

## Analysis of a Naturalistic Conversation Discourse for Designing Classroom Activities

Mohammad U. FAROOQ

Motivated though the recommendation by *Brazil*: it is clearly not enough that students should become proficient in discourse of lesson-like formality: the ability to take part in informal conversations must be counted among their aims, and the teacher therefore needs to know something about how such discourse works; this article is an attempt to study the discourse occurring in naturalistic conversation, and then employ the experience to design pedagogical activities to help Japanese learners take part in communication outside the class. In this regard a casual conversation between two native speakers of English is (1) record, (2) transcribed, and (3) analyzed through the *Francis — Hunston Model of Natural Conversation*. Pedagogical implications are discussed that comprise adapting and/or designing classroom activities using the *acts*, and implement them through *simulation* and *replication* activities to have Japanese learners realize their forms and functions in order to employ them in naturalistic conversation with confidence.

### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 Significance of the Problem

A teacher in an ESL/EFL classroom is likely to have encountered certain difficulties in teaching spoken English. Some of them include how to deal effectively with the dialogues of a prescribed textbook that appear frequently and take a considerable amount of classroom time; how to have learners concentrate on the various listening and speaking tasks; and finally merely with classroom teaching within its limited time how to prepare learners so that they can take part in conversations

outside the class.

To find answers to these issues is definitely not an easy task; however, they are crucial in that they give something for classroom practitioners to think about and work on. Based on the writer's experience of EFL teaching, it has been extremely difficult to find a workable approach that can help learners communicate effectively outside the class (see Farooq 1993-a and 1993-b).

The issues seem to be more challenging if the class size is large, and a majority of learners are at an elementary level, and interested in conversational English, as predicted by Richards (1974: 177). EFL teachers accustomed to English education in Japan would be fully aware of the fact that this description of the situation closely matches with most of Japanese learners. For instance, Loughheed (1992: 2), from a reliable report on TOEFL scores of speakers of nineteen different first languages, informs us that the average score for Japanese learners was statistically proved lowest. This may imply that most Japanese learners would be beginners if seen at a global level. Additionally, since Japanese traditionally have been textbook- and teacher-centered learners (Thompson 1995: 223) since childhood, in EFL classrooms they expect their teachers to take full responsibility for teaching.

The argument so far may suggest that teachers are likely to have a responsibility, especially ones working with EFL classrooms of Japanese learners, to look for an approach to deal with the above issues, by first getting some experience with the approach and then utilizing their experiences to help these learners. The literature also makes similar suggestions. For instance, Brazil commented on the learners' aims regarding spoken English and their teachers' responsibility as follows:

it is clearly not enough that students should become proficient in discourse of lesson-like formality: the ability to take part in informal conversations must be counted among their aims, and the teacher therefore needs to know something about how such discourse works (1995: 109).

In the light of the preceding discussion, this paper, therefore, is an attempt to focus on spoken discourse occurring in naturalistic conversation for the purpose of self-education prior to preparing learners to develop the ability to take part in communication outside the class.

## 1.2 Objectives of the paper

The objectives of the paper are

- (i) to record and transcribe a casual conversation between two speakers; and
- (ii) to make and evaluate an analysis using categories proposed by Francis and Hunston (see Brazil 1995: 141).

The specific research questions addressed are as follows:

- (1) Will the categories of a casual conversation fit those proposed by Francis and Hunston?; and (2) What will be the possible problems with any misfit categories?
- The report will first provide brief information on the background of the problem through a literature review; next describe the procedures involved in recording, transcribing, and analyzing the casual conversation; and last respond to the above questions (1)-(2).

## 2 Literature Review

### 2.1 Classroom discourse

Based on Halliday's rank scale description of grammar (Brazil 1995: 29), Sinclair et al. (1972) and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) (cited in Coulthard 1996: 120) designed and latter revised (Sinclair and Coulthard 1995) a model for analyzing classroom discourse. The rank scale in the model consists of *transaction*, *exchange*, *move* and *act* where these discourse units relate to one another 'in a hierarchical relationship'. In the model, a transaction is comprised of a series of exchanges classified as *Boundary* and *Teaching*. Exchanges consist of *moves*, which in turn are made of act(s). Moves are classified as *Framing* and *Focusing* in the Boundary exchange; and *Opening*, *Answering* and *Follow-up* in the Teaching exchange along with classes of act in each move (see Sinclair and Coulthard 1995: 7-8; and 18-21). The structure of a typical Teaching exchange in terms of its elements *Initiation* (I), *Response* (R), and *Feedback* (F) takes the form I (R) (F) with elements uniquely realize by the moves, where the elements in parenthesis are optional.

In subsequent versions (Coulthard and Brazil 1981, and 1995), however, proposing (i) new labeling for the moves as *eliciting*, *informing*, and *acknowledging*; and (ii) taking into consideration the intonational concept of *key* (see Brazil 1997: 46-66) for making a decision on the last part of an exchange (i.e. R and/or F) and on adding an element R/I, they extended the exchange structure to I (R/I) R (F),

where the I and the R are each realized by two moves, and the F by a single move (Coulthard and Brazil 1995: 72-73). The newer model has been successfully used as descriptive system for spoken discourse in language teaching classrooms (see for instance Willis, J. 1995; and Hewings 1995).

## 2.2 Non-classroom spoken discourse

Attempts have also been made to describe data in which discourse is not predictably controlled as by a teacher in a classroom. Stubbs (1981) employing a single 9-act interchange (consisting of 4 exchanges) focused on a telephone conversation. Burton (1978) provided a general exchange structure applicable to casual conversation. Ventola (cited in Willis, D. 1995: 112), on the other hand focused on ethnographic analysis of service encounters. Francis and Hunston (1995) refined the original model of Sinclair and Coulthard by exploring over a hundred transcripts and reporting an analysis based on a complete telephone conversation between two speakers.

In Francis and Hunston's (1995) system a *Transaction* consists of the *Organizational* and *Conversational* exchanges along with their further categorizations. Each exchange is realized by a particular move which in turn is realized by the *head* element of an act. For convenience, their proposed categories and how they relate to each other are summarized in Appendix I and a summary of the 32 acts reported in their paper (p 128-133) is presented in Appendix II.

The writers point out that the system they present is applicable "particularly to everyday conversation" (p 125), which obviously includes face-to-face casual conversations. However, the situation they selected to motivate their proposed categories, like that of Stubbs (1981), is likely to be more structured and as a result less problematic both in terms of transcription and its analysis than the one occurring in a face-to-face setting. Warren (cited in Sinclair 1995: 81) points out

that the study of spoken discourse may have been over-affected by the use of telephone calls and quiz programmes as data. They are much more predictably patterned than less specialized discourse; at the beginning and end of telephone calls there are set routines, no doubt stabilized because of a lack of shared environment.

Therefore, the current study attempts to explore spoken discourse which is generally regarded as apparently loosely structured (see Willis, D. 1995: 111) and is not reported by Francis and Hunston.

### **3 Method**

#### **3.1 Recording the data**

##### **3.1.1 Situation**

Of six discourse situations outlined in Francis and Hunston (1995: 123), the situation of a casual conversation between friends was chosen for this study for the following reasons. Since the aim was to acquire confidence on the part of the writer through working on spoken discourse in naturalistic conversation (section 1.1), it was assumed best to explore a situation which seemed to be more natural and apparently less structured than the others. For instance, Stubbs (1981: 119) exemplifying formal situations, pointed out that “The concept is not so obviously applicable to casual conversation between social equals”. Additionally, in other situations one of the speakers was likely to be dominant (e.g. child-adult talk), or turns less frequent with lengthy utterances (e.g. professional interviews), or the stretches could be short (commercial transactions) (see Carter and McCarthy 1997 for available transcriptions).

##### **3.1.2 Speakers**

The choice of the number of speakers was limited to two, partly because of the available data (Francis and Hunston 1995: 157: 161) for the purpose of comparison and partly because more than two speakers may pose complications in terms of the process of analysis such as deciding the boundaries of exchange and transaction (see McCarthy 1996: 23). The participants, native speakers of English, were close friends who visited each other very often. They were North American and had been working as EFL teachers in Japanese universities for about ten years.

##### **3.1.3 Recording**

A small portable Digital Pulse Control (DPL) tape recorder, specifically designed for recording voices, was handed to one of the speakers to record a conversation with his friends. The speaker, who was willing to have his conversation utilized for research purposes, was informed about the objectives of the recording. Of four re-

cordings of 10-25 minutes long, one recording of 20-minute duration was randomly selected to use for this study.

## **3.2 Transcribing the data**

### **3.2.1 Transcription**

A full transcription of the 20-minute recording was made because it was difficult to arrive at a connected stretch with fairly frequent alternations of speaker in accordance with the given directions (see Brazil 1995: 141). Although the entire transcription had a balance of speakers' alternations, in the former part of the recording one of the speakers had much longer utterances than the other; therefore the latter part of the recording was selected for transcription. The length of the recording was 4:37 minutes, which was decided following Francis and Hunston's example to see how a face-to-face casual conversation differs from the one on telephone in terms of internal discourse structures. Finally, pauses were transcribed using a stop watch. For simplicity, the pauses were used in numbers equal to or greater than 0.3 (by counting fractions of 0.05 and over as 0.1 and disregarding the rest).

### **3.2.2 Reliability and validity measures**

According to Carter and McCarthy (1997: 21), "transcription is an extremely difficult and imperfect art, ...Even the original speakers themselves are not always sure what it was they said when they hear the tape!". Therefore, for the purpose of reliability and validity of data as suggested by Seliger and Shohamy (1995: 205-208) and Griffee (1997: 177), transcriptions of the recording were independently prepared by speakers A (Borland 1998) and B (Slovic 1998) in addition to the writer. Comparing three versions of the transcription, a final version was prepared with the speakers' agreement. Not only the transcription of the data but also its independent coding is a part of the reliability and validity procedure. However, one can imagine in practice it is not an easy task to have a transcription coded by independent analysts. Therefore, the coding was done only by the writer.

## **4 Data analysis**

### **4.1 Preliminary analysis**

At the preliminary phase, the focus was placed on intensive study of Francis and Hunston's (1995) model, using the experience to analyze the data of the current

study. A re-analysis of their transcription (p 157-161) was done. However, certain key points were not fully explained by the writers. For instance, the transcription does not explicitly indicate where an act ends. Compare lines 14, 18, and 32 with 42, 73, 125, 152, 155, where the latter lines do not show any pause between acts. The upper limit of the pause '(#)' is mentioned as being 'less than one second' (p 156). However, an inexperienced analyst would need to know the lower limit of the pause '(#)' as well in order to use the concept in his/her own analysis with confidence. Furthermore, the paper does not indicate the time of the recording. Therefore, based on the writers' comments on page 123, it was assumed that their conversation was of five minutes' duration.

## 4.2 Analysis of the casual conversation

Stubbs (1981: 115-119) provided a practical example of analysis based on a short speech event of 9 single-act moves for analyzing a casual conversation. However, because of space limitations it is difficult to adopt a similar procedure for the 123 acts reported in this study. Instead, attempts have been made to include all relevant details in Appendix III (the transcript) in relation to Appendix I (a summary of Francis and Hunston's analytical categories) and Appendix II (a summary of Francis and Hunston's acts). The following section will focus on the general procedure of how the analysis was made by referring mainly to the Appendices and quoting some examples from them.

### 4.2.1 Deciding act boundaries

Adopting the definition given by Sinclair and Coulthard (1995: 4-5) that "Discourse acts are typically one free clause, plus any subordinate clauses" and the one pointed out by Francis and Hunston (1995: 133) that "An act must always begin with a new tone unit", acts' boundaries were decided. For instance, compare the act

Well if you're found guilty, then you appeal it... [Appendix III: 89-91] with  
Well (#: 0.5) we won't do this if you accept this... [line 55-57],

where in the latter example a short pause (#) in the range of 0.3-0.9 *sec* divides the act boundary. The lower limit of the pause is defined as a point where the measurement of 0.3 *sec* time was practically possible by a stop watch. For other examples,

see the Appendix III: 05, 08, 59. Instances where a speaker was thinking during speaking were not regarded as the end of an act (lines 69, and 135). This division lead to an *utterance* “defined as everything said by one speaker before another began to speak” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1995: 2) consisting of a maximum of four acts (lines 77-88)

#### 4.2.2 Deciding the element of move structure

The next step was (i) to make a distinction between free-standing and dependent acts within an utterance and (ii) decide how the acts of a speaker relate to the other speaker’s acts that precede and follow. Free-standing acts stand alone as complete contributions and carry out the basic business of the classroom and the dependent acts attempt to ensure that things are done efficiently (Brazil 1995: 16). Adapting the concepts for a conversation outside the classroom, the focus was then primarily on the free-standing acts in relation to what appear before and after them. For instance,

Plummet (mid key)... (Appendix III: line 173), and

I just, I try to change change everything over as soon as I can... (lines 179-181)

seem to be the free-standing acts in relation to

Or plummet?... (line 172), and

Even at these rates?... (line 184).

In terms of the element of move structure *esI* (see Appendix I); a free-standing act corresponds to an utterance’s or a move’s head (h). Other acts in the move that are dependent acts correspond to the signal (s) and pre-h and to the post-h that are attached respectively before and after the head. In this study, once the decision on the *esI* in each speaker’s utterances was made, it was rather straightforward to arrive at an exchange by following the definitions outlined in Appendices I and II.



4.2.3 Exchanges

**Table 1** Summary of types of exchanges found in the data

Type of exchange	Exchanges found in the data (see Appendix III)
Organizational Structuring	44
Conversational Elicit	2, 4, 5, 22, 27, 30, 31, 33, 41, 42
Inform	1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43
Clarify (bound-Elicit)	8, 16, 40
Re-initiate (bound-Elicit)	3, 6, 7, 28

In the current study, instances of five types of exchanges were found. These were Structuring (Organizational), Elicit, Inform, and two bound-Elicit: Clarify, and Re-initiate (Conversational), as summarized in Table 1. The element of move structure (i.e. s, pre-h, h, and post-h) (see Appendix I) was realized by particular acts. The acts, in turn realizing the elements of the exchange structure (i.e. I, I/R, R, F) (see Appendix I) consequently leading to the realization of an exchange, are presented in braces ‘{ }’ in Appendix II for clarity along with those found in Francis and Hunston’s (1995: 157-161) data. An example from Appendix III for each type of exchange is analyzed below.

4.2.3.1 Organizational

4.2.3.1.1 Structuring

Example 1		act	e.s	move	e.s
296	B: Oh okay (#: 0.3)	fr	pre-h	opening	I
297	Got to get ready for	ms	h		
298	my class				
299	A: 0	(aqu)	h	(answering)	R
300	(1.7)				

‘Oh okay’ said in high key falling intonation followed by silence (#: 0.3) realized the framer act (Appendix II: 01). ‘Got to get ready for my class’ as a metastatement (line 04) realized the head of an opening move followed by silence (0) as the head of an answering move in an Structuring exchange (line 06). The data contains the only instance of the Structuring exchange.

### 4.2.3.2 Conversational

#### 4.2.3.2.1 Elicit

Example 2		act	e.s	move	e.s
184	B: Even at these rates?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I
185	A: Yeah (mid key)	conc	h	informing	R
186	B: Really (low key)	ter	h	acknowl	F
187	(1.5)				

'Even at these rates?' in relation to lines 169-181 in the Appendix III indicated that speaker B was confirming his expectation. It realized the head of an eliciting move in the Elicit exchange (see Appendix II: line 13) which was confirmed by A using mid-key, the head of an informing move at R (line 19) followed by B's terminate act in the acknowledging move at F (see line 23). Several instances of Elicit exchanges were found in the data (see Table 1).

#### 4.2.3.2.2 Inform

Example 3		act	e.s	move	e.s
01	A: But here he is and they	i	h	informing	I
02	they had him on ah				
03	assault with a deadly				
04	weapon (1.5)				
05	B: What [#: 0.3]	s	pre-h	eliciting	R/I
06	his fists?	n.pr	h		
07	A: No	i	h	informing	R

A's statement (01-04) realized the informative act i since the speaker was providing information which was new to B (Coulthard and Brazil 1995: 64). The act i realized the head of an informing move at I (Appendix II: 18). B's response 'what' and 'his fists?', where the latter an ellipted form of a yes-no question, was heard with rising intonation. Here, B is giving information and at the same time eliciting information as a dominant function. The act n.pr realized the head of an eliciting move at R/I in the Inform exchange (see Appendix II: 18). A's response 'No' realized an i. The Inform exchange realized by i was the most common exchange found in the current data. For more examples see Table 1.

4.2.3.2.3 Clarify (bound-Elicit)

Example 4		act	e.s	move	e.s
59	A: And of course (#: 0.5)	s	pre-h	informing	I
60	so we wound up paying	i	h		
61	3000 dollars and they				
62	dropped the whole thing				
<hr/>					
63	B: 3000 dollars? (high key)	ret	h	eliciting	Ib
64	A: 3000 bucks (high key)	conf	h	informing	R

The question ‘3000 dollars?’ (line 63) was used here by B to seek clarification of a part of the preceding move, where the act ‘ret’ realized the head of an eliciting move at Ib in a Clarify exchange (Appendix II: 14). B’s clarification of the preceding utterance using high key produced a repetition of A’s response also said in high key for emphatic purposes (Tsui 1995: 106) and to indicate a surprise (Brazil 1997: 42). Two other examples of Clarify exchanges were also found in the data (see Table 1).

4.2.3.2.4 Re-initiate (bound-Elicit)

Example 5		act	e.s	move	e.s
08	B: Something else (#: 0.8)	s	pre-h	eliciting	I
09	a crowbar?	n.pr	h		
<hr/>					
10	A: Hah?	P	h	eliciting	Ib

In example 5, ‘A’ could not clearly hear what was said by speaker B in the preceding Elicit exchange. In other words speaker A was reinforcing a point of the preceding utterance. A closed item ‘Hah’ (line 10) said with rising intonation realized the head of an eliciting move at Ib in a Re-initiation exchange (Appendix II: 16). See other examples in Table 1.

4.3 Transactions

Transactions in the data were realized by the ‘topic unit’ and the linguistic signal ‘framer’ according to the definitions given by Francis and Hunston (1995: 140), and

Carter and McCarthy (1997: 25). For instance, in lines 01-103, 104-175, 176-295, and 296-300 of Appendix III a transaction boundary is identified by the topic unit (line 01-103), the framer 'anyway' (see lines 104, 178), and the 'Oh okay' (line 296). In the first example 'anyway' is taken as 'embedded in a move head', while in the second example it is regarded as 'an embedded framer' (see Francis and Hunston 1995: 128 and 161).

#### 4.4 Incomplete exchanges and implied elements

**Table 2** Summary of elements of exchange structure found in the data

General structure: **I or Ib (R/I) R (Fn)**,

I: Initiation; Ib: Bound-Elicit; R/I: Response/Initiation;

R: Response; and Fn: Follow-up (Fn: F1, F2, ...

I or Ib and R: Obligatory

R/I and Fn: Optional

No	Exchange structure	Exchanges found in the data (see Appendix III)	Obligatory missing element
01	I R	5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 38, 41, 44	
02	Ib R	7, 8, 40	
03	I Ib R	15-16	
04	I	37	
05	I Ib	2 and 3	
06	I (Incomplete)	12, 19, 21, 27, 29	R
07	I R/I R	1, 32	
08	I R/I	4	
09	Ib R/I	6	
10	I R/I R F	34, 39	
11	I R F	17, 18, 33, 35, 42, 43	
12	I Ib R F	26 and 28	
13	I R/I R F F	36	

Various possibilities of the structure of an exchange can be expressed by I (R/I) R (Fn) (see Appendix I) including I R; I R/I R; I R Fn; I R/I R Fn, which remain the same if I is replaced by an Ib. Additionally, the structures merely add an Ib if it

appears soon after I (see Francis and Hunston 1995: 152). Finally utilizing the concept in which a missing obligatory element of structure (that must be the R part) is implied as ‘understood’ (ibid: 155), the possibilities will lead to all the preceding structures being seen as complete exchanges without an R part. Table 2 above outlines a summary of exchange structures found in this study with their structures (column 2) and the instances (column 3) where they appear in the data (Appendix III), as well as the ones with the obligatory missing element R (column 4). In the light of the preceding discussion, it can be argued that all the exchanges in Table 2 can be regarded as complete with the exception of line 06 (column 4).

## 5 Conclusion

### 5.1 Outcomes of the study

This paper began with the following research questions (see section 1.2):

- (1) Will the categories of a casual conversation fit those proposed by Francis and Hunston?; and (2) What will be the possible problems with any misfit categories? They will be responded to below.

#### 5.1.1 Analytical categories

On the assumption that the analysis of the casual conversation of this study that is reported in the preceding sections has been done with a reliable realization of all the acts, elements of move structures, elements of exchange structures, and transactions, then the analytical categories found in this study fitted those proposed by Francis and Hunston (1995). However, there were instances that posed difficulties in fitting the categories as explained below.

#### 5.1.2 Problems in fitting the categories

In exchange 19, ‘You know’ (line 88) realized a post-h since it appeared a second time in the same exchange. It could be considered a separate Inform exchange with an observation move since “A wants to create the impression that A and B share a common ground” as is pointed out by Stenstrom (1996: 90).

Exchange 27 was an incomplete interruption by speaker B before A finished his response. The exchange could not fit in as a bound-*elicit*, since it was not an elicitation of a response related to in the previous utterance as in Francis and Hunston’s (1995: 158, exchange 22) data. It was labeled an *Elicit* exchange, and therefore the

following exchange a Re-initiation (see lines 128-157).

Exchange 34 was difficult to fit in the structure I R/I R F. It appeared that B's response/initiation in high key produced A's response in the high key which in turn produced B's acknowledge again in the high key. This may be because of the response/initiation produced by B in high key which indicated a surprise.

Exchanges 13, 24, 26, and 29 have one thing in common. Each has either three- or four-act utterances of speaker A (see Appendix III: lines 43-53; 110-119, 126-150; and 158-167). For other examples of long utterances in the data see lines 64-69; 77-88; 173-181; 194-201; 231-243; and 252-274. It was difficult to fit these utterances in accordance with the proposed structure of moves which has a maximum of four elements namely (s) (pre-h) h (post-h). According to Francis and Hunston (1995: 124), the structure of the exchange is I (R/I) R (Fn) which requires both I and R to form an exchange since R/I and Fn are optional. It seems that the structure in an exchange which consists of only one informing move without an R suggested by Brazil (1995: 123) is more appropriate. A similar structure i.e. [Inf (F)], with F as optional is proposed by Stubbs (1981) and exemplified by moves in a lecture where no response is required or expected. Stubbs also presented an example and commented that "Even in a casual conversation, it is arguable that one finds sequences of Infs, with only some acknowledged" (p 114), which supports the possibility of such instances in the current study.

In naturally occurring conversations it is unrealistic to expect or assume a balance of speakers' utterances and their speaking turns, unless one segment out of several conversations is carefully selected; and it is highly probable that one of the speaker's utterances will be longer than the other (see examples in Carter and McCarthy 1997). In the current study, the average lengths of utterance of speaker A and B were 16 (i.e. 682 words/42 utterances) and 5 (203/42) words respectively. Speaker A had utterances which were three times longer than those of B, while in Francis and Hunston's data it was 7 words for speakers A (282/40) and B (276/40). Stenstrom (1996: 9) states that the length of a tone unit depends mainly on how the speaker talks; the faster s/he talks the larger the number of words per tone unit. The rate in this study was 202.5 words per minute (wpm) (i.e. 885 words/4.37 min), fairly close to what was reported by Chaudron (1993: 66) as in the range of 134.5-203.8 wpm. On the other hand, in Francis and Hunston's (1995: 157-161) data, the rate was found to be 112 wpm (558 words/5 min). Chaudron (1993: 66)

reported a rate of 107-112 wpm when ESL native teachers addressed non-native beginning-level students.

Strictly speaking, in everyday conversation between native speakers of English which is particularly focused by Francis and Hunston (1995: 125), one may expect a normal rate of speakers' speed leading to longer utterances. If this is the case, then Francis and Hunston's reported telephone data of slow or unnatural speed that resulted into shorter utterances requires justification as well as that of their exemplified data based on Singapore English (p 125 and 128) which is commonly regarded and also reported as ESL (see Trudgill and Hannah, 1994: 134-138).

On the basis of the preceding examples, the related arguments, and the experience gained working on the analysis reported in this study, it is safe to suggest that if one is to analyze a conversation between two native speakers of English in situations reported by Francis and Hunston (1995: 123) with lengthy utterances of one or both the speakers, it is crucial to include an Inform exchange without an R along with their categories otherwise; there would be problems of fitting the proposed categories.

## 5.2 Pedagogical implications

Based on experience gained in this study and the one in classroom teaching, a primary step an EFL teacher of Japanese learners in this direction is likely to take is to adapt and/or design regular classroom activities employing Francis and Hunston's acts (Appendices II) and implement them through *simulation* and *replication* activities (see Willis, J. 1995: 178-179; and Coulthard 1996: 158) to have the learners realize their forms and functions in order to use them in conversation outside the class with confidence. To this end, two of such activities were designed (see Appendix IV for a brief description), and practically tested in classrooms of Japanese learners. In the first activity learners realize forms of acts of everyday conversation, while the second activity provides them with an opportunity to notice their functions as well and that how the acts are combined to form moves and consequently exchanges.

## 5.3 Recommendation for further research

A recommendation for further research would be towards focusing on Francis and Hunston's (1995) model to explore whether a 'movie discourse' (see for in-

stance Ephron 1990) fits in their proposed categories and what further refinement is possible since recording and transcribing naturally occurring data is not only difficult, it is also very time-consuming on the basis of writer's experience in this study. Although, extensive samples of naturalistic conversational data is now available (see Carter and McCarthy 1997), the data focusing on audio recordings is likely to exclude the visual features of a spoken discourse which are important to analyze spoken discourse as pointed out by Sinclair (1995: 80) "Perhaps it will never be possible to describe discourse without such recourse". Any work on the spoken discourse relating to a movie discourse which is pre-determined requires justification on the part of an analyst. However, if such a model is developed, it would be much easier, less time consuming and economical for teachers to bring examples of naturally occurring spoken language in their EFL/ESL classrooms.

## References

- Borland, W.** 1998, November. Aichi Gakusen University, Japan. Personal Communication.
- Brazil, D.** 1995. *Classroom and Spoken Discourse*. Centre for English Language Studies. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.
- Brazil, D.** 1997. *The communicative value of intonation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brock and Cindy, A.** 1986. 'The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 20: 47-59.
- Burton, D.** 1978. 'Towards an analysis of casual conversation'. *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*. 7, 2, 131-164.
- Carter, R and McCarthy, M.** 1997. *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C.** 1993. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulthard, M.** 1996. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Coulthard, M. and Brazil, D.** 1981. 'Exchange structure'. In Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (Eds). *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. 82-106. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. and Brazil, D.** 1995. 'Exchange structure'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 50-78. London: Routledge.
- Ephron, N.** 1990. *When Harry Met Sally*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Publisher.
- Farooq, M.** 1993 (a). 'Teaching Oral Communication in College Classes'. *Research Bulletin of Aichi Women's Junior College. General Education and Interdisciplinary Research*. (26): 83-92.
- Farooq, M.** 1993 (b). 'Teaching Oral Communication in the Classes'. *Research Bulletin of Aichi Women's Junior College. Humanities*. (26): 127-138.



- Francis, G. and Hunston, S.** 1995. 'Analysing everyday conversation'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 123-161. London: Routledge.
- Griffiee, D.** 1997. 'Validating a Questionnaire on Confidence in Speaking English as a Foreign Language'. *JALT Journal*, (19) 2: 177-197.
- Hewings, M.** 1995. 'Intonation and feedback in the EFL classroom'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 183-196. London: Routledge.
- Lougheed, L.** 1992. *TOEFL Prep Book*. Englewood Cliffs: Regents/Prentice Hall.
- McCarthy, M.** 1996. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.** 1974. 'A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis'. In Richards, J. (Ed.). *Error analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. 172-188. Essex: Longman.
- Seliger, H and Shohamy, E.** 1995. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J.** 1995. 'Priorities in discourse analysis'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 79-88. London: Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M.** 1995. 'Towards an analysis of discourse'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 1-34. London: Routledge.
- Slovic, H.** 1998, November. Aichi Gakusen University, Japan. Personal Communication.
- Stenstrom, A.** 1996. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. Essex: Longman
- Stubbs, M.** 1981. 'Motivating analyses of exchange structure'. In Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (Eds). *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. 107-119. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, I.** 1995. 'Japanese Speakers'. In Swan, M, and Smith, B. (Eds). *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems*. 212-223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tofuku, M and Shaikh, F.** 1997. *Oral Communication Ib, 15 Conversations*. Nagoya: Dick Corporation.
- Trudgill, P. and Hannah, J.** 1994. *International English: A guide to varieties of Standard English*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tsui, A.** 1995. 'A functional description of questions'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 89-110. London: Routledge.
- Willis, D.** 1995. 'Caught in the act: using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 111-122. London: Routledge.
- Willis, J.** 1995. 'Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 162-182. London: Routledge.

**Appendix I: Summary of Francis and Hunston's analytical categories**

The appendix summarizes the details of Francis and Hunston's (1995: 125-127) analytical categories.

es2 the element of Exchange structure: Fr; I R; I or Ib (R/I) R (Fn); I R (Fn), where the elements in brackets are optional, Fr (Frame), I (Initiation), R (Response), R/I (Response and Initiation), F (Follow-up), Ib (Bound-elicited), and Fn (F1, F2, ...)

es1 the element of Move structure: (s) (pre-h) h (post-h), where the elements in brackets are optional.

		1. Element of Move Structure (es1)			
2. — Element of Exchange Structure (es2) —		(signal (s))	(pre-h)	head (h)	(post-h)
Analytical Categories					
· Organizational					
· Boundary framing	Fr	m	fr		
· Structuring	I R				
· Greet					
· Summon opening		m	fr, s	ms, con, gr, sum	com
· answering		m	s	acq, re-gr, re-sum, rej	com, qu
· Conversational					
· Elicit	I (R/I) R (Fn)				
· Inform					
· Clarify	Ib (R/I) R (Fn)				
· Repeat					
· Re-initiate eliciting		m	s	inq, n.pr, m.pr, ret, L, P	com, P
· informing		m	s, rec	i, obs, conc, conf, qu, rej	com, conc, qu
· acknowl		m	rec	ter, rec, rea, ref, end, prot	com, ter
· Direct	I R (Fn)				
· directing		m	s	d	com, P
· behaving		m	s, rec, rej	be	com, qu

**Appendix II: Summary of Francis and Hunston's Acts**

The appendix summarizes the details of Francis and Hunston's (1995: 128-133) acts (column 1); how the acts are realized (column 2); what parts of a move and an exchange they realize (column 3); and what their functions are (column 4). Note that the description of the act 'acquiesce-aqu' realized by silence (and mentioned in parentheses similar to the engage-eng) is not given in Francis and Hunston's acts on pages 128-133. However, for clarity, it is included below.

- { } : Examples (in **bold**) found in the present study (see Appendix III).
- [ ] : Examples found in the Francis and Hunston's (1995) analysis (see pages 157-161)

Act	Realized by...	Realized...	Function...
01 framer (fr)	closed class of items: (i) OK, (all) right, anyway [122] <b>{104, 178, 296}</b> . Item precedes an exchange-initial move head [123] <b>{297}</b> . (ii) well, now, good. exchange. Item precedes an exchange-initial move head and is said in high key falling intonation followed by silence stress.	(i) When the item precedes an <i>ms</i> or <i>con</i> , it realizes the pre-head of a framing move in a Structuring interpretation is (ii) When the item precedes any other exchange-initial move head, it realizes the head of a framing move in Boundary exchange. the signal (s) element of all moves	to mark boundaries in the conversation, where such an  consistent with consideration of topic.
02 marker (m)	the same closed class items as <i>fr</i> : (I) OK, (all) right, anyway. Item precedes a non-initial exchange move head [33, 126] (ii) well, now, good. [42, 73] <b>{55, 59}</b> (And of course) <b>126, 213, 231</b> (actually)) Also oh [14], er(m) and look [155] Item is not said with high key falling intonation		to mark onset of a move.
03 starter (s)	(i) statement [87, 103] <b>{31, 43, 78, 110, 128, 158, 209, 232}</b> (iii) command or (ii) question [18, 30] <b>{05}</b> . (iv) moodless items <b>{08}</b>	the pre-head of an opening, answering, eliciting informing directing or behaving move.	to provide information about or direct attention towards the act realizing the move head.
04 meta-statement (ms)	(i) statement [4, 51, 153, 167] <b>{297}</b> (ii) question or (iii) command.	the head of an opening move in a Structuring exchange	to structure the conversation prospectively in some way and to obtain a warrant for doing so.
05 conclusion (con)	(i) a statement or (ii) question often with anaphoric reference.	the head of an opening move in a Structuring exchange	to 'tie-up' a particular topic, and to obtain a warrant for doing so.
06 acquiesce (acq)	(i) yes [53] and other items [168] indicating assent both verbal and non-verbal. (ii) silence-aqu [6, 154] <b>{299}</b> , interpreted as a default mechanism whereby failure to protest ( <i>rej</i> ) is an indication of acquiesce	the head of an answering move in a Structuring exchange	to provide a warrant for a suggestion as to prospective ( <i>ms</i> ) or retrospective ( <i>con</i> ) structuring made by the other participant in a two-party conversation.
07 greeting (gr)	a closed class of items which form the first-pair parts of the adjacency pairs used in the rituals of greeting and leave-taking: hello [3, 8, 10, 13]; hi; good morning; (good) bye (-bye) [169, 172]; have a nice/ good day; [170]; be seeing you.	the head of an opening move in a Greet exchange	Self-explanatory.
08 reply-greeting (re-gr)	a closed class of items which form the second-pair parts of the adjacency pairs used in the rituals of greeting and leave-taking: hello [12]; hi; good morning; (good) bye (-bye) [173]; fine thanks (and you?); thanks (and you?) [171];	the head of an answering move in a Greet exchange	Self-explanatory

09 summon (sum)	same to you; yeah see you (i) the ringing of the telephone [1], a knock at the door, etc, (ii) calling of somebody's name [1, 49].	the head of an opening move in a Summon exchange	to engage another participant in a conversation or to attract his/her attention.
10 reply-summon	the items used (i) to answer a telephone (hello [2], the giving of one's number) (ii) to answer the door (opening it, calling come in) (iii) by yes, what? and other indication of attention (both verbal and non-verbal) given upon by hearing someone's name called [50].	the head of answering move in a Summon exchange	to indicate willingness to (re-sum) participate in a conversation, or that is giving one's attention.
11 inquire (inq)	wh-questions (seeking information) or ellipted forms of these. [24, 54, 61, 84, 86] <b>{11, 16, 172, 210, 249, 276, 284}</b>	the head of eliciting move at Ib (except in Clarify and Repeat exchanges)	to elicit information
12 neutral proposal (n.pr)	questions seeking yes or no answers Do you...?. Are you...?, etc [19, 124] Ellipted forms of these. <b>{06, 09, 14}</b>	the head of an eliciting move (except at Ib in Clarify and Repeat exchanges)	to elicit a decision between yes and no.
13 marked proposal (m.pr)	(i) questions seeking yes or no answers Don't you...?. Aren't you...?, etc (the forms of the questions indicate the polarity of the expected answer) [31, 43, 66, 156, 163] <b>{102}</b> (ii) Declaratives said with questioning intonation [78] <b>{149, 151, 169, 182, 184}</b> (iii) Declarative followed by tag questions [74].	the head of an eliciting move (except at Ib in Clarify and Repeat exchanges)	to elicit agreement.
14 return (ret)	questions often ellipted [26, 28, 37, 57, 127, 132, 160] <b>{22, 63, 250}</b>	the head of an eliciting move at Ib in a Clarify exchange	to seek clarification of a preceding utterance.
15 loop (L)	a closed class of items: pardon, sorry [85, 162], what [92, 102], eh, again said with rising intonation.	the head of an eliciting move at Ib in a Repeat exchange	to elicit the repetition of a preceding utterance which was not clearly heard
16 prompt (P)	a closed class of items: hah (with rising intonation) (161) <b>{10}</b> come on, go on give me an answer <b>{19}</b> , guess.	(i) the head of an eliciting move at Ib in a Re-initiation utterance, exchange (ii) the post-head of of any other eliciting move or (iii) the post-head of a directing move.	to reinforce the point of a preceding whether this was to elicit an <i>i</i> , a <i>conc</i> (etc), or a <i>be</i> . When it realizes a move-head, it follows a silence.
17 observa- tion	statement [120, 140, 143, 145, 146] <b>{84, 104, 292}</b>	the head of information move at I (Inform (obs) exchange)	to offer information which is already part of the share knowledge of the participants in In other words it has
18 informa- tive (i)	(i) statement [15, 22, 33, 39, 56, 59, 69, 91, 99, 105, 123, 129, 133] <b>{01, 12, 17, 20, 26, 34, 37, 47, 49, 56, 60, 65, 73, 89, 97, 114, 123, 146, 163, 179, 188, 200, 206, 214, 224, 238, 245, 251, 252, 277, 287}</b>	the conversation. a predominantly phatic function. the head of an informing move at I (Inform exchange); or at R/I [105] or R (Eliciting exchange), where the head of the eliciting move	to supply information or to give a decision between yes and no.

	(ii) yes or no {07, 15} items and their variants [25] both verbal (I (don't) think so), and non-verbal (nod and shakes of the head).	at I or R/I is realized by either <i>inq</i> , or <i>n.pr</i> .	
19 concur (conc)	(i) low or (ii) mid key yes and no items both verbal [27, 29, 116, 158, 159, 166] {103, 171, 173, 174, 183, 185} and non-verbal (iii) repetition or paraphrase	the head or post-head of an informing move at R/I or R. (Elicit exchange), where the head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by m.pr	to give an agreement.
20 confirm (conf)	(i) high key yes [67] {191} and no items both verbal and non-verbal, or (ii) repetition {24, 64} or paraphrase	the head of an informing move at R/I or R (Elicit exchange), where the head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by m.pr	to give an assert agreement
21 qualify (qu)	'qualified' statement [20, 126] {153} or tentative yes and no items (where tentativeness is intentionally signaled), both verbal ('to some extent yes', 'no not really', 'well I suppose so (not)' and non-verbal (shrugging the shoulders)	the head of an informing move at R/I or R (Elicit exchange) where the head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by n.pr or m.pr; or the post-head of an answering, informing or behaving move.	to qualify a decision or an agreement by indicating that the polarity is not unconditional or to detail conditions and expectations.
22 reject (rej)	(i) statement [45, 76] or (ii) yes and no [81] items, and (iii) their variations (both verbal and non-verbal) (iii) silence (interpreted as default mechanism whereby failure to supply a <i>re-gr</i> , <i>re-sum</i> , <i>i</i> , <i>conc</i> , <i>qu</i> , or appropriate <i>be</i> an indication of rejection)	(i) the head of an answering move in a Structuring, Greet or Summon exchange, or (ii) the head of an informing move at R/I or R (Elicit exchange) or (iii) the pre-head of a behaving move in a Direct exchange.	(i) to refuse acquiesce to a suggestion as to the structuring of the conversation; or (ii) to refuse to give an appropriate answer to a <i>gr</i> or a <i>sum</i> , or (iii) to reject the Underlying presuppositions of an <i>inq</i> , <i>n.pr</i> , <i>m.pr</i> ; or (iv) to indicate unwillingness to comply with a <i>d</i> .
23 terminate (ter)	(i) low key yes and no items, and (ii) their variants [41, 47, 142] {186, 204, 205, 295} both verbal and non-verbal; or (iii) low key repetition	the head and/or post-head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F exchange	to acknowledge a preceding utterance and to terminate an (although it may be followed by further acknowledging moves)
24 receive (rec)	(i) mid key yes [139] and no items, and (ii) their variants [17, 144] {42, 54, 58, 77, 109, 121, 157, 219, 223, 244, 275, 291, 294} both verbal and non-verbal; or (iii) mid key repetition	(i) the head or pre-head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F (ii) the pre-head of an informing move at R (Elicit exchange); or (iii) the pre-head of a behaving move	(i) to acknowledge a preceding utterance or (as pre-head) (ii) to indicate that the appropriate <i>i</i> , <i>be</i> , etc is forthcoming
25 react (rea)	(i) high key yes {192, 194} and no items and (ii) their variants; or (iii) by high key repetition	the head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F	to indicate positive endorsement of a preceding utterance.
26 reformulate (ref)	statement [121, 150] {72, 75, 92, 122} which paraphrases a preceding utterance	the head of an acknowledging move at R and/F	to acknowledge a preceding utterance or offer a received version of it

27 endorse (end)	statement [21, 97, 109, 131] { <b>30, 36, 70</b> } or moodless item [151]	the head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F	to offer positive endorsement of, sympathy with, etc.. (good idea, you poor thing, well I never, very interesting, etc)
28 protest (prot)	(i) statement or (ii) yes and no ( <b>127, 203</b> ) items and (iii) their variants	the head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F	(i) to raise an objection to a preceding utterance; (ii) it acknowledges the utterance while disputing it correct- ness, relevance, appropriateness, the participant's right to have uttered it, or anything else
29 directive	command	the head of a directing move	to request a non- (d)
30 behave (be)	action	the head of a behaving move	verbal response to provide a non- verbal response to a preceding <i>d</i> , whether this involves compliance, non-compliance, or defiance
31 comment (com)	statement [34, 46, 48, 68, 77, 93, 110, 117] ( <b>28, 69, 88, 118,</b> <b>154, 167, 196, 220, 227</b> )	the pre-head of all moves except framing	to exemplify, expand, explain, justify, provide additional information, evaluate one's own utterance
32 engage (eng)	(i) mm [134, 137] (ii) yeah { <b>256</b> }, and (iii) low or (iv) mid key echoes	does not realize any element of move structure	to provide minimal feedback while not interpreting the flow of the other participants utterance

## Appendix III: Transcription of a casual conversation between two friends

### Key to symbols

Time: (length of the recording) 4:37 minutes

[#] pause of less than a second and between the range of 0.3 through 0.9 sec

( ) pause more than a second

(x sec) thinking time

... (three dots) speaker is likely to continue

? inaudible

*e.sI*: the element of move structure realized by the preceding act

*e.s2* the element of exchange structure realized by the preceding move

*ex* number of exchanges

*tr* number of transactions

—— (a single line) exchange boundary

----- (a broken line) the next exchange is bound-Elicit

===== (double lines) transaction boundary

0 silence

\* Instances of problems of misfit

<i>line of dialogue</i>	<i>act</i>	<i>e.s1</i>	<i>move</i>	<i>e.s2</i>	<i>exch</i>	<i>ex</i>	<i>tr</i>
continued....							
01 A: But here he is and they	i	h	informing	I	Inform	1	1
02 they had him on ah							
03 assault with a deadly							
04 weapon (1.5)							
05 B: What [#: 0.3]	s	pre-h	eliciting	R/I			
06 his fists?	n.pr	h					
07 A: No	i	h	informing	R			
08 B: Something else [#: 0.8]	s	pre-h	eliciting	I	Elicit	2	
09 a crowbar?	n.pr	h					
10 A: Hah?	P	h	eliciting	Ib	Re-initiate	3	
11 B: What?	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	4	
12 A: You won't believe	i	h	informing	R/I			
13 what it was							
14 B: A coke bottle?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	5	
15 A: No	i	h	informing	R			
16 B: What?	inq	h	eliciting	Ib	Re-initiate	6	
17 A: You'll never believe	i	h	informing	R/I			
18 what it was							
19 B: Go on tell me (1)	P	h	eliciting	Ib	Re-initiate	7	
20 A: The, he was on the	i	h	informing	R			
21 telephone							
22 B: The telephone?	ret	h	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	8	
23 (high key)							
24 A: The telephone	conf	h	informing	R			
25 (high key) (1)							
26 They actually had it	i	h	informing	I	Inform	9	
27 down							
28 He assaulted him with	com	post-h					
29 a telephone							
30 B: That's crazy	end	h	acknowl	R			
31 A: You know how those	s	pre-h	informing	I	Inform	10	
32 telephones hook up to							
33 things [#: 0.6]							
34 You could never hit a	i	h					
35 guy with that							
36 B: That's crazy	end	h	acknowl	R			
37 A: But they, they couldn't	i	h	informing	I	Inform	11	
38 get on assault with							
39 a deadly weapon if							
40 they didn't put							
41 something down							
42 B: I see	rec	h	acknowl	R			
43 A: See what they were	s	pre-h	informing	I	Inform	12	
44 doing, they do this in					(Incomplete)		
45 the U.S. all the time							
46 now							
47 They'll plea bargain ya	i	h					
48 (1)							
49 They'll get everything,	i	h	informing	I	Inform	13*	
50 they throw everything							
51 they can and then							
52 they give you this							
53 little bargain thing							
54 B: yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	R			
55 A: Well [#: 0.5]	m	s	informing	I	Inform	14	

56	we won't do this if you	i	h				
57	accept this						
58	B: Right (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	R		
59	A: And of course [#: 0.5]	m	s	informing	I	Inform	15
60	so we wound up paying	i	h				
61	3000 dollars and they						
62	dropped the whole thing						
63	B: 3000 dollars? (high key)	ret	h	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	16
64	A: 3000 bucks (high key)	conf	h	informing	R		
65	The the alternate was	i	h	informing	I	Inform	17
66	possibly to be tried						
67	on a felony						
68	(1.2)						
69	That's ah just (1 sec) stupid	com	post-h				
70	B: Absolutely	end	h	acknowl	R		
71	that's crazy						
72	A: Yeah I know [#: 0.9]	ref	h	acknowl	F		
73	I mean those things	i	h	informing	I	Inform	18
74	happen now						
75	B: Well I think they've	ref	h	acknowl	R		
76	always happened, but						
77	A: Yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	F		
78	I mean he probably	s	pre-h	informing	I	Inform	19*
79	would have he					(Incomplete)	
80	probably wouldn't						
81	have gotten found						
82	guilty or anything						
83	like that						
84	But, you know, how	obs	h				
85	can you take a chance?						
86	(cough)						
87	(2.2)						
88	You know	com	post-h				
89	B: Well if you're found	i	h	informing	I	Inform	20
90	guilty, then you						
91	appeal it						
92	A: Yeah you can do that	ref	h	acknowl	R		
93	but you ever get stuck						
94	on a felony you never						
95	get rid of that						
96	(1.2)						
97	I can't imagine any	i	h	informing	I	Inform	21
98	judge finding a person					(Incomplete)	
99	guilty of a felony for						
100	something like that						
101	(3.5)						
102	B: But it <i>wasn't</i> his fault	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	22
103	A: Yeah (mid key) [#: 0.8]	conc	h	informing	R		
104	Anyway what I was	obs	h	informing	I	Inform	23
105	going to say about						2
106	Banner Japan was,						
107	before I got into						
108	that was						
109	B: Yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	R		
110	A: They they predict the	s	pre-h	informing	I	Inform	24*
111	yen is going to get to						
112	160 and maybe 180						
113	(2.4)						
114	They were predicting	i	h				



115	160 by December but						
116	it looks like they're						
117	wrong there (2.3)						
118	They were predicting	com	post-h				
119	that four months ago						
120	[#: 0.8]						
121	B: Uh-huh (?) [#: 0.7]	rec	pre-h	acknowl	R		
122	they're not right there	ref	h				
123	Maybe they're just	i	h	informing	I	Inform	25
124	trying to scare people						
125	(1.8)						
126	A: Well [#: 0.6]	m	s	acknowl	R		
127	No what...	prot	h				
128	I'll tell you why		pre-h	informing	I	Inform	26*
129	they say is that	s					
130	and it makes a lot of						
131	sense						
132	because in December						
133	there is going to be a						
134	big bang opening of						
135	ah (1.3 sec) financial						
136	markets of Japan						
137	and these life insurance						
138	companies expect to be						
139	able to put the money						
140	overseas						
141	and they figure						
142	it's going to						
143	be about 20 percent						
144	of total Japanese						
145	savings [#: 0.7]						
146	It's likely to go ah	i	h				
147	over to the US						
148	and places and that's +						
149	B: And that...	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit (Incomplete)	27*
150	+ December or January						
151	B: And that causes a	m.pr	h	eliciting	Ib	Re-initiate	28
152	low yen?						
153	A: That's going to be	qu	h	informing	R		
154	You got about nine	com	post-h				
155	trillion dollars in						
156	savings here						
157	B: Yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	F		
158	A: So that means there	s	pre-h	informing	I	Inform (Incomplete)	29*
159	will be a huge demand						
160	to buy dollars and						
161	sell yen						
162	(1)						
163	And they're figuring	i	h				
164	that's gonna change						
165	it around						
166	(1.3)						
167	I hope not	com	post-h				
168	(3.1)						
169	B: And the the yen's	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	30
170	going to sky rocket?						
171	A: Mm (mid key)	conc	h	informing	R		
172	B: Or plummet?	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	31
173	A: Plummet (mid key)	conc	h	informing	R		

174	Yeah the dollar'll	conc	post-h					
175	sky rocket							
176	But I don know but	fr	pre-h	informing	I	Inform	32	3
177	that's what they said							
178	anyway (cough)							
179	I just, I try to change	i	h					
180	change everything							
181	over as soon as I can							
182	B: Really?	m.pr	h	eliciting	R/I			
183	A: Yeah (mid key)	conc	h	informing	R			
184	B: Even at these rates?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	33	
185	A: Yeah (mid key)	conc	h	informing	R			
186	B: Really (low key)	ter	h	acknowl	F			
187	(1.5)							
188	A: There's a lot of	i	h	informing	I	Inform	34*	
189	difference between							
190	119 and 132							
191	B: Yeah (high key)	conf	h	informing	R/I			
192	A: For the money you	rea	h	acknowl	R			
193	get yeah (high key)							
194	B: Sure (high key)	rea	h	acknowl	F			
195	[: 0.7]							
196	There's a lot of	com	post-h					
197	difference between							
198	110 and 119							
199	[: 0.7]							
200	It was down to 114 a	i	h	informing	I	Inform	35	
201	couple of weeks ago							
202	(1.1)							
203	A: It's not gonna hit 110	prot	h	acknowl	R			
204	I don't think	ter	post-h					
205	B: Yeah (low key)	ter	h	acknowl	F			
206	A: I think the days of a	i	h	informing	I	Inform	36	
207	hundred to one yen							
208	ah are forever gone							
209	B: A hundred to one...	s	pre-h					
210	But how about a	inq	h	eliciting	R/I			
211	hundred and ten							
212	to one?							
213	A: Well (1) (cough)	m	s	informing	R			
214	I suppose you could	i	h					
215	have it slip down there							
216	sometime, if you are							
217	a hundred and nineteen							
218	you can drop 9 points							
219	B: Sure (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	F			
220	because I mean the the	com	post-h					
221	the economic malaise							
222	of Asia has got to pass							
223	A: Yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	F			
224	B: Things've got to start	i	h	informing	I	Inform	37	
225	picking up at (0.9 sec)							
226	some point [: 0.8]							
227	I (?), I I would love to	com	post-h					
228	send money to							
229	America but I'm							
230	waiting							
231	A: Actually ah [: 0.8]	m	s	informing	I	Inform	38*	
232	I've just read	s	pre-h					
233	something in a							

234	Business Week ah						
235	just yesterday as a						
236	matter of fact about						
237	this very point						
238	I had some money I	i	h				
239	put into I put almost						
240	seven thousand, 6900						
241	dollars ah in 1994 into						
242	a Fidelity fund in						
243	Hong Kong						
244	B: Uh-huh (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	R		
245	A: I have left out of that	i	h	informing	I	Inform	39
246	sixty nine hundred						
247	dollars about twenty						
248	nine hundred dollars						
249	B: What happened to it?	inq	h	eliciting	R/I		
250	A: To what?	ret	h	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	40
251	B: Values (? unclear)	i	h	informing	R		
252	A: I put it into Hong	i	h	informing	R		
253	Kong and the Hong						
254	Kong dollar went						
255	down. +						
256	B: Yeah	(eng)					
257	A: + the Hong Kong						
258	market was						
259	down (0.9 sec)						
260	And then it came						
261	back finally but I						
262	didn't pull it out						
263	when I should've						
264	And finally I pulled						
265	it out and put it into						
266	a Korean fund (1.2 sec)						
267	Ah and Korea started						
268	tanking but I got it						
269	out before Korea really						
270	tanked (0.8 sec)						
271	Then I put it						
272	somewhere else and						
273	finally put it into						
274	Indonesia						
275	B: Yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	F		
276	How is it going?	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	41
277	A: It was down to about	i	h	informing	R		
278	38, 39 hundred when						
279	I put it into						
280	Indonesia (0.9 sec)						
281	and then it went						
282	down to about						
283	fifteen hundred						
284	B: Why don't you put it	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	42
285	into some American						
286	mutuals? (1.3)						
287	A: I just have to pull it	i	h	informing	R		
288	out of Asia period						
289	and move it onto						
290	the US						
291	B: Yeah (mid key)	rec	h	acknowl	F		
292	A: What there is left	obs	h	informing	I	Inform	43
293	you know						
294	B: Hun (mid key) (1.6)	rec	h	acknowl	R		

295	A: Yeah (low key) (1.8)	ter	h	acknowl	F		
296	B: Oh okay [#: 0.3]	fr	pre-h	opening	I	Structuring	44
297	Got to get ready for	ms	h				4
298	my class						
299	A: 0	(aqu)	h	(answering)	R		
300	(1.7)						

continued....

## Appendix IV: Classroom activities

Activity (1): The objectives of this activity are to introduce students to the acts of everyday conversation listed in the Appendix II, for instance, the inquiry (inq) and have them realize its various forms, which are what, when, where, why, who, how, and ... or.. type questions.

### Procedure

(1) The teacher introduces the forms and function of the target act, the inq, exemplifying through interaction with the students. (2) In a role play situation, for instance, a student (S1) meets someone on the street and helps him/her by providing required information. (3) The teacher elicits information in a natural speed from the S1 in front of the class by showing an authentic text written in L1. The material can be provided by the students or collected by the teacher, preferably one he/she really needs someone to explain about. Examples are tourism information written in Japanese or information the teacher encounters in his/her everyday life and is therefore unable to figure out. The material serves an information gap between the students S1 and the teacher in order to have the teacher ask referential questions (see Brock and Cindy 1986). (4) The teacher or a student records the conversation for later use. (5) Students Sn (where n = 2, 3, N) while listening to the conversation between the teacher and the S1, count the number of occurrences of the target forms. (6) The students in pairs or groups compare their answers. (7) The teacher uses the recorded conversation to introduce new acts or to review the ones which have already been taught and repeats steps (5) and (6).

Activity (2): The objectives of this activity are to have students realize the forms and functions of the acts, moves and exchanges in situational dialogues.

### Procedure

The teacher gives students a prearranged dialogue with the moves randomly ordered in which each move is labelled with a letter of the English alphabet and if all the moves are arranged in sequence it leads to an English word, usually an uncommon word. (2) The students in pairs or groups discuss and put the dialogue's moves in its original order, and hence find the English word. See the example below (Adopted from Tofuku and Shaikh 1997: 47)

Directions: In the following situational dialogue, each speaker's lines (Clerk and

Mariko) are written in the wrong order. Work in pairs or groups and put the sentences in order and find the hidden word.

HIDDEN WORD = \_ U L \_ I \_ I L \_ \_ O \_ \_ I \_ \_

The dialogs lines are associated with the alphabets such as

CLERK as (M) Good afternoon. May I help you?, (I) Can I get anything else for you?, (L) Of course. Just a moment ... here you go., (I) Well, do you take vitamins regularly?, (O) Just once a day after breakfast., (L) I recommend that you take a multiple vitamin with iron., (A) That'll be \$12.85 with tax., (R), Here's your change. Take care. And

And MARIKO as (U) Yes, I need this prescription filled., (M) Yes. I've been really tired lately. Do you know what it could be?, (T) Thank you., (L) No, I never take vitamins., (N) O.K. I'll take these. How much are they?, (I) How often do I need to take them?, (I) Here you go., (E) Thank you. Good-bye.