



Universidad Pública de Navarra
Nafarroako Unibertsitate Publikoa

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS, SOCIALES Y DE LA
EDUCACIÓN
GIZA, GIZARTE ETA HEZKUNTZA ZIENTZIEN FAKULTATEA

Máster Universitario de Profesorado de Educación Secundaria
Unibertsitate Masterra Bigarren Hezkuntzako Irakasletzan

Trabajo Fin de Máster
Master Bukaerako Lana

The Interlocutor Factor in the Phonological Cross-linguistic Influence of Secondary L1-Spanish EFL Students

Estudiante: Judith Martín Esandia

Tutor/Tutora: Raúl Azpilicueta-Martínez

Especialidad/ Espezialitatea: Inglés

Junio, 2022

RESUMEN

Aunque la investigación sobre la influencia interlingüística haya investigado la influencia fonética interlingüística y subtemas como la representación fonológica de niños bilingües, la importancia de la inteligibilidad u ocasiones en las que ciertos sonidos se manifiestan como fonemas exclusivamente en ciertas lenguas, todavía ha de abordar el efecto que el factor del interlocutor podría ejercer en las decisiones fonológicas de los estudiantes de lenguas extranjeras. Con el fin de abordar esta incógnita, el presente estudio realizó un conjunto de ejercicios orales con once alumnos del modelo plurilingüe de 4^º de la ESO del colegio I.E.S Ibaialde. La primera fase requería que, en parejas, los participantes fueran incluyendo en su conversación palabras previamente seleccionadas. La segunda fase preservó el mismo procedimiento modificando únicamente al interlocutor, que pasó a ser la investigadora en vez de un compañero. Este cambio se realizó para observar el efecto que el interlocutor ejerce sobre las decisiones fonológicas que tomaron los estudiantes durante ambas fases y así poder compararlas. Los resultados sugerían que, aunque los fonemas presentaban diferentes grados de dificultad a la hora de su pronunciación, el número de errores cometidos durante las conversaciones con la investigadora disminuyeron, aumentando a su vez los aciertos. La investigación concluye que la comunicación con interlocutores de nivel lingüístico diferente puede ser beneficioso para el perfeccionamiento de la pronunciación del alumnado.

ABSTRACT

While research on cross-linguistic influence has addressed phonological cross-linguistic influence and its many subtopics such as bilingual children's phonological representation, the importance of intelligibility or instances in which some sounds manifest as phonemes exclusively in certain languages, it has yet to explicitly address the impact that the interlocutor factor might exert on foreign language learners' phonological choices. To address this research void, the present study performed a set of oral tasks with 11 I.E.S. Ibaialde plurilingual 4ESO students. The student-student interaction required the participants to engage in conversation in pairs while adding certain words containing challenging English phonemes for L1-Spanish learners of English to their speech. Subsequently, the researcher-student interaction preserved the same procedure solely swapping the interlocutor from another student to the researcher to observe the effect of the interlocutor factor on the students' phonological choices in both

interaction types. The data seemed to indicate that although the participants found certain sounds more troublesome to pronounce than others, there was a substantial increase of correct pronunciation instances and a decrease of errors during the interactions with the researcher. The research concludes that communication with interlocutors of different linguistic levels could be beneficial for the improvement of the students' pronunciation.

INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1. Cross-linguistic influence	6
2.2. Phonological cross-linguistic influence	6
2.3. The interlocutor factor	8
3. RESEARCH QUESTION.....	10
4. METHOD.....	11
4.1. Participants.....	11
4.2. Materials and tasks	11
4.3. Procedure	12
5. RESULTS.....	15
5.1. Student-student interactions.....	17
5.2. Researcher-student interactions	20
6. DISCUSSION	22
7. CONCLUSION, PEDAGOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS	26
8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY	30
APPENDICES	33

1. INTRODUCTION

Both cross-linguistic influence (CLI) and the interlocutor factor have been heavily investigated as individual factors affecting L2 production. Fabiano and Goldstein (2005) suggest that bilingual children's phonological performance in foreign languages could be directly determined by the way their brain has arranged the phonological representations of said languages, and concluded that cross-linguistic instances constitute, in fact, part of what being bilingual is. In this respect, a common strategy used by bilinguals is to utter the closest phonetical segment their mother tongue offers when they encounter a phoneme in the L2 that does not exist in their mother tongue, e.g., the English /z/ for L1 Spanish speakers (Boomershine et al. 2008).

As regards the interlocutor factor, according to O'Neal (2015), this variable determines whether the mistake produced as a result of CLI is intelligible, which emphasizes the importance of the interlocutor in communication. Beyond intelligibility, the interlocutor factor provokes speakers with similar linguistic backgrounds to mimic and repeat each other's language patterns for better understanding during conversation in a foreign language (Trofimovich 2015). This finding alone bears important implications in second and foreign language settings. All in all, individuals' phonological performance during interaction is directly influenced by the interlocutor, their first tongue and performance of the foreign language. In addition, exposing foreign language students to multiple interlocutor types could be beneficial, as they could potentially align to their pronunciation and use different registers or even accents (Rojas et al. 2016).

Nevertheless, in order to shed light on the extent to which the interlocutor factor affects individual's phonological CLI, more specific research is required. The present paper addresses this research niche by analyzing data from interactions with different interlocutor types, student-student and researcher-student, and analyzing participants' phonological choices in each of them in order to bridge the gap between phonological CLI and the interlocutor factor.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Extensive literature has been written on both phonological CLI and the interlocutor factor. Nevertheless, research on a combination of the previously mentioned topics seems to be scarce encouraging the present study to analyze the effect of the interlocutor factor on the phonological CLI of secondary school L1-Spanish learners of English as Foreign Language.

2.1. Cross-linguistic influence

Original records of CLI date back to the 1950s and 60s when errors in the L2 were thought to be forecasted by analyzing the subject's L1 and its grammar. According to the behaviorist theory unique innate characteristics of each language would transfer to another language resulting in error. The next decade marked a turning point against this notion, and errors were not merely attributed to transfer anymore, but to development. Nowadays, even though it has been acknowledged that the notion of transfer occurs at all levels, it is not regarded as the cause of all mistakes committed in the L2. What is more, it can even be helpful sometimes, in what was labeled positive transfer (Benson, 2002).

Smith and Kellerman (1983) concluded that the term 'transfer' was not appropriate for every instance of influence of a language over another and therefore, CLI would be a more suitable term to define this phenomenon with.

2.2. Phonological cross-linguistic influence

According to Major (2008) phonological transfer in the L2 dates back to Contrastive Analysis in the 50s, when different types of sound transfer were categorized by Weinreich (1953). This subcategorization contained sound substitution, phonological processes, underdifferentiation, overdifferentiation, reinterpretation of distinctions, phonotactic interference, and prosodic interference.

As stated by Fabiano and Goldstein (2005) there are three different alternatives to determine phonological representation in bilingual children. Firstly, their point of departure could be a unitary system for both languages, which could potentially divide into two as they grow up (data suggest that instances of CLI decrease as bilingual children gain more experience in both languages). Secondly, they could develop two independent systems from the beginning, as some bilingual children do not display any indication of phonological CLI. Finally, it is also possible for these children to develop two semi-independent systems that communicate and influence each other.

Regarding the study, Fabiano and Goldstein (2005) were not able to shed light on whether age/years of practice in both languages is the factor reducing occurrences of CLI on bilingual children's speech. In addition, the study "demonstrated that bilingual children exhibit phonological differentiation as well as the borrowing of elements from one language for use in the other." Subsequently, this study seems to suggest the final alternative, the Interactional Dual Systems Model, inferring that the three subjects in the research possessed separate but connected phonological systems. Therefore, it is conceivable for phonological cross-linguistic instances to be part of what constitutes to be a bilingual, regardless of age.

Essential to spoken language literature Chang (2015) distinguishes three types of *phonological similarity* of which *Allophonic similarity* is of utmost importance for the current research.

"Allophonic similarity is based on within-language comparisons between sounds at the level of contextually defined allophones, which are specific to a particular language (...) Consequently, a pair of sounds can be perceived differently by listeners of different language backgrounds if the two sounds exist in an allophonic relationship in one language, but not the other" (pg. 201).

Therefore, some sounds can happen to manifest as phonemes in certain languages, but not in others as such distinctions of sounds do not exist in those specific languages. Such lack of appearance could result in CLI errors, in which the L2 sound will be produced as the closest phonetical segment in the L1 allowing the distinct sound of that of the L1 influence the L2 and vice versa. For example, [θ] is not present as a phoneme in Dutch, which makes Dutch speakers perceive it as a sound closer to [s] and [ʃ] than an English speaker would. Nevertheless, taking Spanish pronunciation patterns into consideration, the voiced dental fricative [ð] resembles more [d] than the voiced alveolar tap [r] while to native English speakers the voiced dental fricative [ð] has more similarities with the postalveolar approximant [r] than with the voiced alveolar stop [d] (Boomershine et al. 2008).

This association distinction across languages with these particular phonemes is due to the fact that in English, the [d] sound contrasts with the [ð] sound while alternating with the [r] sound, but in Spanish [d] is pronounced /d/ in initial position, but /ð/ in intervocalic position. These perceptions of sounds bound to individuals' L1 might be the cause of pronunciation mistakes in production of the L2, and such mistakes could be categorized into intelligibility or oddity errors. Nevertheless, according to Lloyd (1935) intelligibility should be the only criterion by which EFL should be judged. Unorthodox accents, rhythms, or intonations will not matter as long as the message is understood.

Both Lloyd (1935) and O'Neal (2015) share their view on intelligibility (capacity to understand articulated words), variables such as rhythm, accent, intonation and pronunciation can be oddly

articulated and still be completely intelligible. O'Neal (2015) however, dares to add the variable of the speakers to the phenomenon stating that intelligibility is dependent on those interacting, making the interlocutor's reaction the most advantageous means of measurement. Scilicet, as Munro et al. (2006) stated, "the most valuable information about whether a particular speaker is intelligible is likely to come from the people with whom the speaker seeks to interact."

As O'Neal (2015) only analyzes five instances where consonant pronunciation is detrimental for intelligibility, and the study does not have sufficient data to conclude that pronunciation of most consonants is crucial for intelligibility to happen, but they do indeed suggest it. Instead, the study seems to be evidential of "the efficacy of adjusting pronunciation once it has been oriented to as unintelligible" (O'Neal, 2015). Therefore, intelligibility is also dependent on the willingness of the speakers to negotiate meaning.

Besides, Levis (2005) highlights that judgments on intelligibility are a bit more complex as they involve nonlinguistic factors as well as linguistic ones. Contrary to Lloyd (1935), Levis (2005) states that even intelligible pronunciation might get a negative evaluation depending on context: A professional context might demand the EFL speaker to sound native-like while maintaining the speaker's identity and group membership reflected on their accent might be the right choice for day-to-day scenarios.

2.3. The interlocutor factor

There are a myriad of variables, such as gender (McNamara, 2004), topic choice (Chichon, 2019), familiarity (Poteau, 2011), proficiency of participants (Davis, 2009), etc. that need to be considered when analyzing the interlocutor factor in conversation. For example, according to Norton (2005), when the pair of speakers is composed of both a female and a male, females are likely to talk less. In addition to the previously mentioned variable of context, Molnar et al. (2015) seem to have found evidence of how the environment provides key information to the bilingual speaker before even deciding which language best *aligns* with that specific situation. Garrod & Pickering (2004) illustrated evidence for alignment in dialogue without previous agreement at any language level: *Spatial reference frames* (mimicking the way the interlocutor refers to objects, egocentrically or allocentrically), *domain characterization* (the manner of referring to a location/position), *lexical repetition* (to use the same vocabulary/expressions and change them along with the interlocutor), *syntactic structure* and *accent and speech rate*. Interestingly, once the speakers align their speech in one aspect, it is more likely for them to align the rest. Consequently, Pickering & Garrod (2006) ascribe communication success to alignment.

Trofimovich (2015) inspired by Garrod & Pickering (2004) examines interactive alignment. He observes that interlocutors understand each other easier and faster when they mimic and use each other's language patterns including pronunciation: Native speakers use each other's lexical content and phrasal structure without noticing it in dialogue. In the case of L2 learners, the data are less obvious and interactive alignment depends on certain variables. When both interlocutors are non-native speakers of English and they do not share their first mother tongue, interactive alignment is not likely to happen due to diversity, when speakers share their natal tongue per contra, interactive alignment is usually present. Therefore, Trofimovich (2015) suggests priming and repetition as tools for pronunciation improvement.

Moreover, Kim, et al. (2011) examined interactions between native speakers and nonnative and native speakers. On the one hand, the findings suggested that "a match in regional dialect facilitated phonetic convergence" among natives, therefore denoting that, the desire for resembling their partner's language patterns lessens as a consequence of a mismatch at dialectic level and not only at L1 level. Furthermore, the study contemplates the possibility of the speakers having the option to select their wished social distance based on the variables of their choosing, one being not sharing the same L1, which could conclude in potential misalignment without necessarily experiencing continuous unintelligibility. Nevertheless, Kim, et al. (2011)'s study cannot deny nor confirm the variable considering that the nonnative participants wished to be understood by the natives. Such motivation led nonnatives to align to their native interlocutors to the best of their abilities. Apart from linguistic identity and the possible feeling of loyalty to proudly express it in their L2 production, the cognitive load necessary to understand their native partner might have acted as an "inhibitory influence" not present in conversations with speakers with their same L1.

All in all, the research observes that "language-distance-linked phonetic convergence patterns can be accounted for by two parallel mechanisms: the need for intelligibility and the extra demands of nonnative speech production and perception."

According to Rojas, et al. (2016) depending on whom the student is talking to they tend to generate different types of speech, which is why he suggests that "the determination of language experience of school-age bilingual children should examine differential language use with multiple interlocutors, particularly interactions with older siblings and peers" (Rojas, et al., 2016, p. 166). This way individuals get used to changing registers, languages, and even accents depending on their companion.

Considering previous findings, there is a need to analyze the extent to which students are influenced by the interlocutor in their selection of phoneme pronunciation. Nevertheless, to the author's best knowledge, there are no studies specifically addressing this issue.

3. RESEARCH QUESTION

Considering the research above, this paper seeks to answer the following question:

- What is the effect of the interlocutor factor on the phonological CLI of secondary school L1-Spanish learners of English as Foreign Language?

4. METHOD

4.1. Participants

The participants were selected from the internship in the school I.E.S. Ibaialde, where the author of this research paper experienced being a teacher assistant for eight weeks. There were exactly twenty 15-16-year-old-students in this 4ESO class and the teacher, via appropriate testing, suggested that the students in question, possessed an adequate and similar level of English relative to age and level of study due to their previous and ongoing involvement in a CLIL program where they learn various subjects such as geography & history, TIC, P.E., and ethical values through the medium of English. The participants were attending this education program in I.E.S. Ibaialde for the entirety of their compulsory secondary education and each grade's curriculum appointed different subjects to be taught in English. As they are classmates, the research assumes the students usually use English around each other during their English lessons and plurilingual subjects, which means they are most likely used to their partner's English and are comfortable using the language with each other. In addition, they all attended Basque as a subject while learning the rest of the subjects in Spanish.

4.2. Materials and tasks

First of all, the study required written parental authorization, so that the recordings of the students could be used in the research. In order to obtain it, a consent form was sent home for the parents to sign. In addition, as a means to collect the necessary data to be transcribed and analyzed, the research was in need of a computer to be used as a recorder.

In an effort to conduct the interactions, some vocabulary cards containing commonly mispronounced phonemes by Spanish speakers were handed to the students at the moment of data collection, even though tables 1 and 3 illustrate not only 15 words the students had to accommodate into their speech but also their phonetic transcription, the version of the instructions received by the participants displayed nothing but the words in plain English. The solemn purpose was to make sure the learners would use the targeted phonemes in their speech without giving away the aim of said task. Accompanying those targeted words, the students also received the instructions for the speaking exercise, which would be available to them five minutes prior to the commencing of the activity. Procedural repetition was performed in both interaction types where participants were required to have organic conversations about a given topic while trying to accommodate the same 15 fixed words in their speech.

For the purpose of avoiding awkward silences and hesitation, the annex also included suggestions pointing out what their speech could potentially convey.

Table 1.

Words to be included during the student-student interactions

THESE /ði:z/	BORING /'bɔ:ɪŋ/	YES /jes/
SHE /ʃi/	HELLO /hə'ləʊ/	WOULD /wɔ:ld/
STRANGE /streɪndʒ/	VERY /'veri/	JOB /dʒɒb/
TRAVEL /'trævəl/	PRESENT /'prezənt/	CHANGE /tʃeɪndʒ/
STOP /stɒp/	MEAN /mi:n/	YELLOW /'jeləʊ/

Table 2.

Instructions for the student-student interactions

Topic of conversation	Favorite TV show or movie
Suggestions for the conversation	-It is a conversation, try to ask questions. -The shared information does not need to be true. Lying is acceptable
Worth mentioning information	-Characters and their lives -Opinion about said TV show or movie -Reasons why you like the show or movie -the plot -Anything of interest you think is worth mentioning

Table 3.

Words to be included in the conversation during the researcher-student interactions

BEAT /bi:t/	BASIC /'beɪsɪk/	YEAR /jɪr/
SHY /ʃaɪ/	HARD /hɑ:d/	WOULD /wɔ:ld/
STRANGE /streɪndʒ/	VOICE /vɔɪs/	JAZZ /'dʒæz/
COVER /'kʌvər/	MUSIC /'mjuzɪk/	CHOICE /tʃɔɪs/
SPANISH /spæɪnɪʃ/	EASY /'i:zi/	YOUNG /jʌŋ/

Table 4.

Instructions for the researcher-student interactions

Topic of conversation	Favorite music artis
Suggestions for the conversation	-It is a conversation, try to ask questions. -The shared information does not need to be true. Lying is acceptable
Worth mentioning information	-Music artists and their lives -Different songs of your liking -Reasons why you like the artist -Opinion on their music -Anything of interest you think is worth mentioning

4.3. Procedure

First and foremost, the research was in need of signed parental authorization, concomitantly it was crucial for the students to be kept in the dark about the exercise's aim to analyze their pronunciation

of the selected phonemes as being self-aware of their pronunciation could have tainted the whole research and the results would have been useless. Therefore, the shared information for the completion of the activity, both in the parental authorization and the instructions, was kept very broad and focused on the introduction of the provided words in the conversation and the given topic (their favorite TV show or movie) so that the students would not go blank during their conversations. This distraction prevented the students from overthinking their pronunciation as well as ensuring the research would have at least one instance of the initially targeted phonemes.

For the purpose of completing the student-student interactions, the students were divided into pairs and asked to step outside the classroom in turns, where they would be provided with five minutes to read the first appendix containing the instructions and targeted words necessary to perform the tasks. Once those five minutes came to an end the couple would enter a different classroom with nothing but the two copies of the first annex and the previously mentioned computer serving as a recorder so that they could have a safe and comfortable space to converse. It was key at this time of the experiment for the students to be left alone with the only company of each other so that the only interlocutor was undeniably their partner. Further, while the first couple's conversation was being recorded, which needed to last five minutes as well, a second couple would step outside to prepare their activity with the assistance of the first annex.

The selection of the initially targeted phonemes was based on mistakes commonly committed by L1 Spanish EFL learners, this is: /i:/ vs /ɪ/, /s/ + consonant ≠ 'es' + consonant, /b/ vs /v/, /j/ vs /dʒ/, /ʃ/ vs /s/ vs /z/, /h/ vs /x/ and /tʃ/. Nevertheless, /i:/, /ʃ/ and /tʃ/ did not present enough of a struggle for the students to pronounce collecting an insufficient number of mistakes, therefore, these phonemes were swapped for /ŋ/ vs /n/.

In the span of one and a half classes, ten conversations were performed and recorded following the previously mentioned procedure and collecting data from the entirety of the class, 20 students. For the researcher-student interactions, however, the research was only granted another one and a half classes more, where the other 11 conversations were able to be recorded. This particular set of conversations differed from the first set in three ways; firstly, the topic of conversation was changed to their favorite music artist, secondly, the words needing to be introduced in the conversation had been changed to other words containing the same phonemes while carefully respecting the number of times each phoneme was present during student-student interactions, and lastly, the students' conversational partner was their teacher assistant and the author of this paper instead of another classmate. The dynamic of the activity, however, remained unaltered, both the students and the researcher had to

include a set of words containing the same targeted phonemes while talking about a given topic. Nonetheless, it was vital for the researcher to correctly pronounce the targeted phonemes without drawing any attention to them so that the research could analyze the presence of alignment or lack thereof.

After collecting the indispensable data in audio format, the researcher started transcribing said conversations and added a second version of the transcription highlighting the mistakes and right uses of the phonemes uttered by the students. Subsequently, those mistakes and proper pronunciations were counted and displayed on a table to compare and analyze the potential present alignment and differentiate the type of mistake committed.

5. RESULTS

The research question of the present study intends to determine the extent of the effect the interlocutor may have on the phonological CLI of secondary school L1 Spanish learners of English as foreign language. Firstly, the results obtained from both student-student and researcher-student interactions will be displayed and compared, and then we will analyze each of these in further depth.

The following table (5) compares the results obtained from both the student-student interactions and the researcher-student interactions.

Table 5.

Results of both interaction types: student-student and researcher-student

Type of interaction	/v/	/z/	/d ₃ /	/j/	/h/-/x/	/s+cons/	/ŋ/	Total
Student-Student	107 E 20 C	141 E 75 C	17 E 21 C	60 E 55 C	69 E 33 C	24 E 6 C	17 E 45 C	435 E 255 C
Researcher-Student	41 E 30 C	141 E 179 C	4 E 22C	57 E 59 C	89 E 57 C	29 E 11 C	1 E 139 C	364 E 497 C
Student-Student	84%E 16%C	65%E 35%C	45%E 55%C	52%E 48%C	68%E 32%C	80%E 20%C	27%E 73%C	63%E 37%C
Researcher-Student	58%E 42%C	44%E 56%C	15%E 85%C	49%E 51%C	61%E 39%C	72%E 28%C	0.7%E 99.3%C	42%E 58%C

The letter 'E' stands for errors while the letter 'C' represents the instances in which students pronounced the sound correctly

As can be seen in table 5, the number of times the fricative /v/ was replaced by plosive /b/ during student-student interactions added up to a 107, while the researcher-student interactions recorded 66 fewer instances of this particular mistake. This substantial decrease of errors was accompanied by an increase of 10 correct pronunciations of the fricative /v/. Even though the number of mistakes always surpasses the correct utterances, the researcher-student interactions had 56 fewer attempts of pronouncing the phoneme /v/ and yet the participants pronounced it right 42% of the time. Contrarily, during the student-student interactions, the students mistook the fricative /v/ with plosive /b/ 84% of the time they intended to pronounce it, while only uttering the phoneme /v/ successfully 16% of the time it was required.

Even though the number of times the participants mistook the voiced sound /z/ with the voiceless /s/ was exactly the same in both interaction types, a 141, the instances of correct pronunciation were much higher than 75 in researcher-student interactions. No less than 179 instances were recorded during researcher-student interactions, 104 more than in the student-student interactions. There seems not to be any explanation as to why those who mastered the sound up to 28 times would still mispronounce the

voiced phoneme in words that had been correctly uttered many times before. However, there seems to be an improvement as in the student-student interactions 65% of the attempts to pronounce the phoneme /z/ failed and by the researcher-student interactions that percentage decreased by 21%. Coincidentally, there was a 21% increase of the correct pronunciation of the fricative in the researcher-student interaction also.

Thirdly, the interlocutor seems to have had one of the biggest influences on the phoneme /dʒ/ as the errors committed went from 17 to four, which would constitute an error decrease of 30%. In addition, the successfully pronounced phonemes increased from 55% to 85% still maintaining the number of correct utterances of the phoneme extremely close, 21 and 22.

Unlike the previous cross-linguistical mistake (/dʒ/), the fourth one (/j/) seems not to have been substantially affected by the interlocutor as the results were very similar. During the student-student interactions, there were 102 attempts at pronouncing the phoneme /j/ and 52% of the time those attempts resulted in errors, while during the researcher-student interactions, the students tried to pronounce it 116 times erring 49% of the time.

Similarly, judging by the 7% difference between the student-student and researcher-student interactions' results, the interlocutor seems not to have influenced the utterance of the sound /h/ substantially. The most notable difference lies in the number of attempts the sound /h/ was intended to be pronounced, resulting in an increase of 44 attempts, 20 of which resulted in failure to produce the right sound.

As with the previous two phonemes, the error of adding the vowel 'e' to a word starting by an 's' and followed by another consonant seems not to have been substantially influenced by the interlocutor factor. The results display an 8% difference between interaction types where the errors always surpass the correct utterances by at least 44%, which would confirm that the phoneme's pronunciation presented a consistent struggle for the students irrespective of the interlocutor they are dealing with.

Lastly, a mistake the interlocutor seems to have influenced considerably is pronouncing /n/ rather than /ɲ/. During the student-student interactions, students committed this mistake a total of 17 times (all mistakes committed by the same four students, pointing at individual differences), which represented that 27% of the times the students attempted to utter the phoneme /ɲ/, they failed, whereas the right sound was uttered a total of 45 times. Contrarily, during the researcher-student interactions, the phoneme was mistaken only once while the correct utterance of the phoneme /ɲ/ was articulated a total of 139 times having a 99.3% success rate on uttering the sound /ɲ/.

To sum up, mistakes number four, five and six appear to remain constant regardless of the interlocutor, whereas mistakes one, two, three and seven seem to have been positively influenced by the interlocutor factor. All four cases have had both a consequential decrease in the errors committed and a meaningful increase in the number of instances the subjects have uttered the correct pronunciation of the preselected sounds.

5.1. Student-student interactions

The following table (6) reflects the specific instances in which each student erred and produced the correct pronunciation for the selected phonemes during the first task (student-student interactions).

Table 6.

Recollection of errors and instances of correct pronunciation during the student-student interactions.

STUDENTS	/v/	/z/	/dʒ/	/j/	/h/-/x/	S+cons	/ŋ/	Errors & Correct A.
M1	5 /b/	5 /s/	4 /j/	7 /dʒ/	0 /x/	1 /es+c/	0 /ŋ/	22E
	0 /v/	5 /z/	1 /dʒ/	1 /j/	10 /h/	1 /s+c/	3 /ŋ/	21C
F1	1 /b/	8 /s/	1 /j/	4 /dʒ/	0 /x/	1 /es+c/	0 /ŋ/	15E
	2 /v/	6 /z/	2 /dʒ/	2 /j/	2 /h/	0 /s+c/	4 /ŋ/	18C
M2 /jav/	6 /b/	8 /s/	2 /j/	0 /dʒ/	12 /x/	2 /es+c/	0 /ŋ/	30E
	5 /v/	9 /z/	3 /dʒ/	10 /j/	1 /h/	1 /s+c/	5 /ŋ/	41C
M3	6 /b/	12 /s/	2 /j/	4 /dʒ/	12 /x/	N/A	3 /ŋ/	39E
	1 /v/	7 /z/	2 /dʒ/	4 /j/	1 /h/		4 /ŋ/	19C
M4	5 /b/	26 /s/	4 /j/	2 /dʒ/	11 /x/	1 /es+c/	3 /ŋ/	52E
	1 /v/	9 /z/	2 /dʒ/	4 /j/	0 /h/	1 /s+c/	1 /ŋ/	18C
M5	11 /b/	9 /s/	1 /j/	12 /dʒ/	5 /x/	2 /es+c/	2 /ŋ/	42E
	0 /v/	4 /z/	3 /dʒ/	0 /j/	0 /h/	0 /s+c/	3 /ŋ/	10E
M6	2 /b/	13 /s/	1 /j/	7 /dʒ/	6 /x/	6 /es+c/	0 /ŋ/	35E
	1 /v/	1 /z/	1 /dʒ/	1 /j/	0 /h/	1 /s+c/	5 /ŋ/	10C
M7	26 /b/	17 /s/	1 /j/	5 /dʒ/	10 /x/	5 /es+c/	7 /ŋ/	71E
	5 /v/	7 /z/	1 /dʒ/	12 /j/	0 /h/	0 /s+c/	1 /ŋ/	26C
M8	17 /b/	19 /s/	1 /j/	9 /dʒ/	4 /x/	2 /es+c/	2 /ŋ/	54E
	3 /v/	7 /z/	3 /dʒ/	9 /j/	1 /h/	1 /s+c/	2 /ŋ/	26C
F2	17 /b/	14 /s/	0 /j/	4 /dʒ/	5 /x/	0 /es+c/	0 /ŋ/	40E
	2 /v/	5 /z/	2 /dʒ/	9 /j/	14 /h/	1 /s+c/	5 /ŋ/	38C
F3	11 /b/	10 /s/	0 /j/	6 /dʒ/	4 /x/	4 /es+c/	0 /ŋ/	35E
	5 /v/	15 /z/	1 /dʒ/	3 /j/	4 /h/	0 /s+c/	5 /ŋ/	33C
Total	107 /b/	141 /s/	17 /j/	60 /dʒ/	69 /x/	24 /es+c/	17 /ŋ/	435E
	20 /v/	75 /z/	21 /dʒ/	43 /j/	33 /h/	6 /s+c/	45 /ŋ/	243C

During student-student interaction, the participants collectively mispronounced the seven targeted sounds 435 times while they pronounced them correctly 243.

Firstly, the phonemes /v/ vs /b/ will be addressed, which is one of the most repeated and common mistakes. Only one student (F1) was able to produce higher instances of the correct pronunciation of this phoneme than its erred version, which, incidentally, was only achieved by one instance more. On the other side of the coin, there are two people (M1 & M5) whose entire utterances of the phoneme /v/ were

mispronounced as /b/, then there is one instance in which out of 31 times of uttering the phoneme only five were correct, those being repetitions of solely two words 'favorite' and 'have'. In fact, apart from the word 'favorite', only four people seem to be able to utter the phoneme /v/ at the beginning or in intervocalic position correctly; therefore, most of the correct utterances of /v/ correspond to the word "favorite" and to words with the phoneme at the end of the word like 'have'. Although the targeted mistake is pronouncing /b/ when /v/ is the correct pronunciation, there is one student (M2) who anecdotally said /jav/ instead of /dʒab/ where the targeted phoneme is also at the end of the word. It is worth pointing out that not one of them was able of avoiding pronouncing /b/ instead of /v/ at least five times.

The previous phoneme's results are closely followed by /s/ vs /z/ in the number of wrong utterances although in this case, the reason for error seems to be random considering they indistinctively pronounced the same word correctly and incorrectly even within the same sentence. The word 'is' for example, is the most repeated example of this occurrence. The juxtaposition of this erratic circumstance would be the word 'songs', which seems to be consistently pronounced correctly. They also tend to produce the right phoneme if it is preceded by a consonant in words like 'things', 'times' or "characters" for example. Nevertheless, even if some words are indeed uttered with their correct pronunciation at times, the results indicate that more likely than not the phoneme will be mispronounced. After all, the phoneme /s/ was pronounced in /z/'s instead 141 times while /z/ was uttered 75 times.

Thirdly, in regard to using the phoneme /j/ rather than /dʒ/, only two students (F2 & F3) managed to avoid the mistake altogether, another two students (M1 & M4) erred four times and the rest were mistaken once or twice. The transcriptions seem to suggest that the instances causing confusion just so happen to be spelled with either 'g' or 'j' for example words like 'religious', 'legend', 'giant' or 'job', but never when the phoneme is spelled with 'ng' or 'dg' as in 'change', 'strange' or 'budget'. Nonetheless, there are instances of words spelled with 'j' and 'g' that have been successfully pronounced, such as, 'just', 'enjoy' or 'general', although all of them have also been mispronounced by other students. In any case, there were seventeen instances of this mistake and 21 correct utterances of the phoneme /dʒ/.

Regarding the wrong use of /dʒ/ instead of /j/ there seems to be an even bigger confusion as the number of mistakes is higher and avoided only by one student (M5). Most of these instances occur when the students pronounce /dʒu/ while trying to say 'you' or /dʒes/ when their intention is to say 'yes', which is how one of them managed not to utter this phoneme right and committed up to 12 mistakes, seven of which by saying /dʒes/ and five by saying /dʒu/. In fact, the only other mispronounced word apart from the derivations of 'you' and 'yes' such as 'your' and 'yeah' is 'yellow'. Similarly, to /s/ vs /z/, most of the

students pronounced 'you' and 'yes' right in one sentence and wrong in the next only varying in the number of times each of them made use of these words. In conclusion, these errors amount to sixty while the phoneme /j/ was pronounced in the right context 55 times.

Fifthly, the participants very often uttered the pronunciation of the English /h/ as the Spanish /x/. Even though the intensity of the phoneme /x/ varied, only two students seemed to be capable of avoiding the sound altogether and as many as three students did not generate the correct sound once. The participants who uttered both phonemes, /h/ and /x/, seemed to do so indistinctively as the error seemed to mostly happen at the beginning of words like 'hello', 'have' or 'happen'. In addition, there was an instance in which instead of confusing /h/ with /x/ two students pronounced 'humoristic' as /juməristik/ by silencing the letter 'h'. Phoneme /x/ was used for /h/ sixty-nine times, whereas the instances in which /h/ was correctly uttered was only 33.

Only one student avoided adding an initial 'e' to words starting with an 's' and followed by a consonant altogether, while four participants consistently failed to pronounce the correct sound. Supplementarily, some students could produce the correct sound and yet utter 'es' followed by a consonant thereafter, even in the same sentence. All in all, The vowel 'e' preceded the sound 's + consonant' 24 times while it was correctly pronounced six times.

Lastly, four participants seemed to have indistinctively pronounced the phoneme /n/ instead of /ŋ/ at the end of words like 'thing', 'traveling' or 'training' 17 times and yet utter the phoneme /ŋ/ other 45 times.

5.2. Researcher-student interactions

Table seven displays the recollection of errors and instances of correct pronunciation the participants uttered during the conversation with the researcher. It is worth mentioning that the level of familiarity between the participants and the researcher is minimal and they are certainly not familiarized with each other's speech patterns. Therefore, if any type of alignment were to occur, it would be based on the recorded interaction.

Table 7.

Recollection of errors and instances of correct pronunciation during the researcher-student interactions.

STUDENTS	/v/	/z/	/dʒ/	/j/	/h/-/x/	/s+cons/	/ŋ/	Errors & Correct A.
M1	1 /b/ 3 /v/	7 /s/ 10 /z/	0 /j/ 2 /dʒ/	6 /dʒ/ 12 /j/	1 /x/ 16 /h/	0/es+c/ 3 /s+c/	0 /n/ 10 /ŋ/	15E 46C
F1	0 /b/ 2/v/	5 /s/ 23 /z/	0 /j/ 2 /dʒ/	5 /dʒ/ 4 /j/	1 /x/ 10 /h/	3/es+c/ 2 /s+c/	0 /n/ 15 /ŋ/	15E 43C
M2 /ˌɪndəˈvɪduwəl/	2 /b/ 4 /v/	16 /s/ 4 /z/	1 /du/ 1 /dʒ/	2 /dʒ/ 8 /j/	15 /x/ 3 /h/	1/es+c/ 1/s+c/	0 /n/ 7 /ŋ/	36E 21C
M3	6 /b/ 2 /v/	18 /s/ 13 /z/	0 /j/ 2 /dʒ/	5 /dʒ/ 6 /j/	9 /x/ 9 /h/	3/es+c/ 3 /s+c/	1 /n/ 13 /ŋ/	42E 45C
M4	4 /b/ 0 /v/	15 /s/ 19 /z/	1 /j/ 5 /dʒ/	1 /dʒ/ 6 /j/	23 /x/ 0 /h/	1/es+c/ 2/s+c/	0 /n/ 15 /ŋ/	45E 32C
M5	9 /b/ 4 /v/	5 /s/ 14 /z/	0 /j/ 4 /dʒ/	10 /dʒ/ 11 /j/	7 /x/ 0 /h/	6/es+c/ 0/s+c/	0 /n/ 15 /ŋ/	37E 33C
M6	1 /b/ 3 /v/	21 /s/ 10 /z/	3 /j/ 1 /dʒ/	3 /dʒ/ 7 /j/	9 /x/ 1 /h/	3/es+c/ 1/s+c/	0 /n/ 11 /ŋ/	40E 23C
M7 2/v/ youtuv	4 /b/ 2 /v/	14 /s/ 27 /z/	0 /j/ 2 /dʒ/	1 /dʒ/ 3 /j/	16 /x/ 2 /h/	0/es+c/ 6 /s+c/	0 /n/ 20 /ŋ/	35E 42C
M8 3 /nx/	4 /b/ 5 /v/	21 /s/ 15 /z/	0 /j/ 1 /dʒ/	17 /dʒ/ 1 /j/	8 /x/ 0 /h/	6/es+c/ 0 /s+c/	0 /n/ 10 /ŋ/	56E 22C
F2 /dʒendərz/	8 /b/ 4 /v/	10 /s/ 28 /z/	0 /j/ 2 /dʒ/	0 /dʒ/ 22 /j/	0 /x/ 16 /h/	3/es+c/ 0 /s+c/	1 /n/ 13 /ŋ/	21E 72C
F3	2 /b/ 1 /v/	9 /s/ 16 /z/	N/A	7 /dʒ/ 3 /j/	1 /x/ 0 /h/	3/es+c/ 0 /s+c/	0 /n/ 8 /ŋ/	22E 20C
TOTAL	41E 30C	141E 179C	4E 22C	57E 59C	89E 57C	29E 11C	1E 139C	364E 497C

The first phoneme to be subjected to analysis is /v/, which all but one participant (F1) confused it with /b/ at least once and adding up to exactly 41 times. Nevertheless, the students also managed to utter the phoneme /v/ correctly in 30 instances, some of which even occurred in the initial position of words like 'very' or 'voice'. The highest number of times someone mistook the minimal pairs was nine while also uttering the fricative correctly four times, one of which instances being in the initial position of the word.

Unanticipatedly, there was an instance of the Spanish 'z', which would be the equivalent of the English /θ/, uttered when M4 expressed his interest in the artist Ozuna. As it is a proper name that follows Spanish pronunciation patterns, it cannot be considered a mistake.

Thirdly, the students only uttered the phoneme /j/ for /dʒ/ four times, and all of those occurred pronouncing the word 'imagine', which is less than half if compared with the results of the student-student interactions. The mistake was avoided by seven out of 11 participants and F3 even avoided uttering the mistake and correct form altogether. Nevertheless, the rest of the learners managed to correctly pronounce the phoneme /dʒ/ 22 times, which surpasses the student-student interactions' results by one. In addition, the word 'individual' confused two participants who instead of pronouncing it as /ɪndə'vɪdʒuəl/ both uttered /ɪndə'vɪduəl/.

Fourthly, the mistake of using the phoneme /dʒ/ instead of /j/ was mostly committed in the words 'you' and 'yes'. These two words are repeated many times by the 11 participants, and there seems not to be any reason why they could indistinctively mispronounce them or utter them correctly. In addition, the other two words that seemed to have caused confusion when attempting to pronounce them were 'young' and 'years', additionally, if the participants mispronounced these words, the research suggests that they consistently failed in producing the right sound altogether.

F2 was the only student who avoided uttering the /x/ sound altogether and other three participants only committed the mistake once. However, three out of the 11 subjects seemed not to be able to produce the phoneme /h/ at all, while the /x/ sound was used up to 15, 16 or even 23 times. In addition, those who could utter both sounds seem to do so indistinctively.

Four students (M5, M8, F2 & F3) seemed to have been unable to produce the sound 's + consonant' without preceding it with an /e/, while other two pronounced this sound exclusively. All in all, the error of adding an 'e' to the previously mentioned sound was repeated 29 times, while only producing the correct sound in 11 instances.

Finally, the mistake of using the phoneme /n/ when the word required the sound /ŋ/ was only committed once by M3, who simultaneously was able to produce the right sound 17 times. In addition, by adding the instances in which the phoneme /ŋ/ was uttered by the participants, the research obtains the second-highest number of correct pronunciations of a phoneme the investigation has recorded, 139.

All in all, data suggests that the number of pronunciation errors committed by the students during the researcher-student interactions seems to have decreased while increasing the correct pronunciation of those same targeted sounds.

6. DISCUSSION

The present study intended to shed light on the degree to which the interlocutor affects the phonological CLI of secondary school L1-Spanish students of English as foreign language.

The results in our study exposed the level of difficulty each targeted sound presented to be correctly uttered by the participants. Generally, phonemes show better rates in researcher-student interactions, although sometimes improvements are minor (e.g. /j/, from 48% to 51%). Therefore, the pronunciation of these four sounds, /v/, /j/, /h/ and /s/ followed by a consonant, could be considered particularly challenging for the learners regardless of the interlocutor.

Regarding the mistake of uttering /dʒ/ rather than /j/, the words ‘yes’ and ‘you’ seem to be the main source of erred instances, which could be due to reinforced fossilization. All 11 participants have mispronounced those words or some type of variation of them even if they have correctly uttered them in numerous occasions before and or after. Therefore, even though the mistake might seem like a random incidence, it could be due to the student’s momentary lack of focus on pronunciation as they would also have to be paying attention to other aspects of engaging in a conversation such as grammar, vocabulary and meaning, having to resort to their fossilized lexicon.

Example 1.

M1: /ε wɛl aɪ mi:n ɪz, ɪz ə 'bɑʊt ə gɜrl hu hæz 'resəntli daɪd ænd hi ɪz jʌst 'gouɪŋ... ʃi ɪz jʌst 'gouɪŋ tu ðə 'heɪbən ænd ɪts ə 'bɑʊt wʌt 'hæpənz tu hɜr ðer ɪn 'heɪbən/

F1: /uhm 'ɪsənt ɪt laɪk ə 'bɑʊt rɪ 'lɪjuz estɪf? bi 'kɒs ɪt 'kɪndə saʊndz laɪk ɪt/

M1: /nɒv, nɒv ɪts nɑt 'berɪ rɪ 'lɪjuz. ɪts jʌst wen **dʒu** get ɪn 'heɪbən ju hæv ɪ 'nɒf pɔɪnts ɪn dʒʊər laɪf ænd ðə rɪ 'lɪjuz pɑrt ɪs ɔf/

F1: /,oʊ'keɪ, aɪ θɪŋk ðæt ɪt kæn bi 'veri 'ɪntrəstɪŋ, bʌt dʒes aɪ wɪl gɪv ju maɪ... aɪ wɪl trʌst **dʒu**, dʒʊər... dʒʊər ɛ teɪst ɪn 'sɪrɪz ænd 'mʊvɪs ænd aɪ hoʊp ðæt aɪ lɜrn 'sɪmθɪŋ ə 'bɑʊt ɪt ænd en 'dʒɔɪ ɪt/

M1: /dʒu wɪl laɪk ɪt/

F1: /θæŋk **ju**/

Example one illustrates how both M1 and F1 uttered /dʒu/ and /ju/ within the same sentence. While F1 seemed calm and had what she was planning to say under control, she was able to say /ju/ correctly, but once she got nervous and hesitated on how to structure her sentence, she had to redirect all her attention to the sentence’s meaning and how she wanted to convey it in her speech. Therefore failing to utter /ju/ and saying /dʒu/ and its derivation /dʒʊər/. Nevertheless, once the momentary lapsus had passed, she managed to utter the proper pronunciation of the word ‘you’ to express her gratitude.

In addition, the participants’ mother tongue seems to have had a substantial effect on the pronunciation of words that are spelled with ‘g’ or ‘j’ but are pronounced as /dʒ/ such as ‘giant’, ‘imagine’,

'jealous' 'just' or 'religious', which they pronounce /'jaɪənt/, /ɪ'mæjən/, /'jeləs/, /jʌst/ and /rɪ'liʒəs/. Whereas they seemed to never mispronounce words that are spelled with 'dg' or 'ng' like 'change', 'strange' 'knowledge' or 'bridge' that they seem to unanimously pronounce as /tʃeɪndʒ/, /streɪndʒ/, /'nɒlədʒ/ and /brɪdʒ/. As example one illustrated, due to the influence of Spanish pronunciation patterns, F1 uttered /rɪ'liʒəs/ instead of /rɪ'li:dʒəs/, subsequently, M1 aligned his pronunciation to F1's and mimicked the mistake by also mispronouncing the word 'religious'. Therefore, the transcription might suggest that F1's error was a consequence of phonological CLI, while M1's same mispronunciation was a direct consequence of the interlocutor factor's influence in her partner's speech.

The previously described prioritization of different aspects of conversation is constantly being redirected contingent upon what is considered crucial at that moment. The other mistake that would fit this description would be that of mispronouncing the phoneme /z/ with /s/ as there are countless instances in which the students pronounce the word 'is' as /iz/ and /is/ indistinctively as can be seen in example two.

Example 2.

M3: /dʒes, ʊs'keɪ aɪ θɪŋk ðæt ðə fɜrst part ɒv ðə fɪlm ɪz ə bɪt 'bɔɪŋ bi'kɔs 'nɒli 'xæpənz 'oʊnli ðer ɪz ðə gɜrl ðæt ɪz ə 'berɪ ɛ laɪk 'welθɪ xæz ə 'berɪ 'welθɪ 'fæməli ɛ ðə mən ɪz ə gaɪ ðæt ɛ wɪnz laɪk ə praɪs ænd 'entərs ðə buʊt ænd baɪ 'entəɪŋ ðɪs buʊt ðeɪ feɪl ɪn lɒv ænd laɪk ðeɪ lɪv ɪn ðə buʊt ænd du wɒt ðeɪ want wɪ'θaʊt ɛ ðə 'perənts ɒv ðə gɜrls ɛ ðə pər'mɪʃən ɒv ðə gɜrlz 'perənts. ʊs'keɪ, ɛ du ju θɪŋk 'eni part ɒv ðə fɪlm fʊd xæv bɪn tʃeɪndʒd?/

M3 not only pronounces /z/ and /s/ indistinctively when the word requires the voiced minimal pair but he also does it what appears to be randomly when pronouncing the same words such as 'is' and 'girls'.

Continuing with the list of particularly challenging sounds to pronounce, the sound /h/ seems to have been troublesome to consistently produce as the sound /x/ was its popular alternative. M6 for example, aligned with the researcher's pronunciation of /h/ while greeting each other only to completely disregard the phoneme's right pronunciation after the conversation became cognitively demanding. By the same token, the correct pronunciation of the fricative /v/ seems to also be forgotten immediately after aligning with their partner's pronunciation once, which would indicate that the focus shifted from pronunciation to meaning rather quickly. This is exemplified by the following extracts:

Example 3.

RESEARCHER: /ʊs'keɪ sɒv ju wɒd seɪ ðæt 'sɒmθɪŋ ðæt ju laɪk ə lət wɛn ju 'lɪsən tu 'mju:zɪk ɪz ðɪ 'ɑrtəsts vɔɪs, 'meɪbi ðæt ðeɪ raɪt ðer oʊn 'lɪrɪks æz wɛl, du ju laɪk 'kɒvərz æt ɔl?/

M7: /dʒes, 'æktʃuəli, moʊst taɪms wɛn aɪ faʊnd ə sɔŋ ðæt aɪ laɪk aɪ traɪ tu goʊ ænd sɜrtʃfɔr 'kɒbərz laɪk nat 'oʊnli vɔɪs 'kɒvərz bʌt 'ɔlsɒv 'kɒbərz tu ðə sɔŋ ɪt'self sɒv aɪ goʊ faɪnd drɒm 'kɒbərz, gɪ'tar 'kɒbərz aɪ laɪk 'lɪsənɪŋ tu ðoʊz 'ɔlsɒv/

Example 4.

M9: /ε wεl, ai θιηk ιt wλz 'vεri mi:n bai xεr part ehm ai θɔt θis wɔd nat 'xæpən ænd wεl ιts ən ιm'pæktιη 'noustəs/

M2: /ε jεs ιts ε ιts 'vεri, ιts 'bεri mi:n frλm θə gεrls pə'r'spektiv tu jλst breɪk λp wɪð hɪz 'pɑrtnə'r bɪ'kɔs ιz broʊk. ai θιηk θæt ju fʊd ε θιηk ə 'bɑvɪ mɔr θιηz θæn ε θə 'mλni wɛn 'fuzɪη jʊər 'bɔɪ frɛnd ɔr 'gεrl frɛnd, ε sɔv ai wɔd tʃeɪndʒ θæt part λv θə 'mubi bɪ'kɔs ai 'dɪdənt laɪk ιt/

M2: /'bεri mi:n, 'bεri mi:n/

In addition, results suggest that /'feivərɪt/ seems to be correctly stored in their collective lexicon, which would reinforce the idea of them being aware of the difference between the fricative /v/ and its plosive minimal pair, showcasing that when influenced by their interlocutor or determined to utter the right sound, they are able to produce the fricative regardless of the position in the word. Nevertheless, when the cognitive load becomes too demanding, pronouncing the right minimal pair does not seem as crucial anymore. As O'Neal (2015) suggests, intelligibility is determined by the variable of the speaker. A native speaker would consider uttering /bɔɪs/ rather than /vɔɪs/ unintelligible since the first would make them think of 'boys' and by the latter, they would understand 'voice'. Nonetheless, the students seemed not to notice the difference and the mistake would certainly be intelligible to them.

As the aim of the research is to analyze the phonological CLI the interlocutor factor has on secondary school L1-Spanish students of English as foreign language, we ought to include the negative effects of said interlocutor factor as well, which is exemplified by the following excerpt from the student-student interactions part of the research:

Example 5.

M6: /ιt wλs 'naɪt, mɛrs 2. ai θιηk θə 'tɑɪtəl kʊld bi ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'eskεri. ιt xæz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt λv 'fλni, 'hjumərɪstɪk 'moumənts/

M5: /oʊ, ιt wλs ə 'jumərɪstɪk fɪlm?/

M6: /nat ə 'jumərɪstɪk, bλt ιt xæs sλm 'æksɪən pɑrts ænd sλm 'fλni 'kɑmən, tεrɪs/

M6 was the first to mention the word 'humoristic' and he included the sound /h/ correctly at the beginning of it. Nonetheless, M5 did not seem to listen to M6's pronunciation and silenced the letter /h/ at the beginning of the word. As the letter 'u' is pronounced /ju/ M5 uttered /jumərɪstɪk/ instead of /hjumərɪstɪk/. M6 then second-guessed what was the correct execution of the word 'humoristic' and aligned his pronunciation to that of his partner. In addition, participants not only share their first language but their dialect also, which according to Kim, et al. (2011) facilitates phonetic convergence. In this particular instance, the students happened to mimic a phonetic CLI that lead them to silence the letter 'h'.

Conversely, the interactions with the researcher offer the exact opposite. The student was pronouncing an unnecessary 'e' at the beginning of the word 'Spanish', which would fall into the mistake

of adding an 'e' to words starting with an 's' and followed by a consonant, when the researcher included the same word into her speech providing the correct pronunciation that excludes the 'e' from the word. Subsequently, example six illustrates how the student, M3, mimicked the researcher's pronunciation in his next sentence finally uttering the correct version of the word 'Spanish' and exemplifying Trofimovich's (2015) observation of interactive alignment when both L2 learners share the same mother tongue:

Example 6.

M3: /'meɪbi laɪk ðə xəf əv ðə 'mjuzɪk, aɪ laɪk 'ɔlsəʊ ə 'nɪðər taɪp əv 'mjuzɪk laɪk ðæt ɪz 'ɔl,weɪz ɪn 'espæniʃ ɛ blət ðə wɒn aɪ 'lɪsən tu ɪn 'ɪŋɡlɪʃ 'meɪnli ɪs 'ɛvri,θɪŋ kwɪn/

RESEARCHER: /,əʊ'keɪ ænd wɒt taɪp əv 'mjuzɪk du ju laɪk ɪn 'spæniʃ?/

M3: /ɪn 'spæniʃ aɪ laɪk laɪk ,reɪdɪ'toʊn ɛ jɛs 'ɔl,məʊst ,reɪdɪ'toʊn/

Regarding the sound /ŋ/, four out of five students who uttered /n/ rather than /ŋ/ a total of seventeen times in the student-student interactions were meaningfully influenced by the researcher's pronunciation to the point where they did not mispronounce the phoneme at all during the second part of the research. M3 however, managed to utter /n/ instead of /ŋ/ only once out of 14 times he intended to produce it. This data suggest that in regards to this phoneme, alignment was present during the researcher-student interaction almost eliminating the mistake altogether.

Nevertheless, in an effort to eradicate the mistake, on an isolated occasion M8 overcorrected himself producing an /x/ after the /ŋ/ in the following extract:

Example 7.

RESEARCHER: /wɒs, hi wɒz 'veri jʌŋ, ænd wɒt wɒd ju sei ɪz jʊər 'feɪvərɪt θɪŋ ə 'baʊt ɪ,lek'trɒnɪk 'mjuzɪk? ɪz ɪt ðə bɪt?/

M8: /dʒɛs, ðə bi:t ænd ðə 'rɪðəm, dʒɛs/

RESEARCHER: /raɪt, sɒs aɪ ɡɛs ðæt ju 'ɔlsəʊ laɪk ðɛr 'vɔɪsəz, raɪt?/

M8: /dʒɛs, wɛl ɪn sɪŋ sɔŋz ðɛɪ doʊnt sɪŋx/

The researcher uttered the sound /ŋ/ twice in the words 'young' and 'thing' thereby setting the tone for M8 to produce the voiced velar nasal correctly. Even though M8 was able to produce the sound /ŋ/ correctly the first time in the sentence while pronouncing the word 'songs', he overcorrected himself and mispronounced 'sing' as /sɪŋx/ immediately after.

To sum up, each targeted sound's pronunciation presented a unique challenge of its own to be correctly pronounced by the participants, although some of them were particularly more difficult to alter through the interlocutor factor than others.

7. CONCLUSION, PEDAGOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

In conclusion, the present paper attempts to provide a better comprehension of the effect of the interlocutor factor on phonological CLI of secondary school L1-Spanish students of English as foreign language.

The study seems to indicate that the influence of the interlocutor does help shape each other's speech at a phonological level. As it has been mentioned in the discussion section, the interlocutor could influence the partner to pronounce sounds both correctly and incorrectly as speech alignment could occur with anyone with a similar linguistic background. Therefore, the only difference lies in whether that interlocutor possesses the knowledge of the right pronunciation and utters it consistently. In a classroom context, there is no guarantee students will be able to do the previously stated and in fact, if a student-student interaction was left unsupervised, they would probably end up reinforcing erred pronunciation. Therefore, it would possibly be best if students could occasionally engage in a not-too-cognitively-demanding conversation with their teacher.

Our findings indicate that this specific group of I.E.S Ibaialde's plurilingual fourth-graders find the sounds /v/, /j/, /h/ and /s/ followed by a consonant especially challenging to correctly pronounce consistently as the number of mistakes committed during both interaction types are proportionately similar.

The participants find the fricative /v/ particularly challenging to produce when located at the beginning or intervocalic position, so much so that the only word of these characteristics they are capable of consistently utter correctly is 'favorite'. However, when the cognitive load is not too demanding and they are able to focus on pronunciation, most students are able to utter the sound /v/ both in initial and intervocalic positions.

Similarly, the students utter the voiceless /s/ rather than the voiced /z/, the sound /x/ instead of /h/, phoneme /dʒ/ for /j/ and insert an unnecessary 'e' at the beginning of words starting with an 's' and followed by a consonant indistinctively, which seems to be the aftermath of the task at hand being too cognitively demanding and hindering their focus on pronunciation. Therefore, in order to make the students use the correct sound consistently, the study suggests to sporadically implement speaking student-student activities that require the learners to forget about other aspects of communication such as meaning, grammar or vocabulary to focus exclusively on pronunciation. As their main focus will be on pronunciation, students will potentially develop the ability to distinguish their classmates' mistakes as well as their own and point them out kindly, which will ultimately assist in correcting their collective

mental lexicon accompanying their vocabulary with its proper fixed pronunciation as it seems to be the case with the word 'favorite'.

Results also suggest that spelling might confuse the students in certain circumstances such as with words containing a 'g' or a 'j' that is supposed to be pronounced as /dʒ/. It has been established that this particular mistake has a direct correlation to Spanish pronunciation patterns, which means that their predominant input for the pronunciation of these phonemes comes from their mother tongue resulting in errors in their foreign language. Therefore, it appears that what is needed to correct this mistake is to repeatedly expose the students to the correct input, but perhaps the subtle repetition of the correct pronunciation is not enough for the students to stop mispronouncing the word. In which case, teachers might have to resort to a more direct approach like organizing a spelling bee where the students would have to pronounce the word correctly so that their partner could spell the word hence connecting the spelling to its actual pronunciation instead of the one they had fossilized.

Thus far, it could be derived that pronunciation learning is in need of diverse teaching methods and techniques as different goals require different learning journeys and interacting with different interlocutors encourages individuals to change speech types, registers and even accents (Rojas, et al. 2016).

However, as teachers do not possess an endless supply of interlocutors willing to accompany them to class, they should take advantage of more advanced groups from the same or different schools. Teachers could not only conjoin classrooms but also foster friendships among the students that could promote interest in pronunciation. Moreover, as their purpose would be communication, mimicking for intelligibility's sake could always be a possibility, which would potentially lead to pronunciation improvement, a favorable circumstance to correct any type of fossilized sound from their mental lexicon and a great opportunity to get used to interacting with different interlocutors.

On the other side of the coin, students rarely have the chance to interact with a researcher or a teacher unless it is an examination. As discussed, when tasks become too cognitively demanding students might focus on other aspects of communication like grammar or vocabulary and forget that pronunciation may cause unintelligibility. Consequently, only providing this resource in a stress-inducing situation where learners know they are being evaluated might not be the best approach for them to fully take advantage of interacting with a teacher. Therefore, those schools which have the chance to accept undergraduates and/or postgraduates under their wing could organize weekly classes for the student doing their internship to work on pronunciation with half the class through prepared conversations, debates or interactive games.

This paper's main weakness is the limited number of participants the research was able to collect data from in both interaction types. As their exams were approaching and they needed to revise the subject, there was only sufficient time to perform the researcher-student interaction part of the investigation with 11 students. Nevertheless, the selection of which students made it to the researcher-student interaction was executed totally at random offering a fair representation of the whole class's English pronunciation level.

Conversely, the dissertation's main strength is the variety of data recorded during both interaction types, student-student and researcher-student, that could be useful to analyze not only the phonemes this dissertation has focused on but numerous other aspects related to the interlocutor's effect on phonological choices.

All in all, findings in the present dissertation support the idea that interlocutors influence phonological choices although some sounds might present a greater challenge to mimic than others. Students seem to align their pronunciation to that of their partner in the hopes of achieving a clearer and therefore faster interaction. On occasions, that mimicked sound might not be the correct pronunciation, but its presence suggests the veracity of the interlocutor factor's effect and it helps shape that influence into something a little more tangible represented by numbers.

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to gratefully acknowledge the students who made the research possible along with their teacher Miss Gómez. We would also wish to give a special thank you to the tutor of this dissertation, Dr. Azpilicueta-Martínez, whose dedication and input have been paramount for the completion of the paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benson, C. (2002). Transfer/Cross-linguistic influence. *ELT Journal*, Volume 56(1), 68-70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.68>
- Boomershie, A., K.C. Hall, E. Hume, and K. Johnson (2008). The impact of allophony versus contrast on speech perception. In P. Avery, E. Dresher, and K. Rice (eds.), *Contrast in phonology*. 43-172.
- Brown, A., & McNamara, T. (2004). "The Devil Is in the Detail": Researching Gender Issues in Language Assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(3), 524–538. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588353>
- Carley, P. (2013). Arthur Lloyd James and English pronunciation for foreign learners. Przedlacka, J. Maidment, J. & Ashby, M. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the Phonetics and Learning Conference* (pp. 27-30). UCL, London.
- Chang, C. B. (2015). Determining cross-linguistic phonological similarity between segments. *The Segment in Phonetics and Phonology*. essay.
- Chichon, J. (2019). Factors influencing overseas learners' Willingness to Communicate (WTC) on a pre-session programme at a UK university. In *English for Academic Purposes* (Vol. 39, pp. 87–96). essay.
- Davis, L. (2009). The influence of interlocutor proficiency in a paired oral assessment. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 367–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104667>
- Fabiano-Smith, L., & Goldstein, B. (2005). Phonological cross-linguistic effects in bilingual English speaking children. *Multilingual Communication Disorders*, 3(1), 56–63.
- Garrod, S., Pickering, M.J. (2004). Why is conversation so easy? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(1), 8-11, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S136466130300295X>
- Kim, M., et al. (2011). Phonetic convergence in spontaneous conversations as a function of interlocutor language distance., 2(1), 125-156. <https://doi.org/10.1515/labphon.2011.004>

- Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 211–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807086288>
- Levis. (2005). Changing Contexts and Shifting Paradigms in Pronunciation Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3) 369–77. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588485>.
- Lin, Y. H. (2003). Interphonology variability: Sociolinguistic factors affecting L2 simplification strategies. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), 439-464 <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.4.439>
- Lloyd James, A. (1935) *The Broadcast Word*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Major, R. C. (2008). Transfer in second language phonology. In J. G. Hansen Edwards & M. L. Zampini (Eds.), *Phonology and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 63–94). essay, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Munro, et al. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 111–131.
- Norton, J. (2005). The paired format in the Cambridge speaking tests. *ELT Journal*. Retrieved February 20, 2022, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ727677>
- O’Neal (2015) Interactional intelligibility: the relationship between consonant modification and pronunciation intelligibility in English as a Lingua Franca in Japan. *Asian Englishes*, 17(3), 222-239, DOI: 10.1080/13488678.2015.1041871
- Pickering, M.J., Garrod, S. (2006). Alignment as the Basis for Successful Communication. *Research Language Computation* 4, 203–228 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11168-006-9004-0>
- Poteau, C. E. (2011). *Effects of interlocutor familiarity on second language learning in group work* (dissertation).
- Rojas, R. et al. (2016) *Interlocutor differential effects on the expressive language skills of Spanish-speaking English learners*. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 18(2), 166-177, DOI: 10.3109/17549507.2015.1081290

The interlocutor factor on the phonological cross-linguistic influence of secondary L1 Spanish EFL students

Smith, M., & Kellerman, E. (1986). Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition: An Introduction. In *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second language acquisition Language Teaching Methodology Series* (pp. 1–6). essay, Pergamon Press.

Trofimovich, P. (2015). *Hub: Interactive alignment: A teaching-friendly view of Second language pronunciation learning*: 10.1017/S0261444813000360. Sci. Retrieved February 13, 2022, from <https://sci-hub.mkxa.top/10.1017/S0261444813000360>

APPENDICES

Appendix I – Instructions for the student-student interactions

WORDS YOU NEED TO INCLUDE IN YOUR CONVERSATION

THESE	BORING	YES
SHE	HELLO	WOULD
STRANGE	VERY	JOB
TRAVEL	PRESENT	CHANGE
STOP	MEAN	YELLOW

- TOPIC → YOUR FAVORITE TV SHOW/MOVIE

Suggestions: it is a conversation, try to ask questions. IT DOES NOT NEED TO BE TRUE; you can lie.

You can talk about:

- Characters, their life
- Why you like it
- Your opinion about it (ask your mate's opinion too)
- The plot
- Anything you want to mention about it

Appendix II - Instructions for the researcher-student interactions

WORDS YOU NEED TO INCLUDE IN YOUR CONVERSATION

BEAT	BASIC	YEAR
SHY	HARD	WOULD
STRANGE	VOICE	JAZZ
COVER	MUSIC	CHOICE
SPANISH	EASY	YOUNG

- TOPIC → YOUR FAVORITE ARTIST

Suggestions: It is a conversation, try to ask questions. IT DOES NOT NEED TO BE TRUE; you can lie.

You can talk about:

- The artist, their life
- Why you like them
- Your opinion on their music (ask your mate's opinion too)
- Different songs you like
- Anything you want to mention about them

Appendix III - Phonetic transcription of one of the student-student interactions

SEVENTH COUPLE → M5 & M6

M5: /hə'loʊ M6/

M6: /hə'loʊ, hæʊ ɔr ju?/

M5: /aɪm faɪn. wʌt dɪd ju du læst 'wi,kend?/

M6: /oʊ, aɪ sɔ ə fɪlm, ə 'skəri fɪlm/

M5: /wʌt fɪlm dɪd ju si?/

M6: /ðə nʌn, ɪt wʌz ə 'prɛzənt fɔr, frʌm maɪ 'pɛrənts fɔr maɪ 'bɜrθ,deɪ/

M5: /oʊ, jɛs, aɪ 'ɔlsəʊ sɔ ðæt fɪlm ɪn ðə 'sɪnəmə ði 'lðər deɪ. ðɪz taɪps ʌv fɪlmz aɪ laɪk ə lət, bʌt ə 'spɛʃli ðoʊz wʌn, aɪ θɪŋk wʌz 'veri 'bɔrɪŋ/

M6: /jɛs, aɪ θɪŋk wʌz ə 'veri streɪndʒ/

M5: /aɪ kʊd ɪm'pruʊ ə lət ʌv θɪŋz mɔr bɪ'kɔz ɪt wʌz 'veri sləʊ ðə fɪlm/

M6: /jɛs, ɪt wʌz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt sləʊ. maɪ 'feɪvərɪt part ʌv ðə fɪlm wʌz ɛ, wɛn ʃi ðə meɪn 'kɛrɪktər draɪvz ɪn hæz 'jeləʊ kɑr ænd stɑps ɪn frʌnt ʌv ðə tʃɛrtʃ wɔts 'sɪŋ feɪs tu feɪs wɪð ðə nʌn/

M5: /oʊ jɛs, aɪ 'ɔlsəʊ laɪk ə lət ðɪs part, ɪt wʌz 'veri 'veri 'ɪntrəstɪŋ, ænd aɪ- ɪt wʌz laɪk ə 'naɪt,mer/

M6: /jɛs, aɪ θɪŋk soʊ/

M5: /aɪ θɪŋk ðə læst part wʌz 'veri 'veri 'bɔrɪŋ, ɪt 'dʌzənt 'hæpən 'eni,θɪŋ. aɪ wʊd tʃeɪndʒ ə lət ʌv parts ʌv ðɪs. aɪ mɪn ðeɪ 'ɪvɪn bɪld, fɪlmd ðə tʃɜrtʃ/

M6: /jɛs, aɪ wʊd pʊt laɪk mɔr 'dɪfərənt 'sɪnəɪz ænd laɪk ðɪs, ðə fɪlm wʊd bi ə 'lɪtəl bɪt mɔr, nɑt 'flaɪ, ɛ bʌt wɪð mɔr 'sɪnəɪz ɪt wɪl/wʊd bi 'meɪbi mɔr 'skəri/

M5: /jɛs, ə 'nʌðər fɪlm, ə 'nʌðər 'skəri fɪlm aɪ sɔ ði 'lðər deɪ wʌz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'betər. wʌt wʌz ðə læst fɪlm ðæt dɪd ju si?/

M6: /ɪt wʌz 'naɪt,merz 2. aɪ θɪŋk ðə 'taɪtəl kæn bi ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'skəri. ɪt hæz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt ʌv 'flaɪ 'moumənts/

M5: /oʊ, ɪt wʌz ə humoristic fɪlm?/

M6: /nɑt ə humoristic, bʌt ɪt hæz sʌm 'ækʃən pɑrts ænd sʌm 'flaɪ 'kɑmən, tɛrɪz/

M5: /du ju θɪŋk ɪn ðə 'fju:tʃər ju wʊd laɪk tu dʒʌb laɪk ə 'kæməərə 'fɪlmər/

M6: /noʊ, aɪ θɪŋk ðæt noʊ, bɪ'kɔz aɪ θɪŋk ðæt aɪ 'wʊdənt laɪk tu bi ɔl ðə taɪm 'fɪlmɪŋ 'vɪdɪoʊz ɔr 'teɪkɪŋ 'foʊ, tʊz ʌv 'sʌmθɪŋ/

M5: /jɛs, aɪ θɪŋk 'ɔlsəʊ ðæt ðɪs dʒʌb ɪt kʊd bi 'veri 'veri-'bɔrɪŋ/

M6: /-ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'bɔrɪŋ. jɛs/

M5: /,oʊ 'keɪ soʊ, hæv ə naɪs deɪ/

M6: hæv ə naɪs deɪ/

M5: /wi hæv 'fɪnɪʃt aɪ θɪŋk/

M6: /weɪt ə 'moumənt. ju wʊd laɪk tu bi nekst deɪ mit tu si ə 'nʌðər fɪlm?/

M5: /jɛs, ænd aɪ θɪŋk wi kʊd wɔtʃ ən 'tʃɑrtɪd aɪ θɪŋk ɪts ə 'veri gʊd fɪlm/

M6: /oʊ, ən 'tʃɑrtɪd ðə nu fɪlm ʌv tam 'hələnd-/

M5: /jɛs, ʌv tam 'hələnd/

M6: /-ðə 'spɑɪdərmeɪn 'æktər?/

M5: /jɛs, ɪt wʊd bi 'veri 'flaɪ/

M6: /,oʊ 'keɪ, ,oʊ 'keɪ/

M5: /baɪ/

M6: /baɪ/

HOW THEY PRONOUNCED IT

M5: /xə'loʊ M6/

M6: /xə'loʊ, xəʊ ar ju?/

M5: /aɪm faɪn. wɒt dɪd dʒu du læst 'wi,kænd?/

M6: /oʊ, aɪ sɔ ə fɪlm, ə 'eskeri fɪlm/

M5: /wɒt fɪlm dɪd dʒu si?/

M6: /ðə nɪn, ɪt wɒs ə 'presənt fɔr, frɒm maɪ 'perənts fɔr maɪ 'bɜrθ,deɪ/

M5: /oʊ, dʒes, aɪ 'ɔlsəʊ sɔ ðæt fɪlm ɪn ðə 'sɪnəmə ði 'lɒðər deɪ. ði:s taɪps ɒv fɪlms aɪ laɪk ə lət, bʌt ə 'speɪli ðoʊs wɒn, aɪ θɪŋk wɒz 'beri 'bɜrɪn/

M6: /dʒes, aɪ θɪŋk ɪt wɒs ə 'beri estreɪndʒ/

M5: /aɪ kʊd ɪm'pruʊ ə lət ɒv θɪŋz mɔr bɪ'kɔs ɪt wɒz 'beri esloʊ ðə fɪlm/

M6: /dʒes, ɪt wɒs ə 'lɪtəl bɪt esloʊ. maɪ 'feɪvərɪt part ɒv ðə fɪlm wɒs ɛ, wɛn si ðə meɪn 'kerɪktər draɪs ɪn xɜr 'dʒeləʊ kɑr ænd stɪps ɪn frʌnt ɒv ðə tʃɑrtʃ wɛt ɪt 'sɪŋ feɪs tu feɪs wɪð ðə nɪn/

M5: /oʊ dʒes, aɪ 'ɔlsəʊ laɪk ə lət ðɪs part, ɪt wɒz 'beri 'beri ɪntrəstɪŋ, ænd aɪ- ɪt wɒs laɪk ə 'naɪt,meɪr/

M6: /dʒes, aɪ θɪŋk sɔʊ/

M6: /aɪ θɪŋk ðə læst part wɒs 'beri 'beri 'bɜrɪn, ɪt 'dɒsənt 'xæpən 'eni,θɪŋ. aɪ wʊd tʃeɪndʒ ə lət ɒv parts ɒv ðɪs. aɪ mɪn ðeɪ 'ɪben bɪld, fɪlmd ðə tʃɑrtʃ/

M6: /dʒes, aɪ wʊd pʊt laɪk mɔr 'dɪfərənt 'sɪnəɪz ænd laɪk ðɪs, ðə fɪlm wʊd bi ə 'lɪtəl bɪt mɔr, nɒt 'flni, ɛ bʌt wɪð mɔr 'esɪnəɪz ɪt wɪl/wʊd bi 'meɪbi mɔr 'eskeri/

M5: /dʒes, ə 'nɒðər fɪlm, ə 'nɒðər 'eskeri fɪlm aɪ sɔ ði 'lɒðər deɪ wɒs ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'betər. wɒt wɒs ðə læst fɪlm ðæt dɪd dʒu si?/

M6: /ɪt wɒs 'naɪt,meɪs 2. aɪ θɪŋk ðə 'taɪtəl kʊld bi ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'eskeri. ɪt xæz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt ɒv 'flni, hjuːmərɪstɪk 'moumənts/

M5: /oʊ, ɪt wɒs ə 'juːmərɪstɪk fɪlm?/

M6: /nɒt ə 'juːmərɪstɪk, bʌt ɪt xæs sɒm 'æksɪən parts ænd sɒm 'flni 'kəmən,teɪs/

M5: /du dʒu θɪŋk ɪn ðə 'fjuːtər dʒu wʊd laɪk tu dʒɒv laɪk ə 'kæməərə 'fɪlmər/

M6: /noʊ, aɪ θɪŋk ðæt noʊ, bɪ'kɔs aɪ θɪŋk ðæt aɪ 'wʊdənt laɪk tu bi ɔl ðə taɪm 'fɪlmtɪŋ 'bɪdɪoʊs ɔr 'teɪkɪŋ 'foʊ,təʊs ɒv 'sɒmθɪŋ/

M5: /dʒes, aɪ θɪŋk 'ɔlsəʊ ðæt ðɪs dʒɒb ɪt kʊd bi 'beri 'beri-'bɜrɪn/

M6: /-ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'bɜrɪn. dʒes/

M5: /,oʊ 'keɪ sɔʊ, xæv ə naɪs deɪ/

M6: /xæv ə naɪs deɪ/

M5: /wi xæv 'fɪnɪʃ ə θɪŋk/

M6: /weɪt ə 'moumənt. dʒu wʊd laɪk tu bi nekst deɪ mɪt tu si ə 'nɒðər fɪlm?/

M5: /dʒes, ænd aɪ θɪŋk wi kʊd wɒtʃ ən'tʃɑrtəd aɪ θɪŋk ɪts ə 'beri gʊd fɪlm/

M6: /oʊ, ən'tʃɑrtɪd ðə nju fɪlm ɒv tam 'xalənd-/

M5: /dʒes, ɒv tam 'xalənd/

M6: /-ðə 'espaɪdərmeɪn 'æktər?/

M5: /dʒes, ɪt wʊd bi 'beri 'flni/

M6: /,oʊ 'keɪ, ,oʊ 'keɪ/

M5: /baɪ/

M6: /baɪ/

Appendix IV - Phonetic transcription of one of the researcher-student interactions

10th SOLO 20 – M7

Researcher: /hə'lou, ai nou ðə ,sɪfju'eɪʃən ɪz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt streɪndʒ blət doʊnt bi ʃaɪ ænd tɛl mi ə'baʊt jʊər 'feɪvərɪt 'ɑrtəst ɔr 'mju:zɪk grup/

M7: /wɛl, ɪts kaɪnd lʌ streɪndʒ bɪ'kɔz ai doʊnt 'rɪli hæv ə 'feɪvərɪt 'ɑrtəst, fɔr mi ðə 'prə,ses lʌ 'faɪndɪŋ 'mju:zɪk ðæt ai laɪk ɪz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt streɪndʒ bɪ'kɔz wɛn ai wɒnt tu faɪnd 'mju:zɪk ai goʊ tu youtubɪt ai 'lɪsən tu ðə sɔŋz ai ɔl'redɪ laɪk ænd ðə youtubɪt 'ælgə,rɪðəm ɪt faɪndz mi ɛ ,rɛkə'mɛndz mi gʊd sɔŋz ænd səm'taɪmz wɛn ai... wɪð ðə ,rɛkəmən'deɪʃənz ðeɪ gɪv mi ai faʊnd mɔr sɔŋz ðæt ai laɪk, ɪts laɪk 'gouɪŋ ænd 'faɪndɪŋ goʊld ɪn ə maɪn/

Researcher: /wɪtʃ sɔŋ wʊd ju seɪ ɪz jʊər 'feɪvərɪt? wɪtʃ wʌn wʊd ju tʃuz ɪf ju hæd tu?/

M7: /wɛl, ɪf ai hæd tu tʃuz ə sɔŋ ai wʊd tʃuz 'ɪndəstri 'beɪbɪ frʌm lɪl nɔz ɛks, ɪt hæz ə 'rɪli gʊd bɪt, ɪt saʊndz 'rɪli gʊd ænd lɪl nɔz ɛks vɔɪs wʌn lʌ ðə fju 'vɔɪsəz ai 'rɪli laɪk tu 'lɪsən, moʊst sɔŋz ðæt ai 'æktʃuəli 'lɪsən tu ai θɪŋk ðeɪ ɑr səm'taɪmz 'ruən baɪ ðə 'sɪŋər bɪ'kɔz ðə 'lɪrɪks ænd ðə vɔɪs doʊnt 'rɪli fɪt ɪn ðə sɔŋ/

Researcher: /,oʊ'keɪ soʊ ju wʊd seɪ ðæt 'slʌmθɪŋ ðæt ju laɪk ə lət wɛn ju 'lɪsən tu 'mju:zɪk ɪz ði 'ɑrtəsts vɔɪs, 'meɪbɪ ðæt ðeɪ raɪt ðeɪ ɔʊn 'lɪrɪks æz wɛl, du ju laɪk 'klʌvəz æt ɔl?/

M7: /jɛs, 'æktʃuəli, moʊst taɪmz wɛn ai faʊnd ə sɔŋ ðæt ai laɪk ai traɪ tu goʊt ænd sɜrtʃ fɔr 'klʌvəz laɪk nɔt 'oʊnli vɔɪs 'klʌvəz blət 'ɔlsəʊ 'klʌvəz tu ðə sɔŋ ɪt'sɛlf soʊ ai goʊt faɪnd drʌm 'klʌvəz, grɪ'tɑr 'klʌvəz ai laɪk 'lɪsənɪŋ tu ðoʊz 'ɔlsəʊ/

Researcher: /raɪt, ðæts kul ænd hæv ju laɪkt ðæt 'mju:zɪk sɪns ju wɜr jʌŋ ɔr ɪz ɪt laɪk ə læst jɪrz θɪŋ? ðɪs jɪr θɪŋ ɔr wʌt du ju θɪŋk?/

M7: /aɪ 'rɪli 'dɪdənt 'foʊkəs mʌtʃ ɒn 'lɪsənɪŋ tu 'mju:zɪk soʊ ai 'hævənt θɔt ə'baʊt... ai 'hævənt 'rɪli stɪk tu wʌn taɪp lʌ 'mju:zɪk soʊ wʌt... moʊst lʌ ðə taɪmz wɛn ai get stʌk wɪð ə sɔŋ ɪt wʌz ɒn 'fæməli trɪps wɛn 'lɪsənɪŋ tu ðə 'reɪdɪ,oʊs, jɛs ɪf aɪv faʊnd ə gʊd wʌn ai stɪk wɪð ðæt wʌn/

Researcher: /du ju laɪk 'spæɪnɪʃ 'mju:zɪk æz wɛl ɔr 'ɛvri,θɪŋ ju 'lɪsən tu ɪz ɪn 'ɪŋglɪʃ?/

M7: /jɛs, 'æktʃuəli 'spæɪnɪʃ sɔŋz ai hæv 'oʊnli tu ðæt ai laɪk, ai doʊnt 'rɪli laɪk 'spæɪnɪʃ 'mju:zɪk, moʊst lʌ ðə θɪŋz ai 'lɪsən tu ɑr ɪn 'ɪŋglɪʃ/

Researcher: 'asəm ænd du ju faɪnd ɪt hard ɔr 'ɪzi tu ,ʌndər'stænd ðə 'lɪrɪks?/

M7: /aɪ faɪnd ɪt kaɪnd lʌ 'ɪzi ai gɔt ju:zd tu ɪt 'prɪti fæst/

Researcher: /soʊ ju get ju:zd tu ði 'ɑrtəst fæst ɔr ɪz ɪt laɪk dʌz ɪt tʃeɪndʒ rə'gɑrdɪŋ ði 'æksɛnt 'meɪbɪ ɔr ðə spɪd? dʌz ɪt tʃeɪndʒ ɔr ɪz ɪt 'ɔl,wɛɪz 'ɪzi fɔr ju?/

M7: /ɪts 'ɔl,wɛɪz 'ɪzi bɪ'kɔz 'ɔlsəʊ moʊst lʌ ðə taɪmz ai 'lɪsən tu fæst sɔŋz ænd ræp sɔŋz ðæt 'rɪli tɔk 'vɛrɪ fæst/

Researcher: /soʊ ju ɑr dʒʌst ju:zd tu ɪt æt ðɪs pɔɪnt?/

M7: /aɪm ju:zd tu 'lɪsənɪŋ tu fæst θɪŋz soʊ ai ,ʌndər'stænd ɪt 'rɪli wɛl/

Researcher: /raɪt, ænd hu wʊd ju seɪ ɪz jʊər 'feɪvərɪt ræp 'ɑrtəst, 'mju:zɪk 'ɑrtəst?/

M7: /aɪ wʊd seɪ ,ɛmɪ'nɛm, bɪ'kɔz lʌ hɪz 'kɛrɪktər, hi ɪz nɔt 'rɪli ðə best 'pɜrsən, blət ðæts wʌt meɪks hɪm 'spɛʃəl, ai gɛs/

Researcher: /,oʊ'keɪ, du ju nou 'ɛni,θɪŋ ə'baʊt hɪz laɪf?/

M7: /nɔt mʌtʃ, blət ai du nou ðæt hi hæz ə lət lʌ kən'flɪkts wɪð 'mɛni 'pɪpəl, hi 'ɔlsəʊ hæd ðæt 'kɒnflɪkt wɪð hɪz 'mʌðər wɛn hi wɛnt tu kɔrt wɪð hɜr/

Researcher: /kən'flɪkts, ju seɪ?/

M7: /jɛs, ai θɪŋk ðeɪ wɛnt tu kɔrt ə'baʊt ə sɔŋ hi meɪd wɜr hi dɪst hɜr/

HOW HE PRONOUNCED IT

Researcher: /hə'lou, ai nou ðə ,sɪfju'eɪʃən ɪz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt streɪndʒ blət doʊnt bi ʃaɪ ænd tɛl mi ə'baʊt jʊər 'feɪvərɪt 'ɑrtəst ɔr 'mju:zɪk grʊp/

M7: /wəl, ɪts kaɪnd əv 'streɪndʒ bɪ'kɔs ai doʊnt 'rɪli hæv ə 'feɪvərɪt 'ɑrtəst, fɔr mi ðə 'prə'ses əv 'faɪndɪŋ 'mju:zɪk ðæt ai laɪk ɪz ə 'lɪtəl bɪt 'streɪndʒ bɪ'kɔz wɛn ai wɒnt tu faɪnd 'mju:zɪk ai goʊ tu 'ju:tʊv ai 'lɪsən tu ðə sɔŋz ai ɔl'redɪ laɪk ænd ðə 'ju:tʊv 'ælgə,rɪðəm ɪt faɪndz mi ɛ ,rɛkə'mendz mi gʊd sɔŋz ænd səm'taɪms wɛn ai... wɪð ðə ,rɛkəmən'deɪʃəns ðeɪ gɪv mi ai faʊnd mɔr sɔŋz ðæt ai laɪk, ɪts laɪk 'gouɪŋ ænd 'faɪndɪŋ goʊld ɪn ə maɪn/

Researcher: /wɪtʃ sɔŋ wʊd ju seɪ ɪz jʊər 'feɪvərɪt? wɪtʃ wɒn wʊd ju tʃuz ɪf ju hæd tu?/

M7: /wəl, ɪf ai hæd tu tʃuz ə sɔŋ ai wʊd tʃuz 'ɪndəstri 'beɪbɪ frʌm lɪl nəs eks, ɪt xæz ə 'rɪli gʊd bɪ:t, ɪt saʊndz 'rɪli gʊd ænd lɪl nəs eks 'voɪs wɒn əv ðə fju 'voɪsəz ai 'rɪli laɪk tu 'lɪsən, moʊst sɔŋz ðæt ai 'æktʃuəli 'lɪsən tu ai θɪŋk ðeɪ ɑr səm'taɪmz 'ruən baɪ ðə 'sɪŋər bɪ'kɔs ðə 'lɪrɪks ænd ðə bɔɪs doʊnt 'rɪli fɪt ɪn ðə sɔŋ/

Researcher: /,oʊ'keɪ soʊ ju wʊd seɪ ðæt 'sɒmθɪŋ ðæt ju laɪk ə lət wɛn ju 'lɪsən tu 'mju:zɪk ɪz ði 'ɑrtəsts 'voɪs, 'meɪbɪ ðæt ðeɪ raɪt ðeɪ oʊn 'lɪrɪks æz wəl, du ju laɪk 'kʌvərz æt ɔl?/

M7: /dʒes, 'æktʃuəli, moʊst taɪms wɛn ai faʊnd ə sɔŋ ðæt ai laɪk ai traɪ tu goʊ ænd sɜrtʃ fɔr 'kʌbərz laɪk nət 'oʊnli 'voɪs 'kʌvərz blət 'ɔlsʊ 'kʌbərz tu ðə sɔŋ ɪt'self soʊ ai goʊ faɪnd drʌm 'kʌbərz, grɪ'tɑr 'kʌbərz ai laɪk 'lɪsənɪŋ tu ðoʊz 'ɔlsʊz/

Researcher: /raɪt, ðæts kʌl ænd hæv ju laɪkt ðæt 'mju:zɪk sɪns ju wɜr ʃʌŋ ɔr ɪz ɪt laɪk ə læst ʃɪrz θɪŋ? ðɪs ʃɪr θɪŋ ɔr wɒt du ju θɪŋk?/

M7: /aɪ 'rɪli 'dɪdənt 'foʊkəs mʌtʃ ɑn 'lɪsənɪŋ tu 'mju:zɪk soʊ ai 'xævənt θət ə'baʊt... ai 'xævənt 'rɪli stɪk tu wɒn taɪp əv 'mju:zɪk soʊ wɒt... moʊst əv ðə taɪmz wɛn ai get stɪk wɪð ə sɔŋ ɪt wɒz ɑn 'fæməli trɪps wɛn 'lɪsənɪŋ tu ðə 'reɪdɪ,oʊ, ʃes ɪf aɪv faʊnd ə gʊd wɒn ai estɪk wɪð ðæt wɒn/

Researcher: /du ju laɪk 'spæniʃ 'mju:zɪk æz wəl ɔr 'evri,θɪŋ ju 'lɪsən tu ɪz ɪn 'ɪŋglɪʃ?/

M7: /ʃes, 'æktʃuəli 'spæniʃ sɔŋz ai xæv 'oʊnli tu ðæt ai laɪk, ai doʊnt 'rɪli laɪk 'spæniʃ 'mju:zɪk, moʊst əv ðə θɪŋ ai 'lɪsən tu ɑr ɪn 'ɪŋglɪʃ/

Researcher: 'asəm ænd du ju faɪnd ɪt hard ɔr 'ɪzi tu ,ʌndər'stænd ðə 'lɪrɪks?/

M7: /aɪ faɪnd ɪt kaɪnd əv 'ɪsi ai gət ju:zd tu ɪt 'prɪti fæst/

Researcher: /soʊ ju get ju:zd tu ði 'ɑrtəst fæst ɔr ɪz ɪt laɪk dʌz ɪt tʃeɪndʒ rə'gɑrdɪŋ ði 'æksənt 'meɪbɪ ɔr ðə spɪd? dʌz ɪt tʃeɪndʒ ɔr ɪz ɪt 'ɔl,wɛz 'ɪzi fɔr ju?/

M7: /ɪts 'ɔl,wɛz 'ɪsi bɪ'kɔs 'ɔlsʊ moʊst əv ðə taɪms ai 'lɪsən tu fæst sɔŋz ænd ræp sɔŋz ðæt 'rɪli tɔk 'bɛrɪ fæst/

Researcher: /soʊ ju ɑr dʒʌst ju:zd tu ɪt æt ðɪs pɔɪnt?/

M7: /aɪm ju:zd tu 'lɪsənɪŋ tu fæst θɪŋz soʊ ai ,ʌndər'stænd ɪt 'rɪli wəl/

Researcher: /raɪt, ænd hu wʊd ju seɪ ɪz jʊər 'feɪvərɪt ræp 'ɑrtəst, 'mju:zɪk 'ɑrtəst?/

M7: /aɪ wʊd seɪ ,ɛmɪ'nɛm, bɪ'kɔs əv xɪs 'kɛrɪktər, xɪ ɪs nət 'rɪli ðə bɛst 'pɜrsən, blət ðæts wɒt meɪks hɪm 'spɛʃəl, ai ges/

Researcher: /,oʊ'keɪ, du ju nou 'eni,θɪŋ ə'baʊt hɪz laɪf?/

M7: /nət mʌtʃ, blət ai du nou ðæt xɪ xæz ə lət əv kən'flɪkts wɪð 'meni 'pɪpəl, xɪ 'ɔlsʊ xæd ðæt 'kənflɪkt wɪð xɪz 'mʌðər wɛn xɪ wɛnt tu kɔrt wɪð xɜr/

Researcher: /kən'flɪkts, ju seɪ?/

M7: /ʃes, ai θɪŋk ðeɪ wɛnt tu kɔrt ə'baʊt ə sɔŋ xɪ meɪd wɜr xɪ dist xɜr/