

Analysing classroom discourse
using the Sinclair/Coulthard model

David Paterson

松 山 大 学
言語文化研究 第28卷第1号 (抜刷)
2008年9月

Matsuyama University
Studies in Language and Literature
Vol. 28 No. 1 September 2008

Analysing classroom discourse using the Sinclair/Coulthard model

David Paterson

1. Introduction

The vast complexity of human communicative behaviour must be reducible to a small number of simple activities. (Sinclair, 1992 : 83)

This paper will apply the Sinclair/Coulthard model for classroom discourse to the analysis of an extract recorded and transcribed from an English language lesson, concentrating upon a search for evidence of structure. This practical example of the model in action will be preceded by a description of the original work (and some of the subsequent transformations it has undergone) attempting to place its conception in the historical context of the development of discourse analysis. How relevant it remains to current educational practice will be the focus of the third and final section, where certain questions will be explored. How successful has the analysis undertaken been in identifying and explaining particular features of classroom talk, and how (and to what degree) might these features be useful for English teachers? Can a model initially designed for primary school classrooms of native English speakers in the 1970s still provide valuable insights into the workings of adult foreign language classes some three decades later?

2. The Sinclair/Coulthard model

2.1 Historical background

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used... Discourse analysts study language in use...

(McCarthy, 1991 : 5)

The need to establish a new field of linguistic study arose from the lack of an appropriate system to describe language on a scale above the sentence unit. The division of such elements into distinct categories and the formulation of a basic set of rules governing their use, particularly in conversation, was the primary goal of initial research in the mid-1970s, drawing inspiration from the examination of speech acts by Austin and Searle (1962 & 1969 respectively, as discussed in Sinclair, Op. Cit.) and work by Halliday (1961, as discussed *ibid.*) on grammar.

Speech act theory assigned functional meaning in communication to utterances (divisible into various classes, such as declaratives, directives, expressives and so on – although there was considerable variation in categories between authors), introducing the concept of ‘illocutionary force’ (Austin, as discussed *ibid.*) to convey the effect of such utterances on the listener *in context*, as distinct from the underlying literal or ‘locutionary’ meaning. This suggested to Sinclair and Coulthard the necessity for a new level of linguistic description in order to show the relationship between each utterance and its discursive function, namely that of discourse.

Halliday (as discussed *ibid.*) would provide the “taxonomic hierarchy” model (Sinclair, *ibid.* : 79) in the shape of the rank scale which they transferred directly

from its source in systemic grammar to the new field, relating discourse to form in the same way as form was already seen to be related to phonology. As morphemes represented the smallest indivisible unit (and thus without structure) in grammar, but were found to consist of a series of phonemes on the phonological level, so too would the lowest ranks of discourse be structurally analysable at the highest levels of grammatical form in clause and sentence (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992: 2).¹⁾ A rough guide to these overlapping elements was provided (ibid.: 5) :

Figure 1.

Discourse	Grammar
LESSON	
TRANSACTION	
EXCHANGE	
MOVE	sentence
ACT	clause
	group
	word
	morpheme

Before explaining the items in the left-hand column in greater detail, one final reference should be made to a parallel development that was taking place largely across the Atlantic in the establishment of what would become known as conversational analysis, with a basis in ethnomethodology. Work on turn-taking and adjacency pairs (Jefferson, 1972 and Sacks et al, 1974, as discussed in Levinson, 1983) concentrated on similar details at the level of utterance but allowed a much looser, simpler framework, with inherent advantages and disadvantages, than that of the Sinclair and Coulthard model, upon whose stricter complexities this study will now turn its focus.

1) The 1992 Sinclair and Coulthard text quoted directly throughout this paper is the first chapter of a later collection of Birmingham work which presented the central section of the original "Towards an Analysis of Discourse" (1975) "with very minor alterations" (Coulthard, Op. Cit : Preface).

2.2 The model

Spoken discourse is produced in real-time and our descriptive system attempts to deal with the ‘now-coding’ aspect of speech. (Sinclair & Coulthard, Op. Cit.: 14)

In choosing the classroom situation as the most suitable setting for the application of this system it was possible to avoid many of the vagaries that might have arisen in a freer environment (linguistically and otherwise). The “clearly defined roles of teacher and pupil” and “responsibility for control” evidently lying with the former helped facilitate the revelation of “a stark and comparatively simple discourse structure” (Willis, J., 1992: 177-8). Sinclair and Coulthard (Op. Cit.: 2-3) started by examining small-scale sequences not dissimilar to adjacency pairs, but soon found their initial two-tier rank system of *utterance* and *exchange* required expansion to cope with various difficulties such as the demarcation of boundaries between exchanges.

As shown in Figure 1 (see previous page), they finally established a more involved rank scale, where the fundamental triumvirate of *act*, *move*, and *exchange* would become the principal focus of this and much of subsequent research. Acts and moves were seen as close equivalents to morphemes and words in grammar. Above these overlapping categories, exchanges were shown to combine to form a *transaction* which might, in combination or even isolation, ultimately realise the highest unit of classroom discourse, the *lesson*. In this sense, lessons themselves may correspond to teachers’ presentational plans, but not necessarily, as factors such as variable teacher performance and unpredictable pupil reaction affect the structural flow. By their own admission, at these higher levels the decreasing evidence of structure on the one hand, and an increasingly social aspect on the other even

brought justification for the categorisations themselves into question (Sinclair, Op. Cit. : 79-80).

The rank scale...soon concentrated on the exchange, much as grammar was concentrating on the clause...In any case the exchange proved fascinating enough...its characteristic three-part structure of initiation, response and follow-up, gave a linguistic context for the understanding of speech acts. (Sinclair, *ibid.*)

Following the authors' lead, this description of the Sinclair and Coulthard model will now restrict itself to examining the primary organisational ranks of act, move and exchange, with particular emphasis on their method for analysing the last of these.

"Towards an analysis of discourse" presented a finite total of twenty-one discourse acts, "many of them specialized and some quite probably classroom-specific" by the authors' own admission (Sinclair and Coulthard, Op. Cit. : 8), referring to acts such as *cue*, *bid*, and *nomination*, all related to the choice of pupil contributor. However, the three most universal – *elicitation*, *directive*, and *informative* – (realised by questions, commands and statements respectively) are assigned the important function of forming the head of an *Opening* move. With *Framing* and *Focusing* moves more concerned with the division of the discourse (indeed, they realise what are labelled *Boundary* exchanges), the two other classes of move of greater concern are *Answering* and *Follow-up*, and it these, in combination with the aforementioned *Opening* moves, that realise the other type of exchange, *Teaching*, clearly of great interest to the present study.

This brings the discussion to arguably the most significant element of the model, its description of exchange structure. To the familiar question and answer

format of the adjacency pair, now viewed as *Initiation* and *Response*, allowing for a greater variety of applications, a third constituent part was added, namely that of *Feedback*, providing an optional means of concluding an exchange through supportive acknowledgement or other reaction to the response received. The most common exchange structure of Initiation (I), Response (R) and Feedback (F) – I R F, typically realised by the move sequence *elicitation - informative - acknowledge* (or possibly *informative - acknowledge - acknowledge*), has remained, in spite of extensive criticism and adaptation, a central focus of discourse analysis through to the present. As McCarthy (Op. Cit. : 122) later observed :

Particularly noticeable in the Sinclair-Coulthard data was the pattern of the three-part exchange in traditional classrooms, where the teacher made the initiation *and* the follow-up move, while pupils were restricted to responding moves. In...many language classes this is still the pattern...

Sinclair and Coulthard found that the I R F structure was directly applicable to the category they labelled *Teacher elicit*—“all exchanges designed to obtain verbal contributions from pupils”, while *Teacher direct*—“all exchanges designed to get the pupil to do but not to say something” (Op. Cit. : P26) was represented by I R (F), brackets indicating the optional nature of the third part. Thus in *Teacher direct*, response is compulsory, with feedback a matter of teacher choice, whereas all three elements are expected to be present in a *Teacher elicit*, given their insistence that :

So important is feedback that if it does not occur we feel confident in saying that the teacher has deliberately withheld it for some strategic purpose. (ibid. : 27)

The third of the Teaching exchanges outlined in this medial section of the rank scale is that of *Teacher inform*, which sees a further reduction in structural complexity in its expression by I (R) where a lack of verbal response (no action is expected of the pupils other than listening) logically curtails the need for any form

of feedback.

Making up the rest of the sextet of *Free* exchanges are pupil-contributed equivalents (*Pupil elicit* – I R and *Pupil inform* – I F) of the Teacher versions just described, and finally a close relation of Teacher elicit in *Check*, often used to establish pupils' progress with a given task. Completing the rank of exchange as a whole are an accompanying set of five *Bound* exchanges, more complex in structure, used to describe various teaching techniques employed when *Free* exchanges have somehow failed to produce the expected results, hence labels such as *Re-initiation* and *Reinforce*.

Given the limitations of space and varying degrees of relevance to the analysis to follow, this has been a rather cursory description of the Sinclair/Coulthard model. Including only those aspects discussed earlier, a brief summary of the rank scale is given below, adapted from the original (ibid. : 6-8 & 26-31).

Figure 2.

RANK	
I	Lesson
II	Transaction
III	Exchange : Boundary structural elements - Frame/Focus basic structure - (Fr) (Fo) moves - Fr : Framing/Fo : Focusing Teaching structural elements - Initiation/Response/Feedback basic structure - I (R) (F) moves - I : Opening/R : Answering/F : Follow-up
IV	Move
V	Act

Types of Teaching exchange : Free - Teacher inform/direct/elicit Pupil elicit/inform Check Bound - Re-initiation i & ii/Listing/Reinforce/ Repeat	
Types of Move : Opening/Answering/Follow-up/Framing/Focusing	

2.3 Later adaptations

It should be noted that Sinclair and Coulthard were aware of the limitations of their model from the onset. The former would later introduce the concepts of ‘prospection’ and ‘encapsulation’ (Op. Cit. : 83-6), allowing for either incomplete sequences of initiation only (I I I...) or the prospection of response fulfilled in I R, with the option of encapsulation by a follow-up move (I R F), rather than the earlier rigid insistence upon the ordered presence of all elements I, R and F almost without exception.

Coulthard and Brazil were also concerned with ‘residual problems’ (1992 : 76)²⁾ that remained or were even the by-product of their important modification of exchange structure (ibid. : 71-2) which allowed for a minimum of two and maximum of four elements in the formation of exchanges, represented as I (R/I) R (F). The new category R/I (response/initiation) was designed to describe pupil responses in particular, where Feedback had previously been restricted to evaluative use by the teacher. Berry (1981, as discussed in Willis, D., 1992. : 113-5), concerned with similar problems, proposed the concept of *primary* and *secondary knower* (K1 and K2, respectively) to account for the distinction between the traditional view of follow-up and the non-judgemental acknowledgement far more habitual in conversation outside the classroom.

Meanwhile, modifications were also being suggested at other levels of rank. For example, while Coulthard and Brazil (Op. Cit. : 70) commented on an overabundance of act classes, later research actually expanded the original set to over thirty items (Francis & Hunston, 1992 : 128-34), with the proviso that a full and

2) Wishing to avoid any confusion of chronology, once more the reference is to an earlier text slightly modified for inclusion in the 1992 collection, originally published in 1979.

finite list of items was “neither feasible nor desirable”.

Perhaps the final words of this introduction to an undoubtedly highly influential work should be left to one of its creators, steadfastly refuting the context in which it has often been placed :

I would like to deny any suggestion that there is a ‘Birmingham School’ of discourse... working in a co-ordinated manner, increasing the dimensions of a shared position. The original work was mostly valuable as a known position, fairly clearly stated, which acted as a stimulus for further development. That development was varied and extensive, and no attempt has been made to meld it into a coherent whole. (Sinclair, Op. Cit. : 83)

3 . Using the model to analyse classroom discourse

3.1 Transcript in context

...the teacher-analyst not only should rely on the surface evidence of the text or transcript, but also should seek explanations for quantified phenomena in the work of others and, above all, should explore the cultural context of the learner.

(McCarthy, Op. Cit. : 192)

A recording of approximately seven minutes duration was made of an English language lesson. Due to considerations of presentation the full line-by-line transcript and analysis are provided in the Appendix, along with further details of the context and participants. An attempt was made to apply Sinclair and Coulthard’s original model while also referring to later adaptations that were outlined in the previous section, in particular Francis and Hunston’s analysis of “everyday conversation” (Op. Cit.) due to the nature and content of the lesson. As will become evident in the following discussion, a number of questions were posed by

difficulties arising through the analytical approach to the data. Would the finite number of categories in the rank scale be sufficient to describe the variety of input in largely ‘free’ conversation between non-native speakers? Would some categories be rendered redundant through complete lack of evidence and others need to be created to take their place with more appropriate terminology? Would the absence of certain features of the original imply an insufficiently universal system or would they merely indicate the fundamental difference between the contexts to which it was being applied? It may be possible to provide some answers to these questions in the evaluative section that will conclude this study, but first, a closer examination of some key points in the analysis will be performed.

3.2 Looking for evidence of structure

A relatively simple approach was taken to the analysis of the transcript – all utterances would be given particular labels as moves and the exchange functions they represented, with limitations of scope precluding similar action at either the lower level of act or the higher level of transaction. The format and some notational elements draw upon Francis and Hunston’s adaptation of the Sinclair/Coulthard model (ibid. : 157-61).

Initially it was hard to discern even the basic structural elements of the conversation amid what appeared to be a majority of largely unclassifiable items. The opening section contains several good examples :

Figure 3.

lines 3 – 13 of transcript

T : teacher

A/B : students

(#) : 1 second pause

(*) : laughs

3	A : Is your house ok ?
4	B : (#)No !
5	A : Has coming typhoon ?
6	T : No ?
7	A : No
8	T : Not ok ?
9	What happened ?
10	A : (*)
11	T : Trouble ?
12	B : Big strong wind
13	T : Yeah, sure sure sure

For every simple I R exchange there would be a number of seemingly scrambled sequences where out-of-sync responses would be provided to repeatedly rephrased elicitations only after various, sometimes unrelated interruptions.

While commencing with what appears to be a clearly identifiable I R exchange (lines 3/4), the following seven utterances³⁾ could be seen to contain no fewer than five elicitations, none of which really receive a direct response until line 12 where an accepting follow-up finally gives us the next clear-cut exchange, this time with an I R F structure (lines 11/12/13). While this is obviously a more complex interactive situation than Sinclair and Coulthard's teacher-pupil dyads, concentrating upon the actual order of contributions rather than the overlaps and interruptions to their intended targets may help to simplify the process. If we insist, as the model did, on a three-part exchange structure, and also allow an eliciting move in the position of follow-up (which the model most certainly did not), then the passage could be divided conveniently into three I R F sequences (lines 3/4/5 : A-B-A, 6/7/8 T-A-T and 11/12/13 T-B-T, as already described). A's laughter could even be

3) Are A's frequent laughs to be viewed as contributions to the discourse, in the position of acknowledgements or other minimal responses, or a less significant nervous habit ?

considered as a response to T's "What happened?", giving an I R structure to lines 9-10, though elicit and re-elicite (lines 9 and 11) seem more justifiable. Thus within the space of a few utterances it has become evident that the analysis of even quite simple dialogue (quite easily understood by any listener) immediately raises time-consuming questions of interpretation, although a strict application of the original model does appear to assist categorisation, albeit with a certain amount of rule-bending.

It was in this spirit that the analysis of the full transcript, given in the Appendix, was performed, with a determination to apply Sinclair and Coulthard's fundamental axioms wherever possible. Space does not permit full line-by-line explanation as provided above, but the reader's attention is drawn to a number of noteworthy features in the references below.

As might be expected in an extract from the opening, news-sharing section of the class, Inform tends to dominate the proceedings, sometimes with the full tripartite I R F structure, but more often in simple I R form, where R is an acknowledgement of the informing initiation. This perhaps reflects the nature of the content whereby students are more anxious to convey their stories to an expectant audience than to pause the proceedings by following-up each comment received. Nevertheless, Feedback remains an option at all times, where it was not for the pupils of Sinclair and Coulthard's study.

One problem arising from the rapid interchange between firstly three and later four or five participants is that responses are sometimes given by more than one person to a particular informing move (this happens less frequently after Elicits, where the intended recipient is likely to be made clearer via non-verbal cues -

Internet 1), and the symbol R+ was introduced to indicate their occurrence in the analysis. It seems quite natural for both students to respond, however minimally, to the teacher's openings, even with identical acknowledgements, as in the "Ah"s (lines 57-8) and "Mm"s (124-5), where any other analysis would surely be a perverse elaboration. A further complication is the overlapping caused by a premature response to an incomplete informing move, which then receives another response on actual completion. In Figure 4, for the purpose of analysis, the acknowledgements can be viewed as separate responses to the informing move divided by the anticipation of the first, but both would seem to effectively be making identical contributions to the discourse.

Figure 4.

lines 64 – 8 of transcript

64	T : Roof tiles
65	and the water comes –
66	B : Yeah
67	T : – easily down
68	A : Oh

In spite of such departures from the standard format, it is clear that the numerous Informing exchanges throughout the data show evidence of both two- (I R) and three- (I R F) part structure. Whereas extended sequences of consecutive Informs can be found in student-led sections (lines 83-94), some might see vestiges of asymmetrical classroom relationships in the longest such passage being teacher-initiated (118-36).

Turning our attention to Elicits, which are, as might be expected, predominantly teacher-led (see lines 230-59 for extensive question and answer pairings that would not be out of place in the traditional educational context of Sinclair and Coulthard's original data), these display both I R and I R F structures,

paralleling the observations made of Informs above. Somewhat surprisingly, given the 1975 study's near-insistence on its presence, there are fewer that include the final follow-up, and those that do are never truly evaluative in their Feedback, even though this is almost exclusively provided by the teacher. Figure 5 gives some examples of this acknowledging I R F structure, while the longer sequence referred to earlier in this paragraph contains consecutive I R Elicits.

Figure 5.

lines 157 – 60 and
192-4 of the transcript

<p>157 T : So the Tuesday you had 158 you couldn't work ? 159 B : Yes ! 160 T : Right</p> <p>-----</p> <p>192 T : How long for ? 193 B : Ah several times a – 194 T : Oh off and on</p>

In the brief examples given here and in the full 280-line analysis there is clear evidence of structure, particularly at the level of exchange, and by implication at the lower ranks of move and act (the latter not examined in the present study). On a higher organisational level it appears hard to discern any obvious partitioning, though the recorded data suggests fairly natural divisions before lines 51, 77, 152 and 209, with only the last being indicated with anything approaching structural formality purely by the silence that precedes it.

Some of the structural clarity of Sinclair and Coulthard's original was obscured by the greater number of speakers participating at a mostly equal level, free to contribute at will, with student-student interaction nearly as frequent as that between teacher and student. Categories from the model, such as Teacher direct exchanges, or classes of act like bid or nomination have been rendered irrelevant by the changed

environment. Overlapping dialogue and doubled-responses have also been given as examples of potentially structure-threatening features, but the overall impression obtained from the simple analysis is that in the key area of exchange, the basic I R (F) representation remains almost universally applicable.

Completing the main body of this paper, the focus will be transferred to the practical implications of such analysis for all participants in the process of language-learning and, in particular, the extent to which teachers may benefit from studying discourse in this fashion. As McCarthy and Carter observe :

Analyses of natural data...once completed, may look appealing on the page but may leave the teacher-analyst feeling 'what next?' The most important question for many teachers is : how do I make data analysis relevant to the teaching context ? (1994 : 185)

4 . Evaluation - benefits of analysis for teachers

Having shown that discourse analysis can illuminate evidence of structure in the communication that takes place within the language classroom, the question remains how useful such a process may be for teachers themselves.

Being put under the spotlight of such a method, as the author was here, can be particularly revealing in terms of the status of teacher-student relations. Teacher utterances clearly have an effect upon the flow of discourse in direct proportion to the extent of the amount of control exerted – on the one hand, Sinclair and Coulthard's original data showed the relative simplicity of exchange types observed in the traditional classroom, while on the other, even the limited analysis conducted here, in a far less constrictive context, demonstrated wide-ranging complexity and accompanying problems of categorisation. Could one possible interpretation be that

fewer clear equivalents of patterns from the original model represents some indication of a less asymmetric balance of power and a more communicative atmosphere ?

On first reading, the Sinclair/Coulthard study, with its frequent affirmation of teacher supremacy-“...the teacher has the right to speak whenever she wants to” while “...the pupil has no right to contribute to the discourse, and the teacher can ignore him” (Op. Cit. : 16&23) – seems very far removed from the student-centred approach to which most have become accustomed. But while Critical Discourse Analysis would later claim that the “teacher-orientated” interpretation in “failing to situate classroom discourse historically in processes of social struggle and change” and exaggeration of its homogeneity are inexcusable flaws (Fairclough, 1992 : 15), an alternative argument can be made for viewing any deviation from the rigidity of the original model in a positive light. The continued presence of many standard I R F exchanges (where I and F are teacher elicitation and evaluative feedback) may be a manifestation of excessive power and social control being exercised within the linguistic framework. Wardhaugh (1992 : 306) comments on the possible outcomes :

the teacher may be said to ‘own’ the conversation, whereas in ordinary conversations such ownership may be said to be shared

If a shift away from the situation described by Sinclair and Coulthard, because it “fails to reflect the complexities of discourse and language use outside the classroom” (Willis, J., Op. Cit. : 178), is suggested by the analysis, then it would imply that all those concerned with creating and presenting learning material should encourage activities that do not display such shortcomings. Dialogue in existing textbooks could also be examined in order to assess its proximity to natural

conversation, and any other data (for example, target language media broadcasting) used to raise both student and teacher awareness of the devices used by skilled practitioners. A wide range of features, *including* those observed in the classroom (as in Part 3 above), can be isolated, taught and practiced in simulations of authentic interaction. McCarthy concludes his guide to the subject for language teachers :

Discourse analysis can supply data...from both learners and native speakers, using the latter to evaluate the former and to suggest directions for the design of classroom activities (Op. Cit. : 145).

As previously stated, analysis can form the basis for teacher self-evaluation regarding the amount of control being exercised through management of the discourse and the opportunities created for student-initiated content. Furthermore, teachers may also find it worthwhile viewing the data as evidence of the effect their input has on student participation, in terms of both quantity and quality of contribution, and how certain options available to them at any given point in the proceedings (such as using an evaluative Follow-up where a simple acknowledgement might be expected, or a subtly-stated Boundary exchange to refocus students' attention – Willis, J., Op. Cit. : 172) might help prevent the discourse from continuing any further in an undesirable direction.

In short, the present study would appear to show that discourse analysis is ultimately a useful tool in focussing our attention on problematic areas in classroom conversation and giving some indication of ways in which they might be avoided or ameliorated, without, however, providing any easily-applicable comprehensive solutions.

5. Conclusion

Transferring the Sinclair/Coulthard model from the native-speaking, teacher-controlled original environment of a British primary school to an English language class for adults in Japan, proved to be as difficult as expected. There were, however, many ways in which the validity of its application was confirmed by the results, which were also successful in identifying a number of discourse features that would seem likely to be of benefit to teachers and thus, via their teaching, to students.

While Sinclair and Coulthard's work has its critics, as does discourse analysis as a whole (Levinson, Op. Cit.), even they are able to acknowledge its basic efficacy :

The strength of the Sinclair and Coulthard framework is in the pioneering way in which it draws attention to systematic organizational properties of dialogue and provides ways of describing them (Fairclough, Op. Cit. : 15).

Bibliography

- Burns, A. (2001). *Analysing Spoken Discourse*. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English In A Global Context - A Reader*. London : Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. & Brazil, D. (1992). *Exchange Structure*. In J. Sinclair & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London : Routledge.
- Di Pietro, R. (1990). *Interactive Discourse in the L2 Classroom*. In M. Halliday et al (Eds.), *Learning, keeping, and using language Volume 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge : Polity Press.
- Francis, G. & Hunston, S. (1992). *Analysing everyday conversation*. In J. Sinclair & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London : Routledge.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge : Cambridge

University Press.

- McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as Discourse*. Harlow, Essex : Longman.
- Richards, J. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. Harlow, Essex : Pearson Education.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. (1992). Priorities in discourse analysis. In J. Sinclair. & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London : Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. In J. Sinclair. & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London : Routledge.
- Ventola, E. (1990). Linguistic Difficulties in Institutional Discourse. In M. Halliday et al (Eds.), *Learning, keeping, and using language Volume 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Willis, D. (1992). Caught in the act : using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy. In J. Sinclair & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London : Routledge.
- Willis, J. (1992). Inner and outer : spoken discourse in the language classroom. In J. Sinclair & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London : Routledge.

Internet :

- 1 – <http://odur.let.rug.nl/~malouf/papers/talk/pdf>
- 2 – <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/fumie4.pdf>

Appendix - full transcript and analysis of recorded data

The data quoted in this paper comes from a group lesson for adult students, in their 50s and 60s, at a small English language school in Matsuyama, Japan. The participants might be labelled as “false” beginners who have failed to make the transition to intermediate level. The teacher (and author) is a British male in his 40s who taught the same members for approximately three years. The following pages give the transcript and attempted line-by-line analysis in full :

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
1 B : Good morning !	opening	I	Greet
2 E : Good morning !	answering	R	Greet
3 A : Is your house ok ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
4 B : (#) No !	answering	R	
5 A : Has coming typhoon ?	eliciting	I (F ?)	Elicit
6 T : No ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
7 A : No	answering	R	
8 T : Not ok ?	eliciting	F	Elicit
9 What happened ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
10 A : (*)		(R ?)	
11 T : Trouble ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
12 B : Big strong wind	answering	R	
13 T : Yeah, sure sure sure	acknowledging	F	
14 B : My house <i>eto</i>	informing	I	Inform
15 working house roof			
16 over (#) plastic -			
17 A : - roof	acknowledging	R	
18 B : - plate, ah wave plate	informing (16 c)	I	Inform
19 T : Ah, that style, yes so	acknowledging	R	
20 (#) anyway			
21 A : Oh !	acknowledging	R+	
22 B : - gone	informing	I	Inform
23 A : I'm sorry	acknowledging	R	
24 T : Oh no !	acknowledging	R+	
25 A : (*)	acknowledging	R+	
26 T : Oh	acknowledging	R+	
27 B : Next to (#) my next to	informing	I	Inform
28 um house er Japanese			
29 roof coming er coming			
30 (*)			
31 my water house (#)			
32 pump ?			
33 pump is broken			
34 A : Oh	acknowledging	R	

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
35 A : Your business -	eliciting	I	Elicit
36 B : Yeah	answering	R	
37 A : Oh	acknowledging	F	
38 T : Oh dear !	informing (ack ?)	I (F+?)	Inform
39 A : (*) whoah	acknowledging	R (F+?)	
40 T : Big trouble !	acknowledging	F	
41 B : All my house	informing	I	Inform
42 working water			
43 T : Oh no !	acknowledging	R	
44 B : must -	informing (42 c)	I	Inform
45 A : Stop	(44 e)		
46 B : stop	informing	I	Inform
47 A : (*)		(R ?)	
48 T : Terrible !	acknowledging	R	
49 B : Very terrible !	informing	I	Inform
50 T : Oh dear dear dear	acknowledging	R	
51 A : Japanese roof is <i>kawara</i> ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
52 B : Yes yes -	answering	R	
53 A : Ah	acknowledging	F	
54 B : - yes	(52 c)		
55 T : So the water er -	eliciting	I	
56 tiles, yeah			
57 B : Ah	answering	R	
58 A : Ah	answering	R+	
59 T : Roof tiles	informing	I	Inform
60 A : A loft ?	answering/elicit.	R/I ?	
61 T : Roof tiles	acknowledging	R	
62 B : Ah, roof tiles	informing	I	Inform
63 A : Roof tiles	acknowledging	R	
64 T : Roof tiles	informing	I	Inform
65 and the water comes -			
66 B : Yeah	acknowledging	R	
67 T : - easily down	informing (65 c)	I	Inform
68 A : Oh	acknowledging	R+	

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
69 T : Oh	acknowledging	F	
70 Now it's (#) ok ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
71 A : Now is ok	answering	R	
72 T : Right	acknowledging	F	
73 A : (*)	?		
74 B : Fix my house	informing	I	Inform
75 T : But on Monday and	acknowledging	R	
76 Tuesday was (#) (gesture)			
77 so busy (##) oh no !			
78 B : Are you ok ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
79 A : Ok, but (#) nearby my	answering	R	
80 house (#) house hmm			
81 damaged			
82 B : Ah	acknowledging	F	
83 A : (*) Antenna of television -	informing	I	Inform
84 B : Hmm mm	acknowledging	R	
85 T : Aah	acknowledging	R+	
86 A : - is down -	informing (83 c)	I	Inform
87 T : down	acknowledging	R	
88 A : - er went down	informing	I	Inform
89 T : Right	acknowledging	R	
90 A : (*) And roof is er	informing	I	Inform
91 wavy roof shoot fly down			
92 T : Oh right (#) right (#) ooh	acknowledging	R	
93 B : Strong wind	informing	I	Inform
94 very strong wind			
95 T : Wasn't it (#) suddenly (#)	acknowledging	R	
96 later though wasn't it			
97 later in the night (###)			
98 They used their shutters	informing	I	Inform
99 they were telling me			
100 about			
101 B : Shutter ?	eliciting	R/I ?	
102 T : Shutter (#)	acknowledging	R	

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
103 A : <i>Amado</i>	informing	I	Inform
104 B : Mm mm	acknowledging	R	
105 T : Shutter I think	informing	I	Inform
106 A : <i>Amado</i> say shutter	informing	R	
107 in English			
108 T : I think maybe shutter	acknowledging	F	
109 is the best word			
110 B : Ah shutter ? (*)	eliciting	I	Elicit
111 <i>Amado</i> equals shutter ?			
112 A : (*)	?		
113 T : Shutter is maybe the	answering	R	
114 the closest			
115 a little different style			
116 A : It in dictionary, yeah (*)	informing	I	Inform
117 B : Eh ? Shutter	acknowledging	R	
118 T : In Britain we don't have	informing	I	Inform
119 (#) shutters -			
120 A : Mm	acknowledging	R	
121 T : - which is strange	informing (119 c)	I	Inform
122 because Britain has very			
123 bad rain and wind -			
124 A : Mm	acknowledging	R	
125 B : Mm	acknowledging	R+	
126 T : - but we don't use	informing (123 c)	I	Inform
127 shutters (#) but in Eur-			
128 ope they have wooden -			
129 B : mm ah wood	acknowledging	R	
130 T : - shutters but in Britain	informing (128 c)	I	Inform
131 no houses I don't think			
132 I've ever seen -			
133 A : Nn	acknowledging	R	
134 T : - shutters in England	informing (132 c)	I	Inform
135 The weather is bad			
136 A : Mm	acknowledging	R	

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
137 T : so why why not ?	eliciting	I	Inform
138 maybe different style	informing	I	
139 A : Long time ago (#) wood	informing	I	Inform
140 wood shutters			
141 T : Hmm that's right (#)	acknowledging	R	
142 no window only shutters			
143 A : Mm	acknowledging	F	
144 T : There was no window	informing	I	Inform
145 I don't know why (#)			
146 but interesting			
147 Aah too bad !			
148 A : (*)	acknowledging	R	
149 T : I'm sorry to hear that (*)	informing	I	Inform
150 whoah !			
151 E : (*)	acknowledging	R	
152 T : And for business	informing	I	Inform
153 of course -			
154 A : eeah	acknowledging	R	
155 T : - it's even worse	informing (153 c)	I	Inform
156 A : eugh	acknowledging	R	
157 T : So the Tuesday you had	eliciting	I	Elicit
158 you couldn't work ?			
159 B : Yes !	answering	R	
160 T : Right	acknowledging	F	
161 B : Speaking (gesture)	informing	I	Inform
162 T : Right right (#)	acknowledging	R	
163 but from yesterday -	eliciting	I	Elicit
164 B : Yesterday	answering	R	
165 T : - was ok right right	acknowledging	F	
166 started again	eliciting	I	Elicit
167 B : Yesterday afternoon ok	answering	R	
168 (*)			
169 T : At last !	acknowledging	F	
170 A : (*)	?		

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
171 B : We are very tired	informing	I	Inform
172 T : Yeah big problem (##)	acknowledging	R	
173 B : Light is er doesn't work	informing	I	Inform
174 A : Oh ?	acknowledging	R	
175 T : Ah did you have a pow-	eliciting	I	Elicit
176 power cut ?			
177 B : Ah	acknowledging	R	
178 T : Blackout ?	eliciting	I	
179 B : Mm	answering	R	
180 T : Right	acknowledging	F	
181 A : Eh ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
182 T : Some of my -	informing	I	Inform
183 B : Candle burn	informing	I	Inform
184 T : - students said	informing (182 c)	I	
185 A : Aah	acknowledging	R	
186 B : <i>Tsukete</i> (gesture)	informing	I	Inform
187 T : We were ok (#)	informing	I	Inform
188 I was worried maybe so			
189 I - candle matches -			
190 A : (*)	(acknowledging	R ?)	
191 T : - ready but it was ok	(acknowledging	F ?)	
192 How long for ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
193 B : Ah several times a -	answering	R	
194 T : Oh off and on	acknowledging	F	
195 B : - few minutes	informing	I	Inform
196 T : A few minutes right	acknowledging	R	
197 B : Mm	acknowledging	F	
198 T : Yesterday one of my	informing	I	Inform
199 students - where ?			
200 I can't remember -			
201 two hours			
202 B : Two hours ?	eliciting	R/I	
203 T : Cut yeah (#) -	answering	R	
204 A : Wow	(informing	I ?)	

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
205 T : - for two hours	informing	I	Inform
206 don't know where			
207 A : Mm	acknowledging	R	
208 E : (####)	framing	Fr	Boundary ?
209 T : Where is D-san ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
210 B : Yeah	answering	R	
211 T : Unusual, isn't it ?	acknowledging	F	
212 A : C-san ! Oh !	informing	I	Inform
213 B : Good morning !	opening	I	Greet
214 T : Good morning !	opening	I	Greet
215 Welcome welcome hello			
216 We were just talking	informing	I	Inform
217 about surviving the			
218 typhoon			
219 C : Typhoon ? Aah	acknowledging	R	
220 A : B -	informing	I	Inform
221 T : B had a lot of	informing	I	Inform
222 trouble (*)			
223 A : (*)	?		
224 B : Terrible !	acknowledging	R	
225 C : Home or everything ?	eliciting	I	Elicit
226 House ?			
227 B : <i>Ee</i> working house	answering	R	
228 C : So ?	acknowledging	F	
229 A : (*)	?		
230 T : I wonder how do we say	eliciting	I	Elicit
231 (#) working house			
232 I don't think we can say			
233 What can we say ?			
234 C : Loft ? Loft <i>demo nai</i> (#)	answering	R	
235 T : Lofts would have to be	informing	I	Inform
236 above -			
237 C : Weird <i>ne</i>	acknowledging	R	
238 T : - so (#)	eliciting	I	Elicit

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
239 B : Work -	answering	R	
240 T : Do you do you work (#)	eliciting	I	Elicit
241 inside the house ?			
242 C : Outside	answering	R	
243 B : Outside	answering	R+	
244 T : No yeah but do you	eliciting	I	Elicit
245 work inside that ?			
246 Do people work inside ?			
247 B : Yeah yeah	answering	R	
248 C : <i>Shigoto ba</i>	informing	I	Inform
249 T : Hmm	acknowledging	R	
250 A : Ah <i>shigoto ba</i>	acknowledging	R+	
251 T : But not an office (#)	eliciting	I	Elicit
252 C : Not -	answering	R	
253 B : Not office	answering	R+	
254 T : But actually that's	eliciting	I	Elicit
255 where the cleaning is			
256 done ?			
257 B : Yes yes (#)	answering	R	
258 Machine and er ah			
259 anything			
260 E : (*)	?		
261 B : (*)	?		
262 T : Not a factory either, is it	informing	I	Inform
263 A : Not factory (*)	acknowledging	R	
264 T : I think to call it the	informing	I	Inform
265 laundry if it is the			
266 laundry is o – I think			
267 laundry is or (#)			
268 workplace !			
269 B : Workplace	acknowledging	R	
270 T : Workplace	acknowledging	F	
271 E : Good morning !	opening	I	Greet
272 D : How about typhoon ?	eliciting	I	Elicit

line of dialogue	move	s. e.	exchange
273 T : Yeah we were just	answering	R	
274 talking (#) well B	informing	I	Inform
275 had the worst time but			
276 (#) her workplace was in			
277 trouble but er (#)			
278 B : Workplace	eliciting	R	
279 T : Workplace is the general	informing	F	
280 word			

Notes on Japanese words used

line	
14 <i>eto</i> = er/um	
51 <i>kawara</i> = roof tile	
103 <i>amado</i> = shutter	
186 <i>tsukete</i> = to light	
227 <i>ee</i> = yes/affirmative	
234 <i>demo nai</i> = but not	
237 <i>ne</i> = sentence end tag (f)	
248 <i>shigoto ba</i> = workplace	

Speakers

T = teacher, male
A = student, female
B = student, female
C = student, female
D = student, female
E = everyone present

Notes on symbols used in transcription

(*) = laughs
(#) = pause or silence
approx. 1 second
approx. 2 seconds
- = interruption and later continuation

Notes on symbol used in analysis

65 c = continuation of utterance from line 65, implying actual continuation of same overall exchange	I = Initiation
	R = Response
	F = Feedback
	R/I = Response/Initiation
	R+ = additional response by other speaker
s. e. = structural element	