

Interactional linguistics and teaching Spanish as a foreign language: an empirical study in the classroom

Lingüística interaccional y enseñanza de español como lengua extranjera: un estudio empírico en el aula

Juan Pablo Carmona García
Escuela Oficial de Idiomas de Granada



VOL. 3 (2024)

ISSN 2952-2013 pp. 94-111

<https://doi.org/10.33776/linguodidactica.v3.8243>

Interactional linguistics and teaching Spanish as a foreign language: an empirical study in the classroom

Lingüística interaccional y enseñanza de español como lengua extranjera: un estudio empírico en el aula

Juan Pablo Carmona García

Escuela Oficial de Idiomas de Granada

Contacto:

juanpablo@eoidegranada.org

Abstract:

This article is based on the assumptions of interactional linguistics and combines elements of conversational analysis and applied discourse analysis in order to characterize communicative exchanges, as well as the strategies used in the negotiation of meanings and in the construction of the students' interactional meaning level B1, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), of Spanish for foreigners. The data used to prepare this work have been collected during the development of ethnographic field work (participant observation, self-observation, preparation of a field diary, monitoring of classes, review of department programming and the curriculum, analysis of class materials and others of the same level), carried out in a public education center in the city of Granada between January and June 2022. In total thirty-seven hours of class have been recorded and transcribed in audio format.

The analysis of the data obtained is based on the concepts of interactional linguistics studies (Mondada, 2001; More and Nussbaum, 2013), discourse analysis (Gumperz, 1982; Calsamiglia and Tusón, 1999; Van Dijk, 2000; López, 2015) and conversation analysis (Sacks et al., 1974, 1977; Sacks, 1992; Tusón, 1997, 2002).

The results extracted from this work help us to better understand the teaching-learning process in informal interactions in the Spanish classroom, as well as to guide our teaching activity to establish objectives, schedule activities, evaluate results and develop competence in a more detailed way oral communication of our students.

Keywords:

interactional linguistics; conversational analysis; discourse analysis; ethnography

Resumen:

Este artículo parte de los presupuestos de la lingüística interaccional y aúna elementos del análisis conversacional y el análisis del discurso aplicado con el fin de caracterizar los intercambios comunicativos, así como las estrategias empleadas en la negociación de significados y en la construcción del sentido interaccional del alumnado de nivel B1, según el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCERL), de español para extranjeros.

Los datos empleados para la elaboración de este trabajo han sido recogidos durante el desarrollo de un trabajo de campo etnográfico (observación participante, autoobservación, elaboración de un diario de campo, seguimiento de las clases, revisión de la programación de departamento y del currículo, análisis de los materiales de clase y de otros del mismo nivel), realizado en un centro de enseñanza pública de la ciudad de Granada entre enero y junio de 2022. En total se han grabado y transcrito treinta y siete horas de clase en formato de audio.

El análisis de los datos obtenidos se basa en los conceptos de los estudios de la lingüística interaccional (Mondada, 2001; More y Nussbaum, 2013), análisis del discurso (Gumperz, 1982; Calsamiglia y Tusón, 1999; Van Dijk, 2000; López, 2015) y análisis de la conversación (Sacks et al., 1974, 1977; Sacks, 1992; Tusón, 1997, 2002).

Los resultados extraídos de este trabajo nos ayudan a entender mejor el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje en interacciones informales en el aula de español, así como a orientar nuestra actividad docente para establecer objetivos, programar actividades, evaluar resultados y desarrollar de forma más pormenorizada la competencia comunicativa oral de nuestros estudiantes.

Palabras claves:

lingüística interaccional; análisis conversacional; análisis del discurso; etnografía

Fecha de recepción: 8 de marzo de 2024

Fecha de aceptación: 8 de mayo de 2024

1. Introduction

The Spanish as a foreign language classroom, as a social, cultural and discursive space, is also a scenario of teaching instruction in which students participate in multiple and varied situations to foster the development of their communicative competence (Hymes, 1971; Llobera, 1995a; Cenoz, 1996; Tusón, 1996; Gumperz, 2002; López, 2015), enabling them to act in a communicatively effective and appropriate manner, using the verbal and non-verbal resources, as well as the strategic resources available to them; constructing appropriate statements, according to their intentions and within the framework of certain interpersonal relationships. Thus, in order to be appropriate, it is relevant to know and employ "all that is implied in language use in a given social context" (Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 23).

In this context, the development of oral expression and interaction is one of the main objectives of the Spanish language classroom. In this sense, we bear in mind the broad classification compiled by Cestero (2005, p. 19) by dividing interactive communicative activities into: 1) institutionalised interactions (debate, round table, colloquiums, etc.); 2) transactional interactions or transactions (interviews, medical consultations, didactic consultations, buying and selling interactions, etc.); 3) conversational interactions or conversations, with a low degree of conventionalisation and planning, which are not predetermined.); and 4) conversational interactions or conversations, with a low degree of conventionalisation and planning, are not predetermined in terms of their social purpose and none of the participants individually controls the distribution of turns.

In the second point, after this introduction, the theoretical assumptions of interactional linguistics, conversational analysis and applied discourse analysis are explained, as well as the main conceptual elements of each of these disciplines used in this work.

The third point explains how ethnography, as a qualitative research method, is a valuable tool for observing, describing and analysing classroom practices. Thus, this method allows us to understand the meaning of the use of linguistic forms employed by participants in specific settings. The main elements of ethnographic work developed during the fieldwork are participant observation and guided interview. The oral data collected and transcribed during ethnographic fieldwork are also described here.

In the fourth section we present the analysis with results and discussion. For the analysis we follow the indications of Gumperz (1982, pp. 35-36) for whom the analysis consists in the detailed study of selected examples of verbal interaction, in observing whether the protagonists understand each other and in accessing the interpretations that the speakers make of what is happening. Due to the limitations of this paper, we focus on classroom interactions as the main element of this article.

Finally, the fifth point presents the main conclusions of this work and, lastly, the bibliographical references used.

2. Theoretical Framework

The assumptions of this work are based on interactional linguistics, conversational analysis and applied discourse analysis.

2. 1. Interactional linguistics

Interactional linguistics studies the use of speech in interaction, “understood as a process of reciprocal and simultaneous adjustments between people to regulate and synchronise their everyday actions or in institutional encounters” (Moore and Nussbaum; 2013, p. 43). It investigates intersubjectivity and the way in which participants make explicit their interpretation of the ongoing activity, the reciprocity of their perspectives and the cognitive processes in which they are immersed. Therefore, its focus of study is the situated use of language, the focus on oral use and the exploitation of natural data, collected in corpora of oral data with multimodal elements, i.e. the set of semiotic features that accompany speech (prosody, gestures, looks or movements), as is the case in our study.

As Mondada (2001, p. 66) has pointed out, interactional data are immersed in their context of enunciation and in the activities in the course of which they have been produced; thus, linguistic forms cannot be separated from the activities in which they have appeared. Thus, one of his key concepts for the study of interaction is *indexicality*, since the meaning of utterances is almost never literal. The researcher’s task will be to analyse inferential processes and implicit assumptions. This way of looking at interaction provides a wealth of information because it examines forms of participation, the contribution of interlocutors, cognitive processes, problems arising from discursive negotiation and, significantly for our work, the verbal and non-verbal forms appropriate to the communicative purposes of the participants.

Gumperz (1982, 1992, 1992, 2001, 2002) proposed the concept of “contextualization cues”, which is very useful for analysing the presuppositions and expectations that operate in the interlocutionary mechanics of the interactions we have studied. This term refers to the set of verbal and non-verbal signs through which speakers signal and listeners interpret what kind of activity is involved, how the semantic content is to be understood and how each utterance relates to what precedes and follows it (Gumperz, 1982, p. 131).

Likewise, as Mondada (2001, p. 81) has also stressed, interactional linguistics leads us to posit an interactional grammar, that is, a dynamic set of resources that acquire their meaning in interaction and that, despite being grounded in repeated uses, are to a large extent malleable, reconstructed and emergent (Ochs et al., 1996; Briz, 1998; Hopper, 1998; Gras, 2011, among others). This leads us to an interactional discourse analysis, defined as ‘the intersection of our analysis of human understandings of the world, of the conditions that produce those understandings, and of their role in the construction of social order’ (Heller, 2001, p. 261). In the field of language teaching, the great potential of interactional linguistics for uncovering intrinsic phenomena makes it a major tool for studying classroom discourse, teaching approaches, modes of interaction and even teacher training itself.

From a structural organisation point of view, classroom interaction has very definite characteristics. As Van Lier (1988) suggests, its structure responds to the expectations of the educational process. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) described a prototypical sequence of exchange, known as IRF (*Initiation-Response-Feedback*). Studies on classroom interaction have focused on ways of taking the floor, the distribution of speaking turns, forms of participation or the orientation of sequences (Erickson, 1982; Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2011; Batlle, 2015, among others).

Allwright (1980) studied classroom interactions in relation to turns, topics and tasks that followed one another. More recently, Seedhouse (2004) considered that all classroom interaction has three proper-

ties: language is a vehicle and object of instruction, learners' productions are subject to assessment and, finally, there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction. This last relationship has been extensively studied from the assumptions of sociocultural theory which conceives learning as a social activity and advocates a dialogical pedagogy (Esteve, 2009, 2010; Van Lier, 2004). From this perspective, we also speak of an interactive competence, arising from the learner's participation in interactive and discursive practices (Preston and Young, 2000). Thus, teaching and learning in the classroom are activities that involve oral language use, i.e. conversation, dialogue and discussion (Nussbaum, 1999; Tusón, 2000; Camps, 2005; Sánchez, 2005, 2009).

For his part, Llobera (1995b) established that two discourses coexist in the classroom: the *contributed discourse*, that is, the one brought to the classroom in the form of language samples; and the *generated discourse*, that is, the one used to articulate the different discourses in the classroom. In this didactic discourse, marked by a "didactic contract" (Edwards and Mercer, 1988), certain interactive adjustments also take place (González, 2001; Díaz, 2010). The most prominent of these are repetition, elicitation, the expansion of tutorial questions or the checking of answers, confirmation and clarification.

2. 2. Conversational analysis

Conversation analysis, a proposal derived from ethnomethodology, was developed in the 1960s under Sacks (1992). Its focus of study is the organisation of people's meaningful behaviour in society, i.e. how individuals in a society carry out their activities and make sense of the world around them. It is also interested in clarifying how actions, events, objects and order are produced and understood. The analysis of interactions illustrates the interpretations that are relevant to the participants and the practices in which these interpretations are realised. Pomerantz and Fehr (2000, pp. 111-114) argue that, although there is no single method of analysis, five aspects have traditionally been taken into account: 1) sequences, 2) the actions of sequences, 3) the packaging of actions, 4) timing and turn-taking, and 5) the way actions are performed (identities, roles and/or relationships).

The study of verbal interaction focuses on the detailed organisation, i.e. turn-by-turn, and the level of sequential organisation, which is mainly concerned with the thematic ordering of exchanges. The rules governing turn-taking are heteroselection (selection of the speaker) and self-selection (speaking without being selected). These mechanisms work because interlocutors recognise the transition relevance places (TRP).

On the other hand, the conversational units we have used in our study are act<movement<intervention (turn)<interchange (adjacent pair) <sequence. The turn of speech is "a structural gap filled by informative utterances which are recognised by the interlocutors through their manifest and simultaneous attention" (Briz, 1998, p. 52). It is perfectly identifiable since it is marked by the change of speaker. Each one of these emissions, turns, is filled with interventions, that is, an utterance or set of utterances (speech act or acts) issued by an interlocutor. These interventions can be of initiation (i.e. interventions that try to provoke or provoke speech from another interlocutor) or of reaction (responses, conformities, disagreements, acceptances, excuses, etc.). There is also another type of turn, the continuator, which is subordinate to the previous intervention of the other speaker. In Spanish, the most typical continuators are: *ajá, sí, mm, claro, ya*.

Interventions are characterised by their propositional content which progresses the thematic development of the discourse. An utterance, the maximum unit from the monologue point of view, is made up of one or more movements, units which are related to the phonic clause or tonal group. The movements are made up of speech acts, which are non-interactional units. The unit above the utterance is the exchange, consisting of two successive utterances by different speakers. The most typical minimal exchange in the organisation of speech turns is the adjacent pair which "is formed by two successive turns which are characterised by the fact that the presence of the first part (the first turn) creates the expectation that a certain second part (the second adjacent pair) will appear next" (Tusón, 1997, p. 58). For Sacks and Schegloff (1973) they are sequences of two utterances: 1) successive, 2) produced by different interlocutors, 3) ordered in first and second parts, and 4) specific: to a given first part corresponds a given second part. Levinson (1989, p. 324) establishes the following adjacent pairs: request/acceptance or refusal, offer-invitation/acceptance or refusal, evaluation/agreement or disagreement, expected or unexpected question/response, accusation/refusal or admission. Broadly speaking, they can be classified into two types of exchanges: request-giving and giving-thank-you.

2. 3. *Applied discourse analysis*

Many of the works on discourse analysis, from their clear inter- and multidisciplinary perspective, have a clear "applied" orientation in the more socially oriented studies. Thus, this discipline puts forward diverse and interesting proposals for application in the fields of politics, law, the media and education, which is the subject of this paper.

As Gunnarsson (2000) reminds us, applied discourse analysis cannot yet be considered a consolidated field, although most discourse analysis work contains an important applied nature. Language, as a social tool of transformation and knowledge transmission, occupies today a very prominent place in modern states and their bureaucratised societies. That is, all aspects related to communication, between human groups in general and between groups of professionals in particular, are a concern for most companies and experts. Hence, most discursive studies on the different areas of social life have tried to reflect, understand and offer improvements in the communicative dimension of these same areas.

In this sense, researchers and discourse analysts have stimulated this type of work and, at the same time, have pursued results that would dynamise the interaction between professionals, teams and systems. In the words of Gunnarsson (2000, pp. 405-406) the focus of applied discourse analysis is: "language and communication in real-life situations and aims to analyse, understand or solve problems related to practical action in real-life contexts. Its object of study is not language per se - whatever that may be - but the use of language in authentic contexts".

On the other hand, the relationship between applied discourse analysis and applied linguistics is clear. Although the first studies of applied linguistics were limited, in the field of education, to the teaching and learning of second and foreign languages, nowadays the different studies of applied linguistics have been extended to other social areas and not only to education. Since Harris (1952) published a pioneering article using the term "discourse analysis" and, consequently, the focus of linguistic attention shifts from minimal units (words or sentences) to larger units (texts and discours-

es), the interest in oral (and written) discourse in its contextual interrelation has modified the approaches of linguistic research itself.

Thus, the proliferation of audiovisual recording systems, together with the development of modern computer systems, has led to an extraordinary explosion in the study of oral discourse. These theoretical and technological extensions have opened up new areas of applied study which have now become fundamental. For example, we can now record teacher-student interaction on video, study the interactional patterns they employ by means of modern computer programmes of reproduction and transcription, and thus arrive at interesting insights into their linguistic uses.

In other words, disciplines such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, forensic linguistics or language planning have been consolidated or have emerged, to a large extent, on the basis of new multidisciplinary approaches, new technologies and their decanted practical applications. It is no less true that applied linguistics and applied discourse analysis have their own role in the theoretical and methodological development of these disciplines to the point of constituting autonomous and not always related knowledge. Thus, many theoretical linguistic studies do not present clear and *applied* connections to real life and, on the other hand, studies of a more applied nature do not serve as theoretical apparatus nor do they solve any of the problems posed by more theoretical linguistics.

Likewise, many contributions from applied linguistics have been used by applied discourse analysis, which has had in the contextual part of language its main element of connection with applied linguistics. Generally speaking, this applied perspective presents a wide variety of fields rather than a homogeneous framework of study.

In the educational context, Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) work on discourse analysis in the classroom examines the discursive, situational and grammatical categories that appear in the corpus of data. On the Spanish scene, the works of Unamuno (1997, 2003) and Nussbaum and Unamuno (2006) reflect on the study of discourses among schoolchildren of foreign origin in Barcelona. Their critical and ethnographic perspective reveals the conditions for the development of the linguistic-discursive skills of these schoolchildren in both foreign and native languages. Nor should we forget the work of Guasch and Nussbaum (2007) on multilingual competence.

3. Data and methodology

The methodology we have employed in this work is qualitative. In the words of Angrosino (2012: 10): "qualitative research aims to approach the world 'out there' (...) and to understand, describe and sometimes explain social phenomena "from the inside" in various possible ways".

Within the scope of qualitative research, ethnography has been used in this research as a method for data collection. This method involves "the collection of information about the material products, social relations, beliefs and values of a community" (Angrosino, 2012, p. 17), which is intended to provide a comprehensive insight into a specific educational context in order to investigate, among other things, the teaching-learning processes of Spanish in the classroom.

More specifically, the ethnography of communication (or speech) allows us to enter, from linguistic and cultural reflection, into specific social realities, in which the observation, characterisation, de-

scription and analysis of forms of communicative interaction in certain groups shows us how our society works and how we function in it. Thus, the interest of the ethnography of communication, as Lomas, Osoro and Tusón (1998, p. 40) have pointed out, lies in the fact that “it presents a theoretical framework that places in their right place the different skills that an individual need to know and master in order to behave in a ‘competent’, that is, ‘adequate’ way in any situation”. Likewise, this first point details the main key concepts of the ethnography of communication, ranging from the communicative (or speech) event, speech communities, the verbal repertoire or communicative competence, as one of the main concepts, which is understood as the ability to know what to say to whom, when and how to say it, and when to be silent (Cots et al., 1990).

3. 1. Research design

The design of the research, as a process of reflection, was conceived from the outset not as a static element, but as a dynamic one based on my own and my students’ actions. Thus, the design of the work began with the drafting of a first programmatic design of the fieldwork. The first areas of exploration in the school, especially when the central research topic was not fully defined, were based on the professional development considerations proposed by Melief, Tigchelaar and Korthagen (2010), namely: experience, reflection on practice, interaction with peers, and interaction with theory.

The project started with observation, data collection (written and oral), review of organisational, legislative and didactic documentation in January 2022 and concluded in June 2022 with the recording and transcription of the interactions in audio format. The observations started at the basic, intermediate and advanced levels, but were finally finalised at the Intermediate B1 level.

3. 2. Centre and participants

This research was carried out in a public school in the city of Granada where other languages are taught (7 languages in total) and which has good facilities, internet connection in all classrooms, sound equipment, digital whiteboards (in many classrooms), projector with screen and laptops for each teacher.

Calsamiglia and Tusón (1999, p. 133) have pointed out that any analysis of language use must include “the protagonists of the communicative interaction that such use entails”. The profile of Spanish learners is very heterogeneous from an ethnic, cultural, linguistic, social and religious point of view. Students range in age from 16 to 70 years old, with diverse educational backgrounds (from elementary school students to graduates, with a Master’s degree or PhD), as well as students in active employment or unemployed and of diverse origins. Eighteen different nationalities have been counted, although Moroccan students are the majority. Thus, this centre also reflects to a large extent the migratory and demographic movements in Spain in recent years.

Some of the students live in the city for strictly work or study reasons (they are studying for a degree, master’s degree, doctorate or other type of studies). Another part for personal reasons, they are married to a partner who works in the city or are simply natives of the area. Many students, especially from Morocco, are housewives. Classes are held in the mornings and afternoons. Many of them make an extra effort after work or class to reconcile Spanish with their work, education and personal

life. However, some of them, due to their own temporary situation, in terms of work or studies, leave the course in the middle or travel to their countries and are absent from class for long periods of time.

3. 3. Data obtained

The data used for this study were collected during the course of ethnographic fieldwork. Firstly, we collected and analysed material intended for pupils (guides, leaflets, forms, lists, websites and textbooks) and material for internal use by teachers (school plans, regulations, curriculum plans, legislation and analysis of classroom materials). Secondly, the materials collected during the ethnography are mainly the oral corpus and field diary notes. In this sense, participant observation and self-observation were the main tools for the collection of such material.

A total of 37 hours of class were recorded and transcribed in audio format. Eighteen communicative exchanges were recorded, in which B1 level learners, grouped in pairs, performed a role-play exercise in which they had to make requests, express opinions, make invitations and offers (with acceptance or refusal), greet or say goodbye in informal communicative situations. The role-play dramatisation technique has been used by Scarcella (1979), Félix-Brasdefer (2004, 2006) or Martínez and Usó (2011), among others, as it allows the researcher to observe complex conversational interactions and reflect an awareness of appropriate language use. We also transcribed 2 excerpts from lectures on interactional competence teaching instruction and 3 classroom interactions in the form of open-ended interviews.

The transcription system used is that of the *Círculo de Análisis del Discurso* (CAD) of the *Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona*, initiated by Amparo Tusón Valls and Helena Calsamiglia (appendix 1). As Ochs (1979) has pointed out, the interpretation of the data begins with the transcription, given that its elaboration requires a series of theoretical and methodological decisions that will influence and determine the subsequent analysis.

Transcripts are an essential tool for the analysis of spoken interactions. Their elaboration process is laborious, arduous and very slow so that they are the most faithful reflection of the content of the recordings. Once this process has been completed, the final result shows aspects of the interlocutionary mechanics (ways of taking the floor, overlaps, pauses, interruptions, repetitions, etc.) that are not perceptible in the direct observation of the recordings. In this respect, Stubbs (1987, p. 35) has pointed out that "it is a useful distancing mechanism that demonstrates complex aspects of conversational coherence that we overlook as real conversationalists or observers".

4. Results and Discussion

Due to space limitations, we will focus our analysis and discussion on classroom interactions on teaching instruction of communicative exchanges. Tusón (2002) explains that the analytical procedure must start from the linguistic forms situated in context, examine how these forms are articulated together with non-linguistic elements to generate meaning and discover the social representations that emerge from the analysis. Through this process, she continues, interactional development is

negotiated, norms are operationalised as habitual behavioural tendencies and, applied to our learners, appropriate or inappropriate uses in these communicative contexts are determined.

Instructional classes aim to provide learners with the linguistic forms necessary to express an act, while showing them the socio-cultural norms of doing it. Traditionally, social routines were seen as external norms that were added to the interaction, but the values of language and culture could hardly be changed once they were established (Janney and Arndt, 1992, p. 31, cited in Escandell, 2009, p. 26). Explicit instruction, with metacommunicative discussion, is therefore of great use in glimpsing the repertoires associated with a speech act and the norms of interaction and interpretation.

In our interactional instruction class, prior to the role-play activity we did in class, we started from the assumption of refusal and from there, with a series of probing questions, the teacher, in cooperation with his students, built up awareness of interactional appropriateness in Spanish. Thus, after asking the class whether “no, gracias” is sufficient in Spanish to express refusal (line 227), the instruction process begins. The teacher makes the students aware that the non-preferred options require more interactional elements (lines 232, 234 and 237) accompanied by justifications (line 243).

Fragment 1 (INT1_15)

Participants: EMM6 (pupil six Moroccan), EMA1 (pupil one German), EHS1 (pupil one Syrian), EMM3 (pupil three Moroccan), EMP1 (pupil one Polish), PHE1 (teacher one Spanish).

Theme: Class on teaching instruction on interactional mechanics

- [...]
227. PHE1 – no gracias \|(F) con no gracias es suficiente en español /\| es suficiente /\|
228. EMM6 – no \|
229. EMA1 – no \|
230. EMM3 – muy amable \|
231. EHS1 – que te:: -|
232. PHE1 – podemos dar las gracias \|[escribe en la pizarra] muy amable \|(F) falta algo/\|
233. EMM3 – todavía /\|
234. PHE1 – aquí falta algo muy importante \|[falta algo {(DC) muy muy} importante\|
235. EHS1 – {(fra) bon appétit \|[Traducción: buen provecho]
236. EMP1 – {(F) que te aproveche /\|
237. PHE1 – {(F) puedes decir \|[muy amable \|[que aproveche \|[escribe en la pizarra] {(F) falta algo /\|
- EMM6 – todavía /\|
238. PHE1 – todavía falta algo muy importante \|(F) que si no lo decimos \|[la persona va a decir \|[uy qué raro \|[falta algo \|[
239. EMP1 – {(F) acaba de comer \|[
- PHE1 – muy bien \|[
240. EMP1 – yuju \|[
241. PHE1 – tenemos que dar una justificación \|[
242. [...]
- 243.

Gumperz (2002) already pointed out that a significant number of the communication problems that arise in intercultural encounters are due to the unshared use of contextualisation cues in the use of negotiation strategies. This results in negative and pejorative evaluations of the other, as well as the construction of mutual stereotypes. This idea is presented in the following excerpt from the lesson (lines 274-280). Thus, in intervention 274 it is shown that it is important to use this ritual: “cuando queremos que “la otra persona \ no piense-| no tenga un prejuicio de nosotros \” O piense actitudes que no se corresponden con nuestra intención: “qué soso \ qué persona tan: -| tan agresiva \ por qué habla así \” (line 280).

Fragment 2 (INT1_15)

Participants: EMM5 (pupil five Moroccan), EHS1 (pupil one Syrian), EMM6 (pupil six Moroccan), PHE1 (teacher one Spanish).

Theme: Lecture on teaching instruction on interactional mechanics

- [...]
274. PHE1 – esto es muy importante \ sobre todo cuando queremos que la otra persona \ no piense -| no tenga un prejuicio de nosotros \
275. EMM5 – mm \
276. PHE1 – es decir \ si nos dicen \{(F) quiere bocadillo /| le apetece /\} y tú dices {(F) no gracias \} el español se va a quedar un poco \ dice uy \
277. EHS1 – uy \
278. PHE1 – qué soso \ y es muy -|
279. EMM6 – soso \
280. PHE1 – qué soso \ qué persona tan:: -| tan agresiva \ por qué habla así \
- [...]

In the last fragment of the explicit instruction lesson, presented below, the teacher explains the interactional ritual in his interventions 284 and 285 because these are elements of great importance: “esto tenéis que tenerlo en cuenta \ de acuerdo /| esto se valora mucho\” (line 288). In the inquiry process of knowledge construction, students understand the pragmatic value of these interactional norms: “es diplomática \” (line 297), “si es una cultura de: la gente de aquí \” (line 299). Indeed, beyond grammatical knowledge, “esto no solo es gramática\” (line 294), the key from this perspective is appropriateness, “porque cuando hablas un idioma \ tienes que pensar y actuar como lo hace un español \ y esa es la diferencia \” (line 300), i.e. “no solamente conocer las reglas\... sino también actuar como =actuaría= \ exacto \ un español en esa situación\” (line 302).

Fragment 3 (INT1_15)

Participants: EMM5 (pupil five Moroccan), EHS1 (pupil one Syrian), EMM3 (pupil three Moroccan), EMM10 (pupil ten Moroccan), EHM1 (pupil one Moroccan), PHE1 (teacher one Spanish).

Theme: Lecture on teaching instruction on interactional mechanics

- [...]
284. PHE1 – {(F) gusta /} {(AC) no gracias \} muy amable \} que aproveche \} se lo agradezco mucho \} es que acabo de comer \}
es que estoy a dieta \} es que soy alérgico \} es que- es que no sé jugar a cartas \} es que no \} muy amable \} muchas gracias
\} no \} insistir mucho \} y entonces el español \}
EMM10 – {(@) hablar \}
285. PHE1 – sí hay que hablar mucho \} porque una respuesta muy breve no:: -\} no funciona\} como la semana que viene tenéis
286. que hacer pi pi pi \}[se refiere a la actividad de fichas que vamos a hacer en clase: anexo 2]
EHS1 – ah \}
PHE1 – esto tenéis que tener lo en cuenta \} de acuerdo / \} esto se valora mucho\}
287. EHS1 – ah \}
288. [...]
289. PHE1 – sí \} {(F) esto es solamente gramática /} aquí \} esto no solo es gramática \}
EMM3 – no \}
294. EMA1 – no \}
295. EMM5 – es diplomática \}
296. PHE1 – [risas] diplomacia \}
297. EHM1 – si es una cultura de:: la gente de aquí \}
298. PHE1 – exacto \} porque cuando hablas un idioma \} tienes que pensar y actuar como lo hace un español \} y esa es la dife-
299. rencia \}
300. EMM10 – sí \} tienes que ofrecer la vida a: un día- diálogo \}
PHE1 – exacto \} tienes que parecer español \} no solamente conocer las reglas\} {(AC) que esto es sujeto \} esto es un verbo
301. \} esto es pretérito perfecto\} sino también actuar como =actuaría= \} exacto \} un español en esa situación \} y esto se valora
302. mucho en los exámenes orales \} por ejemplo \}
- [...]

After the lesson on teacher instruction on interactional mechanics and after having carried out the role-playing activity, a classroom session was devoted to explaining the results of the experience. In short, in intervention 58, the students' knowledge of the interactional rules which operate as "rituals" (Goffman, 1970) or "routines" (Coulmas, 1981) and the verbal (and non-verbal) repertoires linked to these acts, i.e. the "utterances or fragments of utterances which already exist prefabricated in the language to accommodate them to situations which are repeated" (Blecua, 1982, p. 56), is emphasised.

Fragment 4 (INT1_20)

Participants: EMM8 (pupil eight Moroccan), EHS1 (pupil one Syrian), EMM6 (pupil six Moroccan), EMM10 (pupil ten Moroccan), PHE1 (teacher one Spanish).

Theme: Role-play activity review class

- [...]
54. PHE1 – lo que quiere enseñar el manual \ y también la actividad \ es que en español \ recordad \ que no basta con decir no gracias \ es que no puedo \
55. EMM8 – tienes que explicar \
56. PHE1 – sino que: –| cuando la respuesta es una respuesta negativa \<0>
57. EMM10 – tienes que:: explicar \
58. PHE1 – hay que darle mucha:: –| para que \ para que suene a español\|[cambia la voz] ay el cumpleaños \ uh es que puf de verdad \ {(AC) no puedo \ de verdad es que –| otro día \ vale /| es que de verdad \ me viene muy mal \ es que no puedo \} porque si en español decimos solamente \ no gracias \ es que no puedo \<0>
- EMM6 – seca \
59. EHS1 – es duro \
60. PHE1 – suena \ suena \fuerte en español \
61. [...]

Once we have analysed the content of the teaching instruction classes on interactional mechanics, we can see how this research has provided us with information on the type of instruction that our students should receive: Formal instruction rather than just learning by exposure to the medium (Kasper, 1997; Urbina, 2009) and instruction based on the “process” as opposed to the “product” focus advocated by interactional competence specialists by going beyond the simple use of communicative skills to focus on the processes leading to the acquisition of interactional competence (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Félix-Brasdefer & Koike, 2014).

5. Conclusions

As we argued at the beginning of this paper, in communicative exchanges and meaning negotiation processes, learners of Spanish as a foreign language do not always appropriately use contextualisation cues such as rhythm, tone, tempo or emphatic intonation to express certain implicit meanings (e.g. informative focus or illocutionary force). Similarly, we argue, along with Gumperz (2002), that a significant number of the communicative problems that arise in our oral data are due to the unshared use of contextualisation cues and interactional patterns.

In short, on some occasions the lack of appropriateness stems from a lack of knowledge of the interactional rules of the different linguistic rituals or routines in which they are immersed, while on others it is due to the use of verbal (and non-verbal) resources that are not appropriate for the communicative functions they wish to express. Likewise, the analysis detects a certain tendency to simplify the use of linguistic exponents, extending the use of some of them to express different intentions or, in other cases, confusion with the verbal paradigm.

On the other hand, we consider that this research has allowed us to develop through the teaching instruction classes on interactional mechanics, on the part of the students, the recognition of how

linguistic forms are used appropriately or inappropriately in context, as well as to investigate how the interactive rituals of a sociocultural type associated with each situation operate. Consequently, learners have been provided with a wide repertoire of verbal and non-verbal resources for use in different situations and interpretative frameworks; evidence that prior to explicit teaching instruction, they were not always used in adaptable, negotiable and variable ways (Verschueren, 2002).

In conclusion, with the analysis of these data and their application to the teaching-learning process of Spanish as a foreign language, this work helps us to better understand the development of students' oral uses through informal interactions in the Spanish classroom, as well as to guide our teaching activity in order to establish objectives, programme activities, evaluate results and develop our students' oral communicative competence in a more detailed way.

6. References

- Allwright, D. (1980). Turns, topics, and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. En D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.), *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research* (pp. 165-187). Newbury House.
- Angrosino, M. (2012). *Etnografía y observación participante en Investigación Cualitativa*. Morata.
- Batlle Rodríguez, J. (2015). *La organización secuencial de las reparaciones en interacciones entre profesor y alumnos de español como lengua extranjera centradas en el significado: Repercusiones en la intersubjetividad y la competencia interaccional de los hablantes* (Doctoral Thesis). Universidad de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Blecua Perdices, J. M. (1982). *Qué es hablar*. Salvat.
- Briz Gómez, A. (1998). *El español coloquial en la conversación. Esbozo de pragmatogramática*. Ariel.
- Calsamiglia, H. & Tusón, A. (1999). *Las cosas del decir. Manual de análisis del discurso*. Ariel.
- Camps i Mundó, A. (2005). *Hablar en clase, aprender lengua*. En C. Barragán y otros (eds.), *Hablar en clase* (pp. 37-44). Claves para la Innovación Educativa, 31. Graó.
- Cenoz Iragui, J. (1996). *La competencia comunicativa: su origen y componentes*. En J. Cenoz y J. Valencia (eds.), *La competencia pragmática: elementos lingüísticos y psicosociales* (pp. 95-114). Servicio Editorial Universidad del País Vasco.
- Cestero Mancera, A. M.^a (2005). *Conversación y enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras*. Arco/Libros.
- Cots Caimons, J. M.^a, Nussbaum, L, Payrató, Ll. & Tusón, A. (1990). Conversa(r). *Caplletra. Revista de Filologia*, 7, 51-72.
- Coulmas, F. (ed.) (1981). *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*. Mouton.
- Díaz Rodríguez, L. (2010). Análisis del discurso del profesor en la clase de ELE. MarcoELE, 11. <http://marcoele.com/descargas/navas/17.diaz.pdf>
- Edwards, D. & Mercer, N. (1988). *El conocimiento compartido*. Paidós/MEC.
- Erickson, F. (1982). *Classroom discourse as improvisation: Relationships between academic task structure and social participation structure in lessons*. En L. C. Wilkinson (ed.), *Communicating in the classroom* (pp. 153-181). Academic Press.

- Escandell Vidal, M.ª V. (2009). *Social Cognition and Second Language Learning*. En R. Gómez Morón, M. Padilla Cruz, L. Fernández Amaya & M. O. Hernández López (eds.), *Pragmatics Applied to Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 1-39). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Esteve Ruescas, O. (2009). La interacción, un proceso que implica conversar. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 39, 56-59.
- Esteve Ruescas, O. (2010). *Interacción, conciencia lingüística y desarrollo de la autonomía en el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras*. MarcoELE, 10. http://marcoele.com/descargas/expolingua_2006.esteve.pdf
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). *La mitigación en el discurso oral de mexicanos y aprendices de español como lengua extranjera*. En D. Bravo y A. Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español* (pp. 285-299). Ariel.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). *Teaching the negotiation of multi-turn speech acts: Using conversation-analytic tools to teach pragmatics in the FL classroom*. En K. Bardovi-Harlig, J. C. Félix-Brasdefer y A. S. Omar (eds.), *Pragmatics language learning* (pp. 165-197). University of Hawai'i Press.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. & Koike, D. (2014). *Perspectives on Spanish SLA from Pragmatics and Discourse*. En M. Lacorte (ed.), *Handbook of Hispanic Applied Linguistics* (pp. 25-43). Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1970). *Ritual de la interacción. Ensayos sobre el comportamiento cara a cara*. Tiempo Contemporáneo.
- González Argüello, M.ª V. (2001). *Modificaciones en el discurso del profesor de español como lengua extranjera* (Doctoral Thesis). Barcelona, Universidad de Barcelona.
- Gras Manzano, P. (2011). *Gramática de construcciones en interacción. Propuesta de un modelo y aplicación al análisis de estructuras independientes con marcas de subordinación en español* (Doctoral Thesis). Universidad de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Guasch, O. & Nussbaum, L. (2007). *Aproximacions a la competència multilingüe*. Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1992). *Contextualization and understanding*. En A. Duranti y C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon* (pp. 229-252). Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (2001). *Interactional Sociolinguistics: a personal perspective*. En D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen y H. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 215-228). Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. (2002). *Las bases lingüísticas de la competencia comunicativa*. En L. Golluscio (ed.), *Etnografía del habla. Textos fundacionales* (pp. 151-163). Eudeba.
- Gunnarsson, B. (2000). *Análisis aplicado del discurso*. En T. van Dijk (coord.), *El discurso como interacción social. Estudios sobre el discurso II. Una aproximación multidisciplinaria* (pp. 405-441). Gedisa.
- Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28, 1-58.
- Heller, M. (2001). *Discourse and Interaction*. En D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen y H. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 250-264). Blackwell.

- Hopper, P. J. (1998). *Emergent grammar*. En M. Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure* (pp. 155-175). Erlbaum.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *Acerca de la competencia comunicativa*. En M. Llobera (ed.) (1995), *Competencia comunicativa. Documentos básicos en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras* (pp. 27-46). Edelsa.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatics competence be taught?* National Foreign Language Resource Center. <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/NW06/>
- Kasper, G. & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Blackwell.
- Levinson, S. (1989). *Pragmática*. Teide.
- Llobera i Cànaves, M. (ed.) (1995a). *Competencia comunicativa. Documentos básicos en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras*. Edelsa.
- Llobera i Cànaves, M. (1995b). *Discurso generado y aportado en la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras*. En M. Siguan (ed.), *La enseñanza de lenguas por tareas* (pp. 17-38). ICE-Horsori.
- Lomas, C., Osoro, A. y Tusón, A. (1998). *Ciencias del lenguaje, competencia comunicativa y enseñanza de la lengua*. Paidós.
- López Alonso, C. (2015). *Análisis del discurso*. Síntesis.
- Martínez Flor, A. & Usó Juan, E. (2011). Research Methodologies in Pragmatics: Eliciting Refusals to Requests. *ELIA*, 11, 47-87.
- Melief, K. Tigchelaar, A. & Kortagen, F. (2010). *Aprender de la práctica*. En O. Esteve, K. Melief y A. Alsina (eds.), *Creando mi profesión: Una propuesta para el desarrollo profesional del profesorado* (pp. 19-38). Octaedro.
- Mondada, L. (2001). Por una lingüística interaccional. *Revista Iberoamericana de Discurso y Sociedad*, 3(3), 61-89.
- Moore, E. & Nussbaum, L. (2013). La lingüística interaccional y la comunicación en las aulas. *Textos de Didáctica de la Lengua y de la Literatura*, 63, 43-50.
- Nussbaum, L. (1999). La discusión como género discursivo y como instrumento didáctico. *Texto de Didáctica de la Lengua y de la Literatura*, 20, 9-17.
- Nussbaum, L. y Unamuno, V. (coords.) (2006). *Usos i competències multilingües entre escolars d'origen immigrant*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Ochs, E. (1979). *Transcription as theory*. En E. Ochs y B. B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). Academic Press.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. & Thompson, S. (eds.) (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. & Fehr, B. (2000). *Análisis de la conversación: enfoque del estudio de la acción social como prácticas de producción de sentido*. En T. van Dijk (ed.), *El discurso como interacción social. Estudios sobre el discurso II. Una aproximación multidisciplinaria* (pp. 101-139). Gedisa.
- Preston, D. R. & Young, R. (2000). *Adquisición de segundas lenguas: variación y contexto social*. Arco/Libros.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7(4), 291-327.

- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Sánchez Cano, M. (2005). *La conversación en el aula*. En C. Barragán y otros (eds.), *Hablar en clase* (pp. 81-92). Claves para la innovación educativa 31. Graó.
- Sánchez Cano, M. (ed.) (2009). *La conversación en pequeños grupos en el aula*. Graó.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The Ethnography of Communication*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Scarcella, R. (1979). *On speaking politely in a second language*. En C. Yorio, K. Perkins y J. Schachter, J. (eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus* (pp. 275-287). TESOL.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversational Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1987). *Análisis del discurso. Análisis sociolingüístico del lenguaje natural*. Alianza.
- Tusón Valls, A. (1997). *Análisis de la conversación*. Ariel Lingüística.
- Tusón Valls, A. (1996). *El concepto de competencia comunicativa y la enseñanza del español como lengua extranjera*. En N. Sans y L. Miquel (eds.), *Didáctica del español como lengua extranjera. Colección Expolingua* (pp. 223-235). Fundación Actilibre.
- Tusón Valls, A. (2000). Conversar para aprender. *Aula de Innovación Educativa*, 96, 15-19.
- Tusón Valls, A. (2002). El análisis de la conversación: entre la estructura y el sentido. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 3(1), 133-153.
- Unamuno, V. (1997). *Lenguas, identidades y escuela: etnografía de la acción comunicativa* (Doctoral Thesis). Universidad de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Unamuno, V. (2003). *Lengua, escuela y diversidad sociocultural: hacia una educación lingüística crítica*. Graó.
- Urbina Vargas, M. S. (2009). Una propuesta pedagógica para el desarrollo de la competencia pragmática en español como segunda lengua o lengua extranjera. Estrategias Innovativas para el Mejoramiento. *Revista de Innovaciones Educativas de la Universidad Estatal a Distancia de Costa Rica*, 11 (16). <http://investiga.uned.ac.cr/revistas/index.php/innovaciones/article/view/553/454>
- Van Dijk, T. (ed.) (2000). *El discurso como interacción social. Estudios sobre el discurso II. Una aproximación multidisciplinaria*. Gedisa.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology of language learning. A sociocultural perspective*. Kluwer Academic Press.
- Verschueren, J. (2002). *Para entender la pragmática*. Gredos.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse. Language in Action*. Routledge.

Annex I (transcription system)

The transcription system used is that of the Círculo de Análisis del Discurso (CAD) of the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. These are the conventions:

= text 1 =	Moment of simultaneous speech or overlapping
= text 2 =	
	Short pause (less than one second)
	Long pause (more than one second)
<n° sg.>	Pause duration (minimum one second). Example: <5>.
<0>	Without pause
:	Vowel lengthening
::	Vowel lengthening (more time) time
:::	Very long vowel elongation
text_	Interruptions
text-	word truncation (abrupt cut in the middle of a word)
XXX	Indecipherable fragment
{{@} text}	Pronounced with laughter
{{&} text}	Dubious transcription
{{P} text}	Intensity pianissimo
{{PP} text}	Intensity pianissimo
{{F} text}	Intensity forte
{{FF} text}	Intensity fortissimo
{{A} text}	High pitch
{{B} text}	Low tone
{{AC} text}	Accelerated tempo
{{ACC} text}	Very fast tempo
{{DC} text}	Slow tempo
{{DCC} text}	Very slow tempo
{"text"}	Replacements
+text+	Phonetic or approximate transcription
[text]	Transcriber's comments
{{(ara) text}	Language change: Arabic
{{(eng) text}	Language change: English
{{(fre) text}	Language change: French
\	Descending intonation
/	Ascending intonation
-	Maintained intonation