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**ABSTRACT**

Oral production in dyadic and virtual conversations between native speakers and learners in Italian as a foreign language (IFL) provides information on narrative strategies used in the asymmetric oral interaction by the two interlocutors. In this study, the conversations, which took place in an academic context during the year 2019-20, featured learners of Italian Language D-III (third semester) of the Translation and Interpreting (UA) degree. With regard to the methodology, the model adopted is action research and we focus on its third phase, the compilation and analysis of oral production, which derives from the first two (experiencing the problem and imagining a solution by putting it into practice) and leads to the fourth (modification and improvement of the activity). Through telecollaboration, the learners produce the conversations that become the analysis material of the teacher-researcher. The results of this project will be an input for the renewal of the next academic year’s Italian language curricular design. As specific objectives, we seek to classify the strategies and identify how the speakers organize and structure the communication according to their communicative language competence (B1), following the criteria proposed by CEFR and PCIC related to narration. By implementing this practice, the interlocutors create a learning context centered on the learner, who, throughout the process, by autonomous and collaborative means, achieves the purpose of communication.
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

The Universities of Alicante (UA), Salerno (UNISA) and Suor Orsola Benincasa (UNISOB) in Naples have been leading a telecollaboration project, Teletándem, since 2009 through which the students of Italian Language D (third foreign language) of the degree in Translation and Interpreting (at the UA) perform peer-to-peer oral interactions with their counterparts at UNISA (Modern Languages and Literatures) and UNISOB (Modern Languages for Communication and International Cooperation). The oral material has been contributing to CORINÉI (Corpus Oral de Interlengua Español-Italiano), which is still under construction, since the earliest stages of the project (Chiapello et al., 2018, pp. 29-74; González-Royo & Martín-Sánchez, 2019, pp. 531-546). As the interactions take place between university students and are recorded in an academic environment, this activity can therefore be inserted in a European Higher Education Area context. Furthermore, the whole activity enables the teachers to ascertain the effectiveness of using a computer-assisted model within a virtual context, compared to traditional modes of learner participation: face-to-face, blended and distance learning.

The sample of conversations was taken from third semester learners of IFL, who reach a B1 level of competence. Since one of the fundamental abilities shown by CEFR (2018) and PCIC (2006) for that level is the use of narrative, in this study we aim to identify this macro-function within the selected sub-corpus, following the criteria proposed by the two manuals. Accordingly, one of our main priorities is to observe the topic and type of situation in the past that the learner and interlocutor are
interested in conversing about. Likewise, in such oral interlanguage sub-corpus, it is essential to determine whether the speaker of a sequence is NS (native) or NNS (non-native) and how the narration is structured. Our general analysis and evaluation rely on grammatical and pragmatic competences and oral production strategies (Martín-Sánchez, 2017, pp. 155-163). However, due to space constraints, in the current contribution we will overlook the use of past tenses, *consecutio temporum*, deixis and discourse markers in order to concentrate on the communicative language strategies of the online interaction: turn-taking, cooperating and asking for clarification (CEFR, 2018, pp. 11-14 & 98-103).

We embrace the vision of the “living theory”, shared by authors such as Whitehead (1989, 2008) and Whitehead & McNiff (2006, pp. 28-46) who recognize the teacher as researcher and practitioner within the same activity context. The teacher-researcher fosters, guides and analyzes the curricular routes, while the language learning focuses on the students, who are given ample space for their autonomous and individualized work, following Nunan’s proposal (1988; 2004).

Although the general aims of the activity include global practice of spontaneous oral exchange (NS/NNS), exercising and strengthening the communicative skills of the learners, the present study seeks to observe how each pair of speakers organizes and structures the asymmetric oral interactions in IFL, in order to compile the strategies brought into play (CEFR, 2018, pp. 70-104), and to identify whether they fulfill the communication, based on the competences of the B1 level.

2. METHOD

The present study is embedded in the Analysis of Conversation and follows the principles of action research in the EHEA, as per the details below.

2.1. Context and participants

This analysis was conducted on 54 conversations produced by 27 students of the UA during their third semester of IFL (Italian Language D-III) as part of the Translation and Interpreting degree in the academic year 2019-20. The required level of proficiency was B1 (CEFR). Interactions were the result of virtual meetings through Skype, or other forms of VoIP technology, with native Italian speakers enrolled at UNISA and UNISOB, which were recorded in an academic context. Regarding the pedagogical basis, this activity is ascribed to the task-based and computer-aided approach, as a real-world task outside the classroom (Nunan, 2004, pp. 1-4; 50-51). Teachers were required to organize and coordinate the activity, providing an organizational prompt limited to the tools and the deadlines. They deliberately refrained from suggesting any specific topic or linguistic skill, as they sought to elicit spontaneous speech.

2.2. Instruments for data collection

The students attended an informative session in the classroom and were provided with clear instructions on how to carry out the production (VoIP technology such as Skype, Google Hangouts, etc.), recording (Mp3 Skype Recorder, Pamela for Skype, etc.), transcription (Val.Es.Co. & PRESEEA rules), and submission of the recorded conversations through the university platform (UACloud).

They recorded a total of 13.5 hours of conversation (around 15 minutes per conversation), which was the sample used for our analysis. As mentioned in the course syllabus, conversations and their transcriptions had to be included in the student portfolios, and were assessed by teachers in order to evaluate and determine the learners’ oral proficiency level. That said, we should make it clear that the transcriptions were written up without any modification in order to reflect the NNS’s authentic written production.
2.3. Procedure

Firstly, in the planning stage, the teacher explained the main aims of the oral activity, as well as its integration in the course syllabus. After this, native partners were randomly assigned to our students, and a document containing all the instructions to carry out this practical activity, including its deadlines, was uploaded on the UACloud, specifically under the Assessment tab (Evaluación/Entrega de prácticas).

Secondly, during the action stage, each pair of NS/NNS made contact via WhatsApp, Facebook or Instagram in order to schedule their sessions. Then they produced, recorded and fully transcribed their conversations, and were instructed to include all the material in their personal student portfolios, accompanied by a sociolinguistic survey, meeting two deadlines.

Thirdly, the core part of our investigation consisted in determining which strategies and topics the NNS employed in the narrative sequences, provided that grammatical and pragmatic competences were generally appropriate to the level (B1) and that errors did not interfere in the accomplishment of the communication.

3. RESULTS

The presentation of the results centres on the topics that have been formed the basis of most of the 54 conversations gathered at B1 level during the first semester of 2019-20. Classification is not exhaustive and we identified some other examples of narration, but we have limited our study to past facts referring to the five most recurrent topics in this sub-corpus: celebrations (Christmas, New Year’s Eve, the Epiphany Festival, etc.), studies (exams, university, Erasmus, readings), travelling (narrated as personal life experiences), social events and other personal activities (work experiences, etc.). As can be seen in Table 1, the production of all informants consists in the narration of facts that deal with the various topics mentioned above.

Table 1. Conversation topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversations</th>
<th>Social events</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Celebrations: Christmas</th>
<th>Personal activities</th>
<th>Total/ informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2 1 2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female/male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 2 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>* 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>* 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0 0 2 0 0 3 2 0 0 0 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0 1 1 2 1 0 1 4 2 0 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0 0 4 1 2 1 0 0 0 3 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Each learner included in his/her portfolio two conversations held with his/her native interlocutor, duly recorded and transcribed. The columns in the table record the identified narrative episodes classified according to their topic in each of these conversations. In the last column on the right, all of them are added together for each of the learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social events</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Celebrations: Christmas</th>
<th>Personal activities</th>
<th>Total/ informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ñ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/ conversations</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Average number of conversations per student
The above figure (1) displays the average number of conversations recorded by each student, which is 6, and all the cases below and above. Figure 2 shows that only 37% of learners recorded more conversations than the average, while 63% recorded less than the average. In figure 3, we show the percentages of conversations related to each topic.

Although there is no room in this paper to deal with grammar aspects, a good management of the *consecutio temporum* with past tenses was observed in the NNS. Similarly, elements that contribute to the temporal organization of the narrated facts were used accurately, according to B1 level requirements. Thus, we refer to the following examples to endorse this statement. Finally, the NS always introduces a positive input for learners in all aspects of communicative competence.

The practical activity proposed to our students was to interact orally with their native partners through virtual exchanges. There were some instances of monologues describing the speakers’ experiences or providing information rather than a sequence of balanced turn-taking. We also observed two fragments in which the NS as well as the NNS took the lead in turn. This gave the impression of a prepared speech which was being recited during the recording operation, simulating the typical turn-taking of an unplanned conversational exchange, like in example (1) that follows:

**Example 1.** 2019_UA_NNS:F_1

10  **NS:** Allora, ho viaggiato molto in Europa in generale, sono stata in Turchia e in Tunisia, non dimenticherò mai la corsa fatta li sui dromedari che feci nel deserto, ero spaventata e divertita allo stesso tempo, me ne innamorai. Ma il viaggio che non dimenticherò mai è stato quello di questa estate in Sicilia, qui in Italia. Avevo prenotato solo il biglietto d’andata e avevo previsto di rimanere una decina di giorni, ma non avevo una data di ritorno. Avevo solo delle mete indicative che ho scelto dopo molte ricerche. Ogni giorno era un’avventura, mi sono trovata perfino a dormire in tenda, sul bordo piscina di una struttura per campeggiatori perché non aveva più posti, è difficile trovare “riparo” la notte di ferragosto, figuriamoci una stanza d’albergo. Prenotavo qualsiasi cosa giorno per giorno. Quello che sicuramente mi è piaciuto di più, l’esperienza che mi è piaciuta di più è stata quella di fare body rafting nel canyon delle gole di Alcantara. Invece tu? Raccontami un po’ di qualche tuo viaggio.

In the next example (2), we refer to the part of the same conversation in which the NNS answers the NS. The production is excessively structured and organized, hence our assumption that this conversation was planned and rehearsed beforehand. This fact clearly indicates the lack of a spontaneous narrative sequence, which is what the teacher expected.
Example 2. 2019_UA_NNS:F_1

11 NNS: Premettendo che non ho viaggiato molto, o almeno non tanto come avrei voluto, mi è piaciuto molto il mio Erasmus a Parigi, perché lì ho conosciuto molte persone e ho visitato differenti città della Francia, per esempio Alsace e Lorraine, Tours e molte altre. Sono stato anche ad Amsterdam, che mi è piaciuta moltissimo, perché facevo sempre cose diverse. Semplicemente andavo per la città ammirando i numerosi monumenti che incontravo, anche se qualche volta mi sono perso.

Generally, however, our students have respected the spirit and requirements of the collaborative task in most of the virtual exchanges. We shall now discuss the traits of some of the selected examples that have characterized the narrative episodes.

In example 3, the NNS introduces in turn 29 an experience of her past and describes a series of facts that were expressed by her companion in turn 28 and earlier. The story is naturally integrated into the conversation, as NNS responds to NS (the conversation opener).

Example 3. Personal experience: 2019_UA_NNS:C_1

24 NS: Ho capito sí sí// So che Alicante é molto bella, a me piacerebbe visitarlo un giorno
25 NNS: Sí/ (RISAS) e tu no hai paura de-; del Vesuvio (RISAS)
26 NS: (RISAS) <si un po’> io vivo molto vicino al Vesuvio/ <in fatti> i nostri paesi si chiamano Paesi Vesu-vianni perché sono vicini al Vesuvio
27 NNS: <ah> che bello
28 NS: sí pero/ per noi il Vesuvio é/ <mh> una sorta di fratello quindi// spadiamo che non ci faccia tutti scherzi// e quindi non abbiamo–; non abbiamo paura (RISAS)
Speriamo che vada tutto venu
29 NNS: Sí perché la mia compagna de-; di/ Teletándem de l’anno scorso <era> di–; di Pompei

In example 4, T83, the NNS relies on a narrative sequence to communicate to her interlocutor that she knows the novel on which the film that is being commented on is based. In T87 she adds information on the subject with an extension of the topic through a new narrative sequence. As pointed out in sustained monologue descriptors, “the NNS can reasonably fluently relate a straightforward narrative or description as a linear sequence of points and can relate to a plot of a film and describe her/his reactions.” Regarding coherence and cohesion, she can “link a series of shorter, discrete simple elements into a connected, linear sequence of points […] and link them together using a limited number of cohesive devices.” (CEFR, 2018, p. 142)

Example 4. Sustained monologue: 2019_UA_NNS:C_2

81 NNS: un reassunto <eh> de un libro; libro che noi abbiamo letto
82 NS: ok e che libro hai letto?
83 NNS: io non ho paura di Niccolò/ non mi ricordo il cognome
84 NS: nemmeno io però lo conosco il libro moli anni fa quando ero più piccola più piccolina ho visto il film di questo libro l’ho visto a scuola e non ho dormito per qualche notte perché mi fa paura (RISAS) osservav
l’argomento <pf> l’argomento è forte <eh> <fortissimo>
85 NNS: si
86 NS: mamma mia il ragazzo
    si è un po’ inquietante il ragazzo fa un po’ paura
87 NNS: si ma a scuola hai visto il film?
88 NS: quando ero piccola andavo a scuola ellementare (o) <si a scuola> <ah>! Si perché noi a scuola
    questo film si usa qui in Italia <ah> il servizio cineforum cinema significa che per esempio una volta
    ogni due o tre mesi si portano le classe al cinema a vederla dei film.

The following example (5) is a question-answer sequence in which the NNS, in T16, briefly outlines her experience and the NS, in T17, reopens the topic offering the opportunity for the NNS to resume the narrative sequence she has started, which perhaps would have not developed any further. This is a new case of co-building the sequence through the structure of the conversation. In T18 the NNS answers, recalling past facts, leading to a new narrative sequence in which the NS, in T19, answers and recounts past facts which were not expressed earlier.

Example 5. Personal issues: 2019_UA_NNS:Z_1

16 NNS: si si si/ questo è vero/ ma ho già cominciato la mia estate un po’ triste per questa ragione/ e allora sono
dovuto tornare nel mio paese fino a settembre
17 NS: ah ho capito/ ricordo che mi avevi detto che il tuo paese/ era molto piccolo e che non c’erano molte
    cose da fare/ ¿vero?
18 NNS: è vero/ è vero/ è stata un’estate molto noiosa// sono stata ad insegnare l’inglese ai bambini/ come
    l’anno scorso// (c:) ho avuto sette studenti e in realtà ero piuttosto occupata// ci vuole molto tempo per
    preparare le lezioni/ lezioni/ e farle divertenti// ¿tu- tu hai lavorato questa estate?
19 NS: si// ho fatto la cameriera/ in un ristorante/ cinque stelle// e poi contemporaneamente ho fatto anche
    animazione ai bambini/ è stata molto dura perché non avevo neanche tempo per me stessa/ quindi l’ho
    dedicato completamente al lavoro// e niente/ io davvero credo che sia importante lavorare o/ comunque
risparmiare qualcosa e avere una dipendenza/ una propria dipendenza economica

In example 6, the interlocutors cooperate fully, building a balanced interaction in which the NS-NNS question-answer pattern prevails. Both partners talk about their activities during the Christmas holidays and speak fluently during the sequences (T38, T39). In addition, the NS’s turns of support are also observed throughout the narrative sequences (T45, T47, T49, T51).


32 NNS: =e cosa hai fatto per la Vigilia di Natale?
33 NS: alla Vigilia di Natale ho mangiato alla sera mi sono uscita con i miei amici
34 NNS: <hm>
35 NS: e abbiamo giocato a carte e a tombola non so se conosci la tombola è un gioco=  
36 NNS: =si
37 NS: italiano / lo conosci?
38 NNS: si noi lo chiamammo Bingo credo che si chiama credo che è lo stesso
39 NS: si è un gioco in realtà napoletano
40 NNS: <hm>

La docencia en la Enseñanza Superior. Nuevas aportaciones desde la investigación e innovación educativas
però si in tutta l’Italia / è molto divertente e poi si vince molti soldi però io ho perso tutti in realtà non ho vinto poi niente abbiamo passato la notte a giocare con tutti i amici e con tutta la famiglia tu cos’hai fatto?

io sono andato a Edimburgo in Scozia
wow! bello
e mi è piaciuto tantissimo sebbene non sia la prima volta
ma stavolta ho visitato differenti luoghi della città
come Dean Village per esempio e Holyrood Park
in cui è Arthur’s Seat che è così come una collina molto simile a quelle delle Highlands
bello=
E ma è in la città d’Edimburgo
con chi sei andato?
con la mia ragazza
quanto tempo sei stato?
(e:) quattro giorni
bello era contenta tua fidanzata?
si molto

The goal-oriented cooperation of the narrative has also been manifested in some conversations, among which we have selected example 7. From turn T167, when the NNS stops speaking fluently, the NS intervenes to help develop the narrative sequence and thus overcome a communication-related impasse.

Example 7. Goal-oriented cooperation: 2019_UA_NNS_J_1

E quando eri a l’università, sei andata in erasmus?
No, mai, non sono, no, mai, però al liceo si, ho fatto molti stanze culturali con una ragazza spagnola, americano, un ragazzo americano, anche una palestinese, da Palestina, e nortegiese. Molte stanze culturali. Li ho ospitati a casa mia e poi sono andata a casa loro. Tu?

(e:) <No> (RISAS)
Mai?
Quando ero al liceo, (e:) una ragazza francese
(e:) (e:)
Hableme en español
Vino a mi casa durante una semana
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

ICTs have introduced innovative teaching-learning methods such as the concept of virtual immersion featured in our project. It can be used as an alternative or accompaniment to face-to-face, distance or blended participation, according to the particular need (Covid19, Erasmus, etc.). Within this new context, the NS create useful language input for their interlocutor, and therein lies the success of tele-collaboration. Hence, it has been adopted as a practical element in the teaching-learning of IFL for translation studies, as was the case in previous experiences of the team cited in the references, which focused on oral online interaction. The CORINÉI material also provides useful information about the interlanguage concerning the narrative structures in the oral production of the learners.

In our project, we deliberately refrained from providing any specific prompts related to topics or linguistic skills to be used, as we aimed to promote an activity in which the learners made their own choices, in order to achieve spontaneous speech. In fact, the topics were mainly related to their interests and experiences (social life, academic issues, travelling and celebrations) that typically took place during the semester referred to above. Likewise, the narrative sequences are derived from the personal preferences of the speakers. Therefore the teacher-researcher’s task is to collect, classify and analyze the data proceeding from the learners’ interactions and then to interpret them in retrospect.

As far as the results are concerned, we identified the use of narrative sequences by NNS that match the CEFR descriptors at B1 level throughout the sub-corpus. Both interlocutors, the NNS and the NS, communicated scenarios through sustained monologues and narrative sequences to achieve the goal of the exchange. The NS’s corrective feedback (CF) certainly supports the development of the interaction even in those cases where its intervention is minimal. However, as indicated in the procedures and results sections, various models have been developed in other publications, within our research networks in university teaching, which empirically demonstrate the viability of Teletandem and CORINÉI (SFL and IFL) for the achievement of the same objective. Nevertheless, we are still at
a too early stage of analysis to verify whether our team’s curricular design is in full compliance with the latest updates of the CEFR requirements.
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