
This is the **published version** of the article:

Bermejo Cruz, Claudia; Dooly, Melinda, dir. L1 use in group interaction in EFL classes. July 2020: 58 p.

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/230658>

under the terms of the  license



L1 use in group interaction in EFL classes

Claudia Bermejo Cruz

Supervisor: Melinda Dooly

Defended: June 2020

For the completion of the Master of Arts in

Formació de Professorat d'Educació Secundària Obligatòria i Batxillerat,
Formació Professional i Ensenyament d'Idiomes

Speciality: English

Abstract

This research paper analyzes the first language (L1) interactions of 14 students, aged between 14 and 15 years, assembled in groups to accomplish 3 different collaborative and interactional tasks, such as writing, reading and grammar-based tasks in an EFL class. The data were gathered in a state secondary school located in an upper-middle class neighborhood of Barcelona, through the use of recorded videos. The L1 interactions employed by the students in group are analyzed to determine the functions of the L1. This paper also examines if the L1 functions observed are beneficial or a potential obstacle to learn the second language. Findings show that using the first language in EFL classes has social and cognitive benefits and it contributes to second language learning.

Keywords: L1 use, second language learning, group interaction, EFL

Resum

Aquest document de recerca analitza les interaccions en la primera llengua (L1) de 14 estudiants, d'entre 14 i 15 anys, reunits en grups per realitzar 3 tasques col·laboratives i interaccionals diferents, com ara tasques d'expressió escrita, comprensió escrita i gramàtica en una classe d'anglès com a llengua estrangera (EFL). Les dades es van recollir en un institut públic d'un barri de classe mitjana-alta de Barcelona, fent ús de gravacions de vídeo. Les interaccions en L1 dels alumnes s'han analitzat amb l'objectiu de determinar les funcions que la L1 pot tenir. Amb aquest document també s'examina si les funcions de la L1 són beneficioses o un possible obstacle per aprendre la segona llengua. Els resultats mostren que fer servir la primera llengua en una classe d'anglès com a llengua estrangera té beneficis socials i cognitius i, per tant, contribueix a l'aprenentatge de la segona llengua.

Paraules clau: ús de la L1, aprenentatge de la segona llengua, interacció en grup, EFL

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theoretical framework.....	3
3. Methodology.....	8
3.1. Contextualization.....	8
3.2. Participants.....	8
3.3. Data collection.....	9
3.4. Data analysis.....	11
4. Analysis.....	13
4.1. Task management.....	13
4.2. Vocabulary search.....	16
4.3. Grammar search.....	18
4.4. Off task.....	19
4.5. Disagreement.....	21
5. Discussion and conclusions.....	24
5.1. Research questions and findings.....	24
5.2. General conclusions.....	28
5.3. Data limitations.....	29
5.4. Further research.....	29
6. References.....	30
7. Appendices.....	33
7.1. Transcription conventions.....	33
7.2. Complete transcripts of video-recorded sequences.....	34
7.3. Video recordings.....	53

1. Introduction

For over 100 years there has been a certain reluctance to employ the first language (L1) in EFL classes. Most teachers have been under the assumption that if students speak their native language they “miss” opportunities to produce output in the target language. In fact, these teachers would tend to avoid group work in order to minimize L1 use. However, some authors such as Alley (2005:250) claim that group work is crucial in EFL classes because it is when “the negotiation of meaning and the expression of personal ideas most naturally occur”, thus it reinforces interaction which facilitates language learning (Dooly, 2018).

As described by Dooly and O’Dowd (2018), in language, and subsequently language education theories, there are two contrastive perspectives: “language as a rule-governed discrete combinatorial system” and “language as a social fact” (Cook & Seidlhofer’s, cited in Dooly & O’Dowd), resulting in the two main contradictory pillars of language acquisition, the cognitivist and the sociocultural approaches.

According to Moore (2016), both cognitive and sociocultural approaches agree on, for instance, that there are biological and social differences that impact learning a language in childhood and adulthood, or that motivation, personality, multiple intelligences and attitudes can be beneficial or an obstacle to learning a language. Nevertheless, interaction has a different role in each approach.

In the cognitive approach, the interaction hypothesis, attributed to Krashen (1985), concerns the process of learning, in which the learner first receives the information (comprehensible input phase), then processes it (intake phase) through some filters such as the learner’s attitudes, intelligences, motivation, etc. Finally, the learner uses and produces what has learnt (output phase) resulting in social interaction. In contrast, the sociocultural approach supports the view that learning is a process in which the start, the

means and the purpose occur in communicative practices in sociocultural environments; in other words, social interaction in group work is fundamental and it is the purpose of all learning (Moore, 2016).

Considering the sociocultural approach, there is some disagreement on employing the L1 in L2 classes (Galali & Cinkara, 2017). As described above, while there are some teachers who discourage L1 use because they believe that to succeed in second language learning students should be exposed extensively to the L2 and should speak the L2 all the time, some others assert that it is good to let students speak their L1 in group work since they can define the nature of the task collaboratively, and they provide their peers with strategies to organize and complete the task among other things (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Tognini & Oliver, 2012). Bearing this in mind, is it good to let students negotiate meanings and express personal ideas in their L1?

The aim of this study is to analyze first language' (L1) use when students work in group during interactive tasks in EFL classes. This is firstly to observe and identify moments when the L1 is used amongst the members of the working groups. Secondly, we will identify which utterances in the L1 are beneficial or a potential obstacle to the use of the target language and subsequent learning process. Thus, the research questions pursued in this study will be the following:

- In which moments do students use the L1 in group work in EFL classes?
- Which utterances in the L1 are beneficial or a potential obstacle to the use of the target language?

We are going to address an interactional analysis of a selected group of students taking into account *task management*, *vocabulary*, *grammar*, *off-task* and *disagreement interpersonal interaction* in order to see if L1 use is really beneficial in group work and therefore to bear the results in mind for professional development.

2. Theoretical Framework

In order to provide the theoretical framework and the current study with complete understanding the terms *L1*, *L2* and *foreign language* will be defined in this section, since they have been applied differently according to the contexts where they have been studied or written about. The term *L1*, which is the short name of *first language*, refers to the native language or mother tongue (this is Spanish or Catalan in the context of our paper). The term *L2*, which is the short name of *second language*, refers to the language used at school and the “second” language you are competent to or the target language (this is English in the context of our study). Finally, the term *L2* and *foreign language* are interchangeable, thus they are used as synonyms.

Studies have shown that interaction takes place when students are under pressure (feel the need) to communicate (Gass, 2003). When students interact, they have opportunities to receive beneficial input and to put a language they are acquiring into practice. Moreover, producing output provides students with opportunities to receive feedback about their effectiveness of their communication skills. Hence, according to sociocultural and social constructivist premises, interaction facilitates language learning (Dooly, 2018; see also Mackey, 2012).

In addition to this, it is expected that if students in a foreign (L2) learning context speak the same native language, some of the interaction will occur in the language they share (Tognini & Oliver, 2012). Previous studies demonstrate that using the first language (L1) in communicative classrooms is part of formal and informal interaction for child and adult peers (Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Antón & DiCamilla, 1998). Besides, recent studies support the view that using the L1 in a L2 classroom facilitates students to learn the L2 more effectively (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Galali & Cinkara, 2017; Iswati &

Hadimulyono, 2018; Borràs & Moore, 2019; see also Llompart, Masats, Nussbaum & Moore, 2019; Vallejo & Dooly, 2019).

However, there is still some disagreement on using the L1 in L2 classrooms (Galali & Cinkara, 2017). Some authors such as Krashen (Krashen 1985, cited in Tognini & Oliver 2012) and Howatt (Howatt 1984, cited in Cook 2001) indicate that to succeed in second language (L2) learning, students should be exposed to the L2 extensively. The assumption that students should be exposed extensively to the L2 is also shared by the Catalan curriculum, which asserts that the classroom provides students with a real communication context, thus the teacher's language must be the one students are learning (the L2, therefore English) in order to develop and acquire the competences established (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2015b:7). Considering a limited use of the L1, Kim and Petraki (2009), Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011) and Hidayati (2012) agree with Galili and Cinkara (2017) that it is appropriate to use the L1 for “translating new ideas, concepts, and vocabulary terms as well as for classroom management and instructional purposes” (55).

According to Cook (2001), during the twentieth century, some basic language assumptions were accepted by most teachers and now they are taken for granted as the foundation of language teaching. Such assumptions are that oral language is more basic than written language use, explicit grammar instruction should be avoided, and language should be preferably practiced as a whole, rather than as separate parts. Not surprisingly, another assumption that was accepted is the avoidance of the L1 in the classroom, which leads us to confirm that the L2 is seen as positive, whereas the use of L1 is considered to be negative.

Since the 1880s several teaching methods have avoided L1 use through the Direct Method, which does not allow to use the use of the L1 during peer interaction and teacher-

student interaction in EFL classes (Cook, 2001). Yet the first teaching method employed in EFL classes was the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) in which the L1 was indispensable for learners to learn the L2 and their level was determined on how good their translations would be. What is more, some other methods which allow the L1 as an aid to the second language learning have been used in EFL classes such as Communicative Language Teaching Approach, Audio-Lingual Method and Silent Method (Galali & Cinkara, 2017).

The above studies indicate that discouraging the use of the L1 in the classroom limits the possibilities for language learning and it seems that there is no reasonable argument to avoid the L1. Willis (1996:130) advises “Don’t ban mother-tongue use but encourage attempts to use the target language”. In the following lines, more arguments that support the view that the L1 should not be avoided will be presented.

Using the L1 in EFL classes provides learners with ‘scaffolding’ support that they require to build up the L2, particularly learners with lower level of proficiency (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Iswati & Hadimulyono, 2018; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Galali & Cinkara, 2017 and Tognini & Oliver, 2012). As for tasks completion, the L1 is useful to be used during problem-solving tasks as it will help learners to accomplish tasks successfully (Iswati & Hadimulyono, 2018).

Moreover, Stern (1992) also agrees with the notion that the L2 exists together with the L1 in the student’s mind, “the L1-L2 connection is an indisputable fact of life” (Stern, 1992:282). Regarding Cook’s view (2001), most students use and mediate between two languages (their mother tongue and target language) in EFL classes, rather than using the L2 independently. Cook claims that “if the aim of learning a language is to improve the students' minds cognitively, emotionally, or socially, the L2 had better not be isolated from the rest of the mind” (Cook, 2001:408).

Antón and DiCamilla (1998) found in their study that L1 use has both social and cognitive functions during group work. They discovered that students spoke in their first language to define the nature of the task collaboratively, let us say, to develop a common perspective on a social level. Students also used the L1 to provide their peers with strategies to organize and complete the task on a cognitive level. Such strategies were maintaining each other's interest during the completion of the task; devising strategies to manage the task; keeping in mind the goal of the task; and focusing on important items of the task (see also Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Tognini & Oliver, 2012). Last but not least, learners used the L1 to understand language forms meanings, in other words, grammar aspects.

Furthermore, Swain and Lapkin (2000) identified three principle functions for L1 use by students in group work: 1) moving the task along, for instance, starting the task and managing linguistic and organizational aspects in order to complete the task; 2) focusing attention, let us say, concerning grammar and vocabulary aspects; and, 3) interpersonal interaction, in other words, off task interactions and disagreements. As regards these functions, Swain and Lapkin (2000) found in their study that L1 use has significant cognitive and social functions and could provide students with chances to learn the L2, hence the L1 should not be banned.

Galali and Cinkara's (2017) and Tarone and Swain (1995) investigated the social and linguistic factors that had an effect on L1 use by students during group work. They emphasized the clear and functional distinction students made to use the L1 and the L2. Students used the L2 to talk about academic topics since they require complex syntax and vocabulary, and they used the L1 to interact among their peers. They discovered that a crucial influence to use the L1 by learners was the lack of the L2 vernacular needed in

order to interact informally with peers, which is an indispensable item to create and maintain group's identity in adolescence.

It can be observed that L1 use has beneficial cognitive and social functions in peer interaction. Therefore, "if there is no overriding obligation to avoid the L1, each use can be looked at on its merits" (Cook, 2001:413). The first beneficial factor to use the L1 in the classroom is *efficiency*. Cook suggests that anything done through the first language can be more effective. The second factor is *learning*: if the L2 learning can be helped by using the L1, then students can use it. A third factor is *naturalness*: if participants feel more comfortable about some topics in the L1 rather than the L2, then they can be encouraged to use the first language. Finally, the fourth factor is *external relevance*: if students use both languages and this helps them to learn specific L2 uses they may need in the world and not just inside the classroom, then they ought to use the L1.

Some studies mentioned above (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Iswati & Hadimulyono, 2018; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Galali & Cinkara, 2017 and Tognini & Oliver, 2012) also affirm that without the L1 use, the students may not carry out the tasks effectively, or perhaps they are not accomplished at all. They assume that the L1 could facilitate to L2 learning, hence, it should not be prohibited.

3. Methodology

3.1. Contextualization

The data have been gathered in a state secondary school located in an upper-middle class neighborhood of Barcelona. According to the school's principal, the students come from well-cultured families who collaborate and are concerned about their children's studies. Most of the students are born in Barcelona but there is also a minority of students (10%) who are South American, Pakistan and Moroccan newcomers.

This center is a large institution so the students are assembled in four different groups for each level throughout the six years of secondary education (*ESO* and *Batxillerat*). In addition to this, the school offers Science and Technology, and Humanities and Social Science Education. Regarding languages studies, the school promotes the importance of learning different languages apart from Catalan, Spanish and English. Students have the opportunity to learn German and French, and they can also do exchanges with foreign students.

Furthermore, the center's pedagogical organization pays special attention to diversity, and therefore, it has implemented a new model for diversity management which is based on splitting heterogeneously the regular groups in 2 out of 3 weekly hours in Spanish, Catalan and English classes. This model permits the low-performance students to enhance their learning and acquire their competences in an effective way since the ratio of students is reduced and the teachers can provide them with more assistance.

3.2. Participants

The participants in the current study are 14 teenagers from two EFL classes of the 3rd year of ESO. There are 9 male students and 5 female students aged between 14 and 15 years old. Their level of English is different due to several factors: metalinguistic knowledge, language learning aptitude, learning style, personality and motivation. For instance,

regarding personality, there are 5 students in this study who are extroverts and engage in oral conversations more frequently than their peers.

According to the *Common European Framework of Reference*, the selected students are supposed to have the English level A2. Despite students' differences in their level of English previously mentioned, they share the same mother tongues, which are mainly Catalan and Spanish. This means that they can use their mother tongues in order to clear up any misunderstanding derived from English and help each other.

As it has been previously mentioned, the students are divided heterogeneously into two groups in the English class in 2 out of 3 weekly hours of the foreign language class schedule. The selected classes for data collection only include the split classes since the noise level is comfortably low for recording.

3.3. Data collection

Four videos in total were recorded in two classes over a two-week period in March 2020 for data collection. The recorded videos reflect peer interaction when the students are working in groups of three to five learners and only in a few occasions the teacher is involved in the conversation to help the students.

Three activities were selected to be video recorded resulting in, as we have described above, four videos in total. Two of these activities were part of a project about saving water, and the other activity was created by the students-teachers. This task was part of their teaching unit and it consisted of a jigsaw reading about toxic people.

The three activities and the participants are described in detail in the following lines. We should bear in mind that all students' names are pseudonyms for ethical reasons. The transcripts have been done following the Jeffersonian system of transcription (Jefferson, 2004). The school's principal signed a consent form confirming permission that students could be recorded.

The first activity which was carried out during the first week was a collaborative interactional and writing task from a project about water conservation. It consisted of describing an invented family and a house in groups of three and five. First the students had to decide a name for each member of the family and then describe them briefly: their profession, their hobbies and their relationships with the other members of the family. Then they had to discuss what their house would be like so that they could calculate the amount of water they would spend in a week, although this calculation is part of another activity that was not recorded. The students who were video recorded for this task were Marta, Pol and Mónica from one group, and Manuela, Candela, Raül, Jonathan and Raquel from another group.

The second activity, also as a part of the project about saving water, consisted of a grammar-based task about conditionals in which the students had to discuss in groups of four what they would do to save water. As this task is related to the previous activity, the students had to revise their calculations of water spent in a week-period and their house' features to see what options of reducing water use would be viable. The participants in this activity were Jordi, Pere and Hugo.

The third activity was done during the second week and it was a jigsaw reading about celebrities who had had toxic relationships. There were four different texts with four different celebrities and each group of three students had to read one text. The aim of this task was to explain to each other what their text was about, to summarize the main ideas, and to check the vocabulary. The students who were selected for this task were Sergi, Fran and Roger.

As for the recordings, the activities were video recorded with a mobile phone. The students-teachers carried the phone and recorded. The students were aware that they were being recorded. During the first week the students-teachers notified the students that they

were going to be recorded only for academic purposes and the first recordings were mock so that the students could get used to being recorded. At first, the participants appeared to be shy and nervous, but then after the first minute of being recorded they seemed to forget about the camera, which made it easier to collect data in a natural way.

3.4. Data analysis

Swain and Lapkin (2000:257-258) analyzed the use of the L1 made by grade 8 French students and they identified three main purposes for its use: (1) moving the task along, (2) focusing attention, and (3) interpersonal interaction. In fact, they created the following coding categories for L1 utterances:

1. Moving the task along
 - (a) sequencing (figuring out the order of events)
 - (b) retrieving semantic information; understanding pieces of information;
developing and understanding of the story
 - (c) task management
2. Focusing attention
 - (a) vocabulary search
 - (b) focus on form; explanation; framing; retrieving grammatical information
3. Interpersonal interaction
 - (a) off task (includes L1 vernacular use)
 - (b) disagreement

The qualitative and interpretive interaction analysis of the current study will be carried out following these categories since our data collection shows a high-degree of useful productions in the first language. For instance, Swain and Lapkin focused on the use of the first language when the French students completed a jigsaw task in pairs, which is similar to one of the activities we have described above. Taking into account these categories we will address the two main questions of this study: in which moments do

students use the L1 in group work in EFL classes? And, which utterances in the L1 are beneficial or a potential obstacle to the use of the target language?

There are other authors who have established similar categories to analyze L1 use in their researches, such as Cook (2001). Cook found that through the first language learners may explain the task to each other and negotiate roles they are going to take, both fitting in the task management category by Swain and Lapkin. Cook also realized that students checked their understanding or production of language against their peers, which could be correlated with the second category by Swain and Lapkin, focusing attention on vocabulary and grammar. Tognini and Oliver (2012) followed similar categories as Swain and Lapkin. In their studies they mention the following purposes for L1 use: (1) task management, (2) task clarification, (3) vocabulary and meaning, and (4) grammar.

Antón and DiCamilla (1998), while investigating adult learners, found that learners used the L1 to provide each other with strategies to manage and complete the task, and “to explicate and build on each other’s partial solutions to specific problems throughout the task” (321) by using L1 forms and by understanding the meaning of the text in L2 through L1. Finally, they also realized that learners used the L1 to produce inner reflections. As can be noticeable, these three categories are also similar to the ones from Swain and Lapkin.

How the data were analyzed is described as follows. First, the recorded videos were watched carefully pausing them in key points: moments when learners were speaking in Catalan or Spanish, their first language. Then, notes about L1 utterances were taken so as to have an idea of the data collection. Taking into account the purposes of the use of the L1 that Swain and Lapkin, and other researchers mentioned above, established, we could see if these purposes corresponded to our data. Eventually, the selected videos were transcribed and an interaction analysis was applied to the transcribed data.

4. Analysis

In this section of the study we will address a qualitative and interpretive interaction analysis of 14 students working in 4 groups in EFL classes. In order to carry out an in-depth analysis, we have organized the data as follows. We will present the most relevant and interesting excerpts from the transcriptions in which the students are using the L1 and we will describe and analyse them. In order to provide the analysis with coherence, it will be divided by the purposes of L1 use according to Swain and Lapkin (2000).

4.1. Task management

Excerpt 1

36. Marta grandfather ↓(.)
37. Teacher alright ↓-
38. Pol is ↑ vale ↓ is pirula's grandfather ↓(.)
39. Marta pirula ↓ ((laughs)) (6.3)
40. °ah no (.) claro ↓(.) es verdad ↓(.) porque sería ↑°-
ah no yeah that's right because it would be
41. Teacher but you are four ↓(.) where is (.) the father and the mother ↑(.)
42. Pol [they are dead ↓(.)
43. T who is the father ↓(.)
44. Mónica [the father ↑ dead ↓
45. Pol they are dead]
46. T omg ↓ really ↑(.) ok ↓ it's your family ↓ you decide ↓ (6.8)
47. so ↓ pocoyo ↑(.) is that you pol↑ yeah ↓(.)
48. Mónica is my [grandfather ↑

This excerpt is part of the first activity, in which the students have to invent and describe a family and decide a name for each member of the family. In this fragment, they are deciding who a member's grandfather is.

As can be seen, in line 36 Marta offers a one-word suggestion for a family member (grandfather) in the target language. The teacher responds affirmatively to that proposal

in the next turn (line 37) to which Pol then offers a name in a sentence that begins in the target language. He self-interrupts with an interjection in Spanish (*vale*) and then reformulates (self-repair) to an almost complete sentence in the target language (is Pirula's grandfather). Marta responds to Pol's suggestion by repeating the name and laughing and makes a side-comment in Spanish, perhaps motivated by the rather unusual name Pol has suggested. This sequence between the two students regarding the grandfather's name is interrupted by the teacher in line 41, in what seems to be a move to bring the students back to task (an implicit disapproval of the previous interaction between Marta and Pol). Pol decides to answer the teacher by making use of humor in the target language in line 42 and 45, to which the teacher appears to be surprised by such an unexpected and unusual response (line 46).

93. Marta charlie ↑(.) [is ↑
94. Pol charlie is ↑] **tú eres mi hija** ↓(.)
you are my daughter
95. Marta **sí** ↓(.) pirula's mother ↓(.)
yes
96. Teacher so you are ↑ the mother ↓(.) [you are the mother ↓ ok ↓.]

In this fragment, Marta and Pol are discussing who a member family is. In line 93 Marta begins with a sentence in English but she leaves it incomplete, perhaps as a way to reflect on her decision or to receive some support from her peers. Pol repeats what Marta says in the next turn and offers a suggestion in the L1 in order to assign a role (line 94), to which Marta responds affirmatively also in the L1 and makes a clarification (pirula's daughter) for Pol's proposal.

In this excerpt we can see that the students make use of their native language to make side comments and clarifications of the task (*es verdad, porque sería*), to assign roles (*tú eres mi hija*), and to express agreement on peers' proposals with interjections (*sí*), (*vale*).

Excerpt 2

7. Candela **[e:hm...]** **tú** ((pointing at Raquel with her finger))
e:hm... you
8. Raquel xxx ((denying))
9. Jonathan **maría**
10. Candela **martita** ((writes it down))
11. Raquel ((shaking her head))

In this excerpt, also part of the first activity, another group of students are deciding on invented names for their family members. Candela starts giving the turn to Raquel in the L1 (line 7), to which Raquel responds negatively in the next turn (line 8). Perhaps she feels self-conscious as she does not produce any utterance and as she has got the whole group's attention. Then Jonathan and Candela offer a one-word suggestion for a family member (line 9 and 10), in this case for Raquel, but Raquel rejects their proposal by shaking her head (line 11).

35. Manuela **jo sóc april** ((writing it down))
i am april
36. Raül **pues april**
april then
37. **pues xxx (.) y tú cómo te llamas↑ (.) joseph↑** ((looking at Jonathan))
then xxx what is your name (.) joseph
38. Manuela **no pero yo soy la hermana xxx↑ (.) y ella es e:h** twenty-three years old ((pointing at Raquel))
but i'm the xxx sister (.) and she is e:h
39. **i'm fourteen years old↑** ((pointing at herself))
40. **and you're one↓** ((pointing at Raül and waiting for approval))
(1.5) sí↓ no↑
right

Afterwards, Manuela suggests a name for a family member in Catalan, to which Raül expresses his agreement by repeating the name in a sentence that starts with an interjection in Spanish (pues) (line 36). In the next line, Raül gives the turn to Jonathan by asking him for a suggestion for a family member's in Spanish (line 37), then by

offering him an English one, as a way to continue with the task completion. As can be observed in line 38, Manuela engages in the conversation again to make a clarification in the L1 regarding the family members' relationships (line 38), then she switches to English to refer to their age in a complete sentence (line 39 and 40), but she eventually uses again the L1 to receive her peers' approval in a question form.

In this excerpt we have observed that the learners are making use of the L1 to give turns to peers and to ask for ideas or suggestions for family members' names (tú), (y tú, ¿cómo te llamas?), to offer suggestions for family members' names (jo sóc April), to express agreement on peers' proposals (pues April), to make clarifications regarding family members' relationships (no, pero yo soy la hermana), and to receive peers' approvals (sí, ¿no?).

4.2. Vocabulary search

Excerpt 3

30. Teacher any word ↑(.) that you don't understand ↑(.)
31. Roger ah:: no ↓(.) a-abruptly ↓(.)
32. Teacher abruptly ↓(.) ok↓(.) what do you think suddenly is ↑(.) unexpectedly ↑(.)
Can you (.) [explain ↑(.)
33. Fran **de repente**] ↓(.)
suddenly
34. Sergi **exacto** ↓(.)
exactly
35. Fran when you don't expect the things ↑(.) is tha:t (.) you don't see them coming ↓(.)
36. Sergi °**de la noche**° ↓**de la noche a la mañana** ↓(.)
overnight
37. Teacher ok ↑(.)
38. Fran **algo más** ↑(.)
anything else
39. Roger **no** ↓(.) **bueno** ((points with his finger another word))
no well
40. Fran **bueno** (.) **pues** ↓(.) **es que son sinónimos** ↓(.)
well so they are synonyms

41. Roger ah **vale** ↓(.)
ok
42. Sergi **y** abruptly **es abruptamente** ↓(.)
and is abruptly

This fragment is part of a jigsaw reading task about celebrities who had had toxic relationships. The students have summarized the main ideas of the text and they are dealing with vocabulary aspects.

The teacher addresses the group to make sure they understand all the vocabulary in line 30, to which Roger responds negatively in the next turn (line 31) as he does not know the meaning of a word. The teacher does not give any answer, but she rather asks explicitly the members of the group to convey its meaning in line 32, as a way to stimulate interaction. Thus, Fran decides to offer an accurate translation of the word (line 33), to which Sergi expresses his agreement in Spanish in the next turn (line 34). Then Fran formulates a complete explanation in the target language (line 35), and Sergi offers an expression in Spanish, perhaps motivated by the lack of response from his peer, Roger. The teacher responds affirmatively to that explanations in line 37. Afterwards, Fran refers to Roger again in the L1 to know if he has got any other question regarding vocabulary (line 38), to which Roger utters an interjection in Spanish (bueno) in the next turn (line 39). Then Fran responds to Roger's demand by making a clarification in the L1 (line 40) and Sergi offers a literal translation in Spanish for the word in question (line 42).

As can be observed, the students in this excerpt use their native language to convey the meaning of certain words by translating them (*de repente*) and offering synonyms and expressions (*de la noche a la mañana*). They also make use of the L1 to express agreement on peers' suggestions (*exacto*), to refer to peers and ask them questions regarding vocabulary aspects (*¿algo más?*), to utter interjections (*bueno*), (*pues*), and to make clarifications regarding words' meaning (*es que son sinónimos*).

4.3. Grammar search

Excerpt 4

95. Pere **no**↑ (.) **pero es que no va con s**↑
no (.) but you don't need an s
96. Jordi **ah no**↑
97. Pere **no**↑ (0.5) **es re- re- reduce**↑
no (0.5) it's re- re- reduce ((pronouncing it in the Spanish way))
98. Jordi **reduise** (.) **con c**↑
reduce (.) with a c
99. Pere **no** (0.5) **él reduce** (.) **yo reduzco** (.) **él reduce** ((conjugating in Spanish so as to show how to spell it by the way it is pronounced in Spanish))
no (0.5) he reduces (.) I reduce (.) he reduces
100. Hugo he: (.) reduced↑
101. Jordi a: (.) °e c°↑
102. Pere ((smiling)) no↑
103. Jordi **no sé cómo se escribe**↑ (.) °=**perdona tío**=°↑
I don't know how to spell it (.) °=sorry man=°
104. T R E D U (.) R E D U C E
105. Pere U ((pronouncing it in English))
106. Jordi ((to Pere)) u ((pronouncing it in Spanish)) (.) [**no**↑
107. T yeah [C
108. Pere [=S S= (.) **está bien**
fine
109. T no (.) [C
110. Pere [no (.) C
111. T it's C and E (.) very good ↑
112. Pere E E E ((drawing repeatedly an e with his hand in the air))

The excerpt shown is part of a grammar-based task about conditionals in which the students are discussing which options of reducing water would be viable. After deciding and writing down some sentences with conditionals, the participants come across a grammatical obstacle.

Jordi thinks that the verb *reduce* in English is written with an *s* at the end, to which Pere responds negatively and makes a clarification in Spanish in line 95. In the next turn, Jordi appears to be incredulous about his peer's clarification (line 96) and Pere tries to

help him with the spelling by pronouncing the verb in the Spanish way (line 97). Then Pere makes use of phonetics and interlingual resources in line 99, perhaps motivated by Jordi's lower level of proficiency (line 98), as a way to show similarities between the native and the target language. This sequence between the two students regarding spelling aspects is interrupted by Hugo in line 100, in what seems to confuse Jordi in the next turn (line 101). Pere then responds negatively with laughter, as a way to stay patient with his friend (line 102), to which Jordi makes a side-comment and offers an apology in the L1 in the next turn (line 103). The teacher also engages in the conversation to help Jordi with spelling (line 104, 107 and 109) and Pere keeps helping his peer by giving him some feedback (line 108) and resorting to gestures (line 112).

As shown, in this fragment the participants speak their L1 to make clarifications regarding spelling aspects (*pero es que no van con s*), and they make use of phonetics and interlingual resources in order to see the similarities between the native and target language (*yo reduzco, él reduce*). The students also use the L1 to make side-comments and offer apologies (*no sé cómo se escribe, lo siento tío*), and to give feedback to peers (*está bien*).

4.4. Off task

Excerpt 5

41. Candela ((points at Raquel)) your name↑
 42. Raquel ((distracted by another teacher))
 43. Candela raquel↓ (0.5) your name↓
 44. T2 okay (.) you all have to write it down↓ huh↑
 45. Candela °okay°
 and
 Manuela
 46. T1 jonathan (.) you too
 47. Candela raquel ((hurrying her up))
 48. Raquel °xxx°
 T1 can you (.) can you speak louder↑
 49. Raquel a:h (.) yes (.) let me think

50. **a ver** (1) e:hm...
 let me see (1) e:hm...
51. Manuela e:h (.) antonio (.) [e:m (.)
52. Raquel [alexa ((addressing to Candela))
53. Manuela e:h (.) [e:h (.) an o:ld↑ ((lowering her hand at Raquel))
54. Candela alexa ((looking at Raquel and smiling))
55. Manuela alexa (.) alexa ((laughing)) **ponme una canción**
 alexa (.) alexa ((laughing)) *play a song*
56. Manuela e:hm ((to the teacher)) a typical (.) old english name↑

This excerpt is part of the first activity, in which the students have to describe a family and decide the family members' names. There is a moment in which there is off-task interaction because it has no relation with the task itself.

As can be seen in line 41, Candela starts giving the turn to Raquel, who seems to be distracted by the teacher (line 42). The teacher then interrupts to make a task clarification in line 44 and 46, in what seems to be a move to bring Candela, Manuela and Jonathan back to task (line 45). Candela insists on Raquel suggesting a name for a family member in line 47, to which Raquel offers a sentence in the target language and then reformulates (self-repair) to a sentence in the native language (*a ver*) in lines 49 and 50. In the next turn, Manuela offers a one-word suggestion for an invented name in line 50, motivated by the lack of response from Raquel. Eventually Raquel makes a suggestion for the family member's name in line 52, to which Candela repeats the name again with laughter in line 54, perhaps motivated by a joke both students share. Manuela seems to get the joke in the next turn (line 55) and explicitly repeats the name proposed by Raquel in a full sentence in Spanish that appears in an advertisement (*Alexa, ponme una canción*), as a way to make fun of it and express a personal reflection that is not related to the task itself. Then Manuela asks a question to the teacher (line 56) in order to continue with the task completion.

In this excerpt we have observed that the students make use of their native language to express a personal reflection or to tell jokes that are not related to the task itself in order to make fun of it.

4.5. Disagreement

Excerpt 6

47. T so ↓ pocoyo ↑(.) is that you pol↑ yeah ↓(.)
48. Mónica is my [grandfather ↑
49. Pol he is ↑(.) forty]↓(.)
50. Marta forty ↑(.) **si eres el grandfather** ↑ **cómo vas a tener cuarenta años**
↓(.)
if you are the how can you be forty
no ↓(.) you have ↑
51. Mónica ninety-nine!-

This fragment is also part of the first activity, in which the students have already decided some invented names for their family members. Now they are dealing with the age of a member family (grandfather) but they do not seem to reach an agreement.

As can be seen, the teacher starts asking for a clarification: who is a family member in line 47, to which Mónica responds to that clarification in the next turn (line 48). Then Pol offers a complete sentence in the target language to refer to the age of that member in line 49. Mónica responds to Pol's suggestion by repeating the age and makes a side-comment in Spanish in line 50, perhaps motivated by the rather unusual age for an elderly person Pol has suggested, as a way to express disagreement on that proposal. Moreover, Marta does not agree with Pol's suggestion because she then tries to reformulate the sentence in the target language despite her lower level of proficiency (line 50). Mónica provides a one-word suggestion regarding the age of the family member, as a way to help their peers (line 51).

83. Marta no ↓(.) my name is ↑ emmm ((laughs))
84. Pol **miguel quesada** ↓(.)
85. Marta **soy la madre no el padre** ↓(.)

- I'm the mother not the father
86. Pol **una madre también se puede llamar miguel quesada** ↓(.)
a mother can also be called
87. Marta eemmm (3.7) **ay espérate** ↓(.) bruna ↓(.) ((laughs))
wait
88. Mónica **bruna muy inglés no suena** ↓ eh ↑ **pero** ↑ bruna
it doesn't sound really english but
89. Marta °**es verdad, [vale°**
you're right ok
90. Pol **es que bruna no existe** ↓(.)]
bruna doesn't exist
91. Marta no ↓ **pues bruna no** ↓(.) charlie ↓(.)
no so not

Afterwards, the students are deciding another invented name for a family member (mother) but they seem again not to reach an agreement. In line 83 Marta starts a sentence in the target language but it is interrupted by Pol in the next turn (line 84), who suggests a male name, so as to attract his peers' attention and make fun of his response. Marta responds negatively to Pol's suggestion in line 85 by stressing that the family member is a female and not a male in her native language, as a way to let him know that he may be wrong about his proposal. However, Pol insists on his suggestion also in Spanish (line 86), to which Marta then makes a side comment in Spanish, perhaps motivated by Pol's unhelpful proposals, and eventually suggests a name (line 87). In the next turns, Mónica tries to persuade Marta in the L1 that the name suggested by her does not really sound like an English name (line 88), and Pol remarks that it does not exist (line 90). As can be observed, both students do not agree on Marta's proposal, resulting in a new name suggestion offered by Marta in line 91.

In this excerpt we have observed that the participants use the L1 to make clarifications (soy la madre, no el padre), to insist on one's proposal (una madre también se puede llamar Miguel Quesada), to make side comments motivated by unhelpful peers' proposals (ay, espérate), to express disagreement on peers' proposals regarding family

members' names and ages so as to persuade them (Bruna muy inglés no suena), (es que Bruna no existe), and to express agreement on peers' proposals (es verdad, vale).

5. Discussion and conclusions

The results of the analysis allow us to confirm that we have obtained significant findings and therefore, some relevant conclusions can be taken. In this chapter we will first address the research questions mentioned in the introduction and then we will draw the conclusions of the study taking into account the theoretical framework.

5.1. Research questions and findings

In which moments do students use the L1 in group work in EFL classes?

The moments in which students use the L1 in group work in EFL coincide with the categories and purposes described in the analysis section, which are: (1) moving the task along, and particularly, task management, (2) focusing attention on vocabulary search and retrieving grammatical information, and (3) interpersonal interaction in off tasks and disagreements.

Regarding task management, students employ their native language to make task clarifications, as a way to make sure all members of the group, especially those with lower level of proficiency, understand what they are supposed to do and what the task consists of. According to Antón and DiCamilla (1998), learners use the L1 to provide each other with strategies to manage and complete the task, and sometimes they understand a task better when it is clarified by a peer since they know each other and perhaps they use a more basic language.

Learners also speak their L1 to negotiate and assign roles (this function also includes making suggestions and asking for suggestions to peers). Taking into account that in the first activity learners had to describe an invented family, thus negotiating and assigning roles would be predictable, they use the L1 again to make sure they know which family member corresponds to each group member. Interestingly, Cook (2001) found that through the first language learners may negotiate roles to each other in order to fulfill the

task successfully. Moreover, for some students negotiating in the L2 is sometimes difficult, hence using the L1 allows them to make their suggestions and express their opinions precisely.

Also related to negotiating and assigning roles, in several moments students use the L1 to receive peers' approval and to express agreements on peers' suggestions, as a way to make good impression on peers and reinforce group cohesion. This is interesting if we take into consideration what Galali and Cinkara's (2017) and Tarone and Swain (1995) discovered: a crucial influence to use the L1 by students is the lack of the L2 vernacular needed so as to interact informally with peers, which is an indispensable item to create and maintain group's identity in adolescence.

In the second function, focusing attention on vocabulary search, students make use of the L1 to convey words' meaning to peers by translating these words and also offering synonyms and similar expressions. Not surprisingly, students first resort to translations since it is easier for those with lower level of proficiency, and then to other resources such as synonyms and similar expressions when their peers find insufficient the option of translating. Learners also employ the L1 to make clarifications and to ask questions to peers regarding vocabulary, and to make sure they understand all the words of the text.

Focusing attention on grammatical information we have found that students speak their L1 to make clarifications regarding spelling aspects when they did not know how to write a word in English. Then students also resort to phonetics and interlingual resources when a word in Spanish and English is similarly spelled, so as to provide peers with support.

Another function seen in the gathered data is the off-task interpersonal interaction. Students make use of their native language to express personal reflections or to tell jokes

that are not related to the task itself, as a way to interact informally with peers. We have described above that in order to create and maintain group's identity, teenagers interact informally through the L1 since they do not have L2 vernacular (Galali & Cinkara's, 2017 and Tarone & Swain, 1995). In this case, they tell jokes because they want to make fun of the task, have a good impression in front of their peers and to be part of a group.

Also related to the third function, interpersonal interaction, students use the L1 to express disagreement on peers' proposals, for instance when they are deciding invented names for family members, and to insist on one's proposal as a way to persuade peers and make them change their opinion.

Which utterances in the L1 are beneficial or a potential obstacle to the use of the target language?

We have seen in the previous research question and in the theoretical framework that the first language has numerous advantages in EFL classes and facilitates students to learn the second language more effectively (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Galali & Cinkara, 2017; Iswati & Hadimulyono, 2018; Borràs & Moore, 2019; see also Llompart, Masats, Nussbaum & Moore, 2019; Vallejo & Dooly, 2019).

If students make task clarifications through the L1 in order to check that all group members understand what the task consists of they are providing each other with 'scaffolding' support that they need to build up the L2, especially learners with lower level of proficiency (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Iswati & Hadimulyono, 2018; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Galali & Cinkara, 2017 and Tognini & Oliver, 2012). Therefore, L1 utterances for task clarifications are beneficial to accomplish the task and to learn the L2 successfully.

As for negotiating and assigning roles and interpersonal interactions (disagreements), students also use the L1 to provide each other with strategies to organize

and complete the task on a cognitive level (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998). These strategies of negotiating member names or assigning family members to each student of the group has social and cognitive benefits as specified by Antón and Di Camilla (1998) and Cook (2001:413): *efficiency* (anything done through the L1 can be more effective), *learning* (if the L2 learning can be helped by using the L1, then the L1 can be used it), *naturalness* (if students feel more comfortable about some topics in the L1, then they can use it), and *external relevance* (to use both the L1 and the L2 if this helps them to learn specific L2 uses). Moreover, Iswati and Hadimulyono (2018) claim that the L1 use is significant during problem-solving tasks since it will help them to accomplish the tasks successfully. In fact, Bhooth, Azman and Ismail (2014), Swain and Lapkin (2000), Galali and Cinkara (2017) and Tognini and Oliver (2012) also affirm that without the L1 use, the students may not carry out the tasks effectively, or perhaps they are not accomplished at all, so utterances in the L1 in this case are also beneficial for second language learning.

Regarding vocabulary or grammar search, the fact that students convey words' meaning or explain grammatical aspects through the L1 shows that they are providing 'scaffolding' support to understand and build up the L2, which makes it easier for students with lower L2 level. If students do not understand a new word in English and they are given the word's definition also in English they may feel uncomfortable. Even though they learn new grammatical concepts or a new word by its translation they are already learning the L2. Thus, resorting to the L1 will help them to use new English words in the future. Even those authors such as Kim and Petraki (2009), Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011) and Hidayati (2012) who consider a limited use of the L1 is best, agree on using the L1 for "translating new ideas, concepts, and vocabulary terms" (Galali & Cinkara, 2017:55).

5.2. General conclusions

As we have observed in the studies included in the theoretical framework and in our own data, students use the L1 in group work for several purposes: task management, vocabulary and grammar search, and interpersonal interactions in off tasks and disagreements. In addition to this, considering the sociocultural approach, which labels language as a social fact and supports the view that social interaction in group work is fundamental for language learning, the L1 is a beneficial tool for second language learning.

When students interact through the L1 in group work they can define the nature of the task collaboratively, make sense and understand the requirements of the task and to know what they are supposed to do. They can also provide each other with strategies to manage, organize and complete the task successfully, as well as to scaffold each other to understand vocabulary terms and language forms. What is more, without the L1 use, students may not carry out tasks effectively, or perhaps they are not accomplished at all (Bhooth, Azman & Ismail, 2014; Iswati & Hadimulyono, 2018; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Galali & Cinkara, 2017 and Tognini & Oliver, 2012).

Therefore, discouraging first language use in the classroom and in group work could limit the possibilities for second language learning. The L1 should not be prohibited, but neither should it be actively encouraged since it may substitute second language learning rather than support it. The teacher then should be responsible to guide students when they can use the L1 or avoid it.

The conclusions reached at this point let us corroborate that the current study is useful for teachers to have knowledge of L1 contribution to second language learning when addressing group work interaction and guiding L1 use in EFL classrooms. Since L1 use is a reluctance latent for some teachers, and for some others, in contrast, a golden

opportunity to achieve a high L2 proficiency, this study can serve as a support for professional development on second language teaching.

5.3. Data limitations

The period to collect data was supposed to be six weeks but we were interrupted by the Covid-19 pandemic so we had some limitations regarding the amount of time to gather data. We eventually had a two-week period in March 2020 for data collection, resulting in a limited amount of diverse videos. In fact, only three activities were recorded.

Another limitation is that some videos recorded during whole group classes could not be used due to the background noise level. Hence, only the videos from the split classes were selected for data collection.

5.4. Further research

We have seen that students use the L1 for off task interpersonal interaction, for instance to tell jokes or to express personal reflections that are not related to the task itself so as to interact informally with their classmates. Furthermore, we have seen that this L1 use is beneficial to create and maintain group's identity (Galali & Cinkara's, 2017 and Tarone & Swain, 1995). Since students do not have L2 vernacular they use the L1 instead. Nevertheless, is it really beneficial for second language learning if interpersonal interactions are not related to the task itself?

Making use of the L1 in this case may help students to feel more comfortable in the group, and so to accomplish the task successfully. On the contrary, if they feel really comfortable and have a close relationship with the members of the group they may also get distracted and not fulfill the task. For further studies it would be interesting that this specific function of the L1 was analyzed in order to obtain new in-depth conclusions that could complement the current study.

6. References

- Alley, David C. (2005). A study of Spanish II high school students' discourse during group work. *Foreign Language Annals* 38 (2): 250-257.
- Antón, Marta & DiCamilla, Frederick. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 54 (3): 314-342.
- Bhooth, Abdullah & Azman, Hazita & Ismail, Kemboja. (2014). The role of the L1 as a scaffolding tool in the EFL reading classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118: 76-84.
- Borràs, Eulàlia & Moore, Emili. (2019). The plurilingual and multimodal management of participation and subject complexity in university CLIL teamwork. *English Language Teaching* 12 (2): 100-112.
- Cook, Vivian. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57 (3): 402-423.
- Dooly, Melinda. (2018). Collaborative learning. In J.I. Liontas & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1-7). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dooly, M. & O'Dowd, R. (2018). Telecollaboration in the foreign language classroom: A review of its origins and its application to language teaching practices. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd (Eds.), *In this together: Teachers' experiences with transnational, telecollaborative language learning projects* (pp. 11-34). New York/Bern: Peter Lang.
- Galali, Attaa & Cinkara, Emrah. (2017). The Use of L1 in English as a Foreign Language Classes: Insights from Iraqi Tertiary Level Students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 8 (5): 54-64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.5p.54>
- Gass, Susan. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Generalitat de Catalunya. (2015b). Competències bàsiques de l'àmbit lingüístic. Llengües estrangeres. Identificació i desplegament a l'educació secundària obligatòria. Retrieved from <http://ensenyament.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/departament/publicacions/coll·eccions/competencies-basiques/eso/ambit-linguistic-lleng-estr.pdf>
- Hidayati, Istiqlaliah Nurul. (2012). Evaluating the Role of L1 in Teaching Receptive Skills and Grammar in EFL Classes. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1 (2): 17-32.
- Howatt, Anthony P.R. (Anthony Philip Reid). (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Iswati, Luluk & Hadimulyono, Arum Octaviani. (2018). The role of L1 in L2 classes. EduLite. *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture* 3 (2): 125-134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.3.2.125-134>
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Lerner, G. (Eds.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kim, Yuri & Petraki, Eleni. (2009). Students` and teachers` use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly* 11: 58–89.
- Krashen, Stephen. (1985). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Llompart, Júlia & Masats, Dolors & Moore, Emilee & Nussbaum, Luci. (2019). Mézclalo un poquito. In Melinda Dooly & Claudia Vallejo (Eds.), *The evolution of language teaching: Towards plurilingualism and translanguaging*. Special Issue: Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1598934
- Mackey, Alisson. (2012). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: a collection of empirical studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahmoudi, Leila & Amirkhiz, Seyed. (2011). The Use of Persian in the EFL Classroom the Case of English Teaching and Learning at Pre-University Level in Iran. *English Language Teaching* 4 (1): 135-140.
- Moore, E. (2016). Aprendizaje de lenguas e interacción social. In D. Masats & L. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Enseñanza y aprendizaje de las lenguas extranjeras en educación secundaria obligatoria* (pp. 35-58). Madrid: Síntesis.
- Stern, H. H. (Hans Heinrich) & Allen, P. H. (Patrick Heinrich) & Harley, B. H. (Birgit Heinrich). (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, Merrill & Lapkin, Sharon. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language teaching research* 4 (3): 251-274.
- Tarone, Elaine & Swain, Merrill. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal* 79 (2), 166-178.
- Tognini, Rita & Oliver, Rhonda. (2012). L1 use in primary and secondary foreign language classrooms and its contribution to learning. In E. Alcon & M. P. Safont (Eds.), *Language learners' discourse in instructional settings* (pp. 53–78). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Vallejo, Claudia & Dooly, Melinda. (2019). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: emergent approaches and shared concerns. Introduction to the special issue. In Melinda Dooly & Claudia Vallejo (Eds.), *The evolution of language teaching*:

Towards plurilingualism and translanguaging. Special Issue: International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.
DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1600469

Weinreich, Uriel. (1953). *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton

Willis, Jane. (1996). *A framework for task-based language learning*. Harlow: Longman.

7. Appendices

7.1. Transcription conventions

The following symbols are taken from Jeffersonian Transcript Notation:

T	Teacher
T1	Teacher 1
T2	Teacher 2
↑	Rising pitch or intonation
↓	Falling pitch or intonation
:::	Prolongation of a sound
(.)	A brief pause
=text=	Latching
(# of seconds)	Timed Paused
text in bold	Utterances produced in another language that is not English
<i>text in italics</i>	Translations into English
<u>underline</u>	The speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech
XXX	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript
(())	Annotation of non-verbal activity
-	Abrupt halt or interruption in utterance
[]	Start and end points of overlapping speech
°	Whisper, reduced volume, or quiet speech
ALL CAPS	Shouted or increased volume speech
<text>	Speech delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker

7.2. Complete transcripts of video-recorded sequences

Transcript 1 – from minute 0:50 to 5:48 (excerpts 1 and 6)

1. Marta she (.) has[↑] °has°[↑](.) have[↑](.)
2. T she has[↑] what do you want to say[↓](.)
3. Marta **els anys** [↓](.)
the age
4. Marta ah[↓] do you say[↑] I have 24 years old[↑] or what do you say[↓](.)
5. Pol is[↓](.)
6. T yes (.) well done pol[↑](.) You say (.) she is ok[↑]
7. pirula is[↑](.) how old is she[↑](.) 2 years old[↑](.)
8. Mónica emmm (.) one year old[↓](.)
9. Teacher alright[↓](.) so she[↑](.) she has[↑](.)
10. Mónica no[↓](.) I have[↓](.)
11. T eh[↑](.) I have[↑](.)
12. Mónica **sí** [↓](.)
yes
13. Teacher I am[↓](.) ok[↑](.) pol said that she is because you are writing pirula[↓](.)
14. so[↓](3.1) alright[↓] so she is[↓](.)
15. Marta one year old[↑](4.2)
16. and[↑]she loves[↑] eat[↓](.) ((laughs))
17. T she lo::ves[↑](.) something is missing[↓](.) she loves[↑](.)
18. Marta eating[↓](.)
19. T that's it[↓](.)
20. Marta she loves[↑](.) eating[↓](.) ((while writing))
21. T ok[↓](.) let's go for the second member of the family[↓](.)
22. Mónica **la nerea no compta** [↑](.)
doesn't nerea participate
23. Marta nerea[↑]
24. T nerea[↑](.) where are[↑](.) ok[↓](.) you are talking to[↑](.) sorry[↓](.)
25. Marta ok[↓](.) pol[↓] what is your name[↓](.)
vaya frase más difícil para este nombre [↓](.)
such a difficult sentence for this name

26. Mónica pocoyo ↓(.)
27. Pol ((thinking)) **venga** ↓ pocoyo ↓(.)
ok
28. Mónica **vaya familia** ↓ ((laughs))
what a family
29. Marta **vaya familia** ↓ pocoyo ↓(.)
what a family
30. T no ↓ it's original ↓ ok ↓ let's describe pocoyo ↓(.)
31. Mónica is a vampire ↓(.)
32. T a what ↑(.)
33. Marta father ↓ no ↑(.)
34. T father ↑ or the grand ↑
35. Mónica grandma ↓ ai (.) granfa ↓
36. Marta grandfather ↓(.)
37. T alright ↓-
38. Pol is ↑ vale ↓ is pirula's grandfather ↓(.)
39. Marta pirula ↓ ((laughs)) (6.3)
40. °**ah no** (.) **claro** ↓(.) **es verdad** ↓(.) **porque sería** ↑°-
ah no yeah that's right because it would be
41. T but you are four ↓(.) where is (.) the father and the mother ↑(.)
42. Pol [they are dead ↓(.)
43. T who is the father ↓(.)
44. Mónica [the father ↑ dead ↓
45. Pol they are dead]
46. T omg ↓ really ↑(.) ok ↓ it's your family ↓ you decide ↓ (6.8)
47. so ↓ pocoyo ↑(.) is that you pol ↑ yeah ↓(.)
48. Mónica is my [grandfather ↑
49. Pol he is ↑(.) forty] ↓(.)
50. Marta forty ↑(.) **si eres el grandfather** ↑ **cómo vas a tener cuarenta años**
↓(.)
if you are the how can you be forty
no ↓(.) you have ↑
51. Mónica ninety-nine!-

52. T excuse me ↓ did you say you ha::ve ↑(.) you have ↑ or ↑
53. Mónica your ↑
54. T you are ↓
55. Mónica your ↓
56. T you are ↓
57. Pol ninety-nine ↓
58. T he is ↑(.) omg ↓ ninety-nine ↓(.)
59. Mónica **lo he dicho yo** ↓(4.8)
I said it
60. Pol ok ↓(.) and what I like ↑(3.1)
61. Marta **cagar** ↓ ((laughs)) (3.8) **no es verdad** ↓(.) emmm
to shit it's not true
62. Mónica and she loves ↑(.)
63. Marta he ↓[he ↓
64. Mónica bachata ↓
65. Pol he↓]
66. Mónica **què** ↑
what
67. T it's the grandfather ↓(.) It's he ↓(.)
68. Pol he loves ↑(.)
69. Mónica a-and he loves ↑(.) bachata ↓(.)
70. Pol how do you say **cridar** ↑(.)
shouting
71. T [**cridar** ↑ shouting ↓
shouting
72. Marta no ↓ no ↓(.) he loves ↑ he loves] watering plants ↓
73. Pol no ↓ he loves ↓ [shout ↓ shout ↓ shouting to plants ↓
74. Marta watering pla:::nts] ↓(.)
75. Pol shouting to plants ↓(.)
76. T shouting to who ↑(.)
77. Marta **chillar a las plantas** ↓(.)
shouting to plants
78. Mónica **qué** ↑(11.8)

- what*
79. Marta ok ↓ my turn ↓(.) [emmm
 80. T very good ↓ my turn ↓](.)
 81. Marta my name i:::s ↑
 82. Mónica rosalia ↓(.) ((laughs))
 83. Marta no ↓(.) my name is ↑ emmm ((laughs))
 84. Pol miguel quesada ↓(.)
 85. Marta **soy la madre no el padre** ↓(.)
I'm the mother not the father
 86. Pol **una madre también se puede llamar** miguel quesada ↓(.)
a mother can also be called
 87. Marta eemmm (3.7) ay **espérate** ↓(.) bruna ↓(.) ((laughs))
wait
 88. Mónica bruna **muy inglés no suena** ↓ **eh** ↑ **pero** ↑ bruna
it doesn't sound really english but
 89. Marta °es verdad, [vale°
you're right ok
 90. Pol **es que bruna no existe** ↓(.)]
bruna doesn't exist
 91. Marta **no** ↓ **pues** bruna **no** ↓(.) charlie ↓(.)
no so not
 92. Mónica **dónde estás charlie** ↑(.)
where are you charlie
 93. Marta charlie ↑(.) [is ↑
 94. Pol charlie is ↑] **tú eres mi hija** ↓(.)
you are my daughter
 95. Marta **sí** ↓(.) pirula's mother ↓(.)
yes
 96. T so you are ↑ the mother ↓(.) [you are the mother ↓ ok ↓(.)
 97. Marta yes ↓] and **hija cómo es** ↑(.)
what is daughter
 98. T daughter ↓.)

Transcript 2 – from minute 0:00 to 4:55 (excerpts 2 and 5)

1. Manuela =no no no=↑ (.) english names↑
2. Raül juan josé soler↓
3. Jonathan **oye pues jonathan es inglés**↑
jonathan is an english name you know
4. Manuela **no**↑ **però** english names **que és més °graciós°**
but english names because it is funnier
5. Raül **tu tatarabuella era de españa**↓
your great-great-grandmother was from spain
6. Jonathan antonio (1) [pablo]
7. Candela [**e:hm...**] **tu** ((pointing at Raquel with her finger)
e:hm... you
8. Raquel xxx ((denying))
9. Jonathan maria
10. Candela martita ((writes it down))
11. Raquel ((denies))
12. Manuela **no**:↑ **però english names porfi**↑
no: but please english names
13. Raül alex
14. Candela ((staring at Manuela)) no:↑
15. Raül alex (.) [alex]
16. Candela [**alex**↑] ((pointing with her finger at Raquel))
17. Raül xxx ((celebrating enthusiastically))
18. Candela ((pointing again at Raquel, laughing and writing it down)) alex
19. Raül no↑ alex no↑ [no (.) no↑ ((staring at Raquel))
20. Manuela [alexia (.) **de alexandra** ((staring at Raquel))
the shortened version of alexandra
21. Raül **no (.) alex no**↓ (.) **pue:s**
no (.) not alex (.) the:n
22. Manuela ((to Raül)) alex de alexandra
alex, from alexandra
23. Candela alex (.) ia ((smiles at Manuela and raises her eyebrows))
24. Raül °no°

25. Raquel ((looking at what Manuela has on her paper and writing it down on her own))
26. Raúl ((to the teacher)) a typical (.) e:h english name↑ (1) sofia
27. Manuela no ((shaking her head))
28. Raúl sophie
29. T1 sophie: (.) e:h [amy (.) [katie
30. Jonathan [joey [joey
31. Raúl amy ((staring at Raquel))
32. Manuela april ((staring away))
33. Raúl amy
34. Jonathan joey
35. Manuela **jo soc april** ((writing it down))
i am april
36. Raúl **pues april**
april then
37. **pues xxx (.) y tú cómo te llamas↑ (.) joseph↑** ((looking at Jonathan))
then xxx what is your name (.) joseph
38. Manuela **no pero yo soy la hermana xxx↑ (.) i ella es e:h** twenty-three years old ((pointing at Raquel))
but i'm the xxx sister (.) and she is e:h
39. i'm fourteen years old↑ ((pointing at herself))
40. and you're one↓ ((pointing at Raúl and waiting for approval))
(1.5) **sí↓ no↑**
right
41. Candela ((points at Raquel)) your name↑
42. Raquel ((distracted by another teacher))
43. Candela raquel↓ (0.5) your name↓
44. T2 okay (.) you all have to write it down↓ huh↑
45. Candela °okay°
and
Manuela
46. T1 jonathan (.) you too

47. Candela raquel ((hurrying her up))
48. Raquel °xxx°
T1 can you (.) can you speak louder↑
49. Raquel a:h (.) yes (.) let me think
50. **a ver** (1) e:hm...
let me see (1) e:hm...
51. Manuela e:h (.) antonio (.) [e:m (.)
52. Raquel [alexa ((addressing to Candela))
53. Manuela e:h (.) [e:h (.) an o:ld↑ ((lowering her hand at Raquel))
54. Candela alexa ((looking at Raquel and smiling))
55. Manuela alexa (.) alexa ((laughing)) **ponme una canción**
alexa (.) alexa ((laughing)) *play a song*
56. Manuela e:hm ((to the teacher)) a typical (.) old english name↑
57. Candela ((nudges Manuela)) **y yo**↑(.) **de nombre**↑
and me (.) *my name*
58. T1 you can invent it↑ (.) it doesn't matter↑
59. Manuela adolf (.) adolf
60. Candela ((nudging Manuela repeatedly)) **y de nombre**↑
and my name
61. Manuela xxx
62. T1 john
63. Candela alexa (.) [old sister
64. T1 ((to Jonathan, who is walking around)) [jonathan↓
65. jonathan could be english
66. Jonathan =**ya está ya está perdona**=
=okay okay i'm sorry=
67. T1 or jon (.) a diminutive form
68. Manuela ah (.) jon↑ ((writes it down immediately and so does everyone, but Candela))
69. Candela no (.) jon no↑
70. Manuela °**no**↑ (.) **pero en plan de**↑ **xxx**°
°no (.) *but like xxx*°
71. Candela no↑ °**xxx**°

72. Manuela ((whispers to Candela)) °xxx°
73. Candela **no**↑ (.) **déjalo así** ((moves her hand towards Manuela disdainfully)) (1) **está bien**
no (.) *but leave it like that (1) it's fine*
74. Candela **y:**↑ ((banging her fist on the table))
and:↑
75. Manuela ((whispering and smiling)) °xxx°
and
Candela
76. Candela yes (.) yes (.) **con a**
with an a
77. Raül ((interrupts them and slightly touches Candela's photocopy)) **has puesto juan jose soler**↑
did you write juan jose soler
78. Candela juan josé↓
79. Raül soler↓
80. Manuela arianna (0.5) grande ((sticks out her tongue))
81. amy
82. Raquel ((looks at Manuela's photocopy and copies))
83. Candela **cómo se escribe amy**↑
how do you spell amy
83. **amy**↑ ((pronouncing it as it is written))
84. Manuela okay↑ (1) so:
85. Raquel e:h (.) david e:h (.) what age↑
86. Manuela ((writing and dictating)) e:h (.) his (.) her (.) his wife died
87. Raquel ((stares at Manuela, but does not copy))
88. Manuela ((looks at Candela's paper and dictates)) his (.) wife die:d
89. Candela ((echoing and writing)) his (.) wife (.) die:d
90. T2 ((interrupts interaction for a minute to check their homework; meanwhile, Manuela glances at Raquel's and Candela's papers))
91. Candela ((resumes interaction)) his wife died↑ (1) in a ca:r (.) accident↑
92. Manuela e:hm (.) he's so strict↑
93. T1 you don't have to write this thing↓

94. you have to write a description of each member
95. Manuela ((shows slight disappointment when T1r discards her contribution))
96. Candela ((to Manuela)) he's so **qué**↑
what
97. Manuela so strict
98. ((to the teacher)) strict (.) **està ben dit**↑
can we say that
99. T1 street↑ (.) wha-
100. Manuela **bueno (.) estricto (.) com es diu**↑
well (.) strict (.) how do you say that
101. T1 oh (.) yes
102. Raúl ((to the teacher)) **hay que escribir en nuestra hoja también**↑
do we also have to write it down on our paper↑
103. Manuela ((ignoring the conversation between Raúl and T1)) and rich↓
104. T1 yes (.) you have to
105. Jonathan ((expressing disappointment)) **cállate xxx tío** ((to Raúl))
shut up xxx man
106. Candela he <works as a:> (1) manager
107. Manuela no (.) e:hm (1) no (.) e:hm
108. Candela =yes yes= a manager
109. Manuela no (.) e:hm (1) **un abogado**
a lawyer
110. Candela no (.) manager↓
111. Manuela **abogado**↓
lawyer
112. Candela manager↓
113. Manuela lawyer↓
114. Candela a::h (1) ((looking away)) **mitad mitad**↑
half and half
115. Manuela ((scornfully laughing at Candela's suggestion))
116. Candela **dos jobs**↑
two

117. Raül eh (.) candela (1) candela
118. Candela manager like a:n (.) a hobby↑ (.) **y abogado °xxx°**
and lawyer °xxx°
119. Raül candela
120. Candela ((to Raül)) **qué**
what
121. Raül **joseph no se escribe así↓**
you don't spell joseph like that
122. T1 raül↑ (.) you can say that in english↑
123. Raül yes yes (.) english (.) english forever
124. Candela he is a lawyer↑ ((everyone is writing and she looks around))
125. Jonathan **°cómo se llama la: xxx↑°**
what's xxx name
126. Candela <and↑ a mana:ger>
127. Manuela **no tiene sentido eso↑**
that doesn't make sense
128. Candela yes↑
129. Raül ((to Candela)) **e:hm (.) [aparte del nombre qué hay que poner↑**
what do we have to write besides the
name
130. Candela ((to Manuela, ignoring Raül)) **[es como e:n↑ (.) en insaciable↑**
it's like on (.) insatiable
131. Jonathan ((to Raül)) **dónde↑ (0.5) [a ver↑**
where (0.5) let me see
132. Candela **[abogado:**
lawyer
133. Manuela [a::h((approving))
134. Raül **[el nombre y qué hay que poner↑**
name and what else is there to write
135. Candela **[y por la noche es: (.) las dos**
and at night he is: (.) both
136. Jonathan **el nombre de cada uno y e:h (.) el nombre real**
everyone's names and e:h (.) the real names

137. Candela okay (.) juan josé soler
138. Manuela he i:s (.) **cómo se llamaba**↑
how do you say that↑
139. e:h (.) e:h (.) **°jubilado°** (.) e:h (.) retired
140. Candela <retired> ((spelling it in Spanish while writing it))
141. Raül ((to Candela)) **tú** (.) **cómo te llamas** (.) **candela**↑
what is your name↑
142. Jonathan ((to Candela)) **cómo te llamas**↑
what is your name↑
143. Raül candela↑
144. Jonathan candela↑
145. Candela amy↑ (1) amy↓ ((pronouncing it in Spanish))
146. Raül amy↓ ((pronouncing it in English))

Transcript 3 – from minute 0:00 to 2:29 (excerpt 3)

1. T can you discuss together ↑(.) what you:: read about↑
2. Fran he was thirteen ↑(.)
3. he became very famous ↑(.)
4. bu::t ↑(.) at nineteen ↑he started doing drugs ↑(.)
5. he became a toxic person ↑-
6. T can you raise your (.) voice ↑
7. Fran with his relationships ↑(.) and family ↑ and everything ↑(.)
8. Sergi and himself [
9. Fran and] he thought ↑(.) he will never::: li::ke
10. improve ↑ a::nd be a less toxic person ↑
11. but then ↓ he:: get better ↓(.) ((looks at Sergi))
12. Sergi now ↓(.) he is a:: super nice person ↓((raises his thumb and smiles to Fran))
13. Fran yeah ↓(.) ((laughs))
14. T yeah ↓(.) something else ↑(.)
15. Fran **qué opinas** ↓(.)
what do you think?
16. Roger **que sí** ↓(.)

- yes*
17. Fran **vale roger** ↓(.) ((laughs))
ok Roger
18. Roger XXX **no** ↑ **ya está** ↓(.)
isn't it? That's it
19. T what kind of toxic relationship did he have ↓(.)
20. Fran aaahhh (.)
21. Fran toxic relationship with ↓ (2.1) his XXX
22. T who [was:: ↑
23. Sergi ...himself]↓(.) a::nd with his: :(.) relationships ↑ a::nd (.) family ↓
24. T ok ↓(.) so he had a problem with ↑
25. Fran himself ↓(.)
26. T himself ↓(.) mmmm ↑(.)
27. do you understand (.) everything ↑(.)
28. Sergi yes ↓(.)
29. Fran **sí** ↓(.)
yes
30. T any word ↑(.) that you don't understand ↑(.)
31. Roger ah:: no ↓(.) a-abruptly ↓(.)
32. T abruptly ↓(.) ok↓(.) what do you think that is suddenly ↑(.)
unexpectedly ↑(.)
Can you (.) [explain ↑(.)
33. Fran **de repente**] ↓(.)
suddenly
34. Sergi **exacto** ↓(.)
exactly
35. Fran when you don't expect the things ↑(.) is tha:t (.) you don't see them
coming ↓(.)
36. Sergi °**de la noche**° ↓**de la noche a la mañana** ↓(.)
overnight
37. T ok ↑(.)
38. Fran **algo más** ↑(.)

- anything else*
39. Roger **no** ↓(.) **bueno** ((points with his finger another word))
no well
40. Fran **bueno** (.) **pues** ↓(.) **es que son sinónimos** ↓(.)
well so they are synonyms
41. Roger ah **vale** ↓(.)
ok
42. Sergi **y** abruptly **es abruptamente** ↓(.)
and is abruptly
43. T yes ↓(.) these are synonyms ↓(.) ok ↑(.)
44. so ↓(.) if ↓(.) have you ever seen suddenly in a text ↑(.)
45. Roger ((he denies))
46. T no ↑(.) ok ↓(.) suddenly ↑(.) that's what they explained ↓(.)
47. very good ↑(.) sergi: eemm sergi no ↓ sergi and fran ↓(.) ((laughs))
48. Sergi **bueno** sergi **y** sergi. XXX (3.1)
well and
49. T ok ↓(.) anything else that you don't understand ↑(.)
50. Sergi no ↓(.)
51. T you understand everything ↓(.)
52. what about overcome? ↑(.)
53. what does overcome mean ↑(.)
54. Sergi sorry ↓(.) what ↑(.)
55. T overcome ↓(.)
56. Fran get out of this:: ↓(.) ((shrugs his shoulders))
57. Sergi XXX
58. T what (.) sergi ↑ sorry ↑(.)
59. Sergi nono I:: ((he denies)) nothing ↓(.)
60. Fran XXX but like ↑ XXX it saids ↓ overcome this period ↑(.) it is like to
get out of this::
61. Sergi XXX [**yo que sé**
I don't know
62. T very good] ↑(.) yeah ↑(.)
63. so when you have (.) left this ↓(.) behind you ↓(.) yeah ↑(.)

64. you have forgotten about it ↓(.)
65. ok ↓(.) perfect ↓(.) thank you very much ↓(.)

Transcript 4 – from minute 0:25 to 4:38 (excerpt 4)

1. Pere e:h (.) i:f (.) jordi's girlfriend (0.5) doesn't use water↑ (0.5) we will
sa:ve
2. °**cuánto**°↑ ((looks at the photocopy))
how much↑
3. f::: (0.5) fifteen liters (.) °**es que es poquísimo**°
that's barely nothing
4. Jordi ye::s↑
5. Pere **bueno**↑ (.) **pues nada**↑ (.) **más frases**↑ ((to Jordi))
okay ↑ (.) *then*↑ (.) *more sentences*↑
6. Jordi ((smiles at Pere)) e::h
7. Pere if we
8. Jordi eh ((raising his hands trying to draw their attention))
9. if we↑ ((looks at his paper))
10. Pere ((to the camera)) **esto parece una (.) peli**↑ (.) **eh**↑
this is like a film (.) huh
11. Jordi <if we don't> ((raising his hands))
12. Jordi if [we-
13. Pere [((to the camera)) **luego me lo dejas (.) lo edito**↑ (.) **y madre**↑ **mía**
later you share it with me↑ (.) *I edit it*↑ (.) *and you'll see*↑
14. Jordi [((laughs and keeps his hands raised)) if we don't (.) e:h ((moves his
hands as if wiping something))
15. washing the: (.) e:h (.) the di:sh ((stares at Pere))
16. Hugo [dishes
17. Pere [but (.) wh- (.) e:h
18. Jordi **sí**
yes
19. Jordi ((moves his hands as if cutting something up)) **xxx mitad**
xxx half
20. Pere but one ti:me (1.5) °**una vez cada dos días**°

once every two days

21. Jordi ((nods))
22. Pere u:f ((laughs))
23. Jordi ((nods and points at Pere showing mutual understanding))
24. Pere okay↑ (.) okay↑
25. **lo llenamos mucho (.) no↑ (.) el lavavajillas↑**
we fill it frequently (.) the dishwasher (.) right↑
26. Jordi e:hm (.) **y en first o e:n↑**
and using first o:r
27. Pere °ah (.) **es verdad°** ((pointing at Jordi's paper))
true
28. if we:: (.) u:se-
29. T ((to Hugo, who is staring around)) hugo↑ (0.5) what do you think↑ (.)
c'mon↑
30. Hugo nothing↓
31. Jordi ((laugh)) nothing↑
and
Pere
32. Pere ((looks at the paper)) **a ver (.) °=uno dos tres=°**
let's see (.) °=one two three=°
33. **no sé↓ (.) es que son cinco↑ (.) claro↓**
I don't know ↓ (.) we need to have five↑ (.) right↓
34. Jordi if we-↑
35. Pere **podemos también beber menos↑**
we can also drink less
36. Jordi no
37. Hugo =no no no= (.) **eso no (.) tío**
can't do that (.) man
37. Jordi if- if we: (.) e:h (1) [if- if we↑ eh
38. Hugo **falta un xxx↑**
there's xxx missing
39. Pere use
40. Jordi no- eh (.) wash- if we↑ washed the ((waits))

41. Pere the dishes (.) four times a week↑ or three times a week↑
42. Jordi °xxx°
43. Pere **ahora son siete↑ (.) pues cuatro↓**
now we use it seven times (.) so four
44. Jordi °sí↓ (.) **sí cuatro** (.) **no**↑°
°yes (.) yes four (.) right↑°
45. Pere **en el first**↓
using the first one
46. Jordi ((to himself)) °**en el first**°↓
using the first one
47. if we: e:h (.) wash (1) wash or washed↑ ((to Pere))
48. Pere wash↓ (1) **porque es first**↓
because we're using the first one
49. Jordi °wash° (.) the dishes (.) xxx
50. Hugo **cuál escribís**↑
which one are you writing↑
51. Pere qué↑
52. Hugo dishes (.) e:h
53. Pere dishes
54. Jordi wash the dishes
55. Pere e:h (.) four times per week↑
56. Jordi four
57. Pere ((as if dictating and glancing while the others write)) we: (1) we will
u:se↑
58. Jordi e:h °**cómo se dice**°↑
how do you say that↑
59. Pere ha:lf (.) half- what↑
60. T we will u:se
61. Pere we will u:se (.) e:h
62. **cuánto menos**↑ (.) **tres menos**↓ (.) **que son**↑ xxx
how much less↑ (.) three less↓ (.) which are↑ xxx
63. Jordi °xxx°
64. Pere °=**cuánto gasta** (.) **cuánto gasta esto** e:h=°

- °=*how much* (.) *how much does this use*=°
65. ah (.) five liters a day (.) **pues** (.) fifteen liters **menos**↓
then fifteen liters less
66. Jordi **quince menos**↑ (.) **o sea** (.) **lo mismo que mi novia**↑
fifteen less↑ (.) *you mean* (.) *the same as my girlfriend*↑
67. Pere **sí**↓ (.) **lo mismo que tu novia**↓
yes (.) *same as your girlfriend*
68. Jordi **°joder** (.) **macho**°
damn (.) *man*
69. T you have 35 liters here↑
70. Pere yes five- (.) **o sigui** (.) one time↑ [a day
this is to say
71. T [so you want to cut it by half↑
72. Pere yeah↓ (.) mor- more or less
73. T okay
74. Hugo xxx↑
75. Jordi xxx (.) [**qué mierda**
xxx (.) *well shit*
76. Jordi **vale** (.) [e:h if:
okay
77. Pere [we- we wi:ll↑
78. **cómo se dice**↑ (.) hal- (.) **o sea** (.) **reducir a la mitad**↑
how do you say (.) *I mean* (.) *reduce by half*
79. <reduce by half>↑ ((to the teacher)) [right↑
80. Hugo e:h
81. T yes
82. Pere °we wi:ll°↑
83. Jordi e:h
84. Pere reduce↓
85. Jordi e:h we redu:ce↑
86. Pere by half↑
87. Jordi we- (.) =**uy no perdón**=
=oh no sorry=

88. Pere we (.) [will
89. Jordi we [wo- we will↑ (.) [reduce↓
90. T we will reduce it by half↑
91. Jordi °xxx (.) reduced°↑ ((not convinced))
92. Pere by (.) half
93. **qué pobres somos**↑
aren't we poor
94. Jordi ((to Pere)) reduced (.) **con e d**↑
with e d↑
95. Pere reduce ((pronouncing it in the Spanish way))
96. Jordi ah (.) reduce ((pronouncing it in the Spanish way)) (.) **vale**
okay
97. T we will reduce↑ (.) it's not with e d because here you have will↑ (.) so
you need [a:h (.) infinitive↑
98. Jordi a: (.) [**por eso estaba mal**↑
that's why it was wrong
99. Pere **no**↑ (.) **pero es que no va con s**↑
no (.) but you don't need an s
100. Jordi **ah no**↑
101. Pere **no**↑ (0.5) **es re- re- reduce**↑
no (0.5) it's re- re- reduce ((pronouncing it in the Spanish way))
102. Jordi **reduise** (.) **con c**↑
reduise (.) with a c
103. Pere **no** (0.5) **él reduce** (.) **yo reduzco** (.) **él reduce** ((conjugating in
Spanish so as to show how to spell it by the way it is pronounced in
Spanish))
no (0.5) he reduces (.) I reduce (.) he reduces
104. Hugo he: (.) reduced↑
105. Jordi a: (.) °e c°↑
106. Pere ((smiling)) no↑
107. Jordi **no sé cómo se escribe**↑ (.) °=**perdona tío**=°↑
I don't know how to spell it (.) °=sorry man=°
108. T R E D U (.) R E D U C E

109. Pere U ((pronouncing it in English))
110. Jordi ((to Pere)) u ((pronouncing it in Spanish)) (.) [no↑
111. T yeah [C
112. Pere [=ese ese= (.) **está bien**
fine
113. T no (.) [C
114. Pere [no (.) C
115. T it's C and E (.) very good ↑
116. Pere E E E ((drawing repeatedly an e with his hand in the air))
117. Jordi **me xxx la i y la e**↓
the letter i and e xxx me
118. T and ((laugh))
Pere
119. Jordi **es que hoy↑ estoy con las mates↑ (.) vale↑ (.) a mí no me xxx**
today↑ I'm thinking about math (.) okay ↑ (.) so don't xxx me
120. Pere °xxx° e:hm (.) **bueno**↓
okay
121. T alright↑ (.) let's continue↑ (0.5) how many sentences have you got↑
122. Pere e:hm
123. Jordi e:h (.) **cómo ha dicho↑ (.) e:h (.) ha:lf↑ (.) e:h (.) ha::lf** °xxx° ((to Pere))
how was that↑
124. Hugo **tene:mo::s↑ [°un montón°**
we ha:::ve [°a lot°
125. Pere [we- we will [reduce it (.) by- by half
126. T [reduce it
127. Jordi by half
128. Pere ((to Jordi)) **lo reduciremos a la mitad↑ (0.5) el gasto**↓
we will reduce it by half (0.5) the use
129. T did you write water (.) for example↑
130. Pere e:h (.) wash-
131. T if we wash the dishes↑

132. Pere four times a week↑ (.) we will reduce it by half↑ (0.5) reduce the washing the dishes↑ (.) wash (.) bu- (.) [wa- eh
133. T we will reduce water↑ (.) by half↓ (.) okay↑
134. Hugo **poco**↑ (.) **no**↑
little (.) right
135. T because you're not talking about the water (.) you must (.) mention the water
136. Jordi ((to himself while writing)) <it (.) [by (.) half>
137. Pere [e:h ((to Jordi)) your girlfriend (0.5) **ya hemos llegado**
we got there
138. Jordi ((laughs))
139. Hugo **no viene nunca**↑ (.) **ya está**↑
she never comes (.) end
140. Pere a:hm
141. Jordi **la echo de casa o qué**↑
shall I kick her out of the house or what
142. Hugo =**sí sí sí**=
=yes yes yes=
143. Pere **no tío**↑ (.) **la dejas**↓
no man (.) you break up with her
144. Hugo **si no** [xxx]↑
if not xxx
145. Pere [**porque bebe mucho**
because she drinks a lot

7.3. Video recordings

Video from transcript 1

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1F7gPFWma6UM05eNi2zFZv3JUHEz3v5xq/view?usp=sharing>

Video from transcript 2

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FRAYQgaG5sj8Dvt5vcUZKTF7KcMjZkPe/view?usp=sharing>

Video from transcript 3

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1F_aeKfnxOubJtZwZ6uGjL6YnczHJB5-B/view?usp=sharing

Video from transcript 4

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FZfHqf8nbrk3dHj6xChXQyz3qiXHcdj0/view?usp=sharing>

