

Japanese Learners of English Spoken Discourse: Structure or Non-structure

Amy Jenkins

Introduction

Foreign language programs have primarily focused on the teaching of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. However, the importance of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar to inculcate the knowledge of how to use the language has only recently been realised. Moreover, "researchers have shown that conversational dynamics and the performance of speech acts differ from language to language and culture to culture" (Nunan, 1993: 94); thus explicitly teaching how to use languages is slowly becoming a prominent feature of the language classroom. This area is known as discourse analysis and can be broadly defined as "language in use" and "the relationship between sentences" (Pennycook, 1994: 117). Harris (1952), Hymes (1964), Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975) were all originally influential in making discourse analysis a part of linguistics' vocabulary (McCarthy, 1991). Interestingly, British discourse analysis took a different approach from American discourse analysis. Halliday's (1973) functional approach to language and Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model for describing teacher-pupil discourse were the main influences on British discourse analysis that "followed a structural-linguistic criteria, on the basis of the isolation of units, and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse" (McCarthy, 1991: 6). In contrast, American discourse analysts emphasise "the close observation of the behaviour of participants in talk and on patterns which recur over a wider range of natural data" (McCarthy: 6). A third area concentrates on the connection between grammar and discourse. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion and coherence was highly influential in this area.

This paper aims to show that a five-minute conversation in English by two Japanese language learners is structured by one of the principal models of spoken discourse analysis. Prior to the analysis, two influential models,

Sinclair and Coulthard's Birmingham Model and the ethnomethodological approach, will be discussed. In addition, reasons will be given about why the particular model was chosen for the analysis. The second section analyses the five-minute conversation and provides evidence to show that the sample conversation is structured. The final part of the paper will identify the value of this kind of research to both learners and teachers of English.

Discourse Analysis

Sinclair and Coulthard's Birmingham Model

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) originally identified a rank scale to describe classroom interactions. The rank scale consists of *lesson (interaction), transaction, exchange, move* and *acts*. It is considered beneficial as "it captures patterns that reflect the basic functions of interaction and offers a hierarchical model where smaller units can be seen to combine to form larger ones and where the large units can be seen to consist of these smaller ones" (McCarthy, 1991: 22). Also, "no rank has more importance than any other" so "it is a fairly simple process to create a new rank to handle it" (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992: 2).

The lowest rank is speech *acts* and "they are realised at the level of grammar and lexis" (Francis & Hunston, 1992: 128). These acts describe the function of the language or how the listener/speaker is supposed to react to the language. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) originally identified 22 acts, but Francis and Hunston (1992) later revised this and an additional 10 acts were proposed. Acts then combine to form *moves*. Due to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1992) original interest in classroom discourse only five classes of moves were described. The five moves were split into two exchanges: *boundary* exchanges consist of *framing* and *focusing* moves, and *teaching* exchanges consist of *opening*, *answering* and *follow-up* moves. As a result, Francis and Hunston (1992) adjusted the basic structure to handle casual everyday-conversations. In the everyday-conversation model, the names of the exchanges are *organisational* and *conversational*. According to Francis and Hunston (1992), the first three moves: *framing*, *opening* and *answering*, realise elements of *organisational* exchange, and the other five – *eliciting*, *informing*, *acknowledging*, *directing* and *behaving* – realise elements of *conversational* exchange. Moves can be further characterised using the

terms *pre-head*, *head*, and *post-head*. The main part of the move is considered the head. Any utterance or word prior to the head is described as the pre-head and anything that occurs after the head is called the post-head. Therefore the structure of a move is made up of an optional *pre-head*, an obligatory *head* and an optional *post-head*.

Moves then realise elements of exchange. Within an exchange, each utterance is labelled either an *Initiation (I)*, a *Response (R)* or a *Follow-up (F)* (Sinclair and Brazil, 1982). At a later date, R/I was added to accommodate the utterance that is both a response to an initiation and an initiation in itself. As mentioned previously there are two main exchanges in everyday-conversations: *organisational* and *conversational*. Within organisational exchanges there are two sub-sections: the *organisational boundary* which includes the *framing* element, and a second exchange (*organisational*) that includes *structuring*, *greeting* and *summoning*. In these situations I and R are obligatory elements. Conversational exchanges include *elicit*, *inform*, *direct*, and the three bound-elicited exchanges *clarify*, *repeat* and *re-initiation*. All conversational exchanges have the structure I (R/I) R (Fnⁱ), where I and R are obligatory but R/I is optional and F is always optional and unpredicted.

The penultimate part of the rank is the *transaction*. Transactions can be identified by their boundaries but the internal structure has not been clearly identified. Transactions have three elements of structure: *Preliminary (P)*, *Medial (M)* and *Terminal (T)*. Organisational exchanges contain a P and a T element, whereas conversational exchanges have an obligatory M element and optional P and T elements. The number of M elements is unlimited. The last and highest rank is the *lesson* or *interaction*. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) used the term 'lesson' because their data was primarily concerned with the classroom whereas, Francis and Hunston (1992) use the term 'interaction' since their data is from casual conversations. While both parties describe an interaction as "an unordered series of transactions" (Francis & Hunston: 141), they do point out that an order may occur but that order is problematic to characterise.

Ethnomethodology

This area of discourse analysis takes more of a sociologist's point of view

of discourse and attempts to explain "How is it that conversational participants are able to produce intelligible utterances, and how are they able to interpret the utterances of others?" (Nunan, 1993: 84). This is commonly known as 'Conversation Analysis'. Data that is from naturally occurring, everyday conversation is used for analysis. The basic concept for ethnomethodologists is the '*adjacency pair*' introduced by Sacks et al. (1974). '*Adjacency pairs*' are two utterances produced by two different speakers that are related to each other in some way and adjacently positioned. Examples of adjacency pairs include question-reply, introduction-greeting, complaint-apology. '*Insertion sequences*' (Schegloff, 1972) and '*side sequences*' (Jefferson, 1972) then highlighted the fact that some utterances are interrupted thus do not immediately follow on from each other. In addition, questions were raised over the situation where speakers answer their own questions (Tsui, 1989) and where a third utterance in response to the second utterance may be "required, encouraged, or at least allowed" (Tsui, 1989: 547).

In addition to adjacency pairs, ethnomethodologists are concerned with turn-taking. "Turn-taking is highly structured and speakers signal when they are prepared to give up the floor, often 'nominate' the next speaker (verbally or non-verbally) and the next speaker can nominate him- or herself simply by starting to speak" (Johnson & Johnson, 1999: 360). The initial research was carried out by Sacks et al. (1974) where linguistic devices were identified that enable a speaker to enter a conversation, to not take a turn in a conversation and to show that attention is being paid to a conversation. This latter device is known as back-channelling activity. The vocalisations used to back-channel not only vary from language to language but also may sound strange when mother tongue vocalisations are used in second language discourse.

The Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) method of analysis was chosen for this paper as the recorded students had explicitly been taught a number of conversation strategies. It is assumed that if the students used the lexical phrases correctly, then a structured conversation with a number of complete *transactions* and *exchanges*, and appropriately used *moves* and *acts* would be identified. Due to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) research primarily focusing on teacher-pupil discourse, Francis and Hunston's (1992) paper,

which analysed everyday conversation, was closely referred to in this paper. The background to the sample, and discussion and comments on the sample conversation follow in the next section.

Analysis

Background

A conversation between two English-major students at a private, liberal arts college in Niigata, Japan was analysed. The students were part of a lower intermediate speaking class that meets three times a week for sixty minutes. The textbook used "focused on the conversation strategies that every student needs to master to develop conversational fluency" (Kenny & Woo, 2000). In every unit a number of phrases or words was taught to students to aid them in keeping the conversation in English and fluent. Since the beginning of term, students had progressed to having a minimum of five-minute conversations with each other on a variety of topics entirely in English. The recorded conversation was the last of four speaking tests that had been carried out periodically during the semester. Students were given a choice of four topics: music, dating, travel, and college life. The topics were all unit titles from the textbook so students had prior knowledge and experience of conversations concerning the topics. Students were paired up randomly, and the students chose a mutually acceptable topic. At the end of the five minutes a buzzer signalled the end of the conversation. The two students recorded for this paper were Yukie and Keiko. Yukie (Y) spent last summer working in Yosemite Park in the USA for three months. During this time her confidence and ability in English increased to an intermediate level. Keiko (K), on the other hand, has never spent time abroad but is a very diligent student. Her English is of an intermediate level but she is shy and lacks confidence in speaking.

Next, comments on the analysed conversation sample are discussed. A full copy of the sample conversation is included in Appendix A. In addition, turn-taking and conversation styles are discussed, because they are particularly relevant to this situation. Finally, implications of discourse analysis for teachers and students are discussed.

Comments

The conversation consists of an organisational exchange at the beginning and end of the conversation plus five conversational exchanges in the middle. The conversation starts with a greeting then a framing move. The 'so' followed by a short pause can be identified as a framing move, as it starts the conversation on the topic of music. A similar structure is also seen in the third and fifth transaction. Following transactions are identified by the change in topic and the pause before the inquiring move.

Line 38 K: #ⁱ Who is your favourite musician?

Line 84 K: *³ⁱⁱⁱ When you # when do you listen to music?

At the end of the conversation there is also a closing exchange. This exchange although in natural English occurs once the five-minute timer goes off and somewhat abruptly. There is no build up to finishing the conversation; instead the last question is replied to, then straight away the closing exchange occurs. A variety of opening and closing phrases had been explicitly taught to students in order for them to know how to naturally start and finish a conversation. While 'so' had been taught as a way to change the topic of the conversation, the speakers used 'so' mid-transaction to continue the conversation on the present topic or to give information.

Throughout the conversation there are eleven examples where initiation, response and follow-up all occur in the exchange. It should be noted that 'follow-up' moves are considered optional in the model of analysis and unfortunately, due to the method of transcription chosen, some non-verbal follow-up moves may have been missed. Tsui (1989) also points out that follow-up moves may be absent when there is a "misunderstanding, mishearing, or a gap in shared knowledge" (Tsui: 555). In fact, the extract below shows a clear example of the gap in shared knowledge between the speakers.

Line 38 K: #Who is your favourite musician?

Y: My favourite musician is Michelle Blanche. Do you know her?

K: Urr, I know just her name.

Y: Just name, mm-hmm. She is 20 years old.

K: Mm, very young.

Y: Yes but she jointed to.. she jointed to with Santana. Do you know Santana?

Line 49: K: Yes. *⁴ So, who else?

In line 49, Keiko perhaps due to the lack of shared knowledge about the musician, Michelle Blanche, moves the conversation forward swiftly by inquiring after other musicians that Yukie likes. This lack of shared information contributes to the lack of extended discussion on one topic and the lack of a follow-up move. The following extract is also a good example of the misunderstanding and clarifying exchanges that were observed in the sample conversation and the lack of follow-up moves.

Line 23: Y: #My friends said yesterday AJ caught a sief.

K: Sief? *² oh pardon me?

Y: AJ, member of Back Street Boys, caught a seif.

K: Sief?

Y: Jewellery sief.

K: Sief? Eh? What's that mean?

Y: The person stolen jewellery or wallet.

K: OK, I see. *² Eh? *⁴ He was steal something?

Y: Pardon me?

K: (laugh) eh? Was he steal something?

Y: No.

K: He did?

Y: He catched.

K: Ah (high key) he's great.

The confusion is with Yukie's mispronunciation of the word 'thief'; she replaces the 'th' sound with a 's' sound. Yukie's confidence in her language ability illustrated by the firm tone that she uses to produce the utterance contributes to the confusion. Once the meaning of the word thief is cleared up, the conversation refers back to the original sentence, which again needs clarifying. The transaction ends when the misunderstanding is finally cleared

up and Keiko reacts with 'Ah, he's great'. The transaction perhaps could have been expanded to include more details of the incident, however Keiko swiftly asks another question to start the next transaction. In other words, the students - although equal in status - share different music tastes; thus, attempts at expanding the conversation are halted, because knowledge about the music they are discussing is one-sided. Other examples of misunderstandings and mishearing can be seen in exchanges 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21.

One element that has been lost in the transcribing of the conversation is the back-channelling activity. Students were explicitly taught to use 'uh-huh' and 'mm-hmm' while a person is talking to give the impression of paying attention. While both students did this throughout the conversation, it was not important to transcribe all of them.

In summary, the analysis shows that there is definite structure within the conversation. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Francis and Hunston (1992) do not mention the required number of acts needed for a casual conversation but the argument could be made for more pre-heads, post-heads, and follow-up moves in this sample conversation. It is worth noting that the sample conversation was from a speaking test so the speakers may have been (and probably were) nervous and perhaps did not speak as naturally and as well as they would have done if the conversation were recorded in free-conversation practice. Nonetheless, students have successfully used various pre-taught conversation strategies to make the conversation fluent. The following section looks at turn-taking and conversation styles, which although primarily linked with ethnomethodology was thought to be of importance for the Japanese language learner.

Turn Taking

McCarthy notes that, "in any piece of natural English discourse, turns will occur smoothly, with only little overlap and interruption, and only very brief silences between turns (on average, less than a second)" (1991: 127). Yet a Japanese conversation style is likened to a bowling game:

When your turn comes, you step up to the starting line with your bowling ball, and carefully bowl it. Everyone else stands back and watches politely,

murmuring encouragement. Everyone waits until the ball has reached the end of the alley, and watches to see if it knocks down all the pins, or only some of them. There is a pause, while everyone registers your score. Then, after everyone is sure that you have completely finished your turn, the next person in line steps up to the same starting line, with a different ball. He doesn't return your ball, and he does not begin from where your ball stopped. There is no back and forth at all. All the balls run parallel. And there is always a suitable pause between turns. There is no rush, no excitement, no scramble for the ball. (Sakamoto & Naotsuka, 1982: 83)

The same authors describe the western conversation-style as a game of tennis:

If I introduce a topic, a conversational ball, I expect you to hit it back. If you agree with me, I don't expect you to simply agree and nothing more. I expect you to add something – a reason for agreeing, another example, or and elaboration to carry the idea further.... Whether you agree or disagree, your response will return the ball to me. And then it's my turn again. I don't serve a new ball from my original starting line. I hit your ball back again from where it has bounced. I carry your idea further, or answer your questions or objections, or challenge or question you. And so the ball goes back and forth, with each of us doing our best to give it a new twist, and original spin, or a powerful smash (Sakamoto & Naotsuka, 1982: 81).

The sample conversation cannot be entirely likened to a bowling game, since there is some ball movement. This ball movement though is small and appears to be more like a weak tennis rally rather than an interesting, exciting game of tennis. Interestingly, in transaction four (line 38 – line 62), Yukie keeps hitting the same ball over the net, each time getting a weak response back. After a couple of hits back and forth, Keiko takes the initiative to catch the ball and then re-serve the same ball back (i.e., the same question, line 51) for a re-match. This time the responses are stronger and Keiko finally wins the point with her strong response in line 61. Similarly, transaction five consists of two served balls. The first ball finishes after two hits back and forth, whereas the second ball continues for longer, primarily

due to the clarification in the middle. Transaction three, due to it consisting heavily of repeat and clarification exchanges, can strongly be likened to a tennis game. The misunderstanding means the ball is hit back and forth several times, only finishing when the misunderstanding has cleared up. Although the conversation has some western conversation features, the lack of information provided by both speakers means that it could also be identified with the bowling game. Clearly, the lack of shared knowledge identified early also contributes to the lack of ball play.

The Japanese conversation style proposed by Sakamoto and Naotsuka (1982) evidently differs from the model for turn taking described by Sacks et al (1974). Sacks et al (1974: 700) claim that transitions (from one turn to a next) that have no gap and no overlap are common yet the majority of transitions have a slight gap or slight overlap. In the sample conversation the pauses between utterances are fairly long (which may be accounted by the students' level) and there are very few examples of overlap. Overlap was witnessed twice in the sample conversation, occurring each time when there was a breakdown in understanding. At all other times, it was only once one speaker had finished what she was saying that the next speaker started.

35. Keiko: Eh? Was he steal something?

36. Yukie: No. [^v He

37. Keiko: [he [did?

38. Yukie: [he caught.

39. Keiko: (laugh) Ah! He's great.

69. Yukie: Do you know Dido?

70. Keiko: Is he? [he?

71. Yukie: [she.

72. Keiko: She? Is she Japanese?

73. Yukie: No.

74. Keiko: American?

75. Yukie: No, she is British (laugh) maybe

McCarthy (1991) states that, "the speaker can signal a desire to continue a

speaking turn by using non-low pitch, even at a point where there is a pause, or at the end of a syntactic unit, such as a clause. Equally, a down-step in pitch is often a good turn-yielding cue" (McCarthy: 104). In contrast to this statement, low-pitch acknowledging moves occur followed by the same speaker initiating the next move in the sample conversation. It appears that turn taking, at least at this level, is not really affected by the use of low or high pitch rather the speaker who can think of something to say does so first. In addition, although Yukie has more confidence in spoken English she does not dominate the conversation and both speakers initiate a fairly equal number of questions.

In addition, silence is tolerated among strangers or acquaintances in Japan much more than it is in Western conversation where there is a need for a constant stream of conversation. This difference in conversation style along with the opinion that a perfect grammatical, lexical utterance is needed regardless of the time it takes to produce the utterance, can make it somewhat irritating for Westerners when they converse with Japanese speakers in English. Also, Japanese people tend to panic if they are not understood or heard: rather than repeat the utterance one more time they assume their English is bad, panic and remain silent. In Japanese conversations the listener is responsible for interpreting the message (Clancy, 1987) unlike Western conversation where the use of 'what?' and 'Pardon me?' are common. Moreover, it is unlikely that the Japanese listener will ask for clarification as the listener may feel embarrassed about having not understood (Nozaki, 1993). Instead in both formal and casual Japanese conversation, the speaker looks for non-verbal codes that show the lack of understanding - "Japanese speakers use silence more, emphasising the context and the listener's ability to fill in that which isn't said directly" (Shaules & Abe, 1997: 59). Unfortunately, as this analysis was transcribed from a recording of the conversation any non-verbal codes that occurred were lost.

Implications for Teachers and Learners

Teachers need to draw students' attention to the differences in L1 and L2 conversation styles, and encourage students when speaking English to use the Western conversation style. Initially, authentic listening material can be

used and although students may not understand the English, students can be encouraged to focus, for example, on the number of times "uh-huh" is said or try and transcribe the 'follow-up' moves apparent in the text. McCarthy (1991) notes that in bigger classrooms, students rarely practice the 'follow-up' move because the teacher usually performs the follow-up move. In addition, the teacher's 'follow-up' move is an evaluation of the quality of the students' utterance. This differs from a formal/casual conversation where speakers comment or react to the previous utterance, using phrases such as 'how nice!', 'really', 'sounds great' and so on. A simple game where each student gets a card with a common word on it, like 'snow' or 'breakfast' and the goal is to get one's partner to say the word without saying it oneself encourages students to provide a variety of follow-up moves. Additionally, McCarthy also notes that follow-up moves "are often not directly translatable language to language" (1991: 123) so "a range of vocalisations or 'noises' that can be 'culturally peculiar' to the English ear" (1991: 123) may be used. Therefore, EFL teachers, if they want their students to produce native-like discourse, have to explicitly teach students the lexical phrases and vocalisations needed for not only 'follow-up' moves but also back-channel activity and conversational fluency.

In agreement with Cohen (1995), it would be beneficial to make students transcribe various conversations between two native speakers, two students or a native speaker and student. The conversations analysed should take different forms: from casual friend-to-friend discourse to formal role-playing situations. In this way students would be encouraged to "draw their own conclusions about lexical markers that are used in the structuring of such spoken discourse" (Cohen: 30) and make comparisons between their own discourse and native speaker discourse. It should be noted that if this method of teaching spoken discourse is to be truly effective then the process should continue at regular intervals throughout the year. Students can then become aware of their progress and hopefully "be able to observe more and more subtle elements of discourse structure in various native-speaker recordings" (Cohen: 30) and their own recordings. Segments from movies and dramas could also be used to add a more popular theme to the exercise, and students could be encouraged, even out of class, to listen to music and watch movies in English.

Last, students could also be encouraged to keep language diaries. Teachers should allow five minutes at the end of class for students to make a note of what they have achieved in that particular class. Students should be encouraged to notice both their strengths and weaknesses so that they can work harder at improving themselves yet feel pleased in their achievements. In addition, by encouraging students to notice their classmates' English, students will realise that students can help students in the language acquisition process.

Conclusion

In summary, McCarthy (1991) suggested that teachers teach their students' lexical relations and structures to aid their language development. And although this was originally suggested for written discourse there is no reason that this strategy could not be applied to spoken discourse. The analysed conversation shows students have learnt and put into practice various conversational strategies. However, practice is still needed with authentic dialogue to help students realise the conversation-culture of English. In addition, asking students to compare Japanese conversations and English conversations side-by-side would also raise awareness of the differences in conversational structure and culture. It is worth noting that although creating awareness of the differences in conversational structure and culture is a valuable lesson for English language learners, students' personalities play a part in their conversation ability and in some cases the influence of the mother tongue conversation-culture may be too strong to make a major difference in the student's conversation style. Last, Cohen (1995: 27) warns teachers:

If we decide to introduce discourse analysis into our classes on anything but the most superficial level, we should have clear ideas as to our aims in doing so and a clear sense that our students' ability to use the L 2 will become enhanced in some way. If this is not the case then we can only conclude that we have been using our students as some sort of applied linguistic guinea pigs and have failed in our responsibility as language teachers.

Notes

- i There can theoretically be an unlimited number of follow-up moves.
- ii # indicates a pause of one second or less.
- iii *³ indicates a pause of longer than one second and the superscripted number indicates the length of the pause in seconds.
- iv Indicates that there is an overlap in speech.

Bibliography

- Austin, John L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clancy, P.M. (1987). "The Acquisition of Communicative Style in Japanese", in B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (eds), *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. (1995). "Spoken Discourse Analysis in Japanese University Classes," *Niigata University Journal of Linguistics and Culture*, vol. 1, pp. 27-31.
- Francis, G. and Hunston, S. (1992). "Analysing Everyday Conversation", in M. Coulthard (ed), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation", in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 9: Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, Michael A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, Michael A.K. & Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Harris, Z. (1952). "Discourse Analysis." *Language*, 28, pp. 1 -30.
- Hymes, Dell (1964). "Towards ethnographies of communication", in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds), *The Ethnography of Communication*. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), pp. 1 -34.
- Jefferson, Gail (1972). "Side Sequences", in D. Sudnow (ed), *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press.
- Johnson, K. and Johnson, H. (eds) (1999). *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Kenny, Tom and Woo, Linda (2000). *Nice Talking With You*. Tokyo: MacMillan Language House.
- McCarthy, Michael (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nozaki, K. (1993). "The Japanese student and the foreign teacher", in P. Wadden (ed.), *A handbook for teaching English at Japanese Colleges and Universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, David (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin English.
- Pennycook, Alistair (1994). "Incommensurable Discourses?" *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 115 – 138.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel & Jefferson, Gail (1974). "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation", *Language*, Vol.50, pp. 696-735.
- Sakamoto, N. & Naotsuka, R. (1982). *Polite Fictions: Why Japanese and Americans seem rude to each other*. Tokyo: Kinseido.

- Schegloff, E. A. ([1968] 1972). "Sequencing in Conversational Openings", in J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. pp. 346-80.
- Searle, John R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaules, J. & Abe, J. (1997). *Different Realities: Adventures in Intercultural Communication*. English Program Rikkyo University Center for General Curriculum Development. City of Philadelphia: Nan'Un-Do.
- Sinclair, J. & Brazil, D.C. (1982). *Teacher Talk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, John & Coulthard, Malcolm (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, John and Coulthard, Malcolm (1992). "Towards an Analysis of Discourse", in M. Coulthard (ed), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Tsui, Amy (1989). "Beyond the Adjacency Pair". *Language in Society*, Vol. 18, pp. 545-564.

Appendix A. Sample Analysis

| | Dialogue: | Act | E.S. | Move | E.S. | Exchange | Ex | Tr |
|----|---|---------|--------|------|------|----------|----|----|
| 1 | K: Good morning (organisational) | gr | h | O | I | Greet | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | Y: Good morning | re-gr | h | A | R | | | |
| 3 | K: What's up? | gr | h | O | I | Greet | 2 | |
| 4 | Y: Nothing | re-gr | h | A | R | | | |
| 5 | And you? | gr | h | O | I | Greet | 3 | |
| 6 | K: Not much. | re-gr | h | A | R | | | |
| 7 | Y: So * ² , | m | s | E | I | Elicit | 4 | 2 |
| 8 | who is your favourite musician? | inq | h | | | | | |
| 9 | K: Musician? Umm, my favourite musician is Back Street Boys. | inf | h | I | R | | | |
| 10 | Y: Mm-hmm (low key) | rec | h | Ack | F | | | |
| 11 | K: Do you know them? | n. prop | h | E | I | Elicit | 5 | |
| 12 | Y: Yes | inf | h | I | R | | | |
| 13 | I have them CD's. | com | post-h | | R | | | |
| 14 | K: Really? (high key) | inq | h | E | I | Clarify | 6 | |
| 15 | Y: Yes. | inf | h | I | R | | | |
| 16 | K: What's your favourite song? | inq | h | E | I | Elicit | 7 | |
| 17 | Y: Song? Back Street Boys? * ² Let me see * ⁴ let me see "As long as you love me" | inf | h | I | R | | | |
| 18 | K: Er # I know | end | h | Ack | F | | | |
| 19 | Y: You know. (low key) | ref | h | Ack | F | | | |
| 20 | So, how about you? What song do you like? | inq | h | E | I | Elicit | 8 | |
| 21 | K: Hmm, let me see. # I like 'the one' I want it that way' and unn 'Get down' | inf | h | I | R | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|------------|--------|-----|--------|---------|----|---|
| 22 | Y: | and so on. Ah. (low key) | ter inf | h h | Ack | F I | | | |
| 23 | | So # my friends said yesterday AJ caught a sief | L | h | I | I | Inform | 9 | 3 |
| 24 | K: | Sief? * ² Oh pardon me? | inf | h | E | R | Repeat | 10 | |
| 25 | Y: | AJ, member of Back Street Boys caught a sief. | ret | h | I | I | | | |
| 26 | K: | Sief? | inf | h | E | R | Repeat | 11 | |
| 27 | Y: | Jewelery sief. | ret | h | I | I | | | |
| 28 | K: | Sief? Eh? What's that mean? | inf | h | E | R | Clarify | 12 | |
| 29 | Y: | The person stolen jewellery or wallet | end | h | I | F | | | |
| 30 | K: | OK, I see. | n.prop | h | Ack | I | | | |
| 31 | Y: | * ² Eh? * ⁴ He was steal something? | L | h | E | I | Clarify | 12 | |
| 32 | K: | Pardon me? | n.prop | h | E | I | | | |
| 33 | Y: | (laugh) eh? Was he steal something? | inf | h | E | R | | | |
| 34 | K: | No. | n.prop | h | In | I | | | |
| 35 | Y: | =He did? | inf | h | E | R | Clarify | 13 | |
| 36 | K: | =He caught | rea | h | In | F | | | |
| 37 | Y: | Ah (high key) he's great. <i>Laugh</i> | inq | h | Ack | I | | | |
| 38 | K: | #Who is your favourite musician? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 14 | 4 |
| 39 | Y: | My favourite musician is Michelle Blanche. | n.prop | h | In | I | | | |
| 40 | K: | Do you know her? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 15 | |
| 41 | Y: | Urr, I know just her name. | rec | h | In | F | | | |
| 42 | K: | Just name mm hmm (low key) | s | pre-h | Ack | I | | | |
| 43 | | She is 20 years old | end | h | In | R | Inform | 16 | |
| 44 | Y: | Mm, very young | conc | h | Ack | F | | | |
| 45 | K: | =Yes (mid key), | inf | h | Ack | I | | | |
| 46 | Y: | But she jointed to... she jointed to with Santana. | n.prop | h | In | I | Inform | 17 | |
| 47 | | #Do you know Santana? | inf | h | E | R | | 18 | |
| 48 | K: | Yes. | inq | h | In | I | | | |
| 49 | | * ⁴ So, who else? | L | h | E | I | Elicit | 19 | |
| 50 | Y: | Pardon me? | ret | h | E | R | Repeat | 20 | |
| 51 | K: | Who else? | m.prop | h | E | I | | | |
| 52 | Y: | # Err, my favourite musician? | inf | h | E | R | Clarify | 21 | |
| 53 | K: | Yes (low key) | inf | h | In | I | | | |
| 54 | Y: | My favourite musician is # let me see * ³ Stacy Oriko. | rec | h | In | R | Inform | 22 | |
| 55 | K: | Oh I see. (mid-key) | n. prop | h | Ack | I | | | |
| 56 | Y: | Do you know her? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 23 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---|---------|--------|-----|---|-----------|----|---|
| 57 | K: | Hmm, yes, but I don't know her songs name. | conc | h | In | F | | | |
| 58 | Y: | Uh-huh (low key) | s | pre-h | Ack | I | | | |
| 59 | | But, * ² I watched her TV commercials about her CD. | n. prop | h | In | I | Inform | 24 | |
| 60 | | * ² Have you ever seen TV commercial? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 25 | |
| 61 | K: | Urr * ² I don't remember but I think I have watched the TV commercial. | ter | h | In | F | | | |
| 62 | Y: | Uh-huh (low key) | s | pre-h | Ack | | | | |
| 63 | | So * ² | n. prop | h | | I | Structure | 26 | 5 |
| 64 | | Have you ever # been to concert? | info | h | E | R | Elicit | 27 | |
| 65 | K: | No | rea | post-h | In | F | | | |
| 66 | Y: | =No (high key) | inf | post-h | Ack | F | | | |
| 67 | K: | =So, I want to go to concert but I don't have money and I don't have opportunity. | inq | h | | I | | | |
| 68 | | How about you? | end | h | E | R | Elicit | 28 | |
| 69 | Y: | So, # me too | inq | h | In | I | | | |
| 70 | K: | Who do you want to see in concert? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 29 | |
| 71 | Y: | Who? * ² let me see # who? I want to see Michelle Blanche or mm # Dido. | L | h | | I | | | |
| 72 | K: | Dido? | n. prop | h | E | I | Clarify | 30 | |
| 73 | Y: | Do you know Dido? | n. prop | h | E | I | | | |
| 74 | K: | # Eh? Is he? She? | inf | h | E | R | | | |
| 75 | Y: | =She | n. prop | h | In | I | | | |
| 76 | K: | =Is she Japanese? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 31 | |
| 77 | Y: | =No | n. prop | h | In | I | | | |
| 78 | K: | =American? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 32 | |
| 79 | Y: | =No, she is British (<i>laugh</i>) maybe. | n. prop | h | In | I | | | |
| 80 | | #Did you watch Roswell in NHK? | inf | h | E | R | Elicit | 33 | |
| 81 | K: | Ahh, no I'm sorry. | inf | h | In | I | | | |
| 82 | Y: | # Her song used to Roswell | rea | h | In | R | Inform | 34 | |
| 83 | K: | * ² I see (low key). (<i>Thinking and laughing nervously</i>) | inq | h | Ack | I | | | |
| 84 | K: | * ³ When you # when do you listen to music? Ah? When do you listen to music? (low key) (<i>5 minute timer goes off</i>) | sum | | E | | Elicit | 35 | 6 |
| 81 | Y: | =When? | end | h | E | R | Clarify | 36 | |
| 82 | K: | =When | inf | h | In | I | | | |
| 83 | Y: | =Everyday, | rec | h | In | R | Inform | 37 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|------------------------|-------|--------|-----|---|-------|----|---|
| 84 | K: | =Everyday, | ter | post-h | Ack | F | | | |
| 85 | Y: | =almost everyday | gr | h | Ack | I | | | |
| 86 | | Nice talking with you. | re-gr | h | O | R | Greet | 38 | 7 |
| 87 | K: | You too! | | | A | | | | |

Notes

1. A double line indicates a transaction boundary.
2. A single line indicates an exchange boundary.
3. A broken line indicates that the next exchange is bound-elicited.
4. # indicates a pause of less than a second.
5. *⁴ indicates a pause with the length of the pause following.
6. = indicates rapid transition between speakers.
7. In the Move column, O = Opening, A = Answering, In = Informing, E = Eliciting and Ack = Acknowledging.
8. The first es column gives the **element of move structure** realized by preceding act: pre-h = pre-head, h = head, and post-h = post-head.
9. The second es column gives the **element of exchange structure** realized by the preceding move: I = Initiation, R = Response, and F = Follow-up
10. The last two columns give the number of exchanges and transactions respectively.
11. Only the acts that occur in the sample analysis are provided. (taken from Francis and Hunston 1992: 28)

Act definitions

| | | |
|------------------|--------|--|
| Marker | m | Marks the start of a move |
| Starter | s | Gives information about or draws attention towards the next move |
| Greeting | gr | A greeting (self-explanatory) |
| Reply-greeting | re-gr | A reply to a greeting (self-explanatory) |
| Inquire | inq | Elicits information (more than just a yes/no answer) |
| Neutral-proposal | n.prop | Elicits either a yes or no answer |
| Marked-proposal | m.prop | Elicits either a yes or no answer with the answer already expected |
| Loop | L | Elicits the repetition of a preceding utterance that was not clearly heard |
| Return | ret | Seeks clarification of a preceding utterance |
| Informative | inf | Supplies information, or gives a yes/no answer |
| Receive | rec | Acknowledges a preceding utterance |
| React | rea | Indicates positive feedback to a preceding utterance |
| Concur | conc | Gives agreement to a preceding utterance |
| Endorse | end | Offers positive feedback or sympathy with a preceding utterance |
| Reformulate | ref | Acknowledges a preceding utterance or paraphrases it |
| Confirm | conf | Gives or asserts agreement |
| Terminate | ter | Acknowledges a preceding utterance and terminates an exchange |
| Comment | com | Gives additional information |