailbox'.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (79-85):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'mailbox'.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-99):
1 A: he’s bald, (0.5) with glasses, an:::d (1.5) tch with trousers
2 with e::h (1.2) he’s is (0.4) we- wearing slippers, a:n:::d
3 (1.5) and a shirt.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (98-99):
A: si aí tirantes si ... e tirantes tamén o omitín porque non sabía ainda asi cando o vin nese momento tamén pensei que bueno que que realmente ó mellor na súa pintura non tiña tirantes como non ten heh

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-99):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-99):
1 A: he’s bald, (0.5) with glasses, an:::d (1.5) tch with trousers
2 with e::h (1.2) he’s is (0.4) we- wearing slippers, a:n:::d
3 (1.5) and a shirt.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (98-99):
A: si iso quixen dicilo aquí e non sabía como era ... o de remangado non tiña nin idea

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

---
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-99):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (104-107):
1 A: and (. ) {the wall} of the house, you can see {that it is::
2 {A waves her LH palm outwards, B is not looking}
3 {A waves her LH palm outwards, B is not looking}
4 6 A: with paper.} (0.5) {a:n:d (. ) on the paper there’re the paper
5 8 A: is e::h, (0.5) tch i mean, hhh the:: the draw- drawings are
7 9 A: flowers.} (3.0) a:n:::d (1.8) tch °i don’t know what else to
10 14 say.°
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e e nas paredes é hai flores pero flores nun papel porque están empapeladas

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (104-107):
A: non que está empapelada diría there are wall on the eh eh como se di? como?
I: empapelado é wallpapered
A: wallpapered ... porque no sabía dicir empapelado
I: pero ti entendiches que era empapelado?
B: si si
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
hay papel floreado en las paredes

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (104-107):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wallpapered’.
- 1-14: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (104-107):
1 A: and (. ) {the wall} of the house, you can see {that it is::
2 {A waves her LH palm outwards, B is not looking}
3 {A waves her LH palm outwards, B is not looking}
4 6 A: with paper.} (0.5) {a:n:d (. ) on the paper there’re the paper
5 8 A: is e::h, (0.5) tch i mean, hhh the:: the draw- drawings are
7 9 A: flowers.} (3.0) a:n:::d (1.8) tch °i don’t know what else to
10 14 say.°
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (104-107):
A: non porque non sabía dicir baldosas
I: non sabías dicir baldosas?
A: non
I: entón pasaches? directamente?
A: si la pensar pero xa nin pensei nin nin como podería dicilo

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (104-107):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘tiles’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-209):
1 A: and in this in this (scene), e::h they:: (0.6) the: the father
2 is:: (0.8) i don’t know how to:: (0.4) how to say it in
3 english but he’s (0.4) if he has a::: (0.7) tch a:: (0.4) you
4 know? {the skirt? she’s (0.8)} {heh putting it (heh)here, heh}
5 {A’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve}
6 {A’s RH points to where the
7 rolled up sleeve would be on
8 her arm}
9 B: a:::h!=
10 A: {=(heh)remangándose ('rolling up'),} heh heh (1.5) a: like
11 {A’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve, B is not looking }
12 A: e::h (1.0) >i don’t know< but he he’s goin:g to:: start, (0.7)
13 he’s going [to st-]
14 B: [a fight? yeah]
15 B: =hm
16 A: his: his child or something like that, and the::, (1.0) with a
17 hun- with angry? (1.0) with anger,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai está remangándose para para non sei para darlle aí unha
peta ó crío ou a quen fose que lle pegara ó seu ó seu chaval

SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
el padre se está remangando/ enfadado

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-209):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-8: A presents an appeal for assistance followed by a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 10-12: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and refashions her initial CS presenting a combination of a code switching and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: (boy’s head bent/turned)/ little boy looks dejected
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (213-215):
1 A: and then in the last scene, (0.7) e::h (0.7) the boy is not
2 looking at them, heh and (0.4) {he’s looking down,} (1.0)
3 {A’s LH points down, A looks down}
5 A: e:::h (0.8) at he’s looking at the floor. (0.4) at the floor.
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e o chaval así mirando pa abaxo todo arrepentido todo non sei
B: heh heh
A: todo así medio
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (213-215):
A: agora doume conta de que non porque looking down é como
menosprezar a alguén e quería dicir mirar cara abaxo
I: pero quero dicir non querías dicir ó mellor que estaba
decesionado ou arrepentido como en galego
A: si nono dixen pero claro
I: ti imaxinabas así como está aí?
B: si si si
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
el niño no les está mirando (mira al suelo)

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (213-215):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘dejected/disappointed’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (222-223):
1 A: he’s wearing a a tie, (. ) and (. ) an uniform. (1.0) {and with
2 A’s RH
3 mimics
4 holding
5 the cap
6 visor ×2}
7 A: a::, (1.2) with a cap. (0.8) on his head,)
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available
SENDER AND RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (222-223):
A: en bueno nesta insignia outra vez e pensei no do escudo este e
bah soábame o a insignia de cambridge pero eu non non pinta nada
esto aquí e por eso como sabía dicir shield e dixen heh non vai
estar aí cun escudo e dixen pois diso pasel
A: o do escudo eso o de shield que vamos que non viña no viña para nada
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (222-223):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-NS AE

PARTICIPANT A: Amparo, female, 19, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 2nd year undergraduate student

PARTICIPANT B: Ellen, female, 22, Malaysian English L1, beginner Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 5 months

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (15-17):
1  A:  he’s wearing a::: (1.0) a {a jacket, (0.7) {a:: jacket}}
2                          (A’s RH points to her chest with a pencil, B not looking)
3 4 A:  which) is proper (. ) of {a:: suit,} (0.7) of a:: tch (0.5) of
5                          {A’s RH points to her chest with a pencil, B not looking}
6 7 A:  an o:ld man,
8 9 B:  uhuh, okay

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (48-56):
1  A:  {and in the:: jacket,} {he has} (0.6) some kind of (0.8) e:::h
2                          (A’s RH points to her chest with a pencil)
3 4 B:  an em[blem? a (letter)? ]
5 6 A:  [   {like a button,}] {in a:: side,} i don’t know how to
7                          {A’s RH points to her chest with a pencil}
8                          {A’s HH point to her chest with a pencil}
9 10 A:  explain it.
11 12 B:  e:::h [say ] it again, like a?
13   14 A:  [e:::h]
15   16 B:  (uhuh)
17   18 A:  like {a::: button?} i don’t know,
19                          {A’s RH points to her chest with a pencil}
20 21 B:  (uhuh)
22 23 A:  e:::h like is he was wearing a: flower. or [(heh)something]
24                          [oh! {okay}   ]
25 26 B:  {okay} (0.5) {that’s another one} (0.7) okay (2.2) °okay so he
27                          {B nods}
28 29 A:  like this,
30   31 B:  (0.4)
32 33 A:  (okay) (0.5) {that’s another one} (0.7) okay (2.2) °okay so he
34                          {B nods}
35 36 B:  has a, (0.8) (xx) button hole,° okay,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  y en la chaqueta tiene una insignia

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (48-56):
A:  eso no tenía ni idea
I: cuando al principio hablas de la chaqueta y no mencionas la insignia es porque no te fijaste o porque no sabías cómo decirlo?
A: no al principio no me fijé
...
A: con lo de la flor yo le quería decir que estaba más o menos situado donde lleva la flor
...
I: tú pensaste que ella te había entendido que era una insignia?
A: al principio pensé que no me había entendido pero después si

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (48-56): 
B: yeah at first the badge i thought she meant a buttonhole because when she said flower i thought you know? where you put the flower so i thought she meant flower but when she described that it is on the cap then i understood that she meant a badge or an emblem

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
buttonhole/ emblem

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (15-17):
- There is no intention to communicate the meaning ‘badge’ and therefore no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (48-56):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B presents what she believes may be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. She presents two different options, one is a correct guessing and the other one a failed guessing.
- 6: A does not recognize the TL item provided by B as the intended TL item. She misunderstands B and believes B has not correctly understood her message. She refashions her initial presentation. She presents a circumlocution involving an approximation working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 11: B is not able to understand A’s presentation and asks for clarification.
- 14-15: A repeats the previous approximation in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 16: B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. She has in fact interpreted A’s approximation literally and therefore misunderstood the intended meaning.
- 18 and 21: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and presents a new circumlocution.
- 19 and 23-26: B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance by providing acknowledgments. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning because she has interpreted the CS literally, she has not realized A’s strategic attempt to compensate for an unavailable TL lexical item. In 26 she provides what she believes to be the TL intended item.
- A accepts B’s acceptance allowing the conversation to continue. She does not recognize B’s misunderstanding.
- Unsuccesful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.
- The misunderstanding will be recognized and solved in (590-596). See analysis of excerpt (590-596) below.

REFERENT: painful face/painful expression/curved mouth

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-70):
1 A: a:n::d e::h (0.8) he see-, (0.8) tch he’s not crying but i think that he’s about to cry.
3 (0.6)
4 B: o:h! okay. (1.4) he’s about to cry

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (92-96):
1 A: a:n:d his mouth is: strange, (because (0.4) it is like curly.)
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

2 (A’s RH points to her mouth with a pencil and draws waves)

4 A: ({[his mouth,} heh]

5 (A’s RH points to her mouth with a pencil)

6 B: ({{[o::h! okay ] okay}}) >oh that’s how you know he’s about

7 ({{B nods}})

8 B: to cry! < okay mm no i don’t have a curly mouth here, hhh (xx)

9 a straight mouth, heh heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (92-96):

A: por el pelo lo conocía para el pelo y lo copie porque la boca estaba así ondulada no sé cómo se dice eso

I: en español cómo lo habrías dicho

A: no sé como con ondas

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (92-96):

B: ah! she said he had a curly mouth yeah yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

about to cry, straight mouth

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (68-70):

- Learner uses intended TL lexis. There is no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (92-96):

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wavy’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4 and 8-9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and a relevant next utterance.
- 6-7: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and repeats the previous nonverbal strategy.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (111-129):

1 A: and he’s wearing e:::h {a {{tie.}} (0.7) a::: a trouser.

2 (A’s RH points to her neck with a pencil, B is not looking)

3

4

5 B: mhm

6 A: an:::d tch) {something you put e:::h,} (0.7) a ver (‘let’s

7 (A’s HH points to her chest)

8 A: see’), (0.7) heh=

9 B: =what? [(xxx)]

10 A: [ some]thing you put, e:::h (1.0) {under your: jackets, (A’s RH points to her chest with a pencil, moving upwards and downwards)

11

12

13

14

15 A: but over you:r:: (0.8) your skirts.)

16 (1.2)

17 B: oh! [a vest?]

18 A: [ e:::h] (1.2) i=

19 B: =is it a vest?

20 A: i don’t [{heh} know]
21 B: [ (it’s] got a vi collar like? (0.5) >has it got a
22 (B’s HH point to her chest and draw a vi ×2)
23 B: vi [collar?] (0.6) maybe not,
24 A: [e::h ]
25 A: i don’t [know ]
26 B: [heh heh] heh heh heh but he has? does he have a
27 jacket on? the man [in the] chair? no
28 A: {[no no ]}
29 (A shakes her head)
30 (0.8)
31 A: he has no jacket.
32 B: okay, (0.4) (that) (. ) i’m not quite sure, (1.4) e::h okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: este hombre tiene un chaleco

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (111-129):
A: skirt me refería a camisa pero dije heh heh heh fue un despiste ...
I: pensaste que sí que te había entendido bien que era un chaleco?
A: si el chaleco sí
...
I: ella te pregunta a vest? y tú no le contestaste
A: porque no sé no sabía decirlo y entonces es que yo no sabía que
se llamaba vest
I: tú ahí no te diste cuenta que te estaba diciendo chaleco
A: no porque no sabía la palabra

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (111-129):
B: oh! the vest yeah yeah ... i understood he was wearing a vest but
i didn’t write it down because i wasn’t sure whether you were
explaining a vest or not so i thought okay i’ll just leave it for
a while

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (111-129):  
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 6-15: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 17: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
  his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 18: A asks for clarification
- 19: B repeats the intended TL item with rising intonation.
- 20: A is not able to understand B and indicates her lack of understanding.
- 21-23: B asks for clarification of the intended message
- 24-25: A is not able to understand B and indicates her lack of understanding.
- 26-27: B asks for clarification of the intended message.
- 28-29: A understands now her questions and provides the required information.
- 31: B is unsure of her understanding and indicates it, but accepts A’s presentation so far with a final
  acknowledgment.
- Unsuccessful communication. B is not sure of her understanding but does not try to negotiate. A gets
  no evidence of B’s understanding but does not try to negotiate.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (189-194):
1 A: e::h the boy and the father, [e::h] (1.2) are with her hands
2 B: [hm ]
3 A: together, heh
4 B: oh! okay, {they’re holding hands right?}
5 (B closes and raises her LH)
6 A: {yes} [heh ]
7  (A nods)
8 B: [they]’re {holding hands,} okay
9  (B nods, A is not looking)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (214-215):
1 B: because in my pictures, they’re not holding hands. (1.0) the
2 father doesn’t look angry at all, heh heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el niño y el padre van cogidos de la mano

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (189-194):
A: es que no sabía decir cogidos de la mano heh heh heh
I: luego ella te dice holding hands y tú te diste cuenta de que?
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (189-194):
B: yeah holding hands yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
holding hands

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (189-194):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’
- 1-3: A presents a circumlocution strategy
- 4-5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments. B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. She presents also an illustrative gesture.
- 6-7: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 8: B repeats the TL item with falling intonation, i.e. confirming her understanding and acceptance of the learner’s presentation
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (214-215):
- B uses the previous co-constructed form and A accepts it by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is reached and there is no need for a CS.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (234-237):
1 A: there’s e::h (0.6) something like a:::, {something round?}
2  (A’s RH draws a circle in the air, AB look down)
3  
4 A: {{e::h} that you use} {to::: to knock} at the door.=
5  (A makes a fist with her RH, B is not looking)
6  (A’s RH mimics knocking)
7  
8 B: [mhm ]
9 B: =oh! okay, it’s a knocker, okay.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-274):
1 A: but now e::h the father, is knocking at the door.
2 B: o:h o[kay]
3 A: [ e:]:: h he has his e:h hand closed.
4  (0.7)
5 B: uuhuh
6 A: a:n:::d and there are e::h some kind of (0.5) of lines, around
7 e::h it around around his (.) hand.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

8 (1.3)
9 B: some kind of lines? [I don’t see [what you mean,<]
10 A: [e::]:h tch
11 B: he’s knocking? [is he using the door? is he
12 {B’s RH mimics knocking on a door}
13 B: [using the knocker?]}
14 A: [yes, [like if if it was the sound that he was]
15 {A’s HH draw lines in the air}
16 A: making.
17 B: =oh! {okay okay,} (0.8) okay °(xxx)° uuh
18 {B nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: tienen tch un coso heh (heh) para (heh) llamar a la puerta heh heh
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (234-237):
A: eso es que no sé cómo se dice en español tampoco heh
I: heh heh y ella te dice te das la palabra en inglés te diste
cuenta?
A: ni idea
I: a doorknocker
A: ah! sí sí porque o sea yo no sabía cómo se decía pero por esa sí
sé sacaba
I: porque luego en la siguiente te preguntó si el padre estaba
llamando con el doorknocker
A: ah! eso sí que no me di cuenta no no se lo oí

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (264-274):
I: cuando dices que he has his hands closed quieres decir así? que
tiene la mano cerrada? o es porque no sabes decir puño?
A: no que tiene la mano cerrada

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (234-237):
I: and the knocker?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (264-274):
I: here did you understand that he was knocking with his hand not
with a knocker?
B: no i thought that he was knocking with the knocker

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
knocker

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (234-237): 
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-7: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates she understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL item.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (264-274):
- 11-13: B uses the intended TL lexical item ‘knocker’
- 14-16: A understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- Agreement on meaning is reached and there is no need for a CS.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-242):
1 A: a:n::d (1.8) a:nd eh something {like a hole,} to e::h
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

2
3 {A’s RH draws an horizontal line in the air, B is not looking}
4 5 A: {where you can put the letters.}
6 6 {A’s RH mimics dropping mail in a mailbox}
7 8 B: {oh! okay,} the letterbox.
8 9 {B nods}
10 10 A: yes
11 11 B: {uhuh,} okay
12 12 {B nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: tienen tch un coso heh (heh)para (heh)llamar a la puerta heh heh y un buzón heh

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (238-242):
I: ahí te diste cuenta que letterbox era el nombre de
A: sí sí sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (238-242):
I: and the letterbox?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
letter-box

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (238-242):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-7: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL item.
- 10: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 11-12: B confirms again her understanding providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-281):
1 A: a::n::d the boy, e::h has e:::h (1.2) his hand e:h under his
2 mouth, like is if he was thinking.
3 (1.0)
4 5 B: {like this?
6 7 B’s LH touches her chin
8 A: yes}
9 7 B: okay heh [heh heh heh] heh e:::h (0.7) okay
10 8 A: [heh heh heh]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: y el niño aparece ahora con con la mano en y esto cómo se llama heh heh bueno con la mano debajo de su boca como pensando así como pensando en qué va a ocurrir

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (275-281):
A: es que eso es que no me salía y cuando tuve que explicarlo en español sólo se me ocurría en gallego queixo queixo

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
boy supporting his chin
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-281):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.14.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’.
- 1-2: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 4-5: B’s unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. She refashions B’s initial CS substituting it with a nonverbal strategy and a confirmation check.
- 7: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 8: B confirms understanding providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (367-372):
1  A:   a::n:d he’s wearing something, (0.7) tch e:::h (1.2) e:::h that
e:::h use, (0.8) to:: tch (0.6) for that (. ) is, his trousers
don’t goe:s down.
4  B:   oh! (0.7) he’s wearing a belt?
5       (1.5)
6  A:   {e:::h [heh]
7       {A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body}
8  B:          [oh!] no! no!} he’s {wearing suspenders?}
10                                  {B’s HH outline the shape of the
11 A:   yes heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   lleva una camisa unos pantalones largos

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (367-372):
A:   los tirantes ni idea no sabía decirlo
    ...
I:   ella primero te pregunta he’s wearing a belt? ... cuando te dice
    lo de belt eso sabias lo que era?
A:   no no lo sabía

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (367-372):
I:   how did you know he was wearing suspenders?
B:   because she said that you use it to hold your pants up

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
small man wears suspenders

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (367-372):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-3: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 4: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 6-7: A does not understand B and therefore cannot accept her acceptance. A refashions the previous CS substituting it with a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-10: B realizes her previous misunderstanding and understands now A’s intended message. B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 11: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-387):
1 A: a:n:::d i can see in the wall of the house, e:::h= 
2 B: =uhuh
3 A: (pictures with flowers.)
4 (A’s RH draws flowers in the air, A looks down)
5 B: ah! (okay) (1.5) "there’s a picture" on the wall (4.5)
6 (B nods)
7 B: (that’s) okay (1.8) mm:: is there anything else? that you can
8 see, in the house? other than [the picture]
9 A: [ i don’t] know
10 (0.8)
11 B: because, i don’t have anything in the house. heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el papel de las paredes tiene flores

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-387):
A: sí yo pensé que ella me había entendido
I: y en español cómo lo dirías?
A: que el papel de la pared es dibujado
I: o sea que lo de pictures with flowers es porque no sabes decir
wallpaper?
A: sí sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-387):
B: this is one thing i didn’t expect the wallpaper
I: ok so what did you understand?
B: oh! it didn’t cross my mind actually what i understood was there
was a picture on the wall it’s what i understood

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
picture on the wall in the house

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-387):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘flowered wallpaper’.
- 3-4: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 4: B believes she has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and what
she believes to be the intended TL item. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning because
she has interpreted the CS literally, she has not realized A’s strategic attempt to compensate for an
unavailable TL lexical item.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue. B’s acceptance reveals her
misunderstanding but, according to the retrospective interview comments, A does not recognize this
misunderstanding.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding.
Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (388-393):
1 A: the floor of the house (0.7) is e::h of black, and white,
2 [e:::h ] (1.4) plaquets? heh (0.6) well [black] and white,
3 B: [ah! okay] [mm::: ]
4 B: okay {it’s e:h, (0.5) okay, it’s
5 {B waves her HH forwards and backwards indicating
6 understanding x^n)

- 359 -
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7 A: heh
8 B: checkered.
9 A: heh (heh) you ((heh) understand? heh [(heh) heh]}
10 B: [okay] [heh heh] heh heh no i
11 understand, i understand, yeah,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el suelo tiene plaquetas negras y blancas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (388-393):
A: ah! es que no sé decir plaquetas ... yo es que le quería decir que eran plaquetas pero como no sabía ya no le dije más ...
A: mm no sé quería decir algo parecido a plaquet o algo así
I: o sea que de plaqueta hiciste una palabra así que sonara inglesa para ver si?
A: si heh heh heh
I: y te pareció que ella te había entendido?
A: que me entendió pero por lo de black and white no por la palabra esa ...
I: y cuando ella te dice chequered?
A: no eso no se lo entendí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (388-393):
I: the floor did you expected it like this?
B: yeah so i assumed it would be like this

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black-and-white tiled floor

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (388-393):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘tiles’.
- 1-2: A presents a circumlocution involving a foreignizing strategy with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure it can be correctly understood by B.
- 3: B provides a backchannel continuer to indicates she understands and accepts A’s presentation so far.
- 4-8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and the intended TL lexical item
- 9: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and asks for further evidence of his understanding, i.e. checks for comprehension.
- 10-11: B confirms her understanding.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached. Agreement on form, however, is not reached, because A does not recognize the TL intended item provided by B.

RELEVANT: father’s clenched fist/ father clenches his fist
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (422-431):
1 A: e:::h now the father has e:::h on:::e of his hands, e:h
2 (very closed.)
3 {A makes a fist with her RH, B is not looking}
4 (1.0)
5 B: closed in what way?
6 A: e:::h tch [closed.]
7 {A closes and raises her RH}
8 B: [[ it’s] a fist?] uuhh?
9 {B nods}
10 A: yes, like (.) if he was going to:: give (.) a punch,
11 [to the::: o- ], to the:: short man,
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12 B:  {oh! okay} okay
13 (B nods)
14 B:  okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  el padre aparece con el puño cerrao como si fue- le fuera a dar
    un puñetazo al al hombre bajo

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (422-431):
I:  he has one of his hands very closed querías decir eso? no querías
decir puño?
A:  sí quería decir puño que era para dar un puñetazo pero no lo dije
    no sabía

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (422-431):
B:  yeah whenever she said that his hands were closed i assumed that
    he was making a fist because he was about to give the man a punch
    so heh heh heh

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father has fist closed

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (422-431):
  - Intended TL lexical item: ‘fist’.
  - 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
  - 5: B does not understand and asks for clarification.
  - 6-7: A repeats the previous combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
  - 8: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e., she is unsure of
    her understanding and checks for confirmation.
  - 10-11: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an
    acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
  - Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
    communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (456-482):
  1 A:  e:::h now the father of the boy, [is ] preparing to give,
  2 B:          [uhuh]
  3 A:  e:h the small man, a:: punch.
  4 B:  uuhuh
  5 A:  because e:::h , (1.2) he’s e:::h |preparing his cloth. (1.0)
       {A raises her RH clenched in a
       fist}
  6     (0.8)
  7 A:  e:::h (0.5) to::, to give him the punch.
  8     (0.8)
  9 B:  he’s preparing? what? what do [you mean?] {{he has his hand
10 A:          [e:::h ]
11     }{(B raises her LH
12     clenched in a
13     fist})}
14 15 B:  {raised up) like that?}
16 A:  {{yes}} a:::d) tch (1.2) .hhh {{(1.8)) [he is:,       }
17     }{(B raises)
18     (B nods)
19 18 B:  [where are you?] i
20 didn’t find heh {{heh heh})
21 (B nods)
22 A:  [{heh heh} heh °espera (‘wait’)* (2.5) i don’t
23     know how to explain it,
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24 B: mm:: {[(sorry)]}
25 {B waves her LH in circles indicating go on, A is not looking}
26 A: [ e:::h]
27 (4.4)
28 B: you’re trying to explain the father or the small man?
29 A: the father.
30 B: (the fa[ther.])
31 (B nods, A is not looking)
32 A: [ is] {he’s taking: his cloth out of his:
33 {A raises RH clenched in a fist}
34 (A raises RH clenched in a fist)
35 B: o:h!=
36 A: =hand.)
37 B: (uhuh=)
38 (B nods)
39 A: =e::h {to give him a punch,}
40 {A’s LH mimics punching}
41 (1.4)
42 B: he’s
43 (0.6)}
44 A: e::h like when you ha- [have] a:: lot of hot, (0.6) {you do it
45 B: }{[yeah]}
46 (B nods}
47 {A’s RH
48 mimics
49 rolling
50 up her LA
51 sleeve)
52 A: with the::, heh you (heh)do (heh)that.)
53 B: (oh! he’s rolling up his [sleeves!])
54 (B mimics rolling up her LA and RA sleeves)
55 A: [ yes] (heh)yes. [heh ]
56 B: [o:h!] okay okay
57 okay (0.7) he’s rolling up his sleeves, (0.7) o:kay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre del niño se está remangando como si se estuviera preparando para darle un puñetazo al hombre bajo y tiene expresión de enfadado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (456-482):
A: es que yo sabía decir manga pero no me acordaba y no sabía decir remangarse
I: o sea que tuviste dos problemas remangarse y manga?
A: sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father about to punch small man
rolling up his sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (456-482):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 5-8: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 10-15: B is not able to understand A’s presentation and asks for clarification. B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e. checking for confirmation.
- 16: A confirms B’s guessing but indicates that there is some more information she is trying to communicate.
- 22-23: A presents an appeal for assistance strategy.
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- 33-34 and 36: A presents a new combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 35 and 37: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 39-40 and 44-52: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and presents a new refashion of her initial presentation, a new combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 53: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL lexical item and a gesture.
- 55: A confirms B’s correct understanding and accepts her presentation with an acknowledgment.
- 56-57: B confirms understanding providing acknowledgments and repeating the intended TL lexical item.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (456-482):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘sleeves’: while trying to develop a circumlocution to compensate for the TL item ‘to roll up’ the learner encounters a second communicative problem, the lack of the TL item ‘sleeves’. A CS episode embedded in the previous CS episode is then initiated.
- 5: A presents an approximation.
- 10: B does not understand and asks for clarification. B does not understand the CS for ‘rolled up’ and embedded CS for ‘to roll’
- 11-32: A and B try to communicate the meaning ‘rolled up’
- 33: A repeats the previous approximation for ‘sleeves’.
- 35 and 37: B understands the intended message ‘rolled up’ and the embedded one ‘sleeves’; and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 53: B understands and indicates acceptance providing the intended TL lexical item for ‘rolled up’ and for ‘sleeves’.
- 55: A confirms B’s correct understanding and accepts her presentation with an acknowledgment.
- 56-57: B confirms understanding providing acknowledgments and repeating the intended TL lexical items.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: cap

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (515-518):
1 A: he’s e::h wearing, (0.6) e::h something like a:: baseball:
2 hat?
3 B: oh! okay=
4 A: =heh
5 B: (baseball cap,) okay
6 (B nods, A is not looking)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (590-593):
1 A: a::n::d in the:::, (0.7) kind of hat, he’s wearing?
2 B: mhm=
3 A: =he has the same picture, e::h that he had, (1.0) that (0.6)
4 e::h the: small child has, on his jackt. jacket.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una gorra de béisbol y una insignia en la gorra de béisbol

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (515-518):
A: yo sabía que se decía algo de que a las viseras se les llamaba algo de béisbol pero no sabía lo que entonces le dije eso a ver si me entendía

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (515-518):
I: baseball hat?
B: yeah a baseball cap

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
baseball cap on big boy’s head
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (515-518):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘cap’.
- 1-2: A presents a circumlocution involving an approximation strategy.
- 3: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 4: A accepts B’s acceptance.
- 5-6: B provides the intended TL lexical item.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached. There is no evidence however that A has recognized the TL lexical item provided by B. Agreement on form is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (590-593):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘cap’.
- 3: A repeats a previous successful approximation CS.
- B accepts by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: freckles

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (543-557):
1  A: a:n:d in his face, he has, (0.7) e:::h (2.0) something like, e:::h (1.0) points? or: (4.2) .hhh
2  B: dots? spots?
3  A: yes, (0.7) {something {{[ li]ke this.} (1.7) yes.}) [e::h]
4  {A’s RH points to her cheek with a pencil}
5  {B’s RH points to her cheek with a pencil} [heh ]
6  B: [the?] [heh ]
7  A: the things that people who has (0.8) e:::h (1.0) {orange hair,
8  {A’s RH points to her cheek with a pencil}
9  her hair
10  with a
11  pencil}
12  A: use to have, in his face,) {{(2.4) e:::h something like points.
13  (A’s RH points to her cheek with a pencil}
14  (1.5)
15  B: on? what do you mean? (1.5) {{>can you say it again?>>}} }
16  {{B shakes her head}}
17  20 B: (0.6) people who have?
18  (1.0)
19  24 A: e:::h his hair, orange,
20  (oh! okay okay ah! freckles.)
21  B: (B nods, B’s LH points forward indicating understanding)
22 A: {{yes [heh heh ]}}
23  (A nods, A waves her RH forward to indicate understanding)}
24  B: [freckles.] (1.2) okay, (1.4) a::h so this big child?
25  has freckles on his face.
26  31 A: yes=
32  32 B: =uhuh okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el nuevo niño tiene pecas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (543-557):
A: sabía decir la palabra inglesa porque la estudié el año pasado pero no me acordaba en ese momento entonces traté de decírselo
como pude
I: y cuando te dice lo de freckles?
A: sí ya me di cuenta
... 
A: y lo de pelirroja yo sabía que no era orange pero no sabía cómo decirlo

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (543-557):
B: when you you said points right? so i i assumed they will either be freckles or pimples or something so when you said people with orange hair so i assumed you were talking about people with red hair so people with red hair always have a lot of freckles heh heh heh

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
big boy has freckles

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (543-557):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.
- 1-2: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 3: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. She presents two different options.
- 5-19: A rejects the intended TL lexical item provided by B. She refashions her previous CS. She presents an all-purpose expression followed by a circumlocution, working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 20-22: B does not understand and asks for clarification of some part of the learner’s circumlocution.
- 24: A repeats this part of the circumlocution.
- 25-26: B understands now and indicates acceptance of the whole presentation providing acknowledgments and the intended TL lexical item.
- 27-28: A accepts B’s acceptance. Agreement on meaning and successful communication of the original message is reached.
- 29-30: B refashions A’s initial presentation using the intended TL lexical item.
- 31: A understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 32: B accepts A’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment. Agreement on form is reached.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (543-557):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘red hair’: while trying to develop a circumlocution to compensate for the TL item ‘freckles’ the learner encounters a second communicative problem, the lack of the TL item ‘red hair’. A CS episode embedded in the previous CS episode is then initiated.
- 10: A presents a circumlocution strategy, i.e. describes the color of the hair.
- 20-22: B does not understand and asks for clarification.
- 24: A repeats the previous circumlocution.
- 25-26: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments. B is accepting A’s the strategic presentation for ‘freckles’ and the embedded strategic presentation for ‘red hair’.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: striped tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (567-570):
1 A: in the tie, he has lines, white and black.
2 (1.2)
3 B: ah! on the tie of the big boy?
4 (0.8)
5 A: yes also in the tie of the small boy too,
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6   (1.2)
7  B:  ah! okay, (3.5) ¨striped ties¨

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  también lleva una corbata

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (567-570):
A:  es que no me daba si ella no me dice no me daba cuenta de decirle lo de la corbata hasta que me dijo colores yo miré y vi colores
I:  cuando le dices it has lines white and black
A:  que la corbata es a rayas pero no sé decirlo
I:  dijiste líneas porque no sabías decir rayas?
A:  sí

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (567-570):
B:  yeah i assumed it was striped

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
striped ties

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (567-570):
- Intended TL lexical item: ¨striped¨.
- 1: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 3: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- 7: B provides the intended TL lexical item.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached. There is no evidence however that A has recognized the TL intended lexical item. Agreement on form is not reached.

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (590-596):
1  A:  a::n::i: in the:::, (0.7) kind of hat, he’s wearing?
2  B:  mhm=
3  A:  =he has the same picture, e::h that he had, (1.0) that (0.6)
4       e::h the: small child has, on his jackt. jacket.
5       (2.2)
6  B:  a::h! {okay=}
7       {B nods, A is not looking}
8  A:  =a:nd he::: has too the:::, this:: picture, in his:: jacket.
9       (1.4)
10 B:  oh! okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  lleva una gorra de béisbol y una insignia en la gorra de béisbol y esta insignia es la misma que lleva en la chaqueta

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
emblem on boy’s cap/jacket

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (590-596):
- Intended TL lexical item: ¨badge¨.
- 3-4: A presents a circumlocution strategy involving an approximation.
- 6-7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (590-596):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 8: A repeats the previously successful circumlocution strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-NS CS

PARTICIPANT A: Carolina, female, 19, Galician L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 1st year undergraduate student, 1 month in England

PARTICIPANT B: Steve, male, 21, British English L1, intermediate Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 3 months

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (14-16):

1  A:   e::h with tch eh, (0.6) it’s a:: jacket, a::: (3.4) [it has]
2  B:   [is he]
3  B:   wearing {a tie as [well?]} (0.8) all right
4  B:   {B’s RH outlines the shape of a tie on her chest}
5  A:   [yeah]

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (298-303):

1  A:   and he has {a: si- a:: sign here, like, (1.2) tch (1.8) of
2  A:   {A’s RI points to where the badge would be on her
3  A:   chest and draws circles x2}
4  A:   (and has two pockets.)
5  A:   {A’s HH point to where the pockets would be on her belly, B is
6  A:   not looking}
7  A:   (1.0)
8  B:   {uhuh right.} (1.0) it’s got two pockets? (1.5) {and a badge
9  B:   (B nods, AB look down)
10  B:   {B’s RH points
11  B:   to where the
12  B:   badge would
13  B:   be on her
14  B:   chest}
15  B:   {B nods}
16  B:   to say wh- where the school} (0.5) is {{that he] goes,} (2.8)
17  B:   {B nods}
18  A:   {{hm hm}
19  A:   {{A nods}}
20  B:   okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

A:   na chaqueta ten así o signo do colexio supoño

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (14-16):

I:   o da insignia nono mencionaches porque non sabías dicilo ou?
A:   non si que llo dixenlle a sign like
I:   si pero eso dilo logo moito despois cando o volveades a repetir
   cando volveades sobre as viñetas pero aquí agora
A:   non é que non me fixei así moi

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (298-303):

I:   dis sign para referirte ó escudo?
A:   si porque non sei como se di

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (298-303):

I:   did you understand her?
B:   yeah at the end i did
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RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no badge

ANALYSIS
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (14-16):
- There is no intention to communicate the meaning 'badge' and therefore no CS.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (298-303):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'badge'.
- 1-4: A presents an approximation and a circumlocution working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 9-17 and 20: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL lexical item in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 18-19: A accepts B's acceptance allowing him to continue and providing a backchannel continuer.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-8):
1 A: the boy, (0.5) tch e::h (0.5) i i see the boy : (1.4) with a:::
2 (0.8) {with he:rs eye, (1.8) very black.}
3 [A opens her LH and points to her eye]
4 (1.8)
5 B: really? (0.7) {[[mm ] heh}
6 {B nods, B is looking down}
7 A: [mhm]

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e na segunda viñeta vese como lle queda o ollo así inchado

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (4-8):
I: quieres dicir que o ollo está negro aí no debuxo? ou quieres dicir que ten o ollo morado?
A: si que ten o ollo morado
I: e que ten o ollo morado sábelo dicir en inglés?
A: non
I: entón utilizas black para describir como está o ollo
A: si

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (4-8):
I: did you understand he had a black eye?
B: yes yes because in english we say black so i understood

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eye

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-8):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'black eye'.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5-6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 7: A accepts B's acceptance providing a backchannel continuer.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (15-27):
1 B: is he wearing {a tie as [well?]}} (0.8) all right=
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2 {B’s RH outlines the shape of a tie on her chest}
3
4 A: [yeah]
5 A: (=e:h (1.5) tch with:: (1.7) s- strings? (1.5) black and
6 {A’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest ×n}
7 A: white.)
8 B: mm:: ah {all right!} {like a a belt? (1.2) is he wearing a
9 {B nods, looks down}
10 {B waves her HH around her waist
11 outlining the shape of a belt}
12 B: belt?] (1.0) or?:
13 (2.4)
14 A: no. tch {in [the: in] the tie? (0.7) he ha::s
15 {A’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest ×n}
16 B: {{[no belt]})
17 {{[B shakes her head]})
18 B: {{[oh! [the tie?]
19 {{[B’s RH outlines the shape of a tie on her chest ×2, B nods]}
20 A: [ black,] white, black, white,}
21 B: black and white stripes?)}
22 (1.2)
23 A: yeah. (0.5) [heh]
24 B: [oh!] {all right,} i see,
25 {B nods, AB look down}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e unha corbata a raias branca e negra

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (15-27):
I: aí exactamente que dixeches?
A: strings con raias
I: mhm entón dis strings por raias
... 
I: e cando el te di o de black and white stripes? entendes o que che
quere dicir?
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (15-27):
I: did you understand her?
B: not really heh to be honest heh but eventually i think that i
grasped what you meant
B: because when she said string i thought it might be a belt but
when she said black and white black and white i understood
stripes

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
plain tie

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (15-27):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘stripes’.
- 5-7: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-12: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e.
he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. His guessing is however erroneous,
 i.e. he has misunderstood A’s message.
- 14-15 and 20: A recognizes B’s misunderstanding and refashions her previous CS. She presents a
combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 16-17: B recognizes his misunderstanding.
- 21: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 23: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing
acknowledgments.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- 24-25: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (54-72):

1. A: and is wearing a::: (3.8) a jacket? (3.4) no, (1.4) mm
2. B: is he wearing a tie as well?
3. A: no:, (1.0) {[no. ]} (0.7) no, it’s not a jacket, i::t’s
   {A shakes her head}
4. B: [(well)]
5. A: ah! all right.
6. B: is he wearing a tie as well?
7. A: (tch) (4.8) i (2.0) i think {it’s a::: (3.2)} {the:: (1.0)}
   {A’s LH points to her chest, AB look down}
   {A’s RH draws an armhole on her LA shoulder ×n}
8. B: [((clearing throat))]
9. A: that e:h, tch the thing you wear,} {over: your:: (1.0)}
   {A’s RH grabs her LA sleeve}
10. A: blouse,} (2.0) {it’s
    {A’s RH draws an armhole around LA shoulder and}
    outlines the shape of a sleeve along LA}
11. B: ah! {[((clearing throat))]
12. A: [with no:::]} (2.2) un chaleco (‘a vest’), heh
13. B: {un chaleco (‘a vest’) ah all right,} [heh]
14. {B nods}
15. A: [ i] i think,
16. (1.0)
17. B: okay, (0.5) he’s not wearing a shirt?
18. (4.0)
19. A: yeah, he has a shirt but, {[over it,] }
20. {A’s HH point to her chest}
21. (1.8)
22. B: a ja-?
23. (0.8)
24. A: un chaleco (‘a vest’).
25. B: e::h [a jacket.] (1.8) {(the probably thing), yeah.}
26. {B’s RH points to her chest}
27. {B nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (295-297):

1. B: and how many buttons does he have {on his jacket?} (3.6) en
2. {B’s RH point to her chest}
3. ×2, A is not looking
4. B: su chaleco (‘on his vest’)?
5. (3.2)
6. A: e::h three.
7. (1.0)
8. B: three.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (336-338):

1. A: and he has two pockets,
2. (1.2)
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

3 B: {yeah,}
4 {B nods}
5 (2.2)
6 A: e:h {on the:::} (1.8) chaleco (‘vest’).
7 {A’s HH point to where the pockets would be on her belly, B is not looking}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (365-367):
1 B: and is the father still wearing {a jacket?}
2 {B’s RH point to her chest ×2, A is not looking}
3 (4.4)
4 A: hm.
5 (0.8)
6 B: (okay)
7 {B nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (402-405):
1 B: and then, is the father still wearing the jacket? even (1.5)
2 in picture eight
3 (4.2)
4 A: {‘yes’}
5 {A nods}
6 (0.6)
7 B: no

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai ten un chaleco

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (54-72):
I: aí cando estás dicindo o de jacket xa é porque querías dicir chaleco e non sabías como dicilo?
A: non ó principio pensaba que era unha unha chaqueta pero despois ó mirar aquí pareceume mais un chaleco ...
I: e ti décheste conta de que el non che entendera? ou pensaches que si che entendera?
A: si é que como me di chaleco right vale heh heh heh ...
I: e por exemplo cando el di a jacket? ti que pensas que se está referindo ó chaleco?
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (54-72):
I: so you understood jacket? a blazer?
B: yeah yeah

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (295-297):
I: now you are calling it chaleco but you think it is a jacket?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no jacket

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (54-72):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 7-18: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 19: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning as a ‘jacket’.
- 20-21: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and initiates a circumlocution strategy but encounters a second lexical problem ‘sleeves’. She abandons the circumlocution strategy and substitutes it with a code switching.
- 22-23: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance repeating A’s code witching strategy and providing acknowledgments. She has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning as a ‘jacket’.
35: A repeats what she believes to be a previously successful code switching strategy.

36-38: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing what he believes to be A’s intended TL lexical item. She has again misunderstood A’s intended meaning as a ‘jacket’.

A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and indicates acceptance allowing the conversation to continue.

Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. A believes that both A and B have agreed that ‘chaleco’ and ‘jacket’ are being used to refer to a vest. B believes that both A and B have agreed that ‘chaleco’ and ‘jacket’ are being used to refer to a jacket.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (295-297):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘jacket’.
- 1-4: B presents the intended TL lexical item ‘jacket’ followed by a code switching strategy ‘chaleco’ which, he believes, is a previously agreed term of reference for ‘jacket’.
- 6: A interprets B’s presentation on the basis of what she believes to be an agreement between her and her interlocutor that both ‘jacket’ and ‘chaleco’ are used to make reference to a ‘vest’. She believes she has understood B’s message and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 8: B accepts A’s acceptance.
- Unsuccessful communication. A misunderstands B and B does not recognize A’s misunderstanding.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (336-338):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘jacket’.
- 6-8: A presents what she believes to be a previously successful code switching strategy.
- B believes he has understood A’s message and indicates acceptance allowing the conversation to continue. He has in fact misunderstood A.
- A does not recognize the misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (365-367):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘jacket’.
- 6: A interprets B’s presentation as an approximation strategy, i.e. on the basis of what she believes to be an agreement between her and her interlocutor that both ‘jacket’ and ‘chaleco’ are used to make reference to a ‘vest’. She believes she has understood B’s message and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Unsuccessful communication. A misunderstands B and B does not recognize A’s misunderstanding.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (402-405):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘jacket’.
- 1-2: B presents the intended TL lexical item ‘jacket’.
- 4-5: A interprets B’s presentation as an approximation strategy, i.e. on the basis of what she believes to be an agreement between her and her interlocutor that both ‘jacket’ and ‘chaleco’ are used to make reference to a ‘vest’. She believes she has understood B’s message and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Unsuccessful communication. A misunderstands B and B does not recognize A’s misunderstanding.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-77):

1 A: a:n:d catch her:: boy, (0.6) oh! his:: tch (0.8) son, (2.2)
2 an::d go in e::h to the house, of the boy, (1.5) who ha::s
3 (1.8) who had hurt, (2.2) her, him.
4 B: yeah

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (551-555):

1 B: where is, his father’s hands? (2.4) has he got {his hands
2 (B opens her RA
3 and RH to
4 mimic loose
5 hands}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

6 B: loose or in his pockets?
7 (2.8)
8 A: e::h {he’s (2.3) having (0.7)} {tch he i::s catching the hand}
9 {A’s LH mimics holding someone’s hand}
10 (A’s LH holds her RH)
11 A: {of her so- of his son, (1.5) a:nd the other}
12 (A’s LH mimics holding someone’s hand)
13 B: ah! all right

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (75-77):
A: non sei levar da man

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (75-77):
I: did you understand?
B: i could imagine what she was trying to say but no i i didn’t

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (551-555):
I: and now did you understand they were holding hands?
B: yeah yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father and son not holding hands

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-77):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1: A presents an approximation strategy.
- B does not understand, but indicates acceptance allowing A to continue, i.e. feigns understanding.
- A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication: A believes her message has been successfully communicated, but B knows it has not.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (551-555):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 8-12: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (92-95):
1 A: it has a::: tch (3.8) a::: (2.3) {well, fo::r knock.} (1.4)
2                                        {A’s LH mimics knocking}
3 A: it’s=
4 B: =ah! a (a doorknocker?
5                                        {B’s RH mimics knocking}
6 A: yeah)
7 B: oh! i see now, heh

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-101):
1 A: the the: father (0.7) {e::h knock,} (1.4) {wi::th (1.6) hi-}
2                             {A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking}
3 4                                        {A’s LH points to her RH knuckles, B is not looking}
5 6
7 A: her hand, (0.5) his hand.
8 (0.8)
9 B: oh {i see,} [yeah]
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

10 (B nods, B looks down)
11 A: [don’t] use {the:: kno- >bueno} eso (‘well that
12 (A’s LH mimics knocking, B is not
13 looking)
14 A: thing’)< heh
15 (0.8)
16 B: okay heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: a porta ten un un para tocar

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (92-95):
I: non coñecías a palabra chamador?
A: si...
I: el diche que é un doorknocker coñeciala palabra antes
A: non pero
I: pero polo contexto entendiches que
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no doorknocker

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (92-95):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘doorknocker’
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 4-5: B indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 6: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 7: B accepts providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (98-101):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘doorknocker’
- 11-15: A tries to use the intended TL lexical item previously provided by B, but fails. She presents a combination of an all-purpose expression and a nonverbal strategy.
- 16: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (96-97):
1 A: and a::: {(1.6) a place for the letters} but the the:=
2 {l-air draw a rectangle in the air}
3 B: {=okay}
4 (B nods)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: a porta ten un un para tocar e o o espacio pa metelas cartas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
I: e o buzón? non quixeches mencionalo?
A: non despois pero cando el me preguntou

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (96-97):
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

No relevant data available

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
no letterbox

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (96-97):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’
- 1-2: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 3-4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENT:** (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-384):**

1  A: he is:: {(2.4) touching hi- the::}
2       (A’s LH touches her chin)
3       (2.0)
4  B: {{his chin?}
5       {{(B touches her chin}}
6       (2.5)
7  A: {{{“si (“yes””).”}}}
8       {{{A nods}}}
9       (2.5)
10 B: {{{okay}}}
11       {{{B nods}}}

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
No relevant data available

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-384):**
A: ah! si a barbilla non sabia dicilo
I: e cando el te di chin? entendiches que se referia á barbilla
A: si pero porque me soa pero asi saber pois non

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (380-384):**
I: did you understand because of the mime?
B: yeah

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
kid not touching his chin

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (380-384):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’
- 1-2: A presents a nonverbal strategy
- 4-5: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7-8: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 10-11: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

**REFERENT:** suspenders

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (118-122):**

1  A: a::ni:d he ha:s (2.4) tch a::: (2.0) very::: (1.2) e:h (5.6)
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

2 bueno ('well') (2.0) tch he ha- he’s wearing:: a trousers with
3 a:: (3.3) tch (1.0) heh .hhh! e::h {the thing that you use
4 [A’s HH outlines the shape
5 of suspenders on her body)
6 A: to::} (2.3) tch
7 {A’s HH mimic pulling up her pants)
8 B: { {{oh! (yeah!) braces?}}
9 {A’s HH outline the shape of suspenders on her body}
10 {{B’s HH outline the shape of suspenders on her body ×2})
11 (0.5)
12 A: yeah)
13 (0.5)
14 B: yeah (0.8) {okay}
15 {B nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: uns pantalóns así moi anchos que con tirantes

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (118-122):
A: non non sabía dicir tirantes
I: e cando el che di braces ti que entendes?
A: nada heh heh heh non sei
I: daste conta de que braces é tirantes en inglés?
A: non
I: pero daste conta de que el che entendeu
A: si pola mímica

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
nobraces

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (118-122):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’
- 1-7 and 9: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8 and 10: B indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e. he is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 12: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 14-15: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (141-155):
1 A: and in the::, (3.2) tch (0.6) ay! (1.2) when {when he opens
2 | {A’s RH mimics
3 opening a door,
4 B is not
5 looking}
6 A: the door,) {in into the house,} (1.3) there’s a:: wall, (1.0)
7 {A’s waves her RH, B is not looking}
8 A: which ha::s (2.4) very:: ma:- ma- many:: (0.8) flowers, (1.0)
9 pain[ted,]
10 B: [all ] right
11 (2.7)
12 A: and the: floor, {the:: ground floor, i::s, (2.4) in, with,}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

13 (A waves her RH palm down, A holds the
gesture, B is not looking)
15 A: (5.6) tch mm::: (5.4) e::h (1.2) {is black and white.}
16 (A waves her LH, B is not
17 looking)
18 (1.2)
19 B: {black and white?} (2.2) {is is that the color of the wall?}
20 (B nods)
21 {B’s RI points to the wall}
22 B: (0.7) black and white?
23 (2.3)
24 A: no.
25 (1.0)
26 B: no? (1.2) all right, (1.4) sorry what did you say was black
27 and white?
28 (1.2)
29 A: {the:: ground- [the::]
30 (A waves her LH palm down, A holds the gesture)
31 B: [oh the] ground!
32 A: tch {{yeah}} (it's the ground,) [and ] {the: [wall]} is
33 {{A nods}}
34 (A’s LH points
35 backwards)
36 B: [sorry] [okay]
37 (1.0)
38 A: wi::th flowers.
39 B: {all right}
40 (B nods, B looks down)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e no tch no que é o pasillo a entrada da casa vese un a parede con flores de estampado con flores

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (141-155):
I: pareceuche que as flores están pintadas na parede? ou que é un papel de parede?
A: si é un papel
I: porque logo en galego dis que é un papel de parede entón dis que están pintadas porque non sabes dicir papel de parede ou empapelado?
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (141-155):
I: and what did you understand?
B: at the beginning i thought there were flowers real flowers
outside on each side of the door
I: and when did you realize it was not like that?
B: i didn’t

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no flowers on the wall

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (141-155):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wallpapered’.
- 6-9: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 10: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- 12: A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and accepts his acceptance continuing on with the conversation.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (141-155):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wallpapered’.
- 32, 34–35 and 38: A repeats what she believes to be a previously successful circumlocution strategy.
- 39–40: B believes he has understood and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended meaning.
- A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and accepts allowing the conversation to continue.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (144-155):

1 A: and the: floor, (the:: ground floor, i::s, (2.4) in, with,)  
   (A waves her RH palm down, A holds the gesture, B is not looking)
2 A: (5.6) tch mm::: (5.4) e::h (1.2) {is black and white.}  
   (A waves her LH, B is not looking)
3 (1.2)
4 B: (black and white?) (2.2) {is is that the color of the wall?}  
   (B nods)
5 (B’s RI points to the wall)
6 B: (0.7) black and white?  
7 (2.3)
8 A: no.  
9 (1.0)
10 B: no? (1.2) all right, (1.4) sorry what did you say was black and white?  
11 (1.2)
12 A: (the:: ground [the::])  
13 (A waves her LH palm down, A holds the gesture)
14 B: [oh the] ground!  
15 (2.3)
16 A: tch {{yeah}} (it’s the ground,) [and ] [the: [wall]} is  
17 {{A nods}}
18 (A’s LH points backwards)
19 B: [sorry] [okay]
20 (1.0)
21 A: wi::th flowers.  
22 B: (all right)
23 (B nods, B looks down)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e o suelo coas baldosas branca e ne- brancas e negras

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (144-155):
A: ai tampouco sabia dicir baldosas
I: mhm  
...  
I: y ti pensaches que el che entendera  
A: si  
...  
I: cando dis ground floor é ground para ó piso da casa? dilo porque crees que se di asi? ou porque non sabes como se di pero si coñeces esta palabra?  
A: porque creo que se di asi

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (144-155):
I: did you understand something like this?  
B: no because when she said ground i thought she was meaning outside

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (144-155):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘tiles’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8-11: B does not understand part of the circumlocution and refashions the speaker’s presentation uttering it with rising intonation, i.e. checking for confirmation.
- 13: A recognizes his misunderstanding and indicates it.
- 15-16: B asks for clarification.
- 18-19: A repeats part of the initial circumlocution but makes a mistake, i.e. she uses ‘ground’ instead of ‘floor’.
- 20: B does not recognize A’s mistake and therefore misunderstands A’s intended message. He indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating A’s presentation.
- 21: A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and accepts B’s acceptance repeating her presentation

**Unsuccessful communication.** B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

**REFERENT:** father pointing inside/father points to the house

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (171-174):**

1. A: and the father i::s (0.8) (i:s (1.6) signing, into the house,
   (A’s LI and LA point forward)
2. (1.0)
3. B: really?
4. {{(0.8)}
5. {{B nods}}
6. 7 A: yeah like asking, (3.0) fo:r the, (1.0) his father.
7. (2.4))
8. 9 B: mhm

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (429-430):**

1. A: a:n:d {signing inside the the:: house
   (A’s LI and LA points forward)
2. (1.8)
3. 4 B: { (mhm})
5. (B nods)

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**

A: o pai pois tch así enfadado pois sinala cara dentro como pedicindolle a ver que salga teu pai o asi non?

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (171-174):**

A: bueno eu a verdade quero dicir eu sei sign de sinal entonces digoo pois o verbo

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (171-174):**

I: did you understand?
B: yes i would say to point but it did understand

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**

doesn’t point into the house

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (171-174):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to point’.
- 1-2: A presents a combination of a word coinage and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 7: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (429-430):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to point’.
- 1-2: A repeats a previous successful combination of a word coinage and a nonverbal strategy.
- 3-4: B accepts providing verbal and nonverbal acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-213):
1 A: but the father i::s (1.5) is (0.7) tch (2.0) he he e::h he ha::s (0.7) tch he::: whishes, (2.4) tch (1.8) mm::: (xx) what she he do with hi::s (2.0) son? {"you understand?\}" (1.5) heh
2 {B nods}
3 A: heh heh [heh ]
4 B: [i thi]nk so, could you repeat that? if you don’t
5 mind, [heh]
6 A: [tch] yeah the father, (1.7) eh tch eh has a expression of revenge. (1.5) {is [is doing ] like, (1.5) tch (2.0) [A’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve and A’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve x2]}
7 B: [ah {all right}]}
8 {B nods}
9 A: sabes (‘you know’)?}
10 B: {he’s rolling his sleeves [up? ]}
11 (B’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve}
12 A: {(yeah.] heh}
13 {A nods}
14 B: (all right, heh heh)
15 {B nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (476-480):
1 B: did you say that his father is {rolling his sleeves up?}
2 (B’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve)
3 2.2) ready for a fight or [wha]tever, (3.0) a:n:d (0.5)
4 (A nods)
5 A: {[mhm]}
6 7 (A nods)
8 B: what are the other two doing? (0.5) while he’s rolling
9 (his sleeves up,}
10 (B’s LH mimics rolling up her RA sleeve}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: entonces xa si xa se prepara como pa pa pegarlle tamén ó pai
SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (204-213):
A: que que se estaba remangando así en plan pa tch eso pa pegarlle e tal

RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (204-213):
1: did you figure out the father was rolling his sleeves up?
2: no heh

RECEIVERS REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father rolls his sleeves up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (204-213):
- interlocutor in 476-480, and correctly understood by the learner
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 9-12: A presents an all-purpose expression followed by an appeal for assistance working in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 15-16: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 17-18: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- 19-20: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (476-480):
- B uses the previous co-constructed form and A accepts it.

REFERENT: freckles

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (223-232):

1 A: \{he ha::s,\} (3.4) e::h i think it’s the brother, (0.8) (i
2 \{A’s RI draws dots on her cheek, B is not looking\}
3 A: don’t know) heh
4 B: heh
5 A: \{he ha::s,\} (1.3) eh (1.5) \{eh you:\ (1.5) °points° (1.0)
6 \{A’s RI draws dots on her cheek, B is not looking\}
7 \{A’s RI draws dots on her cheek \}
8 A: [marks, points,]}
9 B: \{[ mm:::] spots? or:
10 \{B’s RI draws dots on her cheek \}
11 A: no no=
12 B: =freckles?}
13 (2.0)
14 A: yeah
15 (2.4)
16 B: ah all \{right
17 \{B nods\}
18 A: tch (1.2) bueno (‘well’)}
19 (0.8)
20 B: \{okay\}
21 \{B nods\}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten pecas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (223-232):
A: si pecas
I: cando dis marks ou algo así?
A: si dime bueno spots eu entendín granos dígolle no non sei
I: e logo el diche freckles e que entendiches? non sabías o que era?
A: no heh
I: a ti que che pareceu? que el non che entendera? que crees que entende el?
A: ó principio que lle digo que ten e esto como el me di granos e
dígolle no e dime el ah! e bueno eso
I: freckles?
A: si e pensei que xa pensei que xa entendera
I: mhm

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
no spots/freckles
ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA 223-232:
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.
- 1-2: A presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 5-8: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and presents two approximations in combination with a nonverbal strategy.
- 9-10: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and a gesture, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. He has in fact misunderstood A’s intended message.
- 11: A recognizes B’s misunderstanding and indicates it not accepting his presentation.
- 12: B makes a second guess and he presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 14: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 16-17: B accepts A’s acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-NS PM

PARTICIPANT A: Paula, female, 29, Galician L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 1st year undergraduate student, 3 months in England

PARTICIPANT B: Michael, male, 23, British English L1, intermediate Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 7 months

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-25):

1 A: and a:: jacket, (0.5) {with a::: (1.6) eh (0.5) i i don’t
2 [A’s RH points to the right side on her chest]
3 4 A: know, something in::: in the:: right,} (1.7) {in the:: lef:::t
5 [A’s LH points to the left side on her chest]
6
7 8 A: sides} of the jacket,
9 B: like what?=
10 A: =e:h .hhh! {like a:: (2.4) like a: paint or like
11 } {A’s RI points to her chest and draws circles x2}
12 B: a what?
13 A: a:::
14 (2.9)
15 B: a [flower?] 16 A: [like a ] mm yes like a flower.
17 B: {on the? on the::? on the: lapel? (0.5)} {on the left of the
18 } {B’s LH points to the left side on her chest}
19
20 21 A: {{yeah.} } (1.5) because you cannot see the right (0.7) side
22 ((A nods))
23
24 25 A: of the jacket.
26 (1.0)
27 B: right but you can see:: {the left side?} (1.0) the co- the
28 {B’s LH points to the left side on her chest}
29
30 collar of the jacket? (0.5) the lapel?
31 A: the color!? 32 (0.5)
33 B: the lapel?
34 (1.7)
35 A: {yes.} (0.5) you can see it.
36 {A nods}
37 (0.8)
38 B: an::d (1.5) but you can’t see the lapel on the right?
39 (1.0)
40 A: {no! you cannot=}
41 (A shakes his head)
42 B: =is there anything on the lapel? (0.5) on the left?
43 A: yes, {there is a: a like a flower,}
44 {A’s RI points to left side on her chest}
45 B: like a flower?
46 A: {yeah=}
47 {A nods}
48 B: =right in mine there isn’t, (0.5) so that’s that’s a
difference,

INTERRALLANGUE DATA (114-116):
1 A: and you can see the flower in the jacket, in the: (0.8)
2 (again), but not in the other side. (1.7) not in the right
3 side, (0.5) of the jacket.
4 B: right! okay,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o neno leva un uniforme e na chaqueta ten así un símbolo

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (4-25):
A: no me o sea non sabía como decir que tiña unha insignia
I: mmh pero décheste conta de que era unha insignia ou pareceuque outra cousa?
A: non o sea ou ou un pin no estaba segura si era un pin ou un
escudo de algo pera algo que estava posto na chaqueta
I: mmh e non sabías
A: non sabía
I: e cando dis o de flor? por qué dis o de flor?
A: porque dixome el que ten? que é como unha forma de flor? e dixen
eu ah! si si unha flor porque entón xa dixen ah! pois será unha
flor o que pasa que non me din conta
I: pensaches que na súa había unha flor?
A: pensei que era como unha marca da chaqueta quero dicir eh pois
pôdía ser unha flor e eso é unha marca pois o símbolo da marca
sabes?
I: mmh vale entón ti aí creche que el che entendera o que querías
dicir?
A: si
I: e que tiña o mesmo na súa chaqueta?
A: si pensei que tiña unha unha flor bordada, que a insignia tiña
unha flor
I: vale

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (114-116):
A: ah! eso que podías ver outra vez a flor
I: hm
A: mira aí vese mellor que é un escudo pero eu seguín pensando que
era unha flor xa convencidísima que era unha flor debuxada
bordada pensaba que era algo bordado na chaqueta

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (4-25):
B: yeah but it’s a badge it’s a school badge they go to the same
school so it’s the school badge

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
flower lapel

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUE DATA (4-25):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-8: A presents a combination of an all-purpose word ‘something’ and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B asks for clarification.
- 10-11: A refashions her initial presentation and offers an approximation ‘paint’ and a nonverbal
strategy.
- 12: B does not understand the message and asks for clarification again
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- 15: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 16: A confirms what she believes to be the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating B’s words. A is now misinterpreting the picture and misunderstanding B. B is using ‘flower’ in its literal sense whereas A interprets it as an approximate term for badge, i.e. using the part for the whole.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (4-25):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 43: A uses ‘flower’, what she believes to be an agreed alternative term of reference for ‘badge’.
- 45: B checks for confirmation. He is interpreting ‘flower’ in its literal sense and therefore misunderstanding A’s message.
- 46: A does not recognize B’s misunderstanding and confirms what she believes to be his correct understanding.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (114-116):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1: A uses ‘flower’, what she believes to be an agreed alternative term of reference for ‘badge’.
- 4: B believes he has understood the message and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments. He has in fact misunderstood A’s message.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

 REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (76-80):
1  A: you can see the:: the this boy, (1.0) {e:h who is e::h having
2       (A’s RH half open in
3       front of right eye)
4  A: a black e:h (0.8) eyes.) (0.5) [because ]
5  B: [he’s got] a black eye? (2.4)
6  he’s [got?]
7  A: [yes,] {because of the:: fight.=}
8       (A’s RH mimics punching)
9  B: (=no.)
10 (B shakes his head)

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (134-136):
1  B: he’s got he’s got a black eye and that’s di[fferent,]
2  A: [yeah    ]

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (226-227):
1  B: (he’s he’s pointing his eyes?)
2  (B’s II point to her eyes)
3          (1.0)
4  A: (one, (0.5) eyes, only, (0.5) the on::e who::) has:: (2.0)
5       (A’s RI points to her right eye)
6  A: black. (1.0) a::nd father suddenly gets up,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (290-292):
1  A: well an::d (1.2) boy as well is is {with the:: again is with
2          (A’s RH points to her right
3          eye, B is not looking)
4  A: the black eyes,) a:and {{(0.7) is crying.}
5          (A’s RH draws a tear on her face)
6  B: {hm hm}
7          {B nods}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten un ollo morado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: vese o ollo morado

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai do rapaz que ten o ollo morado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (76-80):
A: quería dicir que tiña un moratón un ollo morado e tal pero bueno
dixen que tiña o ollo negro
I: mhm por que? por que o debuxo é negro? para que che entendera ou?
quero dicir porque ollo morado en inglés disse black eye
A: ah!
I: entón non sei se ti sabías dicir black eye ou non sabías?
A: non non sabía dicir non sabía dicir morado dixen black para que
se me entendese que o ollo estaba negro é dicir que estaba morado
I: de feito el logo diche is got a black eye ou algo así?
A: mhm

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (76-80):
I: black eye
B: yes i understood

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eye

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (76-80):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 5-6: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
  his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an
  acknowledgment. However, she does not recognize the expression provided by B as the desired but
  previously unavailable TL expression
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
  reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (134-136):
- 1: B uses the TL expression ‘black eye’.
- 2: A understands B’s message and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer. She is
  however interpreting as a circumlocution what is in fact the desired TL expression.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (226-227):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 4-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- B understands and indicates acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
  reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (290-292):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6-7 B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
  reached.

REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (91-97):
1 A: a::nd he’s having a tie. {a:: a:::} (xxx) but (heh)i
2 {A shakes her head}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

3 A: (heh) don’t {remember, hhh the::: (2.6) with;} (2.0)
4            {A’s RI draws lines in the air \times n}
5 A: {i don’t (0.5) i don’t know,} (with e:::h hhh) (1.6) well ties
6            {A shakes her head}
7               {A’s RI draws lines in the air \times n}
8 A: (.) can see (.} (with only one color,} {or what [with]
9            {A holds up one finger}
10                   {A’s RI draws lines in
11 the air \times n}
12 B:                                                \[ah! \] with
13       stripes!
14 A: with stripes. [okay. ]
15 B: [ah! he]’s got he’s got a tie with stripes?
16 A: yeah

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (189-190):
4 B: plain, no {no stripes.}
5            {B nods}
6 A: {yes}
7            {A nods}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: leva unha corbata que antes non se vía leva unha corbata de raias

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (91-97):
A: acordábame que que aprendera o de raias i i non me acordaba como
se dicia
I: mhm
A: expliqueino dixen en vez de ser toda dunha cor dixen as corbatas
poden ser todas dunha cor ou doutra maneira algo así dixen

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (91-97):
I: how did you know the tie was a striped tie? because of the mime?
because you could imagine it?
B: yeah because well
I: she told you the tie had two colors
B: yeah yeah and i could imagine

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
plain tie

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (91-102):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.9a.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘striped’.
- 1-12: A presents an appeal for assistance, a complete omission strategy and nonverbal strategies.
- 13-14: B understands and indicates acceptance presenting what he believes to be the intended TL item.
- 15: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the desired TL item provided by B.
- 16: B checks for confirmation of the correctness of his understanding. He refashions A’s initial presentation using now the TL item ‘stripes’ and utters this refashioning with rising intonation, i.e. checking for confirmation.
- 17: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (189-190):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.9b.
- The TL lexical item ‘striped’ has been grounded and is now used by B and understood by A. There is no need for CS use.
REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-205):
1. A: he’s wearing a shirt, but (as well as) (0.8) like a
   (A’s HH point to her chest)
2. A: pullover, (but without) (0.8) the arm:
   (A’s RH outlines the shape of a sleeve along her
   left arm)
3. B: =sleeveless?
   (1.2)
4. A: mhm
5. B: uhuh!=
6. A: =with (two pockets) (and two:: buttons.
   (A holds up two fingers)
7. (A’s HH point to where the buttons would
   be on her chest)
8. (1.7)
9. B: right. (0.5) so one difference (he’s) got (0.5) a sleeveless
   (3.0) jumper,

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (308-322):
1. B: where?
2. A: whe- (3.6) where?
3. B: yeah. ah! on the? [on the shirt?]
4. A: [in the:  yeah, no not on the shirt
   because i i cannot see:
5. B: {he’s still wearing} {the jumper?}
6. (B’s HH outline the shape of a jumper on her body}
7. {A nods)
8. A: yeah,
9. B: right. (1.5) but where? where is this pocket?
10. (1.5)
11. A: tch {in the right, sides, (1.7) of the:: (0.5) of the: (0.5)
   (A’s RH points to where the pocket would be on her body)
12. A: pullover.) well of the this kind of [pullover.]
13. B: [of the ] trou-? of the
14. trousers? (. or the pullo-? the pu[llover? ]
15. A: {[the pullover.]} (0.5)
16. (A nods)
17. A: yeah=
18. B: (=right, the jumper,} okay [right ]
19. (B nods)
20. A: [the jumper, (0.8) okay

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai ten ten un chaleco con dous bolsillos e dous botóns

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (199-205):
A: ai claro non me saía non sabía como se dicía chaleco entón
   intentei explicarlle que era como un xersei pero sen mangas e
   como tampouco me saía manGas utilicei sen brazos
I: si tiveches como dous problemas?
   ...
I: eti aí pensaches que el che entendera que era un chaleco?
A: si e entendeu non?
I: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (199-205):
I: when she said arm did you understand sleeves?
B: yeah
I: and did you imagine a waistcoat like this? because you keep
   saying jumper jumper
B: yeah a sleeveless sleeveless jumper
I: so this is not a waistcoat? this is a sleeveless jumper?
B: no this it’s a waistcoat this is a waistcoat i thought he was wearing a sleeveless cardigan
I: mhm

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
sleeveless jumper
shirt pocket

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-205):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.26.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 8: A confirms what she believes to be the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment. B has in fact misunderstood A and A has not been able to recognize B’s misunderstanding.
- 15-16: B uses ‘sleeveless jumper’, what he believes to be a TL expression shared with the learner.
- A incorrectly believes this is the correct TL expression for ‘vest’.
- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A has no evidence of B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (199-205):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘sleeve’: while trying to develop a circumlocution to compensate for the TL item ‘vest’ the learner encounters a second communicative problem, the lack of the TL item ‘sleeve’. A CS episode embedded in the previous CS episode is then initiated.
- 3-5: A presents a combination of an approximation ‘arm’ and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B refashions A’s presentation using what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 8: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and appropriate TL form, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (308-322):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 6: B uses ‘jumper’ in its literal sense.
- 8-9: A interprets ‘jumper’ as an agreed approximate term of reference for ‘vest’. She believes she has understood A’s message and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments. But she has in fact misunderstood A’s communicative intention.
- Unsuccessful communication. A misunderstands B and B does not recognize A’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (308-322):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- 12-14: A presents ‘pullover’ as an approximate term for ‘vest’.
- 15-16: B checks for confirmation of his understanding.
- 17-19: A confirms his understanding repeating her initial approximation and providing an acknowledgment.
- 20-21: B believes he has understood the message and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and an alternative term of reference ‘jumper’.
- 22: A accepts the new term of reference repeating it followed by an acknowledgment.
- B is using and interpreting ‘pullover’ and ‘jumper’ in their literal meaning whereas A is using and interpreting them as approximate terms for ‘vest’. B misunderstands A’s message and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Unsuccessful communication. Agreement on meaning is not reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: father drops newspaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (246-248):
1 A: well he’s not getting now the newspaper, because the
2 {A’s RA goes down, imitating the picture}
3 newspaper (0.5) is in the floor. on the floor.
4 B: ah! (0.5) right! {in mine it’s not.}
5 {B shakes his head}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: caeulle o periódico debeu de ser coa sorpresa non? ó oir ó neno berreando e tal

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (246-248):
I: e aí por exemplo cando dis o que o periódico is on the floor era iso o que querías dicir? que o periódico estaba no chan? ou ó mellor é porque non sabía dicir que se lle caera o periódico? ou que soltara o periódico? ou
A: eh posiblemente o que quería dicir era que se caera pero non me saia fall down nese momento e dixen que estaba no chan
I: mhm vale
A: mira agora vàme todo non se vale heh heh

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
newspaper on floor

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (246-248):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to fall down’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4-5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and a relevant next utterance.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: holding hands/father takes the boy by the hand

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-278):
1 A: she is e:h he’s (0.8) getting:: her (1.0) her boy with e:h
2 {A’s RH mimics holding someone’s hand,
3 B is not looking}
4 A: (0.8) his hand. (1.4) they a:re=
5 B: =he’s holding? he’s holding the boy’s [hand?]
6 A: {{[he’s ] holding.} (0.8)
7 {{[A nods]}
8 A: yeah.}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (294-297):
1 B: they:: e:::h he’s holding (1.0) the bo:yi, (1.5) with his right
2 hand?
3 A: yeah
4 (0.5)
5 B: the boy’s left?
6 (1.5)
7 A: {yeah}
8 {A nods}

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (334-335):
1 A: the father is not holding now. (1.4) e:::h boy’s:: hand,
2 B: yeah
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e a na seguinte vese ó pai que colle da mao ó neno e van camiñando

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: xa non ten ó neno agarrado da man

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (275-278):
A: que está collendo o neno coa man o sea que está colléndoo pola man e
I: traduciches literalmente do español ó mellor? getting his boy?
A: si si
... 
A: e cando di o de sostelo sostelo non me soou demasiado aínda que bueno el utilizouno polo tanto
I: e que sóese dicir holding holding the boy’s hand
A: uhuh

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (334-340):
I: ai utilizas o de holding porque llo oíches a el?
A: claro

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
holding boy’s hand

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (275-278):
- See also Chapter Five, example 5.18 and Chapter Six, example 6.2a.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘holding hands’.
- 1-8: A presents a combination of a literal translation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 10-12: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgment and refashioning her initial presentation to use the TL item provided by B.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (294-297):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.2b.
- The TL lexical item ‘holding hands’ has been grounded and is now used by B and understood by A. There is no need for CS use.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (334-335):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.2c.
- A is now able to use the previously desired but unavailable TL expression ‘holding hands’. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (354-363):
1 A: you can only see, {the:: (1.0) e:::h the thing (. ) where you
2 (A’s RH mimics knocking, B is not looking)
3 A: can mm::: (3.4) you can use to::} to:: to ring, well not to
4 ring, {to:: to knock.}
5 (A’s RH mimics knocking)
6 B: uhuh! (1.0) right okay mine is just ni- number seventeen it
7 hasn’t got any knocker on it, [so yours] (0.8) hasn’t got a
8 A: [okay ]
9 B: number?
10 (0.5)
11 A: no. [and {the}re’s a::: (knock ])
12 B: [a::nd ]
13 {A’s RH mimics knocking}
14 B: [there’s] a knocker.
15 (0.5)
16 A: knocker, okay,=
17 B: =right

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (392-395):
1 A: father is {knocking,} (0.8) in the door, {but not using the
2 {A’s RH mimics knocking}
3 {A’s RH mimics
4 knocking}
5 A: knocker, (1.2) he’s not using the knocker.=
6 B: =using his hand?
7 (0.5)
8 A: he’s (. ) using (. ) his hand,) yes.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: a porta ten un chamador

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: o pai xa está chamando na porta pero en vez de utilizar o
chamador está utilizando a ma a mao

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (354-363):
I: bueno aí tiveches problema para dicir o do chamador...
I: e cando dis o de ring ó principio é porque non che sae knock?
A: non non sei saeume ring pero logo xa inmediatamente dixen o de
knock

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (392-395):
I: e aí utilizas o de knocker porque llo oíches a el tamén
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (354-363):
B: yeah the letterbox and a knocker

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
knocker

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (354-363):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 1-5 A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6-7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and a relevant next
utterance which includes the intended TL lexical item ‘knocker’.
- 8: A accepts B’s acceptance providing a backchannel continuer.
- 11 and 13: In order to confirm the correctness of their understanding A tries to use the TL item
provided by B and a nonverbal strategy. She is however yet unable.
- 14: B repeats the term ‘knocker’.
- 16: A is now able to use the previously desired but unavailable TL lexical item ‘knocker’.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (392-395):
- The TL lexical item ‘knocker’ has been grounded and is now used by A. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: mailbox/letterbox

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (364-366):
1 A: and {there’s a::: (.) a place} where you can {put the:::
2 {A’s HH draw a rectangle in the air}
3 {A’s HH mimic
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

4 introducing a
5 letter in a
6 mailbox
7 A:  letters.)
8 B:  there’s a letterbox!?
9 A:  yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  a porta ten un chamador e ten un sitio onde se poñen as cartas
    un non sei como se di? como se di? un buzón! un buzón eso

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (364-366):
A:  ai non me saía o de buzón
I:  uhuh entón é porque non che saía o de buzón se che saíra buzón
    utilizarias buzón non?
A:  si pero vamos tampouco me saíu cando lin a historia en galego

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (364-366):
B:  yeah the letterbox and a knocker

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
letter box

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (364-366):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-7: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 8: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
  his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 9: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an
  acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
  communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (400-404):
1 A:  now the boy is like thinking, because eh you can see that
2   (1.0) he’s (.) putting his hand (0.7) {in::: (1.5)) °in his
3   {A’s RH touches her
4   chin}
5 A:  face.°
6   (2.0)
7 B:  that’s different
8   (1.7)
9 A:  tch {the right one.}
10  {A raises her RH}
11 B:  mm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  e o neno está como pensando porque ten ten a súa mao dereita
    posta na barbilla

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (400-403):
I:  e ai dixeches tamén que o rapaz tiña his hand in his face?
A:  si non sabía dicir barbilla
I:  uhuh vale e pensas que el che entendeu barbilla ou que che
    entendeu face?
A:  eu creo que e entendeu o de barbilla porque pola mímica
I:  mmh

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (400-404):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 9: A accepts B’s acceptance.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (461-471):
1 A: an::d {he’s wearing::: (2.2) these things that you can use
   (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on her body)
2 A: when you: (0.5) you you wear (1.5) e:::h} (2.0) short, e:::h
3 trousers, (1.3) {a:::nd
4 (A’s HH outline the shape of the suspenders on
5 her body)
6 B: ah!} so that your trousers don’t fall {down?}
   {B’s RI points
downwards}
7 (1.5)
8 A: (yes)
9 A: braces?
10 B: =right
11 (2.4)
12 A: a:::nd=
13 B: =or if you’re american suspenders.
14 (1.5)
15 A: hm hm (2.4) well i’m not american not [english, heh heh heh]
16 B: {{no i am not either, ]}
17 (B nods)
18 B: (0.5) braces. heh heh heh
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten ten tirantes e unhos pantalóns largos
SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (461-467):
A: tirantes tampouco me saia ... braces?
I: si
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (461-471):
B: yeah braces
RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
braces

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE UTTERANCE (461-471):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.3.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 1-6: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy
- 7: B is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. He refashions A’s initial CS substituting it with a new circumlocution uttered with rising intonation, i.e. checking for A’s confirmation.
- 11-12: A confirms B’s understanding and accepts his presentation providing acknowledgments.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- 13: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item.
- 15: A is unsure and asks for confirmation repeating the TL item ‘braces’ with rising intonation.
- 16: B confirms A’s understanding with an acknowledgment.
- 19: B provides an alternative term of reference ‘suspenders’.
- 24: The TL item ‘braces’ is grounded, proposed by B as the most appropriate term of reference to communicate A’s original message and accepted by A by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: rolled up sleeves
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (458-461):
1 A: {she’s he he’s (0.5) wearing the shirt, (0.5) e:::h (2.0) like
2 A’s RH mimics rolling up left sleeve
3 A: that, in the middle of the:: of his::)
4 B: a::h! right! his sleeves are rolled [up.]
5 A: [of ] his arms, (0.5) yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ten ten tirantes e unos pantalóns largos unha camisa tch eh revirada así nas mangas

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: segue tendo as mangas reviradas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (458-461):
A: quería dicir que tiña remangado pero non me saía
I: e aí non te saía remangado
A: si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (458-461):
I: the rolled up sleeves? and to roll up?
B: yes yes because she says shirt and then she does something like
this so it’s clear

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
sleeves rolled up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (458-461):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rolled up’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and what he believes to be the intended TL item.
- 5: A accepts B’s acceptance and the provided TL item with an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (440-444):
1 A: well you can see that e::h there’s lot of flowers in the:::
2 hhh (2.7) in: this house, because eh open is (0.5) the the
3 door is opened, (0.5) so {you can see the:::} the: house,
4 {A’s HH with the palms outwards move
5 in circles}
6 B: flowers!?
7 A: flowers.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: ó abrir a porta ve- vese a decoración das paredes que son asi
flores

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (440-444):**

A: non me saía parede
I: non che saía pares?
A: non e por exemplo dixeches bueno in the house en vez de parede e aparte ... que che pareceu que era emapelado? pintado?
A: no no pensei
I: no no pensaches xa por exemplo o de dicir emapelado non é que non souberas e que?
A: non no no pensei

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (440-444):**

I: when she says flowers in the house did you imagine something like this?
B: no i imagined i thought there were plants
I: mhm
B: no not the decoration not as part of the wall or the painting
I: mhm
B: i thought the door was open and one could see the flowers
I: mhm

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
flowers

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (440-444):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘wall’.
- 1-5: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B checks for confirmation of the understanding of A’s message.
- 7: A believes B has understood her message and confirms his understanding. She does not recognize that B has in fact misunderstood her communicative intention.
- B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding. Agreement on meaning is not reached.

**REFERENT:** checkered floor/ (tiles)

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (447-453):**

1 B: what else can you see inside the house?
2 A: the::: floor. (1.6) there’s: (1.6) a::: (xxx) {(1.0) heh
3  (A’s RI draws a rhomb on the table)
4 6 A: (heh)like a:::} (2.5) i don’t know, {the::: (1.0)} tch=
5  (A’s RI draws a rhomb on the table)
6 B: =the design?
7 10 A: yeah the design of of the of the floor {is: (0.5) is like
8  (A’s RI draws a rhomb on the table)
9 13 A: that.)
14 B: so the floor isn’t white?
15 A: no. it’s white and black.
16 (5.5)
17 B: mhm

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (557-566):**

1 A: e:::h (1.4) the floor, (1.0) the design of the floor, is not
2 the same as the::: (1.7) number eight.
3 (1.4)
4 B: mm::: what’s it like now?
5 A: hhh e:::h (3.4) .hhh! heh before you can see the: the:
6 {the design (0.5) like that.}=
7 {A’s RI draws a rhomb on the table}=
8 B: =yeah
9 A: {and now you can see like that.}
10 {A’s RI draws a square on the table}=
11 B: so the floor design (is changed) i mean it’s different again
12 it’s just it’s the same all the way through for me there’s no
13 design
14 A: uuhuh (0.5) okay.
15 B: okay.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e vese tamén o suelo que son cuadradiños antes na viñeta oito
viase que eran rombos e ahora cambiou e son cuadrados

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (448-453):
A: quería dicir rombo e nin de coña me saía o de rombo
I: por eso fixeches o debuxo non?
A: entón si fixennile o debuxo
I: e aparte de rombo quixeches dicir ó mellor baldosas? ou eso non?
A: non non solo quería dicir rombo que vía o chan que tiña rombos

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (557-566):
I: pareceuche que era distinto?
A: claro o chan cambiou aquí vianse rombos e aquí cadrados
I: hm
A: non sei ó mellor e que se ve a posición

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (448-453):
B: yeah the floor yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
design on floor

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (447-453):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rhomb’.
- 1-8: A presents a combination of an appeal for assistance and a nonverbal strategy.
- 9: B asks for clarification.
- 10-13: A refashions her initial presentation and repeats the previous nonverbal strategy.
- 14: B is uncertain of his understanding and asks for clarification again.
- 15: A refashions her initial presentation.
- 17: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (557-566):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘rhomb’.
- 5-7: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression, ‘like that’, and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning and successful communication of the original message is reached.
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘square’.
- 9-10: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression, ‘like that’, and a nonverbal strategy.
- 11-13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 14: A accepts B’s acceptance providing acknowledgments
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
REFERENT: father is shouting

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (494-507):
1  A: e::h well the father is:: (2.6) is telling something::
2       angrily. (2.6) he’s very angry, he’s telling something to::
3       (0.5) well (0.5) he’s telling (1.0) mm (0.5) perhaps he’s
4       telling: something like e:h call your father. (1.6) >or
5       something like that {because< he’s pointing, (1.2) inside of
6       (A’s RA points forwards imitating the
7       picture)
8       (1.4) of the:: room, [well] of the:: house.
9  B:                                      [ah! ]
10 B:   right, okay, now does he look angry?
11 A:   tch e::h (2.6) yes {i think so.}
12                         {A nods}
13      (2.2)
14 B:   mm:: because?
15 A:   he looks like if he:: was (0.5) e::h talking loud(/'loud/).
16      (2.2)
17 B:   because of the position of his mouth?
18 A:   {yes=}
19      {A nods}
20 B:   =his mouth is open?
21 A:   is open,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   o o pai está sinalando o pai do neno está sinalando adentro e
berreando tch ten sigue tendo cara de enfadado e aparte ten a
boca aberta ahora porque está berreando

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (494-507):
I:   aí por exemplo cando dis o de is telling something
A:   que está dicindo algo moi enfadado
I:   hm hm porque o repites así o de telling non moi segura e logo hai
un momento que dis que is talking loud entón era ó mellor porque
querías dicir gritar e non che saía
A:   si falando moi alto gritando
I:   xa no de telling? xa cando dis o de telling pensabas en gritar?
on ou non?
A:   si en vez de en vez de dicir posiblemente diría gritar está
gritando algo
I:   shouting ó mellor?
A:   si diría eso en vez de dicir está dicindo algo enfadado

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (494-507):
I:   did you understand that?
B:   yeah yeah

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
open mouth

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (494-507):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to shout’.
- 1-8: A presents an approximation strategy, ‘to tell’ for ‘to shout’.
- 15: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 17: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a relevant next utterance.
- 18: A accepts B’s acceptance allowing the conversation to move on to a new topic.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is
reached.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (569-573):
1 A: e:::h now the father is {e:::h (0.7) doing (.) this with her
2 (A’s RH mimics rolling up left sleeve)
3 A: his skirt.
4 (2.0)
5 B: right} rolling up his sleeves,
6 (0.5)
7 A: {(in order) to fight} somebody.
8 (A’s LA mimics punching, B is not looking)
9 B: {(uhuh)}
10 (B nods)
11 A: e:::h (5.2) {he’s doing that with his:: (1.2) left {{hand,}} }
12 (A’s RH mimics rolling up left sleeve)
13 ((B nods})

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: e na seguinte máis pois o pai xa se está remangando é dicir xa
está disposto a pelear heh ou algo así

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (569-573):
A: que está remangando a camisa
I: uhuh
A: entón como non sabía digolle digolle está facendo esto coa camisa
I: mhm e el entendeuche perfectamente
A: dixen skirt logo shirt porque se me liou co de falda
I: un despiste?
A: pero si xa me din conta en seguida

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (569-573):
I: the rolled up sleeves? and to roll up?
B: yes yes because she says shirt and then she does something like
this so it’s clear

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
father rolling up sleeves

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (569-573):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of an all-purpose expression ‘doing this’ and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and what he believes to be
the intended TL lexical item.
- 7-8: A completes her previous circumlocution.
- 9-10: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 11-12: A accepts B’s acceptance moving on to a next topic. She needs again to communicate the
message ‘roll up’ and she is not able to retrieve the TL expression provided by B so she repeats a
previously successful combination of an all-purpose expression ‘doing that’ and a nonverbal strategy.
- 13: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: cap

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (614-621):
1 A: hhh he’s: wearing:: a::: a hat! (0.8) well [it’s ] not a hat,
2 B: [a hat?]
3 A: (it’s
4 (A’s RH mimics holding a cap rim ×2)
5 (2.6)
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

6  B:  a cap?}
7  A:  yeah, a [cap. ] (1.4) {with something, in the: front of the
8  B:  [right]
9      {A’s RH points to where the badge would
10      be on her head}
11  A:  cap.)
12      (1.5)
13  B:  right

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (653-654):

1  A:  {you} can see the same symbol} {as in the: cap.}
2  B  [hm ]
3  {A’s LH points to where the badge would be on her chest and
4      moves in circles}
5  {A’s RH points to where the
6      badge would be on her head}
7      (1.0)
8  B:  mm
9
10

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

A:  ten unha unha gorra? cun simboliño

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (614-621):

I:  ai era por cap non?
A:  si non me saía o de o de o de gorra sabía que se dicía dunha
maneira diferente a sombreiro i o sea utilicei sombreiro pero
explicándolle que non era realmente un sombreiro senón eso e coa
mímica xa entendeu que era unha viseira e dixome a palabra

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (614-621):

I:  how did you know that the hat was actually a cap? because of the
mime? because of the context?
B:  the context
I:  mm
B:  yeah mainly the context but also she also made something like so
this wouldn’t be the same as this this would be a hat

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
cap

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (614-621):

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘cap’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 7-11: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
communication of the original message are reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (653-654):

- The TL lexical item ‘cap’ has been grounded and is now used by A. There is no need for CS use.

REFERENT: freckles

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (636-640):

1  A:  it seem (0.5) it seems like a (big) (1.0) child.
2      (1.6)
3  B:  right, (1.2) [yeah.]
4  A:          [becau]se e:::h {he has e:::h} or like a pizzero
5      {A’s HH point to cheek and draw
6      freckles}
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

7  A:  heh heh heh
8  B:  freckles?=
9  A:  {=yeah}
10 {A’s RI point to cheek and draw freckles}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  i i éste pois ten pecas

SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (636-640):
I:  si é o das pecas que non sabes como dicilo? el diche freckles e
    ti entendas que pecas son freckles ou
A:  si

RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVERS REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
freckles

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (636-640):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘freckles’.
- 4-6: A presents a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of
  his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 9: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an
  acknowledgment and repeating the previous nonverbal strategy.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful
  communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: striped tie

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (640-644):
1  A:  and he has:: a tie. mm a::: (3.5) strepes? (it [was]?]
2  B:                                                    [ stri]pes
3  A:  {stripes!=}
4       {A nods}
5  B:  =right
6       (1.5)
7  A:  tie,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  ten unha chaqueta uns pantalóns cortos e unha corbata a raias
    coma a do neno

SENDERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVERS RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVERS REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
plain tie

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (640-644):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.9c.
- 1: A tries to use the TL item ‘stripes’ previously provided by B. She founds some pronunciation
  problems.
- 2: B presents again the item ‘stripes’.
- 3: A is now able to use this item without problems.
- There is no need for CS use.
REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (618-621):
1  A:   a [cap.] (1.4) {with something, in the: front of the cap.}
2  B:   [right]
3       {A’s RH points to where the badge would
4       be on her head}
5  (1.5)
6  B:   right

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (651-654):
1  A:   and in the jacket in:: his::: (1.5) left sides, {[you] can see
2  B:                                                    [hm ]
3                                                 {A’s LH points
4                                                 to where the
5                                                 badge would
6                                                 be on her
7                                                 chest and
8                                                 moves in
9                                                 circles}
10  A:   the sa:me symbol} {as in the:: cap.}
11       {A’s RH points to where the badge would be
12       on her head}
13  (1.0)
14  B:   mm

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   ten unha unha gorra? cun simboliño e ese mismo símbolo teno na
     chaqueta

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (618-621):
I:   aí cando dis que ten something
A:   algo refírome ó símbolo este
I:   pero parecíache xa un escudo ou?
A:   si aí si que xa vin que era un escudo que ademais era o mesmo que
     o da chaqueta e xa o digo despois

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (651-654):
I:   o de symbol volve ser pola insignia?
A:   si

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
badge on jacket

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (618-621):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-5: A presents a previously successful combination of an all-purpose expression and a nonverbal strategy.
- 7: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (651-654):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- 1-12: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 14: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.
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DYAD IDENTIFICATION CODE: INT-NS SL

PARTICIPANT A: Sara, female, 22, Spanish L1, intermediate English proficiency level, 4th year undergraduate student

PARTICIPANT B: Larry, male, 26, British English L1, beginner Spanish proficiency level, in Spain for 3 months, also in Spain for 6 months in 1999

REFERENT: badge/school badge/emblem

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (12-14):
1  A:  a::n::d he also ha::s a:: jacket, (2.2) and a:::, (3.5) mm::
2       and a short trousers.
3  B:  yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  lleva una chaqueta

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (12-14):
A:  no sí que me fijé pero no sabía cómo decir escudo emblema

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (12-14):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘badge’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (31-38):
1  B:  are his eyes
2  A:  heh heh
3  B:  e::h (0.5) open or closed?
4  A:  mm (1.8) e:h (one of::, (1.0) one of his eyes is open, and the
5       {A’s LI points to her eye, A looks down}
6  A:  other is dark an:d closed,}
7  B:  ah (all right,) (1.8) [so (he’s got) (1.4) black eye.]  
8       {8 nods}
9  A:  {[ she’s falling down.}
10     {A opens her AA and waves them backwards to mimic falling, AB
11   look down}

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  le han puesto un ojo morado el ojo derecho

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (31-38):
A:  no sabía decir ojo morado heh
I: y cuando él te dice black eye? tú qué entiendes? conocías la expresión black eye que utiliza él?
A: no no ... no yo entendi que me decía que tenía un ojo negro pero no como que tenía el ojo morado

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
black eye

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (31-38):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘black eye’.
- 6: A presents a combination strategy.
- 7-8: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL item.
- 9-10: A accepts B’s acknowledgment as enough evidence of understanding and continues with the conversation even before B has finished his turn.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: stripes/striped tie/stripy tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (48-60):
1  B: what color is his: tie?
2       (2.6)
3  A: and his tie? (1.8) e::h (3.5) mm::: heh heh [hhh]
4  B: just white,
5       (0.5)
6  A: isn’t it?
7  B: white an::d an:::d black.
8  A: what? with {{[black] stripes?}}
9  B: {{B’s RH draws tie stripes in the air with a pencil, A is not looking}}
10  A: {{mm:}}
11  B: {{A’s RI draws tie stripes on her chest, A looks down}}
12  A: ºlinesº
13       (1.2)
14  B: {{lines?=}}
15  A: {{B’s RH draws tie stripes on her chest with a pencil, A looks down}}
16  B: =just crossed!
17       (1.5)
18  A: =heh heh
19  B: ah! all right.
20  A: heh heh

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: eh lleva una una corbata de rayas negras y blancas

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (48-60):
A: no sabía como decir a rayas
I: ... y cuando dices crossed?
A: si heh cruzado heh quería decir a rayas pero no sabía cómo era heh
I: y cuando él te dice stripes?
A: es que no no entendí la palabra que me decía stripes es es a rayas?
I: si ... y cuando te dice líneas tampoco?
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... A: lines sí líneas pero yo quería decir a rayas y no me

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (48-60):
I: did you understand was striped?
B: yeah
I: so why didn’t you write it?
B: i wrote tie different

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
tie

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (48-60):
- Intended TL lexical item: ’striped’.
- 3: A indicates she is having a trouble, with pauses, fillers and laughs, but does not present any CS.
- 4: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item, but her guessing is erroneous.
- 7: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 8-10: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation and gestures, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 11-14: A is not able to understand B’s presentation. She refashions her initial CS and presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 16-18: B is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation repeating A’s approximation with rising intonation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 19: A refashions her CS. She presents a new approximation.
- 21: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 22: A accepts B’s acceptance providing an acknowledgment, i.e. laughter.
- 23: B confirms her acceptance providing more acknowledgments.
- 24: A confirms her acceptance of B’s acceptance providing more laughter.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: vest/sleeveless jumper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-87):
1  B: and what ab-? his tie? (2.4) and shirt?
(1.5)
3 A: his tie? (4.4) tch e::h his father’s tie is::: white.
(1.5)
4 B: hm=
5 A: =hm? (0.5) a:n::d (2.5) he has (2.5) a::: (0.5) he has a::
7 newspaper, (1.4) in his:: (0.5) right hand.
(0.7)
9 B: yeah
10 (3.4)
11 A: a:n::d
12 (0.7)
13 B: his trousers?
14 (1.4)
15 A: his trousers, (2.2) okay, (2.4) e::h (0.7) long trousers.
16 (1.0) white trousers. [like] (it all),
17 B: [yeah]
18 B: and shoe:s and
19 (0.5)
20 A: a:n::d shoes::, (1.0) white shoes, also,
21 B: yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: lleva una corbata blanca un chaleco

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (75-87):
A: ahí quería decir que tenía un chaleco pero no me salía iba a decir chaqueta sin mangas pero dije no ... no sé cómo le sonará ese de chaqueta sin mangas.

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (75-87):
I: anything you did understand different?
B: the jacket
I: what did you think? that he was wearing a shirt like in yours?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (75-87):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘vest’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: pointing outside/backwards/to the left

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-65):
1 A: e::h (2.6) tch (2.4) e:h he’s crying, (2.4) a:n::d he goes::,
2 (1.4) he goes to tell what had (0.8) what had happened, (1.6)
3 to him, to his:: to his father,
4 (1.2)
5 B: yeah=
6 A: =who is (2.5) e::h (1.2) sleeping, (0.8) heh
7 (2.6)
8 B: yeah

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (97-102):
1 B: and the boy’s crying? (0.5) yeah?
2 A: yeah, >°the boy’s crying,°< (4.4) and with: wi::th with his
3 mouth {open,}
4 {A opens her AA, B is not looking}
5 B: (yes)
6 {B nods, B looks down}
7 (4.8)
8 A: a::n::d probably:: (2.4) he’s running,
9 (1.4)
10 B: yeah
11 (0.8)
12 A: towards her fa-, towards his father,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (61-65):
I: tampoco le dijiste que estaba señalando hacia afuera
A: porque no sabía no sabía cómo decírla

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (61-65):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to point’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.
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INTERLANGUAGE DATA (97-102):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to point’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: boy pointing to his black eye

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (104-108):
1 A: e::h ((cough)) (1.4) ((clearing throat)) (3.0) tch (2.2) e::h
2 (2.0) the boy:, (1.4) shows:, his eye to her father, (0.5) to
3 [his ] father,
4 B: [yeah]
5 B: (xxx) [yeah]
6 A: [a::n]::d (3.5) she:: he’s:: he’s still crying. (2.7)
7 a::n::d
8 (2.4)
9 B: why is his eye? is he? oh yeah! go on,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (104-108):
A: sí porque no sabía cómo decir señalar con el dedo o apuntando con el dedo

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (104-108):
I: anything you did not understand? anything you thought it was going to be different?
B: the pointing to the eye ... i thought she meant his eyes were opened not that he’s pointing

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
---

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (104-108):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to point’.
- 1-3: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 4-5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing a backchannel continuer and an acknowledgment.
- 6-7: A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: father’s surprised

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (109-118):
1 A: a::n::d (1.8) his father is:::, e:h (6.2) >°i don’t know how to
2 say it,°< (1.8) heh
3 B: awake? (1.8) heh=
4 A: =°(i don’t know,)° i don’t know, {afrightened, or:: something
5 (afrightened, or:: something
6 {A opens her AA, AB look
7 down}
8 A: like that,}
9 B: surprised?
10 A: yeah, surprised, heh (1.4) a:n::d (3.8) he has::
11 (1.8)
12 B: his mouth open or?
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12 A: and his mouth is open. [a:n:]d his eyes {very:,} (1.5) heh
13 B: [uhuh]
14 (A opens her HH in front of her eyes, B is not looking)
15 16
17 A: (0.8) are very open, heh
18 (2.8)
19 B: yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el padre se queda asombrado

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (109-118):
A: quería decir asombrado sorprendido
I: no conocías la palabra surprised
A: la conocía pero no me salía

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
open mouth

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (109-118):
- See also Chapter Six, example 6.8a.
- Intended TL lexical item: 'surprised'.
- 1-2: A presents an appeal for assistance strategy.
- 3: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation. In fact, she has misunderstood A’s intended message.
- 4-7: A refashions her initial presentation. She presents an appeal for assistance followed by a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 8: B presents what she believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. she is unsure of her understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 9: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and repeating the TL item provided by B.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: father drops newspaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (119-122):
1 A: and the:: (0.7) newspaper, (3.2) has::, (2.4) has fallen down,
2 B: all right
3 A: (to the floor,)
4 (2.2)
5 B: yeah. (0.8) that’s different.

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: se le cae el periódico al suelo

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (119-122):
I: cuando dices que the newspaper has fallen down?
A: sí que se le cae que tira el periódico ... y como no sabía cómo decirlo dije directamente el periódico se cayó

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
fallen newspaper

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (119-122):
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- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to drop’.
- 1: A presents a circumlocution.
- 2: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- 3: A accepts B’s acceptance continuing with the conversation.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: knocker/doorknocker

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (153-160):
1 A: a:n::d (0.6) then, (4.6) tch
2 (1.4)
3 B: is there a handle on the (door?
4 (B mimics grabbing a handle, A is not looking)
5 (1.7)
6 A: yeah,) is a hangle,
7 (1.3)
8 B: {a han[dle? ] {{yeah?
9 (B mimics opening a door)
10 {(A’s RH mimics knocking on a door)}
11 12 A: {(e::h})
13 A: {no!} a:)
14 (1.5)
15 B: oh! a knocker?
16 A: “a! (0.7) {yeah (0.5) heh“)
17 {(A’s RH mimics knocking on a door)
18 (1.8)
19 B: “a knocker, (1.4) yeah.”

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (153-160):
A: lo que no me salía era la manilla
I: cuando te dice handle?
A: handle le entendí esto? pensaba que se refería a esto al llamador
no sabía que se decía knocker
I: knocker lo conocías?
A: no
I: pero cuando te lo dice te das cuenta?
A: sí
...
A: lo que yo no entendí es que él me preguntó si había una manilla
para abrir y yo le dije sí en un principio porque pensé que se
refería a esto entonces cuando él me dijo handle yo me quedé así
y él me hizo así entonces yo fue cuando le dije no...
A: no sabía decir llamador

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (153-160):
B: a knocker

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
knocker

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (153-160):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘knocker’.
- 7: A uses what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item, but she makes a mistake, she uses ‘hangle’ instead of ‘knocker’.
- 11: A presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 13: A recognizes her previous mistake.
- 15: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation.
- 16-17: A confirms the correctness of B’s understanding and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and repeating the previous nonverbal strategy.
- 19: B accepts A’s acceptance repeating the intended TL item with falling intonation.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

**REFERENCE:** mailbox/letterbox

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-149):**

1 A: there’s a::: (1.7) box mail, or something like that, in the
door,
3 (0.8)
4 B: all right! (5.8) yeah, mailbox, yeah,
5 (2.0)
6 A: e::h=
7 B: =letterbox,

**NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:**
No relevant data available

**SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (146-149):**
1: lo de boxmail?
A: lo de donde se meten las cartas
1: lo conocías? te sonaba?
A: me sonaba un buzón de correos pero no sé si es exactamente para
1: a lo mejor te sonaba para el buzón pero no para la ranura de la
casa?
A: sí sí

**RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:**
No relevant data available

**RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:**
mailbox/letterbox

**ANALYSIS:**

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (146-149):**
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘mailbox’.
- 1-2: A presents what she believes to be an approximation strategy. When uttering the approximation she makes a mistake and uses ‘boxmail’ instead of ‘mailbox’.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments and the intended TL lexical item.
- 6: A does not accept B’s acceptance.
- 7: B refashions her previous presentation and presents a new intended TL lexical item.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to continue.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

**REFERENCE:** (touching the chin)/little boy is rubbing his chin/little boy looks anxious

**INTERLANGUAGE DATA (170-171):**

1 A: an::d the boy, (1.2) e:::h (3.4) the boy has:::, has his hand,
2 (1.2) (in:::, (0.5) in the mouth.)
3 (A’s RH points to her chin, AB look down)
4 (1.2)
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5 B: ah! all right! (5.4) it’s not on mine, (8.0) yeah

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (170-171):
A: dije boca porque no me acordaba de cómo se decía barbilla

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
hands in mouth

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (170-171):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘chin’.
- 1-3: A presents a combination of an approximation and a nonverbal strategy.
- 5: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: suspenders

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (186-192):
1 B: and the sh:::- shirt? is he wearing a tie or?
2 (0.8)
3 A: mm::: no, he has, (3.4) tch {a::= [A’s II point to her chest, B is not looking}
4
5 B: =open? (1.3) open shirt?
6 A: he he hasn’t a belt. (1.4) he (has:: a:::
7 (A’s II outline the shape of suspenders on her chest)
8 9
10 (0.7)
11 B: oh! {{braces!
12 { {{B’s HH outline the shape of suspenders on her chest})
13 (0.7)
14 A: yeah. heh) heh heh
15 B: braces,}) yeah,

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: un pantalón con tirantes

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (186-192):
A: tirantes no sabía cómo se decía ...

I: cuando te dice braces es porque braces es tirantes
A: si si me di cuenta

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
braces

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (186-192):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘suspenders’.
- 3-5: A presents a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B presents what he believes to be the intended TL item with rising intonation, i.e. he is unsure of his understanding and checks for confirmation. In fact, he has misunderstood A’s intended message.
- 7-9: A refashions her initial presentation. She presents now an approximation followed by a combination of a complete omission and a nonverbal strategy.
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- 11-12: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment and the intended TL lexical item with a nonverbal strategy.
- 14: A confirms B’s understanding providing acknowledgments.
- 15: B accepts A’s acceptance repeating the intended TL lexical item.
- Agreement on meaning, co-construction of correct and accurate TL lexis, and successful communication of the original message are reached.

REFERENT: wallpaper/flowered wallpaper

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (209-214):

1 A: a:n:d (2.7) an::d and there’s a curtain, i think, with
2 A: flowers,
3 (3.6)
4 B: curtain! >i don’t [have!]<
5 A: [ and] a carpet! (0.6) yeah
6 B: ah! [a carpet yeah! ]
7 A: [a carpet, sorry,) heh (1.2) carpet. (1.0) with flowers.
8 B: "yeah"

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:

A: hay una especie de cortina o una pared con con flores

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (209-214):

A: no me acordaba en ese momento luego se me vino a la cabeza que era carpet
I: primero dices algo así como cortain
A: si para cortina lo hice un poco inglés ...
I: cuando primero dices cortain
A: como no me entendiò entonces me quedé pensando y dije no lo dije mal ...
A: y estampado queria decir estampado antes aqui y no me acordaba dije con flores ...
A: y con lo de cortina seguro que no me entendiò no sé si le hubiera dicho la palabra correcta si me hubiera entendido probablemente no

RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (209-214):

B: i didn’t understand the wallpaper
I: you thought it was a carpet?
B: yeah

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:

carpet

ANALYSIS:

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (209-214):

- Intended TL lexical item: ‘curtain’.
- 1-2: A presents a foreignizing strategy.
- 4: B understands and indicates acceptance provided the intended TL lexical item followed by a relevant next utterance.
- 5: A seems not to consider B’s acceptance as enough evidence to build mutual understanding and refashions her presentation providing what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item. She makes a mistake; she uses ‘carpet’ instead of ‘curtain’.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance repeating A’s presentation and providing acknowledgments. He does not recognize A’s mistake and therefore misunderstands her message.
- 7: A does not recognize her mistake and B’s misunderstanding. She accepts B’s acceptance repeating what she believes to be the intended TL lexical item and continuing with the conversation.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

- Unsuccessful communication. B misunderstands A and A misunderstands B’s state of understanding.
  Agreement on meaning is not reached.

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (209-214):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘patterned’.
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.

REFERENT: checkered floor/ (tiles)
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (203-206):
1 A:   the floor::, (1.2) the floor of the house is black,
2       an:::d an:::d an:::d white with::,
3 B:      [>°oh! that’s different,<>]      [°yeah,<>]
4 A:   with sk− wi:th (0.5) squares.
5       (1.0)
6 B:   all right
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   eh el suelo de la casa es mm blanco y negro con cuadrados

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (203-206):
A:   quería decir cuadriculado o algo así pero creo que no
I:   dices con cuadrados por cuadriculado?
A:   si

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
patterned floor

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (203-206):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘checkered’.
- 4: A presents a circumlocution strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: to roll up/ father rolls up his sleeve
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (265-266):
1 A:   e:::h (3.8) tch (2.3) the father, (1.8) e:::h (3.2) pu:ts,
2       (0.5) {his sleeves back?}
3             {A’s RH mimics rolling up her LA sleeve, B is not looking}
4       (0.8)
5       (0.8)
6 B:   yeah
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:   y el padre del niño enfadado se remanga la camisa para para pegarle a alguien

SENDER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (265-266):
A:   no sabía cómo decir remangarse
RECEIVER’S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (265-266):
1:   did you understand her?
B:   yeah
I: did you understand that he was rolling his sleeves up or that his sleeves were rolled up?
B: no he was rolling

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
sleeves rolled-up

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (265-266):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘to roll up’.
- 1-4: A presents a combination of a circumlocution and a nonverbal strategy.
- 6: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: (boy’s head bent/turned)/ little boy looks dejected

INTERLANGUAGE DATA (291-297):
1 A: mm:: (1.0) the boy:, (2.3) seems, to be: angry, (1.0) and:
2 he’s looking down. (2.3) he’s looking to the floor.
3 (0.7)
4 B: yeah the big one? (0.6) yeah, (0.6) the big boy?
5 (1.0)
6 A: no the:=
7 B: (=the little one?)
8 (A holds her LH palm down to indicate small, B’s RA points down)
9 (0.5)
10 A: the little boy.
11 B: ah! (all right)

NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A: el niño pequeño está mirando para el suelo como preocupado o enfadado o o algo así

SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (291-297):
I: querías a lo mejor haber sido un poco más específica?
A: sí ahora diría que sí que tenía la cabeza gacha así no sé
I: pensaste en eso y no
A: sí pensé en eso pero dije no
I: en español cómo lo habrías dicho?
A: diría cabizbajo

RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (291-297):
B: i thought he was angry here but it was more like dejected or disappointed

RECEIVER’S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
angry little boy

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (291-297):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘dejected’. 
- A makes use of an avoidance strategy, i.e. avoids presenting a CS that may lead to the addressee’s identification of the originally intended message.
- Unsuccessful communication.
APPENDIX C: Data analysis

REFERENT: cap
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (302-303):
1  A:  he has::, (1.4) eh the::: big boy has a:: (1.9) a hat?
2          (1.6)
3  B:  all right
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
A:  el niño grande lleva un som- un gorro y el niño pequeño no
SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (302-303):
A:  el sombrero pero es una gorra no es un sombrero ... porque no
     sabía cómo se decía gorra no sabía decir gorra y por eso dije
     sombrero
RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (302-303):
I:  how did you know it was a cap and not a hat?
B:  school boy heh heh
RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
cap

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (302-303):
- Intended TL lexical item: 'cap'.
- 1: A presents an approximation strategy.
- 3: B understands and indicates acceptance providing an acknowledgment.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.

REFERENT: striped tie
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (304-309):
1  A:  an:::d (2.4) he also has a tie.
2          (1.8)
3  B:  yeah, what color is the tie?
4  A:  yeah, e:h white an:d black.
5          (1.0)
6  B:  °yeah°=
7  A:  =and it is (crossed,) also,
8          (1.6)
9  B:  °yeah°
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA:
No relevant data available
SENDER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS (304-309):
I:  cuando dices white and black and it’s crossed?
A:  porque quiero decir a rayas y no sé
RECEIVER'S RETROSPECTIVE COMMENTS:
No relevant data available
RECEIVER'S REFERENT IDENTIFICATION TASK:
stripey tie

ANALYSIS:
INTERLANGUAGE DATA (304-309):
- Intended TL lexical item: ‘striped’.
- 7: A presents a previously successful approximation strategy.
- 9: B understands and indicates acceptance providing acknowledgments.
- A accepts B’s acceptance by allowing the conversation to move on.
- Agreement on meaning is established and successful communication of the original message is reached.