

**THE APPLICATION OF SINCLAIR AND COULTHARD'S
IRF STRUCTURE TO A CLASSROOM LESSON:
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

**ANDREW WHITE
A MODULE FOUR ASSIGNMENT
CLASSROOM AND SPOKEN DISCOURSE/ WRITTEN DISCOURSE
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND
MA – TEFL / TESL PROGRAM
MAY, 2003**

1. INTRODUCTION

With the goal being a progression toward native-speaker proficiency, discourse which is generally found in teacher-fronted ESL classrooms may seem to miss the mark. Highly structured, speech interaction between teacher and students, characterized by constant verbatim repetition and turn-taking restraints, can seem contrary to real-world conversational language. The teacher's ability to control the rigidity of classroom discourse structure is, of course, insight into his methodology, yet even the most relaxed classroom setting bears little resemblance to students' understanding of real-life language and its purpose.

Consequently, the analysis of classroom discourse is of value to teachers wanting to understand the dynamics of classroom communication, to discover "whether there is a proper equilibrium or an imbalance between real communication and teacher talk." (McCarthy 1991:18).

For the purposes of this paper, I will use a model for the description of teacher-pupil talk developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992), and apply its ranking scale to a data sample of classroom discourse recorded from a personal teaching lesson. Following this, I will comment on the difficulty of applying this model to my data, as I anticipated the "looseness" of my classroom setting to present problems of categorization in such areas as turn-taking, student elicitation and feed-back. An explanation of the Sinclair and Coulthard model precedes my analysis explanations, while a transcript of the data sample and the entire analysis are included as appendixes.

2. THE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS MODEL

The Discourse Analysis model (DA), also known as the Birmingham model or, at the level of *exchange*, the Initiation-Response-Follow-up structure (IRF), was developed by Sinclair and Coulthard from research concerning the structural description of discourse found in the classroom. Since its original description in 1975, it has evolved and expanded to allow the application of less-structured discourse, through the works of Coulthard and Montgomery (1981), Sinclair and Brazil (1982), and Sinclair and Coulthard (1992). Other researchers have focused on aspects of the DA model, including

the use of questions (Tsui 1992) and the function of intonation. (Coulthard and Brazil 1979, Brazil 1985, Hewings 1992).

From their research, Sinclair and Coulthard discovered that language in the classroom followed a very rigid sequence, and that speaking patterns were highly structured. Thus, in creating a structural description of discourse, speech acts found in the classroom could be defined according to their function, and therefore categorized. This advantage is expanded by Willis, “The distinctive feature of a structural description is that the elements in the description and their possible combinations must be rigorously defined. This means that descriptions which are based on the same structural criteria are directly comparable.” (Willis 1992:112).

The ranking scale of the DA model contains 4 components. They are, in descending order of hierarchy: *transaction*, *exchange*, *move* and *act*. Sinclair and Coulthard, in their original model, included the all-encompassing fifth element of *lesson*, consisting of transactions, but have since dismissed it as being a “stylistic type,” dependant on subjective teaching types. There exists a structure in every rank (above the lowest) which can be expressed in terms of the units next below it. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992). Thus, the structure of transaction consists of units of exchanges, exchange units of moves, and move units of acts.

Most discourse research through the DA model is done at the level of *exchange*, comparably as grammar concentrates on the clause. (ibid: 2). There exists two types of exchanges, Boundary and Teaching. *Boundary exchanges* mark an end or a beginning to a stage of the lesson, and can be implemented either with a *framing move* or a *focusing move*. Typical framing and focusing moves are indicated by *acts* such as ‘well’, ‘good’, ‘okay’, in addition to an extended pause, and/or comments by the teacher which summarize the preceding or following discourse. *Teaching exchanges* concern the actual progression of the lesson, and depending on the teacher’s intent, can be actualized through informing, directing, eliciting or checking. There are eleven subcategories of teaching exchanges. Six are *free exchanges* and are defined by their function and by the type of *head act* in the initiating move. Whether the teacher or student initiates the exchange also affects categorization. The five remaining exchanges are *bound exchanges*,

in that they normally contain no initiation and thus are bound to the previous exchange's function in some way.

Teaching exchanges consist of *initiation moves* (called the opening move in Sinclair and Coulthard's original model), *response moves* (the answering move), and *follow-up moves*. This three-move structure of an exchange (IRF) is commonly cited, and will be the basis of my data analysis. IRF structure is characteristic of teacher-led discourse, in which the teacher asks a question or provides information, the student responds or reacts, and the teacher provides some degree of comment or evaluation. As Brazil (1995) explains, "the teacher knows what he or she wants to tell the class but chooses to do it by setting up situations in which they are steered- more or less successfully- into telling it themselves." (p.22). This can be seen in the following example, taken from personal data:

Teacher: We have the fisherman. What is he saying to himself?
Student: He is saying... "I got it."
Teacher: Okay. Sure. He is saying, "I got it."

(Appendix 2)

Moves are composed of *acts*, which are the smallest units in the DA model, and define the function of utterances made by the teacher and students. Sinclair and Coulthard list 22 available acts, which will not be listed here due to space constraints. For example, in the preceding example, the teacher's initiation move consists of two acts, *informative* and *elicit*. The student's response move contains a *reply* act, while the teacher's follow-up move includes an *accept*, which indicates to the student that the response was appropriate, and an *evaluate*, which comments on the quality of the response. In this case the evaluate is a repetition of the response with high-fall intonation.

The structured, planned discourse of classroom interaction fits well with the DA model, yet critics claim problems lie with the immediacy of the discourse approach. According to Francis and Hunston (1992), speech acts in the DA model are labeled as they relate to the following and previous utterances, 'on a moment-by-moment basis' (p.151), not as they contribute to the discourse as a whole. In addition, the model codes utterances in terms of their effect on the discourse only, not taking into account the participants of that discourse. With analysis concerned only with the product of discourse, the issue of how participants interact and negotiate in the speaking activity cannot be addressed.

That a speech act can only be identified as a single move type is another criticism of the DA model. Rather, an act may perform more than one function of the ‘network of available choices simultaneously.’ (Malouf 1995:online). Problems of this kind that were experienced in categorizing my own classroom data will be addressed in Section Four.

3. THE LESSON DATA AND CLASSROOM INTERACTION

The transcribed data to be classified in the DA model consists of a thirty five minute excerpt recorded from a conversation class held at my college. The six students are Korean college professors with an upper-intermediate level of English, who want to increase their English ability both for career and general purposes. The lesson centers around a hand-out of six pictures showing outdoor activities, and a list of questions relating to the pictures and outdoor life in general.

When choosing an appropriate class to be recorded, I was aware that this intimate class setting might create difficulties when analyzing the data in terms of turn-taking and student elicits. Although the lessons are teacher-led, students are given (even demand) the ability to break the “lock-step teaching” of traditional classrooms. (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 243). By allowing this, classroom roles become less rigid and more natural discourse can exist. Nunn (2001) comments that the choices available to participants and the way participants distribute and use these choices determine the roles of teachers and students. “The way we represent interactive classroom rules adopted by participants is closely linked to the way we represent the teaching method actually being enacted.” (p.2). The freedom of students to interject, question and provide additional information more closely resembles natural discourse, yet proves to present several problems in labeling utterances according to the DA model.

4. DIFFICULTIES OF DATA ANALYSIS

In this section I will examine pertinent examples which show the difficulty of categorization my lesson data in the IRF structure of the Sinclair-Coulthard system of analysis. Examples have been labeled numerically from the written transcript included as Appendix 1, while the entire analysis of data can be referred to in Appendix 2.

4.1 Student as Teacher

Given the lack of restrictive turn-taking norms, natural discourse allows participants to question one another's answers. Though this is quite natural in everyday conversation, for a student to assume this role creates difficulties in labeling, as seen in the following:

- 133 T: Yes. I've been camping many times. What do you think? Once a year?
134 P3: No.
135 T: Twice a year?
136 P3: Everyday
137 P1: Everyday?
138 P3: Everyday. Everyday to climb mountain.
139 T: No..no..no. Camping. How often? How often do you go camping?
140 P3: Two times. Two times...one year.
141 P1: Twice...one year.
142 T: Twice a year.
143 P3: Ahh...twice a year.
144 T: I go camping twice a year. Good.

In this example, Pupil 3 has misunderstood the teacher's question and provides an incorrect answer, in line 136. Noticing this, Pupil 1 immediately provides a negative evaluation by repeating the answer with rising intonation. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) define the act of *evaluate* as including 'repetition of the pupil's reply with either high-fall (positive), or a rise of any kind (negative evaluation).' (p.21). Students providing follow-up information is not accounted for in the model's structure of exchanges, yet I felt it appropriate in this situation to label Pupil 1's follow-up move in line 137 as *evaluate*.

Pupil 1 again attempts to provide feedback to another student's response in line 141, 'Twice...one year.' Feeling that his correction was not precise, the teacher provides the correct response, 'Twice a year.' This creates the unique example of teacher feedback given to student feedback. I have chosen to designate the teacher's *evaluate* (line 142), as a follow-up move, making it a *bound exchange* to the original opening move of *teacher elicit*, 'How often do you go camping?' From here, the discourse can continue with another *bound exchange*, with the original student *acknowledging* the teacher's correct *evaluate* in line 143, and the teacher expanding on the correct answer as a follow-up move *comment*.

Further difficulties with categorizing student evaluations of student responses were found in the following example:

- 034 T: What is the hunter aiming at? He is aiming at...

037 P3: Bird.
038 T: Bird is good answer.

039 P3: And deer...deer.
040 P1: Deer?
041 T: Ohhh!
042 P1: He...He is aiming at sky!
043 P3: Okay. Bird.
044 T: Okay.

Following the *response* and *follow-up moves* (in lines 037-038) to the bound teacher elicit, a student provides another *response* to the elicit (line 039), thus creating another bound exchange. Feeling that this response is incorrect, both Pupil 1 and the teacher choose to *evaluate* negatively (in lines 040-041). In my analysis I therefore included both evaluations in the follow-up move position, as they both relate to the incorrect response.

Following this, Pupil 1 proceeds to provide an assertive *pupil informative* (line 042), which clarifies the previous exchange's incorrect answer. In doing so he assumes the role of teacher, which Pupil 3 recognizes by providing an *acknowledge* and correct *reply* (in line 043). The teacher concludes the exchange with an *accept*. In my attempts at labeling, the Sinclair and Coulthard model structure fails to account for this role-changing. In addition, both *pupil inform* and *teacher inform* do not allow for a I(R)(F) structure. Thus, I consider this example to follow the traditional IRF structure, with the student initiating in the teacher's role.

4.2 Pupil Response In A Teacher Inform Exchange

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992: 26) define a *teacher inform* as an exchange where the teacher contributes facts, opinions, ideas and new information to the pupil. Pupils can, but usually do not, provide a verbal response to the teacher's initiation. Thus the structure is I(R) with no feedback. In my data, however, students often repeat key information even when a *nomination* is absent, as seen in the following:

056 T: Pheasant is good. He is aiming at pheasant.
057 P1: Pheasant...pheasant.
058 T: Okay. Pheasant is very delicious.
059 P3: Yeah.

In this example there are two informative exchanges. In the first, the pupil repeats an introduced vocabulary word, possibly as a verbal memorizing technique, (line 057). This may be interpreted as an (student) *aside*, which Sinclair and Coulthard describe as statements, questions and commands "not really addressed to the class." (ibid: 21). However, since the teacher chooses to respond to the student's utterance with 'okay' (an *accept* in the follow-up move, line 058), I have labeled the student's repetition

‘pheasant...pheasant’ as a *reply* in the answering move. Following this rationale, all informatives could conceivably be elicits, with paralinguistic signals playing a role in final assignment. (Tsui 1992: 104). A teacher follow-up move would be optional.

The second informative exchange is more conventional. As the teacher initiates with the *informative*, ‘Pheasant is very delicious’ in line 058, the student responds with a *reply*. Although defined as a ‘linguistic response which is appropriate to the *elicitation*,’ (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 20), I believe, as stated above, *reply* be given the same ability in *informative* exchanges.

4.3 Teacher Response In A Pupil Inform Exchange

When a student offers interesting or relevant information, it is defined as a *pupil inform*. The teacher can then supply an evaluation of the information’s worth and often a comment. (ibid: 28). The structure is IF, with the teacher’s response being a *follow-up* move.

076 T: Where...Where are the deer in Korea?
077 P3: He means a kind of deer.
078 T: Ohhh.
079 P1: Smaller than deer.
080 P3: What is that? His bone...his bone.
081 T: Horn...horn...antler.
082 P1: Horn is small.
083 T: Okay.

Concerning the DA model, I am not in agreement that the teacher’s comments be defined as follow-up. In a more communicative classroom setting then what Sinclair and Coulthard originally accounted for, I find such teacher responses as found in lines 078 and 083 to be lacking in credibility if regulated to the follow-up move. In this example, the teacher begins with a ‘real’ question, performing at the Outer level of language as discussed by Willis, J. (1992: 162-166). Being a request for authentic information, the teacher sets up the fact that he is curious and unknowing of the correct answer. According to Berry (cited in Willis, D., 1992: 114), he becomes a *secondary knower*, or K2. Therefore the initiation of a pupil inform exchange contains real information to the teacher, who some may feel has relinquished his ‘all-knowing’ power in the teacher-led classroom discourse. Rather than an ‘evaluation of the comment’s worth,’ a teacher’s

reply should reflect more legitimate and genuine responses, such as those of acts *acknowledge* and *reply*, and be regarded as a *response move*. Coulthard and Brazil (1992) have since developed the DA model to account for ‘the range of possible realizations in the response slot.’ (Pp.70-71).

149 P2: I can't understand. She is wearing a miniskirt.
150 T: I don't know why?

Similarly, in this example, the teacher has chosen to ‘answer’ the question rather than evaluate its production. The creation of a teacher *reply* for a pupil inform exchange seems more accurate.

4.4 An Overview of Analysis Difficulties

In general, the structure of the original Sinclair-Coulthard system of analysis proved capable of categorizing my classroom discourse, due to the teacher-based lesson and attention given to grammatical correction and feedback. I would predict that a less rigid, discussion-oriented setting would create difficulties in applying the model. Furthermore, the time involved for analysis in relation to the information obtained would make analysis of this kind less than useful for teachers following a more communicative methodology.

Most difficulties in fitting my data to the IRF categories can be attributed to two related factors; small class size and a relaxed perception of teacher/student roles. Both contribute to turn-taking freedom which, in my analysis, creates an excess of bound exchanges. It is my interpretation that all responses to teacher elicits be bound to the original elicit, defined as the bound exchanges *re-initiation (ii)*, structured as IRF(Ib)RF, and *listing*, IRF(Ib)RF(Ib)RF. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 29-30). My adaptation to these bound exchanges is that an evaluation or comment in the follow-up move *not* require a new initiation for following pupil responses, possible interpreted as pupil informs.

118 T: There is a lot of smoke, so he is probably protecting his face from...
119 P3: The fire.
120 T: The fire...the smoke...maybe oil.
121 P3: Oil.
122 T: I don't know.

In this example, I consider lines 121-122 to be a bound *response* and *follow-up* to the previous IRF moves. As Pupil 3's response, ‘oil,’ (line 121) is given in regard to

information provided in the previous exchange's follow-up, it seems excessive to designate it as a new pupil informative exchange. This adaptation occurs frequently in my analysis. Francis and Hunston (1992) support this interpretation, commenting on extending the limits of exchanges. "The decision as to whether to place an utterance in the same exchange as a preceding utterance, or whether to interpret it as initiating a new exchange, may be made on the grounds of intonation, or according to the type of information being sought or given." (p.124). The DA model, as developed by these and other researchers, would seem to account for many of my difficulties in exchange definitions and allocation.

Distinguishing between a *comment* in the follow-up move and beginning a new initiation with an *informative* I found also to require interpretation, with paralinguistic factors contributing. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) acknowledge this, stating that 'outsider's ideas of relevance are not always the same.' (p.20). The following is a typical example:

- 095 T: Tim. Do you have good aim or bad aim?
096 P5: I think I'm good aim.
097 T: Okay. I think I have good aim. Uhh...Uhh...Because why?
098 P5: Uhh...Have I shot a gun, I concentrated.
099 T: Concentrated. Okay. When I shot a gun, I concentrated on the target.

In my analysis, many *comments* in the follow-up move are restatements of student *replies*, providing grammatical correction or completing the desired response. This can be seen in lines 097, 'I think I have good aim.' and 099, 'When I shot a gun, I concentrated on the target.' With the function of *comment* being to 'exemplify, expand, justify, [and] provide additional information,' (ibid: 20), I feel my allocation appropriate, though interpretations can vary.

5. CONCLUSION

In the previous sections I have discussed many of the problems faced in applying Sinclair and Coulthard's original IRF model to my classroom data, plus adaptations I feel more accurately represent classroom discourse structure. I realize that developments in the original model have accounted for less structured discourse types, and further research into these developments would provide more rationale in my categorization.

However, I feel the original model does not adequately account for the ‘interactive choice,’ (Nunn 2001: 5) available to all participants in my examined situation.

Despite difficulties in application, discourse analysis of this type has many benefits to teachers wanting a better understanding of classroom discourse. A greater awareness of teacher feedback, especially in terms of providing grammatical accuracy and repetition, can greatly increase a teacher’s success in explicit teaching. In addition, the attention to intonation needed in categorizing both student and teacher utterances provided valuable insight to its use in evaluation and elicitation procedures in the classroom.

Of key importance in discourse analysis is the intentions of the speaker in each created utterance, rather than its grammatical composite. Thus is the case with the IRF model. By examining the individual parts in classroom discourse, teachers can better understand the whole; language as social interaction. Then can they more effectively create classroom procedure which meets student goals of second language proficiency.

APPENDIX 1: CLASSROOM LESSON TRANSCRIPT

01 T: Two. Number two. Uhh...Tony...Tony. What is the fisherman saying to himself?
02 P2: He is saying...
03 T: We have the fisherman. What is he saying to himself?
04 P2: He is saying, "I got it."
05 T: Okay. Sure. He is saying, "I got it."
06 P2: Oh...I got it.
07 T: I got it. It. What is "it"?
08 P1P2: Fish.
09 T: Okay. I got it. I got...I got one. Big fish. Okay. Jinny. What do you think? What is the fisherman saying?
10 P3: I don't know.
11 T: Imagine.
12 P5: I will got many fish.
13 T: I will...
14 P5: Got.
15 T: Get.
16 P5: Get.
17 T: I will...
18 P5: Get many fish.
19 T: I will...I will get many fish.
20 P5: I will get many fish.
21 T: I will get many fish. Okay.
22 P3: I want to get many fish.
23 T: I want...
24 P3: To get.
25 T: I want to get. Okay. I want to get many fish. I want to get...
26 P1P3: Long fish.
27 T: Oh. Long fish. Okay.
28 P1: Big fish.
29 P3: Big fish. Oh...right.
30 T: Oh...okay. I want to get many long fish. I want to get many big fish. Choi...Choi. What...What is the fisherman saying?
31 P1: I think he is going to throw fishing line and I think he...he think, "good luck...good luck."
32 T: God...Oh please God. Give me good luck.
33 P1: Yes
34 T: Okay. The fisherman...He can say many things. Number three...number three. Jinny. What is the hunter aiming at? He is aiming at...
35 P3: Uh...uh...I don't know. I don't know about the bird.
36 T: Bird.
37 P3: Yeah...bird.
38 T: Bird is good answer.
39 P3: And deer...deer.
40 P1: Deer?
41 T: Ohhh!
42 P1: He...He is aiming at sky!
43 P3: Okay. Bird.
44 T: Okay.
45 P1: Bird.
46 T: He is aiming at a bird. Okay. Jinny said he is aiming at bird. Good answer...good answer. Okay. He is aiming at ...
47 P1: Flying duck.
48 T: Flying duck. Okay. Flying duck.
49 P2: He is aiming at a hawk.

50 T: Hawk!! Bad answer.

51 P1P3: Hawk?

52 T: Bad hunter. He is aiming at hawk? Okay.

53 P1: Eagle...hawk...pheasant.

54 P3: Ahh...eagle.

55 P1: Not delicious.

56 T: Pheasant is good. He is aiming at pheasant.

57 P1: Pheasant...pheasant.

58 T: Okay. Pheasant is very delicious.

59 P3: Yeah.

60 T: Delicious bird. Okay. Very nice. Let's continue with question four.

61 P3: Question four.

62 T: Tom...Tom. What animals can people hunt in Korea?

63 P4: Korean people can hunt...

64 P1: Natural pig.

65 T: Maet Dwaegi. (Korean language)

66 P1: Mountain pig.

67 T: San Dwaegi. (Korean language) Wild.

68 P1: Ahh...wild pig.

69 T: Yeah. In Korea, people can hunt wild pig...uhh...

70 P1: Pheasant.

71 T: Pheasant.

72 P2P3: Pheasant.

73 P1: And deer.

74 T: Deer? Can people hunt deer in Korea?

75 P1P3: Yeah...of course.

76 T: Where...Where are the deer in Korea?

77 P3: He means a kind of deer.

78 T: Ohhh.

79 P1: Smaller than deer.

80 P3: What is that? His bone...his bone.

81 T: Horn...horn...antler.

82 P1: Horn is small.

83 T: Okay. One point or...?

84 P3: Yeah...one point.

85 T: Only one point?

86 P3: Deer is...uh...uh...several points

87 T: Many points. Yeah. Antelope...maybe antelope.

88 P1: Ahh...antelope.

89 T: They are smaller than deer and run fast and they normally...just one point. Anyway. Let's continue. In Korea, people can hunt wild pig, antelope, pheasants, rabbits...Okay?

90 P1: Wild snake.

91 T: Okay (laughing). Wild cats...wild dogs...wild women. Number five. Let's continue. Uhh...Tim.

92 P5: Yes.

93 T: Have you ever shot a gun?

94 P5: Yes...in the military.

95 T: Okay. Yes, I have...in the military. Uhh...Tim...Tim. Do you have good aim or bad aim?

96 P5: I think I'm good aim.

97 T: Okay. I think I have good aim. Uhh...uhh..Because why?

98 P5: Uhh...Have I shot a gun, I concentrated.

99 T: Concentrated. Okay. When I shot a gun, I concentrated on the target. Okay. Very good. Therefore, you have good aim.

100 P5: Yes, I have good aim.

101 T: Good aim. Yes. Number seven. Choi.

102 P1: Yes. Number seven.

103 T: What is the camper doing? Picture three...Picture three. What is the camper doing?
104 P1: He...He is cooking with a skillet...skillet.
105 T: Yes. Very good. He is cooking with a skillet. Okay. Yes. He is camping. He is cooking with a skillet. He is making breakfast. Etcetera...etcetera. Choi.

106 P1: Yes.
107 T: What is he doing with his left hand? What is he doing with his left hand?
108 P1: Left hand...left hand. He...He...
109 P3: He is watching his...
110 P1: Blowing smoke...smoke. Smoke from skillet.
111 P5: Protect smoke.
112 T: Protect face.
113 P1P5: Ahhh...Protect face...Protect face.
114 T: He is protecting his face.
115 P3: Ahhh...I see. While he is cooking...uhhh...What?
116 T: The fire is very hot.
117 P1: Ummmm...
118 T: There is a lot of smoke, so he is probably protecting his face from...
119 P3: The fire.
120 T: The fire...the smoke...maybe oil.
121 P3: Oil.
122 T: I don't know. Yes. He is protecting his face from the fire. He is shielding his face.
123 P1: Shielding.
124 T: Because of the fire...because of the smoke. Okay. Let's continue. Let's move on. Question number nine. Whose turn is it?

125 P2: Me.
126 P1: Tony.
127 T: Tony. Question number nine. What do you think is in the tent? Picture three.
128 P2: There is a radio.
129 T: Okay. There is a radio in the tent. Good.
130 P1: His lover.
131 T: His lover is in the tent. Yes. Okay. His lover is in the tent. Good imagination. Uhh...Sleeping bag, mosquito, flies, pillow, radio...uh...gun. Many answers, of course. Good. Uhh...Number ten...number ten. Jinny. How many times have you been camping? I've been camping many times. I...I love to climbing mountain.

132 P3: I've been camping many times. I...I love to climbing mountain.
133 T: Okay. I've been camping many times. I love to climb mountains. Good answer. Yes. I've been many camping many times. What do you think? Once a year?

134 P3: No.
135 T: Twice a year?
136 P3: Everyday.
137 P1: Everyday?
138 P3: Everyday. Everyday to climb mountain.
139 T: No...no...no. Camping. How often? How often do you go camping?
140 P3: Two times. Two times...one year.
141 P1: Twice...one year.
142 T: Twice a year.
143 P3: Ahh...Twice a year
144 T: I go camping twice a year. Good. Thank you. Tom. Number twelve. Who is hiking in the mountain?

145 P4: Two women?
146 T: I don't know. Maybe. Two women?
147 P3: No...One couple.
148 T: One couple...maybe two students. One boy and one girl.
149 P2: Andrew. I can't understand. She is wearing mini-skirt.
150 T: I don't know why? Well. Tell me. Sometimes when I go hiking in Korea, the women wear high-heeled shoes...and the men wear neck-ties and business shoes.
151 P3: You saw that?

152 T: Yeah...business shoes. Why is she wearing mini-skirt? I don't know.
153 P1: But she wears shoes for climbing mountain.
154 T: Exactly. Yes. She is wearing hiking boots.
155 P1: Hiking boots.
156 T: Hiking boots. B..O..O..T..S. Yes. Okay. Umm...Number thirteen. What is the best mountain for hiking in Korea? Tony...Tony.
157 P2: In my opinion, the best mountain is Jiri Mountain.
158 T: Jiri Mountain.
159 P2: Jiri Mountain is very big and its not...uh...steep.
160 T: Okay. It's not steep. Good.
161 P2: I think it's the best for hiking.
162 T: It's a very easy climb...easy hike. Okay. Tony says Jiri Mountain.
163 P2: I saw a movie. The title is "Vertical Limit."
164 T: Ahh...Okay.
165 P2: The mountain is K2. It's very steep and very dangerous.
166 T: Exactly. Yes...yes. And slippery...a lot of ice. That is not hiking, that is climbing. Big difference. Very good. Fourteen. What are the two people in the canoe doing? You know...you know...you know. Very easy.
167 P1: They are paddling.
168 P2: Paddling.
169 P3: Exploring.
170 T: Good.
171 P1: Uhh?
172 T: They are paddling. They are exploring.
173 P1: Explore...ahh...exploring...ahh...difficult word.
174 T: They are exploring the river. They are taking a honeymoon trip.
175 P3: Yeah...I think so.

REFERENCES

- Brazil, D. 1985. *The Communicative Value of Intonation*. Discourse Analysis Monograph no. 8. University of Birmingham: ELR.
- Brazil, D. 1995. Classroom and Spoken Discourse. Centre for English Language Studies. The University of Birmingham.
- Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. and Brazil, D. 1979. *Exchange Structure*. Discourse Analysis Monograph no. 8. University of Birmingham: ELR.
- Coulthard, M. and Brazil, D. 1992. 'Exchange structure.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 50-78. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (eds.) 1981. Studies in Discourse Analysis. Routledge.
- Francis, G. and Hunston, S. 1992. 'Analysing everyday conversation.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 123-161. Routledge.
- Hewings, M. 1992. 'Intonation and feedback in the EFL classroom.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 183-196. Routledge.
- Malouf, R. 1995. 'Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse.' (online), <http://hpsg.stanford.edu/rob/talk/node2.html>.
- McCarthy, M. 1991. Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 1993. Materials and Methods in ELT. Blackwell.
- Nunn, R. 2001. 'Language learning across boundaries-Negotiating Classroom Rituals.' (online), <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej18/al.html>.
- Sinclair, J. 1992. 'Priorities in discourse analysis.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 79-88. Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. and Brazil, D. 1982. Teacher Talk. Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. 1975. Toward an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils. Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. 1992. 'Toward an analysis of discourse.' in Coulthard, M.

(ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 1-34. Routledge.

Tsui, A. 1992. 'A functional description of questions.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.)1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 89-110. Routledge.

Willis, D. 1992. 'Caught in the act: using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 111-122. Routledge.

Willis, J. 1992. 'Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom.' in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. 162-182. Routledge.