~~The Development of Interactional Competence through Listening Materials in Spanish as a Foreign Language Textbooks: Focus on Repair Work~~

An analysis of repair practices on L2 Spanish listening comprehension materials with implications for teaching interactional competence

Abstract

Listening materials are commonly developed so students show their understanding about a specific oral discourse. In many of these listening materials, students face interactions between speakers. Through the lens of authenticity, they can be understood in terms of Interactional Competence. Oral interactions provided in textbooks are resources in which different interactional practices are involved, repair practices being one of these. With the aim to determine to what extent Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL) listening practices can be understood as appropriate resources to show examples of repair work and develop the students' Interactional Competence (IC) regarding this specific interactional practice, ~~deepen into the possibilities to develop Interactional Competence through textbook materials~~, this article seeks to explore the types of ~~interactional~~ repair practices ~~developed~~ found in SFL listening interactions in textbooks and the relationship between repairs and other characte ristics of the interactions. ~~With this purpose,~~ Following a Conversation Analysis perspective, 109 repairs in 504 SFL audiotaped listening materials are analyzed. The results show that repairs are not a common ~~resource~~ practice in listening materials, other-initiated self-repairs being the most common type of repair work instead. A disparity is also observed in establishing repair through the listening materials depending on the textbook. Some of them include self-repairs together with other interactional features, such as overlapped turns, articulated pauses or response tokens, while other textbooks rarely present any repair work. The findings improve our understanding of how listening materials can be understood in terms of authenticity so students might develop their IC.

1. Introduction

The variety of types of discourse that textbooks provide is immense, including listening materials representing oral interactions. Through the lens of Communicative Language Teaching, listening practices are seen in terms of authenticity (Widdowson 1978; Cook 1981; Breen 1985; van Lier 1996; Pinner 2016; van Compernolle and McGregor 2016) so, according to many scholars (e.g. Martín Peris 2007), they should properly reflect the features of authentic oral language.

If listening materials are to sound as authentic as possible, they should contain the interactional ~~resources~~ practices present when we talk with each other in our everyday life, thus exemplifying what Interactional Competence (IC) is. Textbooks, then, may provide examples of interactions that can be used to show how interaction works and what resources come into play when we talk to each other so ICcan be exploited in the classroom (Waring 2018, 64). One way to achieve this is to understand listening practices as a kind of discourse that shows students the interactional repertoires that they have to master to participate properly in target-language interactions.

Previous work on IC (e.g. He and Young 1998; Kasper 2006; Hall 2018; Waring 2018; Salaberry and Kunitz 2019) has established the necessity to transcend the notion of competence and focus the attention on the interactional practices or interactional repertoires that bring IC to fruition. One such interactional practice is repair (Kasper 2006), one of the most studied and meaningful actions developed in interaction. Repair, that is, the process by which speakers deal with a problem of hearing, speaking or understanding (Schegloff, Sacks, and Jefferson 1977; Hayashi,

Raymond, and Sidnell 2013), becomes an important interactional practice that needs to be properly managed by foreign language students as a way to show IC.

With the aim to determine to what extent SFL listening practices can be understood as appropriate resources to show examples of repair work and, therefore, help to develop the students' IC regarding this specific interactional practice develop new possibilities for IC development, this paper aims seeks to analyze a range of listening practices located in Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL) textbooks with regard to the samples of repair work they provide. More specifically, our focus lies on establishing what types of repair practices are found in SFL audiotaped listening materials and what is the relationship between repair work and other interactional practices. The study seeks to determine to what extent SFL listening practices can be understood as appropriate resources to show examples of repair work and, therefore, develop the students' IC regarding this specific interactional practice. A Conversation Analysis (CA) perspectiveis used here to analyze and discover the members' methods displayed in textbook listening materials interactions. CA concepts and methods have been applied to SLA studies (Markee and Kasper 2004) to analyze classroom interaction (Seedhouse 2004; Sert 2015), and to L2 teaching and pedagogy (Wong and Waring 2010), respectively, including teaching materials (Wong 2002). This approach allows us to discover how the interactional engine underpinning teaching materials interactions enables the establishment of a framework to assess these interactions through the lens of authenticity. Analysis of repairs as a specific interactional practice involved in interaction, allows us to determine to what extent listening materials interactions can work as good resources to develop specific pedagogical actions for the students Interactional Competence.

2. Listening Materials as Authentic Materials

Listening materials are among the most common to develop activities in foreign language learning (Underwood 1989; Field 2009; Martín Leralta 2018). Listening practices offer the students the possibility to listen and understand a large range of oral discourses such as interviews, service encounter interactions, radio shows, and everyday conversations, among many others. From the first generation of scholars that systematized what the communicative approach is, listening materials have been understood as texts that should be realistic and genuine (Widdowson 1978; see Mishan 2004). Following Widdowson, listening practices have to be designed so they reflect what target-language speakers do in their lives in talk-in-interaction. However, this does not mean that authentic texts, that is, texts that are not 'specifically produced for the purpose of language teaching' (Nunan 1989, 54) and come from 'the world beyond the classroom', should be used without any restriction.

Although materials developers consider that the learners should be exposed to language in authentic use (see Tomlinson 2011, 13-14), authenticity in textbook materials has been widely debated (see Porter and Roberts 1981; Rings 1986; Flowerdew and Miller 1997; Guariento and Morley 2001; Mishan 2004; Pinner 2016, among others). Authenticity is a multi-dimensional concept that "have important implications for L2 materials design and language classrooms" (Gilmore 2019, 300) related with language produced by native speakers, For our purpose, we understand authenticity as the qualities bestowed on a text that identify it as discourse produced by native speakers (see Gilmore 2019 for a review of the different approaches to the meaning of authenticity).

Mainly, the discussion, still unresolved, focuses on the extent to which listening practices can be 'real'. Following Cooper (1983), van Compernolle and McGregor (2016) differentiate between

authenticity of genesis and authenticity of correspondence. By authenticity of genesis, we understand all discourse that is produced in all reality, that is, every action in the classroom provokes the usage of a specific kind of discourse that is authentic because it is real, i.e., it has been produced in a specific reality. However, by authenticity of correspondence we mean the authenticity that compares a specific kind of discourse with the same kind of discourse if this were produced in a non-institutional context. Listening practices, in this sense, could be taken into account as samples of contrived data (Su and Tao 2018) that have the aim to come closer to the reality of non-pedagogic communication. For this reason, listening texts have been categorized as *realia* (Porter and Roberts 1981) and as examples of authenticity of correspondence.

Studies of the analysis of the interactions in listening practices show that they appear modified to make them more comprehensible[1] (Gilmore 2007). Interactions do not tend to show a canonic characterization because, in some cases, they do not have openings and closings, a common interactional infrastructure, or common features in the construction of turns and turn taking, such as overlaps, false starts, pauses, or incomplete utterances, among others. However, some criticisms about the authenticity of listening documents point out that noise, hesitations, repetitions or overlappings could disturb the work of the students, focused on understanding and interpreting the texts. Nevertheless, 'real world' materials, that is, materials drawn from a non-pedagogical context, have increasingly been recognized as being beneficial for language learning (e.g. Gilmore 2007, 2011; Mishan 2004; Pinner 2013; Tao 2005; Webb 2010; Zyzik and Polio 2017). Still, some listening materials lack desirable features to establish full authenticity of correspondence, features that are considered interactional practices or interactional repertoires.

---

[1] However, some authors have been considered this idea as a myth (Zyzik and Polio 2017).

3. 3.Teaching Materials and the Development of Interactional Competence ~~The Development of Interactional Competence in Foreign Language Learning~~

IC (Kramsch 1986; He and Young 1998; Young 2008; Hall, Hellermann, and Pekarek-Doehler 2011; Eskildsen 2018; Hall 1995, 2018; Pekarek-Doehler 2018; Pekarek-Doehler and Berger 2015; Waring 2018, Salaberry and Kunitz 2019; among others; see Skogmyr Marian and Balaman 2018, for an overview) is understood as 'the context-specific constellations of expectations and dispositions about our social worlds that we draw on to navigate our way through our interactions with others' (Hall and Pekarek-Doehler 2011, 1-2). IC focuses the attention on the understanding of the elements that allow speakers to create, develop and maintain interactions between them. However, as a construct, IC has to be an attainment in interaction. This is why Pekarek-Doehler (2018, 5) describes IC as procedures or 'methods' that speakers use systematically for organizing social interaction. IC poses a usage-based perspective interested in the models, methods and procedures drawn from social interaction locally and contingently established.

~~Due to the fact that everybody has a basic interactional competence (Kecskes, Sanders, and Pomerantz 2018) in their native(s) language(s), the capacity to interact with others is conformed at the pre-linguistic stage (Eskildsen 2018), when L2 learners are not going to develop their IC, but to take advantage of the possibilities offered in social environments to develop IC in the language they are learning. However, the capacity to maintain interactions may not be exactly the same in a language that a speaker does not master because the ability to maintain and develop interactions in an L1 is not simply transferred to the L2 usage (Pekarek-Doehler and Berger 2015, 235). Instead, the IC is recalibrated through a process of adaptation to the L2 usage~~

~~development. In this sense, teaching practices could facilitate IC development in L2 (Waring 2018).~~

~~The procedures involved in interactional practices have been summarized in a variety of ways (e.g. Kasper 2006; Barraja-Rohan 2011; Hall and Pekarek Doehler 2011; Pekarek-Doehler and Berger 2015) but all authors agree on establishing a classification based on concrete aspects of the interactional level such as turn-taking, sequence organization, repair practices and preference organization. These aspects can be considered interactional repertoires (Markee 2008; Hall 2018), semiotic systems that underlie all talk-in-interaction, or interactional practices (Wong and Waring 2010; Waring 2018).~~

The movement from competence to practice (Wong and Waring 2010; Waring 2018) can be achieved thanks to pedagogical actions that imply a development. These actions, according to Waring (2018), can be quite discouraging because interactional practices are locally contingent. However, with the aim to promote IC learning activities, Wong and Waring (2010) and Barraja-Rohan (2011) laid out a model of activities for the development of interactional practices such as turn-taking, sequence organization, the overall structure of interaction and repair work. These are developed through activities that provide the students with the interactional resources needed to handle their own interactional practices so FL students can know and reflect upon the characteristics of the interaction in a first awareness phase. The results of teaching conversation by applying specific work on different interactional resources has proven that students successfully become more effective conversationalists (Barraja-Rohan 2011).

The pedagogical actions exposed before, that is, the activities to deal with the development of Interactional Competence in classroom, have been developed, mainly, by researchers interested in IC, through a model based on reflection about how interactions are managed by speakers, but

not through the use of textbook listening materials[2]. English as a foreign language textbooks have adopted some certain IC repertoires, such as greetings, opening and closing interactions, reactive tokens or backchanneling in storytelling, but no reflection about how interaction works can be found in them (Gilmore 2015). Traditionally, textbooks have provided interactions quite different form the common language use (Wong 2002; Gilmore 2004). Additionally, false starts, repair work, pauses, hesitations and overlapping talk can hardly be found in dialogues with the aim to, supposedly, facilitate listening comprehension (Gilmore 2007). Indeed, Yeh (2018) states that response tokens rarely appear in textbook materials and, for this reason, she advocates the use of naturally occurring interactions, that is, authenticity of genesis materials, to develop response tokens usage. In the same vein, studies such as those by Tao (2005) or Su and Tao (2018) are in favour of using authentic materials (from an authenticity of genesis point of view), asserting that Chinese as a FL textbooks hardly ever reach high degrees of authenticity, if any (see Rings 1986). van Compernolle (2011, 133-134) indicates that models of spoken interaction render perfect interactions, without troubles that could provoke repair work. In consequence, textbooks do not offer examples of repair, although is a fundamental resource in talk in interaction.

With the aim to deepen into the possibilities to develop IC through textbook materials, this article seeks to explore how interactional practices are developed in SFL textbook listening

---

[2] It should be noted that, during the late 80's and the 90', some materials were published with the aim to take conversation to the centre of the stage. Textbooks as *Conversation* (Nolasco and Arthur 1987), *Conversation and dialogues in action* (Dörnyei and Thurrell 1992), *Exploring Spoken English* (Carter and McCarthy 1997) or *Beyond talk* (Barraja-Rohan and Pritchard 1997) treat interactional aspects such as backchanneling, how to formulate preferred and dispreferred questions, or how to project a turn for the recipient to complete.

interactions. Specifically, our focus will be on repair work (Schegloff et al. 1977; Hayashi, Raymond, and Sidnell 2013), an interactional practice whose usage is decisive to characterize IC (Kasper 2006; Barraja-Rohan 2011; Balaman 2016; Hellermann 2009, 2011; Sert and Balaman 2018; Waring 2018, among others). Repair is the mechanism by which speakers solve problems in talk in interaction. As the way to deal with problems in hearing, listening or understanding, repair is a mechanism with which speakers maintain intersubjectivity and progressivity in interaction. Our focus of research delves into the presence and development of repair work during the interactions. For that purpose, we are going to answer the following research questions: What kind of repairs are found in SFL listening materials? What is the relationship between the repair work and the rest of characteristics of the interaction?

4. Data and Method

The data come from 18 SFL textbooks produced by four different publishing houses (see Table 1). Three of the ~~methods~~ courses are composed of four textbooks, whereas the other one is composed of six textbooks. All the ~~methods~~ courses almost reach the B2 level on the CEFRL scale (2001) and are focused on general Spanish rather than on Spanish for specific purposes. Moreover, they are some of the latest textbooks published and all of them follow a communicative approach. The choice of textbooks meets a willingness to study the most representative Spanish for general purposes textbooks of some of the currently most ⌷ All the textbooks subject of study are from pioneering publishing houses and widely used in the SFL

teaching sphere. [OBJ] We decided to analyze all kinds of interactions established in [OBJ] [3] [OBJ] [OBJ] rom a simple adjacency pair to a radio interview, to have a broader landscape.

[Table 1 here]

In order to know in depth how repairs are carried out in SFL listening materials, the analysis will take into account the types of repairs specified by Schegloff et al. (1977). In their seminal paper, Schegloff et al. (1977) establish four different types of repair, depending on who marks the problem and who solves it: self-initiated self-repairs (SISR), other-initiated self-repairs (OISR), self-initiated other-repairs (SIOR) and other-initiated other-repairs (OIOR).

SISR, the most preferred type of repair in talk in interaction, takes place when the repair work is carried out by the speaker who produces the trouble source. Commonly, this kind of repair is established in the same turn as soon as possible. In (1), Vic initiates repair by a cut-off, which marks that what is being said is problematic, and substitutes the word 'man' with the term 'husbin':

(1) (Schegloff et al. 1977, 364)

```
   1.  Vic   En- it nevuh happen. Now I could of wen' up there

   2.        an' told the parents myself but then the ma- the

   3.        husbin' liable tuh come t' d' doh...
```

On the other hand, SIOR is carried out when the speaker who establishes the trouble source asks for help to the recipient to carry out the repair work. In (2) SIOR is initiated by the speaker and

---

[3] A previous anaysis of the textbooks showed that repair are hardly to be found in other textbooks components. Given the scarcity of this phenomenon thrughout the textboolsas we decided to focus on listening materials as the only component where interactions show some kind of repair work, although this interactional practice is neither taken into account for pedagogical purposes.

completed by the recipient. In this case, the speaker shows difficulty in saying the name of the person and the recipient performs the repair providing the complete name.

(2) (Schegloff et al. 1977, 364)

```
1. B.       He had dis uh Mistuh W- whatever k- I can't think of

2.          his first name, Watts on, the one thet wrote

3. A.       Dan Watts
```

OISR, conversely, is a type of repair characterized by the recipient indicating some aspect of the speaker's turn as a trouble source. Subsequently, the speaker establishes the repair work. This kind of repair is characterized by a second turn with which the recipient focuses the repair work in some aspect of the prior turn, giving to the speaker the possibility to solve the problem. In (3), Maggie does not hear properly the name in the former turn and initiates a repair sequence to the speaker repeats the trouble source.

(3) (Schegloff et al. 1977, 368)

```
1. Bea:    Was last night the first time you met Missiz Kelly?
2.         (1.0)
3. Maggie: Met whom?
4. Bea:    Missiz Kelly
5. Maggie: Yes
```

Finally, OIOR is carried out by the recipient, who marks some aspect of the speaker's turn as a trouble source. This type of repair is the less preferred in naturally occurring talk in interaction, but very common in the pedagogical context (Schegloff et al. 1977). In (4), Ben is repairing Bill's turn by substituting the trouble source by the correct word.

(4) (Schegloff et al. 1977, 378)

```
1. Ben:    Lissena pigeons
2.         (0.7)
3. Ellen:  [Coo-coo::: coo:::
4. Bill:   [Quail, I think.
5. Ben:    Oh yeh?
6.         (1.5)
7. Ben:    No that's not quail, that's a pigeon
```

This study adopts a twofold perspective. On the one hand, we follow a teaching materials analysis (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013) to understand how listening materials are designed and unfold the repair work. Next, we adopt a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective (Sidnell and Stivers 2012) to describe and uncover members' methods in a line-by-line and turn-by-turn analysis, enabling a representation of the interactions as detailed as possible. Although CA is focused mainly on naturally occurring interaction, as listening materials can be considered as realia, this study understands listening materials as naturally occurring interaction. The fact that listening materials try to represent the reality of people's talk in interaction allows us to handle them as if they were generated in a natural setting. Therefore, it can be considered that CA permits to investigate the emergence of locally contingent repair practices in such materials. The data are transcribed following CA transcription conventions (Jefferson 2004; Hepburn and Bolden 2017) with an idiomatic English translation.

5. Results

To know in depth how repairs are carried out in SFL listening materials, the analysis is twofold. Following the types of repairs specified by Schegloff et al. (1977), the number of cases of each kind of repair will be specified. Depending on who marks the problem and who solves it, Schegloff et al. (1977) establish four different types of repair: self-initiated self-repairs (SISR), other-initiated self-repairs (OISR), self-initiated other-repairs (SIOR) and other-initiated other-repairs (OIOR). Thereupon, different examples of repairs will be analyzed, taking into account the characteristics of textbook interactions.

5.1 Repair Work in SFL Textbooks

Regarding the kind of repairs included in listening materials textbooks, a total of 109 repair practices are found in 504 different listening materials (see Table 2). If we focus on the distribution of the different repairs regarding the ~~methods~~ courses, the first thing that stands out is that the overwhelming majority of repairs is concentrated in two of the four textbook collections. A clear difference between *Nuevo Español en Marcha* and *Embarque*, on the one hand, and *Aula* and *En acción*, on the other hand, is evident. The first two ~~methods~~ courses have a great lack of repair work in their listening materials. In *Nuevo español en Marcha* only 7 repairs are found, whereas in *Embarque* there is no repair work. In contrast, the other two ~~methods~~ courses, *Aula* and *En acción*, capture the overwhelming majority of the repairs: 102 of the 109 repairs are found in these two ~~methods~~ courses: 58 in *Aula*, while *En acción* has 44.

[Table 2 here]

It is worth noticing that both in *Aula* and in *En Acción* other-initiated repairs are more common (n=31 in *Aula*; n=35 in *En Acción*) than self-initiated repairs. However, *En Acción* does not provide any kind of SISR, whereas *Aula* is the only ~~method~~ course where this kind of repair is the most recurrent in its listening interaction materials (k=24). These results show that textbooks do not

maintain the preference for SISR, common in naturally occurring talk-in-interaction (Schegloff et al., 1977). The number of SISRs ~~repairs~~ in *Aula* is sl as they are almost 40 per cent of the repairs found in this ~~method~~ course. In contrast, SIORs are the least common kind of repair (n=3 in *Aula*; n=9 in *En Acción*).

5.2 Specificities of Repair Work in Textbook Listening Materials

In this section, some examples of the repair work found are analyzed. The examples aim to show the overall characteristics that repair maintains in the courses analyzed. The findings exposed in Table 2 show some information about using listening interactions to develop students ability to repair. *Embarque* listening materials do not offer any repair work. Listening materials in this ~~method~~ course maintain a specific characterization, very close to what Gilmore (2004, 2007) stated: there is a lack of discursive and interactional resources such as repetitions, false starts, overlapped turns or pauses. Extract 1 exemplifies this characterization. It shows an interaction between two women in which one of them explains to the other what her holidays will be like.

```
Extract 1
```
***Embarque 1.* Student's book. Track 18.**

```
01.  S1  hola Elisa (.) qué tal?
         hi, Elisa, how are you?


02.  S2: ↑hola (0.8) muy bien (0.6) ya estoy de vacaciones
         hi, very well I'm already on holidays.


03.  S1  qué: bien (0.5) dónde vas este año?
         great! Where are you going this year?
```

04. S2 este año (.) unos amigos y yo hacemos un crucero
         this year, some friends and me are going on a cruise

05.   por el Mediter<u>rá</u>neo (.) vamos en un barco ↑<u>muy</u>
         through the Mediterranean sea, we are going in a very

06.   <u>gra:nde</u>
            big boat

07. S1 <u>qué divertido</u> (0.5) hacéis escalas?
         that's cool! Do you have any stop over?

08. S2 sí <u>claro</u> (.) el barco sale de ↑Barcelona y hace la
         yes of course. The boat departs from Barcelona and

09.   primera ↑es<u>ca</u>la (.) en Valencia (1.0) allí hay
         stops over in Valencia first. There are

10.   muchos lugares interesantes (0.6) la ciudad de las
         many interesting places: the city of

11.   artes y las ciencias (.) el hemisfèric (.) la
         arts and sciences, the hemispheric, *the*

12.   catedral (.) la playa de la Malvarrosa (.)
            cathedral, the Malvarrosa *beach*

13.   et<u>cé</u>tera
         and so on.

14. S1 dónde termina el crucero?

where does the cruise end?

15. S2 después de visitar ↑Valencia vamos a Málaga (.) y

after visiting Valencia, we are going to Malaga and

16.   desde allí vamos en ↑autobús (.) a ↓Granada (1.0)

from there, we are going to Granada by bus

17.   en Granada estamos dos días (.) y visitamos la

we are staying in Granada for two days and we are going to visit the

18.   ciudad (0.8) <u>oye</u> qué haces tú en vacaciones?

city. hey, what are you doing on holidays?

19. S1 pues yo este año no tengo vacaciones

I don't have any holidays this year

20. S2 ↓vaya

oh, dear…

This extract shows broadly the characteristics of the interactions in *Embarque*, similar to those in *Nuevo Español en Marcha*. The lack of procedures such as overlapped talk, pauses, hesitations and, of course, repair practices are shown in the transcription; there is even a lack of not projected answers, so <u>ya estoy</u> de vacaciones (line 2) may project an expression of surprise like 'ah, ¿sí?' *('ah, yes?')* before assessing the information positively with <u>qué: bien</u> (0.5) (line

3). There is no reason to value as funny the information provided in the former turn (line 7). In consequence, we observe that, in this extract, the progressivity and projectability in interaction are problematic, as it moves away from a possible authenticity of correspondence. The same happens between lines 14 and 15. The response the speaker is giving to the question is too elaborated and is not projected by the question. H1 is asking about the place the cruise finishes at (line 14). The answer given is not projected by the former turn, so H2 explains the route with too much information, instead of answering the question straightforward (`después de visitar ↑Valencia vamos a Málaga (.)`, line 15).

Extract 1 has another uncommon characteristic in naturally occurring interactions: the turns are formed with complete utterances. Utterances are built with too much information, violating Grice's maxims of quantity and manner. It seems that the discourse is focused on saying the information that the students must recognize to do the activity. Problems with the projectability and the progressivity of interactions are uncommon in *Embarque* and *Nuevo Español en Marcha* interactions. However, the absence of response tokens (or backchannel), interruptions, overlaps, and repair work is common in thes listening audiosse of these textbooks. We have seen that all utterances are constructed with all the elements explicitly exposed, without any element which could interrupt or disrupt the listening of the whole utterances. In consequence, repairs are characterized as elements which interrupt the "correct" construction of the utterance and are disturbing for the proper listening of the discourse on behalf of the students. Neither self-repairs, as the preferred type of repair in naturally occurring interaction (Schegloff et al. 1977), nor other-repairs are found in *Embarque* or *Español en Marcha*, except in a few cases.

In contrast, *Aula* and *En acción* include interactions constructed with specific repair work. One example is seen in extract 2 below from *En Acción*, which represents an interaction between a

SFL student (S2) who just arrived at a school and the secretary (S1) of this school. This interaction is common in the first units in the basic level, so we can find them in three of the four books.

Extract 2

En acción 1. Student's book. Track 8.

01. S1 a ver no te preocupes yo lo escribo por ti cómo te

        well, don't worry, I'll write it for you. What's your

02.   llamas?

           name?

03. S2 Chiara

04. S1 Clara?

05. S2 no ↓no es italiano (.) Chiara

          no, no, it's Italian, Chiara.

06. S1 cómo se escribe?

          how do you spell it?

07. S2 ce hache i a erre a (0.5) Chiara

          cee aitch ei ay ar ay. Chiara

08. S1 mhm (.) y de apellido?

          mhm. And your surname?

09. S2 Bambrilla (.) lo deletreo (0.3) be a eme be erre i ele
         Bambrilla. I'll spell it. Bee ay em bee ar ei el

10.   ele a
         el ay

11. S1 y tu segundo apellido?
         and your second surname?

12. S2 no tengo (.) en Italia no tenemos
         I don't have one. We don't have that in Italy.

13. S1 ah vale h. y de dónde eres (.) italiana verdad?
         ah, ok. And where are you from? Italian, right?

14. S2 sí
         yes

15. S1 cuántos años tienes?
         how old are you?

16. S2 veiteicuatro
         twenty-four

17. S1 vale (.) y dónde vives?
         ok. And where do you live?

18. S2 en Nápoles
         in Naples

19. S1   >no no< ahora (.) en Valencia
         no, no, now, in Valencia

20. S2   ah (.) aquí (.) en Valencia en la calle Azorín número
         ah, here, in Valencia in Azorin street, number

21.   cuarenta y cinco segundo be
         forty five second floor door b

22. S1   cuarenta y cinco segundo be muy bien (0.3) cuál es tu
         forty five second floor door b, right. What is your

23.   teléfono Chiara?
         telephone number, Chiara?

24. S2   seis (.) cincuenta y tres veintiuno treinta y nueve
         six fifty-three twenty-one thirty-nine

25.   sesenta y ocho (0.3) es un móvil
         sixty-eight it's a cellphone

26. S1   sesenta y ocho?
         sixty-eight?

27. S2   sí (.) seis ocho
         yes, sixty-eight

In extract 2, an other-initiated repair is carried out when the secretary is looking for clarification about what she thinks she listened. The secretary expresses with rising intonation the name she thinks the recipient has said. The trouble source, then, is on the student's name, who is in charge of confirming or correcting the trouble source. Further on, a second repair is found (lines 11-13). In that case, the student is correcting the secretary, specifying that the information provided in her question is not appropriate. The problem lies on the fact that in Italy people have only one surname. The other-repair provokes a change of state token (Heritage 1984) by the secretary (line 13). Similarly, another other-repair is observed when the secretary appreciates that the student did not understand her question properly (lines 18-20): she wanted to know the student's address in Spain, not in her original city. Finally, we can observe a fourth repair in this extract when the secretary is soliciting a corroboration to the student to ensure that she listened to the information well (lines 25-27).

Four repairs have been found only in one interaction. Without going deeply into the distribution of repairs throughout the different levels, we can perceive that there is a tendency to show some specific repair work during the first unit at A1 level. Most of these questions are pedagogical repairs (van Lier 1996) included in the interactions at the A1 level to give the students tools to solve problems in the classroom. Therefore, the aim is not only to develop their IC, but also to build up their Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh 2011), that is, these repair practices are understood as interactional practices that comes into play specifically in pedagogical situations. Listening materials, then, considers the listeners as students rather than as speakers. Although listening materials in *En Acción* are constructed with projected turns and fulfill all the Gricean maxims, they are created with completed turns without hesitations, pauses, overlaps or response tokens. That is not the case of *Aula*. In extract 3, we see an interaction where a speaker

(S1) is asking Antonio (S2) how he celebrates a family lunch, as for example the Christmas lunch.

Extract 3

Aula 2. **Track 28.**

```
01.  S1  oye Antonio có:mo cómo es una comida familiar
         listen Antonio, how is a family lunch


02.      normalmente en tu casa (0.4) un día festivo así como:
         commonly at your home, a holiday just as


03.      (.) como en Navidad por ejemplo
         as at Christmas, for example


04.  S2  pues bueno (.) e:h en Navidad s- se come mucho: (.) se:
         well, eh, in Christmas, we eat a lot


05.      bebe se canta: (.) se baila se hace de todo (0.3) e::h
         we drink, we sing, we dance, we do a bit of everything, eh...


06.      >pero bueno en Navidad< ((chasquido)) también hacemos
         but well, in Christmas ((click)) we also have


07.      (.) eh comidas familiares en- en verano >también es muy
         family lunches in, in summer, is also very


08.      típico< °v[ale?°
         common ok?
```

09. S1.   mh[m (.) al aire libre?
                  mhm, outdoors?

10. S2 sí porque:: (.) e:h hay un patio muy gra- mis padres
         yes because eh there is a backyard very bi- my parents

11.   tienen un patio muy- muy grande (.) entonces suele
         have a very big backyard , then my family usually

12.   venir mi familia (0.4) nos reunimos todos y: y bueno
         come. We meet together and, well,

13.   pues (.) tenemos como un pequeño (0.3) como protocolo
         so, we have like a little, sort of a protocol

14.   no? que: primero se saca el aperitivo (.) e:h después
         right? first we eat the starters and then

15.   comemos (.) y:: >y bueno< después tomamos el postre y:-
              we eat lunch, and well, then we take a dessert and

16.   y después del postre se- se toma algo (.) depende de:l-
         and after the dessert we drink something, depending on

17.   del calor que hace
         how hot it is

18. S1 mhm (1.0) y qué coméis normalmente?

mhm, and what do you eat commonly?

19. S2 pues mira al principio: e::h (.) ponemos- el- el
         well, firstly, eh we have the

20.   aperitivo es como embutido:s (.) algunas aceituna:s (.)
         starters, it is like cold meat, some olives

21.   un poco de patatas chips (0.3) mientras esperamos la
         some crisps, while we wait for the

22.   comida
         rest of the meal

In extract 3, the listening material is composed by many interactional features, such as false starts, hesitations, interruptions or pauses. For example, a false start of the question entails Antonio's explanation (line 1). Thereupon, Antonio, before starting his answer, uses an oral marker and shows hesitation (line 4) and a response token is overlapped with a display question pronounced in a lower pitch (lines 8-9).

As can be seen, this interaction is composed by features that are not used in the other textbooks in this study. SISR are also present. One case is the false start provided when the speaker is starting his utterance, but, after a click, he changes the utterance direction. Instead of talking about Christmas, he starts speaking about family lunches in summer (lines 6-7). another self-initiated self-repair is found when the speaker cuts off his utterance and reformulates it to explicitly say that it is the parents' backyard (lines 10.11). This common SISR is provided when

the speaker thinks that the information expressed could be more precise and, then, s/he introduces an element that causes a restart of the utterance (Schegloff 2013).

Extract 3 is an example of what is seen in *Aula*. In this ~~method~~ course, some of its interactions are characterized by a higher authenticity of correspondence (van Compernolle and McGregor 2016) because response tokens, overlaps, false starts and self-initiated self-repairs are included. Therefore, the only ~~method~~ course where interactions have SISRs is the only one where interactions have other features in common with naturally occurring interaction. *Aula* has listening materials with a higher authenticity of correspondence than the other textbooks analyzed.

This assertion is underpinned in extract 4. Here, the listening material is proposed to work explicitly with some specific repair. Proposed for the B1.2 level, the aim of this activity is for students to see some different kinds of repair work. They have to listen to some sequences and try to continue them with a proper turn. The focus of the activity is on the difference in intonation between the two examples. The students have to see and understand the difference between different kinds of other-initiated repairs. For example, in interaction A, the intonation indicates that the repair is due to a listening problem and, therefore, the next turn projected should be the repetition of the trouble source. However, in interaction B, the intonation indicates that the repair work is produced to express surprise.

```
Extract 4a
```
***Aula 4.* Track 68.**
```
A.
1.  S1  ayer dejaste la mesa sucísima después del desayuno

        yesterday, you left the table extremely dirty after breakfast
```

```
2.      (0.4) lo tuve que lavar yo todo
        I had to clean everything myself



3.  S2  cómo?
        what?



B.

1.  S1  ayer dejaste la mesa sucísima después del desayuno
        yesterday, you left the table extremely dirty after breakfast



2.      (0.4) lo tuve que lavar yo todo
        I had to clean everything myself



3.  S2  cómo↑?
        what?
```

After the students have responded to the repair initiator as they properly consider, the recording is listened to again, followed by an interaction proposed by the listening material. With this second recording, the students can check if their turns have been appropriate in relation to each kind of repair initiator.

```
Extract 4b
```

***Aula 4.* Track 69.**

```
A.

1.  S1  ayer dejaste la mesa sucísima después del desayuno
        yesterday, you left the table extremely dirty after breakfast



2.      (0.4) lo tuve que lavar yo todo
        I had to clean everything myself
```

```
3.  S2  cómo?
        what?


4.  S1. que digo: (.) que ayer (.) no recogiste la mesa después
        I'm saying that yesterday you didn't clean the table after


5.      del desayuno
        breakfast


B.
1.  S1  ayer dejaste la mesa sucísima después del desayuno
        yesterday, you left the table extremely dirty after the


2.      (0.4) lo tuve que lavar yo todo
        breakfast I had to clean everything myself


3.  S2  cómo↑? pero si yo lo lavé todo (0.4) no fui yo quien lo
        what? I cleaned everything! It wasn't me the one who


4.      ensució
        got it dirty


5.  S1  ah pues quizás fue Esther lo siento
        ah, so, maybe Esther did. Sorry.
```

Extract 4 is one of the two activities that *Aula* proposes to push the students to think about how repair works. The activity introduces repair as an interactional practice. This is the only activity found in all the textbooks analyzed in which specific work with repair as an interaction

mechanism is developed. Therefore, this is the only listening activity focused on these specific interactional practices. Although only one activity is not enough to say that *Aula* is a textbook which takes into account the importance of working on the students' IC, it is the only one which brings together common features in naturally occurring interaction.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

The analysis carried out in this study had the aim to deepen into the possibilities to develop IC through textbooks materials from four different publishing houses in SFL learning. More specifically, the focus of research was in repair work, as one of the key features for IC development. The analysis tried to show the typology of repairs in SFL teaching materials, and the relationship between repairs and the characterization of the interaction in which they appear. The results show that, in the 4 ~~methods~~ courses analyzed, from a total of 504 interactions in listening materials, 109 cases of repairs are found. However, this number of repairs is irregularly distributed because more than 90% of the repairs included in the listening materials appear only in two of the four ~~methods~~ courses. Regarding the different types of repair, it has been observed that OISR is the most common kind of repair, but in *Aula*, the ~~method~~ course with the highest number of repairs, SISR prevails as the most common type. In consequence, the overall analysis of the repair work in relation with the different ~~methods~~ courses shows that not all of them offer suitable listening materials to develop the usage of this interactional resource in SFL students. In line with van Compernolle's (2011), some materials understand repair as a practice involved in deficient models of interaction. However, some of the ~~methods~~ courses analyzed can be considered good resources to work with repair from listening materials.

A more detailed analysis of some examples of repairs in the different ~~methods~~ courses reveals that the inclusion of specific kinds of repair maintains a close relationship with how the interaction is characterized. It has been observed that SISRs are visible along with other interactional features such as pauses, overlaps or hesitations. That only occurs in one of the four ~~methods~~ courses analyzed. In contrast, when an OISR is developed in some specific textbooks, those in which OISR is not the most common kind of repair, the repair work is pedagogical and it is not focused on common features in naturally occurring interaction. Finally, it has been taken into account that, throughout all the ~~methods~~ courses and within all the 504 interactions analyzed, there are only two cases in which specific work on repair as an interactional practice is done. In consequence, interactional practices are scarce in SFL ~~methods~~ courses, contrary to what is recommended for the development of IC (Barraja-Rohan 2011). Repair, as an interactional practice, "cannot be reduced to a list of useful expressions" (Waring 2018, p. 58). However, in SFL textbook listening materials, the repair mechanism is presented mainly through a pedagogical lens (van Lier, 1996). Repair, therefore, is understood not only as a vehicle to expose learners to grammar or to illustrate the use of question words and interrogative syntax (van Compernolle, 2011, 139), but also mainly to show specific pedagogical questions that students can use in the classroom to solve problems in hearing or understanding.

This study has shown that the gap between what is taught and what is offered in SFL textbooks is broad. Only one ~~method~~ course of one specific publishing house offers listening interaction materials with SISR, after all, the ~~method~~ course with the highest level of authenticity of correspondence. In line with previous research (e.g. Gilmore 2007, 2011; Yeh 2018) listening materials in SFL textbooks are not ready to be taken as listening samples for the development of repair as interactional practice. However, in the textbook with the highest level of authenticity of

correspondence, one specific activity is found that takes into account explicitly what repair work means. It seems that the publishing house with the highest authenticity of correspondence for its listening materials is more conscious about the need to incorporate listening practices more based on authentic interactions. An inauthentic representation of conversation might be easier for less skilled learners to deal with, but, following Basil Berstein's theory of pedagogic device (2003, 138), the representation of conversation as a pedagogical goal and, therefore, as a kind of knowledge, pushes students to represent the interactions they listen to. The absence of repair examples in listening materials can also induce the students not to use this interactional practice in their classroom pedagogical practices. Many textbooks (Wong 2002) and teacher training methods textbooks (Huth, Betz and Teleghani-Nikazm 2019) eliminate much of what actually drives social interaction, establishing a distance between language as process and language as product, due to "the "talk" of the dialogue appears to be linearly organized rather than sequentially constructed" (Wong, 2002, 55). However, *Aula*, as a course with different listening materials, can induce to other classroom practices by the students if the teacher focuses their attention in the interactional practices in the listening materials used in the classroom.

The usage of textbook listening materials keeps being considered as a challenge (Taguchi and Yoshimi 2019). However, as pedagogical implications derived from this study, the establishment of practices for teaching repair through listening materials can be a good way to develop students IC. In the SFL context, some textbooks are designed with listening materials that include features that can be used for the students' IC. Although textbooks do not propose ~~very few~~ activities for students' ~~IC development~~ work with repair through the practice and understanding of ~~repairs~~ these interactional practice, teachers can take listening materials and develop activities that aim to reflect upon this interactional mechanism, due to the common absence of activities focused on

the interactional relevance of repair sequences (van Compernolle, 2011). Subsequently, practices can be proposed after the reflection process so the students consolidate their own understanding about how repair works (Wong and Waring, 2010; van Compernolle, 2011; see Huth, Betz and Teleghani-Nikazm 2019, 112-115, for teachers training purposes). Listening activities with examples of repair can be transcribed and analyzed by the students, with the aim to become aware of how repair works and what implications it has for the interactional development. As Guerrettaz and Johnston (2013) state, teaching materials can be used for more pedagogical purposes than they have been designed for. Teachers, in consequence, have the opportunity to select these materials so the students develop their IC, if they understand the later as a pedagogical purpose (Guerrettaz & Johnston, 2014). However, we have to take into account that it is hard to reduce repair mechanism to a list of useful expressions (Waring 2018, 58). Reflective practice about repair, then, seems to be a good resource for the students' development of the use of this interactional practice. As Wong (2002, 56) proposes, teachers might give learners the opportunity to analyze textbook talk from an interactional point of view as a step to develop their consciousness about how interaction works.

In any case, it is necessary to keep analyzing more listening materials to determine if the results shown in this study are isolated cases or, on the contrary, the SFL context has more textbooks with which interactional features can be developed. As an important aspect of teacher professional development (Matsumoto 2019), the analysis of SFL materials seems to be meaningful for a greater awareness of what kind of input, as teachers, we are providing to our students. CA, as a method that unfolds the intricacies of talk in interaction, can be seen as a good tool to discover and value the possibilities that listening materials have for the IC development.

Not all textbooks are the same. In each one learning is understood in a different way. The input they provide through listening materials maintains their own characteristics. The focus on repairs has led us to understand how SFL listening materials can be characterized as authentic materials. We have also seen to what extent SFL listening materials can be a resource for the development of this specific interactional practice. The development of IC through textbook listening materials is more feasible with some than with others, particularly in the case of repairs. The study of their procedures in interaction allows to accurately know the possibilities that SFL teachers have to develop IC through listening materials and so offer the students new possibilities in their development as foreign language speakers.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Balaman, U. 2016. *A Conversation Analytic Study on the Development of Interactional Competence in English in an Online Task-Oriented Environment*. PhD Dissertation. Hacettepe University.

Barraja-Rohan, A.M. 2011. "Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence." *Language Teaching Research* 15 (4): 479-507.

Barraja-Rohan, A., and C.R. Pritchard. 1997. *Beyond talk. A course in communication & conversation for intermediate adult learners*. Melbourne: Western Melbourne Institute of TAFE Publishing Service.

Bernstein, B. 2003. *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse.* (2nd edition) London: Routledge.

Breen, M. 1985. "Authenticity in the language classroom." *Applied Linguistics* 6: 60–70.

Carter, R., and M. McCarthy. 1997. *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. 1981. "Using authentic materials in the classroom". *Modern English Teacher* 9: 3–7.

Cooper, D. E. 1983. *Authenticity and Learning: Nietzsche's Educational Philosophy*. London: Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., and S. Thurrell. 1992. *Conversation and dialogues in action*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Eskildsen, S. 2018. "Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: interactional competence as biographical discovery." *Classroom Discourse* 9 (1): 68-76.

Field, J. 2009. *Listening in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flowerdew, J., and L. Miller. 1997. "The Teaching of Academic Listening Comprehension and the Question of Authenticity." *English for Specific Purposes* 16 (1): 27-46.

Guerrettaz, A.M., and B. Johnston. 2013. "Materials and Classroom Ecology." *The Modern Language Journal* 97 (3): 779-796.

Guerrettaz, A.M. and B. Johnston. 2014. "A response: The Concept of the Classroom Ecology and the Roles of Teachers in Materials Use." *The Modern Language Journal* 98 (2): 671-673.

Gilmore, A. 2004. "A comparison of textbook and authentic interactions." *ELT Journal* 58 (4): 363–374.

Gilmore, A. 2007. "Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning." *Language Teaching* 40 (2): 97–118.

Gilmore, A. 2011. "'I prefer not text': Developing Japanese learners' communicative competence with authentic materials." *Language Learning* 61 (3): 786-819.

Gilmore, A. 2015. "Research into practice: The influence of discourse studies on language descriptions and task design in published ELT materials." *Language Teaching* 48 (4): 506-530.

Gilmore, A. 2019. "Materials and authenticity in language teaching." In *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Education*, edited by S. Walsh and S. Mann, 299-318. London: Routledge.

Guariento, W., and J. Morely. 2001. "Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom." *ELT Journal* 55 (4): 347-353.

Hall, J. 2018. "From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning." *Classroom Discourse* 9 (1): 25-39.

Hall, J. K., J. Hellermann, and S. Pekarek-Doehler, eds. 2011. *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hall, J.K., and S. Pekarek-Doehler. 2011. "L2 Interactional Competence and Development." In *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*, edited by J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. Pekarek-Doehler, 1-15. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hayashi, M., G. Raymond, and J. Sidnell, eds. 2013. *Conversational repair and human understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He, A., and R. Young. 1998. "Language Proficiency Interviews: A Discourse Approach". In *Talking and Testing. Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency*, edited by R. Young and A. He, 1-24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hellermann, J. 2009. "Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self- initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 53 (2): 113–132.

Hellermann, J. 2011. "Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair". In *L2 interactional competence and development*, edited by J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. Pekarek Doehler, 124–172. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hepburn, A., and G. Bolden. 2017. *Transcribing for social research*. SAGE: London.

Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Huth, T., E. Beth, and C. Teleghani-Nikazm. 2019. "Rethinking language teacher training: steps for making talk-in-interaction research accesible to practitioners." *Classroom Discourse* 10 (1): 99-122

Jefferson, G. 2004. "Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction". In *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, edited by G. Lerner, 13-31. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. 2006. "Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA." *AILA Review* 19: 83–99.

Kecskes, I., R.E. Sanders, and A. Pomerantz. 2018. "The basic interactional competence of language learners." *Journal of Pragmatics* 124: 88-105.

Kramsch, C. 1986. "From language proficiency to interactional competence." *The Modern Language Journal* 70 (4): 366–372.

Markee, N. 2008. "Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA." *Applied Linguistics* 29: 404–427.

Martín Leralta, S. 2018. "Comprensión auditiva". In *The Routledge Handbook of Spanish Language Teaching*, edited by J. Muñoz-Bassols, E. Gironzetti and M. Lacorte, 183-197. New York: Routledge.

Martín Peris, E. 2007. "La didáctica de la comprensión auditiva". *MarcoELE* 5. Retrieved from: http://marcoele.com/descargas/5/martin_comprensionauditiva.pdf

Matsumoto, Y. 2019. "Material Moments: Teacher and Student Use of Materials in Multilingual Writing Classroom Interactions." *The Modern Language Journal* 103 (1): 179-204.

Mishan, F. 2004. *Designing Authenticity into Language Learning Materials*. Bristol: Intellect.

Nolasco, R., and L. Arthur. 1987. *Conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pekarek-Doehler, S. 2018. "Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: the development of L2 grammar-for-interaction." *Classroom Discourse* 9 (1): 3-24.

Pekarek-Doehler, S., and E. Pochon-Berger. 2015. "The Development of L2 Interactional Competence: Evidence from Turn-taking Organization, Sequence Organization, Repair Organization and Preference Organization." In *Usage-based Perspectives on Second Language Learning*, edited by T. Cadierno and S. Eskildsen, 233–270. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Pinner, R. 2013. "Authenticity and CLIL: Examining Authenticity from an International CLIL Perspective." *International CLIL Research Journal* 2 (1): 44-54.

Pinner, R. 2016. *Reconceptualising Authenticity for English as a Global Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Porter, D., and J. Roberts. 1981. "Authentic Listening Activities." *English Language Teaching Journal* 36 (1): 37-47.

Rings, L. (1986). "Authentic language and authentic conversation texts." *Foreign Language Annals* 19 (3): 203–208.

Salaberry, R., and S. Kunitz, eds. 2019. *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence: Bridging Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Schegloff, E. 2013. "Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair". In *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, editd by M. Hayashi, G. Raymond and J. Sidnell, 41-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. 1977. "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation." *Language* 53 (2): 361-382.

Sert, O., and U. Balaman. 2018. "Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction." *ReCALL* 30 (3): 355-374.

Sidnell, J., and T. Stivers, eds. 2012. *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Skogmyr Marian, K., and U. Balaman. 2018. "Second Language Interactional Competence and its development: An overview of conversation analytic research on interactional change over time." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 12 (8). https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12285

Su, D., and H. Tao. 2018. "Teaching the Mandarin utterance-final particle *le* through authentic materials." *Chinese as a Second Language Research* 7 (1), 15-45.

Taguchi, N., and D. Yoshimi. 2019. "Developing and Teaching Interactional Competence in Japanese Style Shifting". In *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence: Bridging Theory and Practice*, edited by R. Salaberry and S. Kunitz, 167-191. New York: Routledge.

Tao, H. 2005. "The gap between natural speech and spoken Chinese teaching material: Toward a discourse approach to pedagogy." *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 40 (2), 1–24.

Tomlinson, B. 2011. *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Underwood, M. 1989. *Teaching Listening*. London: Longman.

van Compernolle, R. 2011. "Responding to questions and L2 learner interactional competence during language proficiency interviews: A microanalytic study with pedagogical implications". In *L2 interactional competence and development*, edited by J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, and S. Pekarek-Doehler, 117-144. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

van Compernolle, R., and J. McGregor, eds. 2016. *Authenticity, language and interaction in second lengua contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London: Longman.

Walsh, S. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse. Language in Action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waring, H. 2018. "Teaching L2 interactional competence: problems and possibilities." *Classroom Discourse* 9 (1), 57-67.

Webb, S. 2010. "A corpus driven study of the potential for vocabulary learning through watching movies." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 15, 497–519.

Widdowson, H. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wong, J. 2002. ""Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating English as a second language textbook dialogue." *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* (*IRAL*) 40, 37–60.

Wong, J., and H. Waring. 2010. *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Yeh, M. 2018. "Active listenership: Developing beginners interactional competence." *Chinese as a Second Language Research* 7 (1), 47-77.

Young, R. F. 2008. *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. London/New York: Routledge.

Zyzik, E., and C. Polio. 2017. *Authentic materials myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Textbooks analyzed

Alonso, M. and R. Prieto. 2011. *Embarque 1. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: Edelsa.

Alonso, M. and R. Prieto. 2011. *Embarque 2. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: Edelsa.

Alonso, M. and R. Prieto. 2014. *Embarque 3. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: Edelsa.

Alonso, M. and R. Prieto. 2014. *Embarque 4. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: Edelsa.

Castro, F., P. Díez, I. Rodero, and C. Sardinero. 2014. *Nuevo español en marcha 1. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: SGEL.

Castro, F., I. Rodero, and C. Sardinero. 2014. *Nuevo español en marcha 2. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: SGEL.

Castro, F., I. Rodero, and C. Sardinero. 2014. *Nuevo español en marcha 3. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: SGEL.

Castro, F., I. Rodero, and C. Sardinero. 2014. *Nuevo español en marcha 4. Libro del alumno*. Madrid: SGEL.

Corpas, J., E. García, and A. Garmendía. 2013. *Aula 1. Curso de español. Nueva edición*. Barcelona: Difusión.

Corpas, J., A. Garmendia, and C. Soriano. 2013. *Aula 2. Curso de español. Nueva edición*. Barcelona: Difusión.

Corpas, J., A. Garmendia, and C. Soriano. 2013. *Aula 3. Curso de español. Nueva edición*. Barcelona: Difusión.

Corpas, J., A. Garmendia, and C. Soriano. 2014. *Aula 4. Curso de español. Nueva edición*. Barcelona: Difusión.

Corpas, J., A. Garmendia, N. Sánchez-Quintana, and C. Soriano. 2014. *Aula 5. Curso de español. Nueva edición*. Barcelona: Difusión.

Corpas, J., A. Garmendia, N. Sánchez-Quintana, and C. Soriano. 2014. *Aula 6. Curso de español. Nueva edición*. Barcelona: Difusión.

Gutiérrez, E., I. Ruiz, and A. B. García. 2010. *En acción 4. Curso de español con enfoque orientado a la acción*. Madrid: EnclaveELE.

Verdía, E., M. González, F. Martín, I. Molina, and C. Rodrigo. 2010. *En acción 1. Curso de español con enfoque orientado a la acción*. Madrid: EnclaveELE.

Verdía, E., J. Fruns, F. Martín, M. Ortín, and C. Rodrigo. 2010. *En acción 2. Curso de español con enfoque orientado a la acción*. Madrid: EnclaveELE.

Verdía, E., M. Fontecha, J. Fruns, F. Martín, and V. Vaquero. 2010. *En acción 3. Curso de español con enfoque orientado a la acción*. Madrid: EnclaveELE.

Method Course	Textbooks and levels	interactions
Nuevo español en marcha	4 textbooks (A1/A2/B1/B2)	156
Aula. Nueva edición	6 textbooks (A1/A2/B1.1/B1.2/B2.1/B2.2)	131
Embarque	4 textbooks (A1/A2/B1/B2)	45
En acción	4 textbooks (A1-A2/B1/B2/C1)	172
TOTAL	18 textbooks	504

Table 1: Dataset: number of textbooks and interactions analyzed

	interactions	SISR	OISR	SIOR	OIOR	total repairs
Nuevo español en marcha	156	0	4	1	2	7
Aula. Nueva edición	131	24	17	3	14	58
Embarque	45	0	0	0	0	0
En acción	172	0	26	9	9	44

TOTAL	504	24	47	13	25	109

Table 2: Number of cases of repair practices by ~~method~~ course

Words: 7826