

*Centre for English Language Studies*

Postgraduate programmes, Open Distance Learning

**ESSAY COVER SHEET AND DECLARATION**

**IMPORTANT: Please complete ALL sections of this template and PASTE it into the FIRST PAGE of your essay**

Student ID number	971734
Module Number (1-6)	1
Title of Degree Programme:	MA Applied Linguistics
Title of Module:	Classroom & Spoken Discourse and Written Discourse
Assessment Task No.	SD/06/02
Submission	First
Date Submitted	July 31st, 2008
Name of tutor	Gregory Hadley
Word Count	4419

**Essay Title: An ethnographic description and comparison of the distinguishing features of an ELF pair-work presentation and a Skype chat highlighting the importance of conversation channels**

**Assignment Task Number SD/06/02:**

Hymes provides a framework for exploring speech events (Hymes, D. (1971) 'Sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking' in Ardener: 47-93; Hymes, D. (1972) 'Models of the interaction of language and social life', in Gumperz and Hymes: 35-71). Use this framework to summarise the distinguishing features of:

a) An English language classroom activity (e.g. a presentation activity, drill, small group discussion, or role-play) that you use in your teaching. (You should record your own data for this.)

b) A casual conversation (you may either record your own data or use published data for this, but whichever you choose, the conversation should be natural and spontaneous, and not 'set up' or elicited by you or another researcher).

Which of (a) or (b) has the features which are easiest to identify, and why? Discuss the usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding different kinds of communication.

You should include short real-life examples to illustrate distinguishing features but you are not advised to collect and analyse extensive quantities of data. (MA ODL App. Ling. Handbook April 2008: 76)

## Contents

1	Introduction and the aims of the paper.....	3
2	A review of some relevant literature in the field.....	4
2.1	Ethnography and communication.....	4
2.2	Ethnography and genres.....	5
2.3	Conversations in language classrooms.....	7
2.4	Conversations on computers.....	8
3	Two ethnographic descriptions.....	9
3.1	Categories of the ethnography of speaking.....	9
3.2	A summary of the distinguishing features of an EFL pair-work presentation.....	10
3.3	A summary of the distinguishing features of a Skype chat.....	13
4	Comparison of the two ethnographic descriptions.....	16
4.1	Participants and key.....	16
4.2	Purpose, message content and message form.....	17
4.3	Setting and channel.....	17
5	Conclusion.....	19
	References.....	20
	Appendix 1: Transcription of the EFL pair-work presentation.....	22
	Appendix 2: Archive of the Skype chat.....	25

## 1 Introduction and aims of the paper

This paper compares ethnographic descriptions prepared by the author of two speech events: a pair-work presentation in the author's EFL classroom and an informal Skype chat between the author and a fellow teacher and friend.

The ethnography of speaking is an approach to linguistic analysis born out of anthropology, more specifically linguistic anthropology and the general field of ethnomethodology. Originally, it was seen as useful for outside observers, linguistic anthropologists, firstly, to discover the rules, grammatical and otherwise, that govern the creation of meaningful speech within communities; and secondly, to detail what has come to be known as the communicative competence of persons in generating meaningful speech (Hymes 1971).

However, the theoretical basis for and implications of *any* ethnography remain somewhat fragmented (for a good general discussion see Macaulay, Benyon & Crerar 2000; with respect to linguistics see Acar 2005 and McHoul 2006). In addition, clear methods for determination of communicative competence are still being developed (see Davis 2001, Ellis 2005, Lee 2006 and Nunn 2007).

In the ethnographic descriptions contained herein, we have two cases where the observer is part of the speech event, though not wholly absorbed in it, in both cases due to peculiarities of the channels involved. We will show that an ethnographic analysis of speech is useful in understanding communication in language classrooms and among individuals forming bonds in non-traditional community contexts.

This will contribute both to the theory of the ethnography of speaking, in particular through consideration of the role of communication channels, and contribute to the inquiry into practical methods for measuring communicative competence.

First we will provide a review of some relevant literature in the field, in particular how ethnography is related to communication and to genres (in the latter case, both generally and locally). The review will be followed by ethnographic descriptions according to categories suggested by Hymes (1971, simplified by Coulthard, 1985) of an EFL pair-work exercise and a Skype chat. We will then compare these two descriptions and indicate which of the two has features that are easiest to identify and why. This is important because though the two ethnographies contained herein each have a channel peculiarity that places the observer both inside and outside the speech event, one of the ethnographies details a very traditional context, a language classroom, while the other details a context that is very much on the edge of linguistic analysis and communication studies, namely, online chat. Finally, we will conclude with suggestions for further research.

## **2 A review of some relevant literature in the field**

### **2.1 Ethnography and communication**

We will first briefly consider two of Hymes' comments specifically on channel. Hymes notes that "*focus on channels* in relation to other components entails such functions as have to do with maintenance of contact and control of noise, both physical and psychological [for both addressors and receivers]" (Hymes 1964: 23). Further, he indicates that "To provide a better ethnographic basis for the understanding of the place of alternate

channels and modalities in communication is indeed one of the greatest challenges to studies of the sort we seek to encourage.” (ibid: 25).

These comments, both in the context of the rest of Hymes’ argument and alongside the current data at hand, may suggest that channel is much more important as a defining feature of speech communities than Hymes had originally considered. Hymes sees speech communities as organized around speech events. However, as an ethnographer, he proposes that “ethnographic objectivity is intersubjective objectivity” with the qualification that “in the first instance, the intersubjectivity in question is of the participants in the culture.” (ibid:14)

Coulthard makes the interesting, and for the aims of this paper, highly relevant, observation that, “Most genres are associated with only one channel and an attempt to use a different channel [...] necessitates some changes” (Coulthard, 1985: 49).

Following Bakhtin’s (2006 2nd Ed.) emphasis on the importance of genres, and thereby channels, for communication, it seems that intersubjective objectivity between participants in a culture may arise out of a shared medium of experience known as a channel.

This leads us directly to considerations of genre.

## **2.2 Ethnography and genres**

Ethnographic work runs parallel to awareness of genres. We will first look briefly at two linguistic approaches to identifying genres.

On the one hand, Coulthard (1985: 42) notes how “Hymes stresses that it is essential to distinguish a *genre*, which is a unique combination of stylistic structure and mode, from the ‘doing’ of a genre.”

Following through with this distinction, as well as the idea that “all genres have contexts or situations to which they are fitted and in which they are typically found” (ibid.), Hymes seems to arrive at the following correlative schematic pairs:

non-verbal context	verbal context
complex genre	minimal or elementary genre
speech situation	[??]
speech event	speech act

Hymes goes on to identify seven recommended criteria for speech events, which we will take up in our ethnographic descriptions below, but does not address an apparent gap in his theory, namely, the verbal correlate to the speech situation. It is perhaps here that a lack of appropriate speech act categories can be seen clearly. As Coulthard notes further, “in the absence of any clear direction those working within the framework of the *Ethnography of Speaking* appear to develop their own categories [of speech acts] ad hoc. (ibid: 43, *bracketed clause added*).

On the other hand, Martin (2001: 155) suggests that “a genre is a staged, goal-oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of our culture.”

Following systematic functional linguists, in particular Malinowski’s insights into the relationship between speech situations and culture (1923, cited in Martin 2001: 151),

Martin seems to argue that in effect, genres are from a semiotic perspective, the broadest categories or the largest identifiable contexts of meaning. Indeed, he arrives at the conclusion that “linguistics is the foundation not only of the study of human communication, but of social science taken in a very broad sense” (ibid: 163).

Martin’s argument seems to highlight the particular usefulness of the ethnography of speaking in describing what are in Hymes’ terms ‘complex genres’. For the purposes of this paper, therefore, we will leave aside any attempts to provide ethnographic descriptions of speech acts and focus solely on examples that illustrate the distinguishing features of speech events.

We will now look at genre considerations first in the case of language classrooms and second in the case of conversations on computers.

### **2.3 Conversations in language classrooms**

Painter (2001: 167) notes that “learning a new language always involves learning at least something of the ways of operating in the society where that language is used.”

McCarthy (1991: 145) in his general overview of applications of spoken discourse analysis for language teachers, comes to a similar conclusion.

However, while Painter explores in detail the relationship between genres and language teaching, McCarthy’s overview contains no direct mention of genres. McCarthy seems instead to focus on the closely-related field of conversation analysis (for example, identifying elements of turn-taking, topics and adjacency pairs). It seems that McCarthy is aligned with analysis of the verbal context of classrooms, while Painter points more towards the non-verbal context of classrooms. As we have decided to focus on complex

rather than minimal genres, on speech events rather than speech acts, we will look closer at Painter's exploration.

Like Martin (2001), Painter (2001: 173) draws on the work of systematic functional linguists, in particular Halliday (e.g. 1978a, 1985/1989), "who suggests that any context for language in use be considered in terms of three components, known as *field*, *tenor* and *mode*." Further, Painter shows how these three components of context map onto "three metafunctional components of the language system (*ideational*, *interpersonal*, *textual*)" (ibid: 178).

The diagram found in Painter's work (ibid: 178) highlights the relationship between ethnographic descriptions and speakers' choices in speaking. A speaker's choices in speaking are intimately related to the speaker's presumed audience. Bakhtin (2006 2nd Ed: 107) states this directly in terms of genres: "Each speech genre in each area of speech communication has its own typical conception of the addressee, and this defines it as a genre."

In the analysis below, we will look at the speakers' choices in speaking to see what they tell us about the genre of the speech event in question, in particular, about the channel. But first, a short exploration of conversations on computers in a similar vein is necessary.

## **2.4 Conversations on computers**

The same points about genre awareness, speakers' choices when speaking and demonstration of generic elements raised in the two sections above will hold as well for our ethnographic description of a conversation mediated through a computer.

In a study on online conversational processing, Holtgraves and Han (2007: 161) make two important points about computer-mediated conversation. First, that computer-mediated conversation “has become an important phenomenon in its own right.” Second, they note “the strong tendency for many features of face-to-face conversation to gradually become incorporated into computer-mediated conversation.” As examples, they cite emoticons, delay speed and using all capital letters.

On the one hand, certain aspects of conversations on computers are obviously unique. Richards (2001, cited in Jacobs 2002: 183) notes that there are “new ways of finding out ... of giving and seeking information ... of hearing and getting heard”. On the other hand, computer conversations also have a relationship to life ‘offline’. For example, Burnett (2003: 249) provides a summary of ways in which commentators have suggested that online chat seems to support the learning process between students and tutors.

In the analysis below, we will consider how the genre at hand deals with both the online and offline realities of the participants in a single channel.

### **3 Two ethnographic descriptions**

#### **3.1 Categories of the ethnography of speaking**

As noted above, Hymes (1971, simplified by Coulthard, 1985) suggests seven categories for an ethnographic analysis of a speech situation. They are: setting, participants, purpose, key, channel, message content and message form. Hymes’ original presentation is slightly more technical with broader theoretical assumptions and implications. Coulthard’s simplification of Hymes categories is comprised of terms that are largely self-explanatory, with the possible exception of ‘key’ and ‘channel’. By ‘key’, the general tone or spirit of the

conversation is indicated. 'Channel', as discussed above, refers to the medium of the speech event.

We turn now first to a summary of the distinguishing features of an EFL pair-work presentation.

### **3.2 A summary of the distinguishing features of an EFL pair-work presentation**

The importance of understanding what goes on in traditional classrooms, including EFL classrooms likely does not need to be underscored. Any insight into how the education process works so that teachers and students can better fulfill their roles will likely be seen as a positive insight.

#### Setting

The classroom is a fairly large first floor classroom at a public girls' middle school in a relatively affluent area in Busan, South Korea. It is clean, with 6 tables, a lectern, a laptop and large flat-screen TV display, a white board, English posters, a large plant, a small library of English story-books and a small library of English resource books. The classroom rules (created with class input) are prominently displayed at the front of the class. The classroom itself is isolated from all other classrooms used by students on the third, fourth and fifth floors of the school. There is a relatively cluttered 'language lab' next door, which is mostly used for storage. There is also a snack shop in a small building near the classroom, which is frequented by students.

The class occurs on July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008 from 2pm to 2:40pm, a Tuesday. On this day, the air-conditioner is not working. It is during the rainy season: it has just rained and is very hot and humid. Several windows are open and several fans are on. The previous week the

students wrote exams and the students are not marked or covering curriculum material in most classes for a two-and-a-half week period until the break between semesters. The normal time for this particular class is 9am – 9:45am. All classes at the school are five minutes shorter this week. This particular class has been moved to the afternoon to accommodate some other scheduling concern for the students. The pair-work exercise transcribed is from 16:47 to 20:29 of the video record of the class. Prior to the exercise, the class settles in, does some silent reading, and watches a series of 4 authentic commercial videos (with visual and music content) to set up the dialogue. Phrases for the dialogue are written in different color markers on the white board.

### Participants

There are two teachers in the class. The author is a 27 year old Canadian male. There is also a functionally bilingual female Korean English teacher, 39 years old. There are two female first-grade Korean middle school students (aged 13) from the audio-visual club recording the class and thirty-seven female first grade Korean middle school students in the class itself. It is a relatively 'poor' class in terms of effort, ranking seventh out of nine classes for the semester. The students have the option of speaking with each other in Korean, though as not part of the pair-work presentation.

### Purpose

The purpose of the ELF pair-work presentation exercise transcribed is to build student confidence in speaking by creating an opportunity to speak in front of peers in a non-threatening situation and express something that students have practiced and have an almost certain ability to say. The overall purpose of the lesson is to practice the future aspect. Due to the setting, the lesson does not fall into the school's English-language curriculum for the year.

## Key

The tone of the class is serious, but somewhat relaxed. As indicated in the setting, it is the last class of the day on a hot and humid afternoon. The students are aware that they are being recorded, and several initially place fans or books in front of their faces.

## Channel

The pair-work exercise is set up with audio-visual material and lecture-style presentation with questions from the teacher and responses from the class. There is also a white-board with key phrases for the dialogue. The main channel feature is that the students are chosen at random to speak in a foreign language with a partner before their peers and a teacher. (See Appendix 1: 24 for examples.)

## Message content

The videos presented to the class to set up the dialogue are noted along with the phrases written on the board in Appendix 1. Questions about images from the videos are used to introduce and stimulate key phrases, such as: “We will go to Beijing because we want to watch the Olympics” and “What will you do this summer? / I want to go to Seoul.”

## Message form

The dialogue is presented as something that the students are required to do. The exercise was introduced at the beginning of the semester along with the random generator.

## Other notable features of the speech community its speech norms

While some students at the school are relatively fluent in English, others are near beginners. The overall class is structured so that all students can meet the same learning objectives.

The next summary at hand is in some ways not nearly as structured; however, in terms of channel, it may prove to be equally so. We turn now to a summary of the distinguishing features of a Skype chat.

### **3.3 A summary of the distinguishing features of a Skype chat**

Computer-mediated conversations are obviously a relatively new phenomenon. Insight into how successful computer-mediated conversations are structured and maintained seems important for individuals who wish to take advantage of the access that computers provide to individuals from, in or operating in different areas of the world with different knowledge sets and information.

#### Setting

The conversation occurs from 10:05am to 10:19am on July 2nd, 2008. One of the participants, the author, is at his desk at home in a third floor one-room apartment in Busan, South Korea. The other participant is at his desk in a public girls' middle school, also in Busan. Both participants are using laptops. It is summertime, more specifically the rainy season. The day is Wednesday and both participants, who are EFL teachers, have not been teaching classes for the past three days due to end of semester exams. One participant, the author, has been 'let out entirely' from class and office hours, while the other participant has office hours for a 'half-day'. The author, though he initiates the conversation, is 'heading out pretty soon'.

#### Participants

The two participants, JAM (the author) and TM are both Canadian males, aged 27 and 26 respectively. The former is of Scottish heritage, while the latter is of mixed European

heritage, mainly Slovenian and Polish. They have known each other for approximately 10 months. They met at a training workshop for teachers as part of the English Program in Korea (EPIK). Though not normally working in the same location, at one point approximately 7 months prior to the conversation, they did work together at the same location for three weeks during Winter vacation at an 'English Camp' put on by EPIK. They subsequently traveled through parts of China together. In addition, much of their relationship was built up through phone-texting, Facebook, e-mail and Skype chat.

### Purpose

JAM received a text message from TM earlier on the same day with an invitation to play the board game 'Baduk' (also known as Japanese 'Go') the next day. (The text message was deleted and is unavailable.) Previous to sending the text message, TM had asked JAM if JAM wanted TM's Baduk board when TM left Korea (an event scheduled for the near future). JAM had replied that they should have a game at least. The primary purpose of the conversation is to decide on a time to play Baduk. JAM, 7/2/08, 10:08 notes: 'baduke (spelling?) tomorrow's not so good for me'. The context of this message is not clear from the conversation itself. After talking about a Baduk time for a while, and an apparent decision to take the conversation offline (TM, 7/2/08, 10:10am: 'alright, let's discuss') TM seems to introduce a secondary phatic purpose, expressing his frustration over some events at work: TM, 7/2/08, 10:11am: 'fuckiing jesus christ' / 'school's starting to change it's shit'.

### Key

The tone of the conversation is initially very relaxed. The greetings expressed are casual (JAM, 7/2/08, 10:05am: 'hey tomasz' / TM, 7/2/08, 10:06am: 'oi!'). The conversation turns slightly more focused with the introduction of its primary purpose (deciding on a time to

play Baduk), but nonetheless remains casual, for example, TM, 7/2/08, 10:08: 'whaddya up to then?'. However, there is a marked change in the tone with the introduction of the secondary phatic purpose, with expletives entering the conversation as at TM, 7/2/08, 10:11am quoted above and further at TM, 7/2/08, 10:13am and 10:15am.

### Channel

The medium used for this conversation is called 'Skype'. Skype is a software that allows users to make telephone calls over the Internet. It also allows video-calls, text-chat and file-transfers. It is interesting to note that at any point in a text-chat conversation, the users have the option of moving the conversation to audio or audio-video within the same general channel (the same software). Skype users can then continue conversing *both* in text-chat *and* in audio or audio-video and transfer information throughout the conversation, sending Internet links, files, etc. Also noteworthy is the ability of users to indicate their online status with icons for 'available', 'unavailable', 'do not disturb', 'away', etc. (The status of JAM and TM at the time of the conversation in question is not indicated in the chat archive.) Further, any Skype user can initiate a chat or call with any other Skype user by searching and selecting someone from the Skype user database. In this particular case, the participants exchanged their Skype contact information via e-mail. As a final note on channel, Skype allows an archive function to be turned on and off for chat conversations, allowing conversation history to be kept for different periods of time, or not at all.

### Message content

The main topics of the conversation are clearly 'work' and 'when is a good time to play Baduk'.

## Message form

As mentioned above, the participants are negotiating a response to a previously-made invitation and making a phatic connection. One notable aspect of the message form is the consistent use of lower case letters and general lack of punctuation (save for question marks and several dashes). The participants seem to have chosen a very informal conversation structure, which nonetheless has a beginning, middle and end.

## **4 Comparison of the two ethnographic descriptions**

Reflections on channel are most important to forward the aims of this paper. We will consider a comparison of the two channels along with their settings, the other 'concrete' features of the speech event concerned with time and place. Before we do so, we will look at participants and the related feature of key, and then consider the largely intention-oriented features of purpose, message content and message form.

### **4.1 Participants and key**

The participants and key seemed slightly easier to distinguish in the case of the Skype chat. This is possibly due to the closer relationship between the participants and the lack of pedagogical constraints on the conversation.

In both the EFL pair-work presentation and the Skype chat, the participants and key seem to be features that affect the outcome of the speech in a direct way. For example, students feel free to shout out before their peers while preparing for the EFL pair-work presentation during the last class of a hot and humid day when they are not being assessed (Appendix 1: 24, column 1). These two features demonstrate audience awareness through identification of interpersonal relationships and mood. Analysis of these features seems

useful in particular for understanding phatic speech that might otherwise be seen as non-sensical. For example, TM's expletives referred to above during the Skype chat.

#### **4.2 Purpose, message content and message form**

The purpose, message content and message form seemed easier to distinguish in the case of the EFL pair-work presentation. This is likely due to the planned nature of the EFL exercise. Its purpose was thought out and clearly defined in a lesson plan beforehand; the message content was chosen carefully; and the message form was set in place as a system of class procedural structures. For the pair-work presentation to be successful, these three features seem essential and affect the outcome of the speech in a very direct way. Indeed, for many students, their speech copies the example message content verbatim (Appendix 1: 24, column 2).

The Skype chat, on the other hand, was a much more immediate and spontaneous conversation, with a larger element of seemingly unconscious factors determining the purpose, message content and form. Though these features do affect the speech outcome of the Skype chat, they do so less directly, possibly due to the large phatic component of an informal chat between friends. The participants are 'free' to say whatever they wish in any form they choose. However, an ethnographic analysis of these features in the case of the Skype chat proved most useful. In particular, the purpose of the chat became clear.

#### **4.3 Setting and channel**

The setting and channel seem equally easy to distinguish in both cases, though perhaps the setting is slightly easier to distinguish in the case of the EFL exercise due to the unseen setting of TM in the Skype chat.

The reason these two features seem to be relatively similar, in terms of the degree of difficulty in identifying them, is that they are the most 'concrete' features concerned with time, place and medium. In both cases, these seem to be features that affect the outcome of the speech event in the most direct way. They are the features that most clearly define the genre. In particular, after assessing where and when a speech event takes place, analysis of the channel shows us exactly how the speech may proceed. In the case of the EFL pair-work presentation, the students may ask and answer a question in a foreign language. They don't have many choices in speaking. In the Skype chat, the channel provides the participants with more choices in speaking, but the speech seems to need to correlate directly to the participants' lives offline.

For the two speech events described herein, even the setting seems more open to variation (within the same speech community) than the channel. For example, in the case of the EFL pair-work presentation, the time of the class had actually been changed. The other features are certainly more open to variation. This may be a particular function of the channels involved, which, as noted in our introduction, are peculiar in placing the ethnographer both inside and outside the speech event: in the case of the EFL pair-work presentation as a teacher providing feedback; and in the case of the Skype chat as a participant in automatically archived conversations. There may be an unnatural amount of control in these channels, or they may provide us with an insight into practical methods for determining speech communities and communicative competence by focusing on how individuals are able to address one another. It may be that channel proficiency is a relevant demonstration of communicative competence. This brings us to our conclusion.

## **5 Conclusion**

The overall semiotic importance of speech genres and the close relationship between channel and genre provides theoretical justification for ethnographic research in linguistics. Where does intersubjective objectivity lie? Is it to be found through analysis of linguistic channels? In particular, it seems fruitful to consider the effect of channels on speech events and speech communities: is channel proficiency a key factor in determining communicative competency and thereby defining speech communities? Studies that alternate channel and genre while maintaining the other distinguishing features of speech events seem useful, as does continued reflection on the role of the ethnographer in speech events.

## References

- Acar, A. (2005) "The 'Communicative Competence' Controversy". **Asian EFL Journal**. 7:3, Article 5
- Bakhtin, M.M. (2006, 2nd Edition) "The Problem of Speech Genres." In Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. (eds.) **The Discourse Reader**. London: Routledge. pp.98-107.
- Burnett, C (2003) "Learning to Chat: tutor participation in synchronous online chat." **Teaching in Higher Education**. 8:2, pp.247-261.
- Coulthard, M. (1985, 2nd Edition) **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis**. Harlow: Longman. pp.33-38; pp.146-159.
- Davis, A. (2001) "The logic of testing Language for Specific Purposes." **Language Testing**. 18:2, pp.133-147.
- Ellis, R (2005) "Measuring Implicit and Explicit Knowledge of a Second Language: A Psychometric Study." **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**. 27, pp.141-172
- Holtgraves, T. and Han, T. (2007) "A procedure for studying online conversational processing using a chat bot." **Behavior Research Methods**. 39:1, pp.156-163.
- Hymes, D. (1964) "Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication." **American Anthropologist**. New Series, Vol. 66, No. 6, Part 2, pp.1-34.
- Hymes, D. (1971) "Sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking." In Ardener, E. **Social Anthropology and Language**. London: Routledge. pp.47-93.
- Jacobs, G. (2002) "Towards a Sociolinguistics of the Web." **Document Design**. 3:2, pp. 183-185.

Lee, Y. (2006) "Towards Respecification of Communicative Competence: Condition of L2 Instruction or its Objective?" **Applied Linguistics**. 27:3, pp.349-376.

Macaulay, Benyon & Crerar (2000) "Ethnography, theory and systems design: from intuition to insight." **International Journal of Human-Computer Studies**. 53, pp.35-60.

Martin, J.R. (2001) "Language, Register and Genre." In Burns, A. and Coffin, C. (eds.) **Analysing English in a Global Context**. London: Routledge. pp.146-166.

McCarthy, M. (1991) **Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers**. Cambridge University Press. pp.118-145.

McHoul (2008) "Questions of context in studies of talk and interaction -- Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis." **Journal of Pragmatics**. 40, pp.823-826.

Nunn (2007) "Redefining Communicative Competence for International and Local Communities." **Asian EFL Journal**. 9:4, Article 6

Painter, C. (2001) "Understanding Genre and Register Implications for Language Teaching." In Burns, A. and Coffin, C. (eds.) **Analysing English in a Global Context**. London: Routledge. pp.167-180.

## Appendix 1: Transcription of the EFL pair-work presentation

### Notes:

Time on the video record: 16:47 – 20:29

T = Teacher

C = Class

S1, etc. = Student 1, etc.

RS = Random student

Previous to the transcription, the teacher presented the sample dialogue and the students practiced it with different partners within their groups while the teacher circulated the classroom and monitored the practice. 누구하고싶어요? means “Who wants to do it? 시작 essentially means “Ready, go” or “Start”. ‘Blue sticks’ are part of a marking system for effort in class. There is some undistinguishable Korean speech by students at various points in the video record, especially during the random student nomination process.

The sample dialogue was set up with the following videos:

‘Big Bang’ Baskin Robins Summer 2008 Commercial

<http://kr.youtube.com/watch?v=PLIClznHwno>

Seoul Grand Sale 2008 Commercial

<http://kr.youtube.com/watch?v=dTULQ7UWkFk>

New York City Tourism “The Ride” 2007 Commercial

<http://kr.youtube.com/watch?v=lpVIRUDngco>

Adidas Beijing Olympics 2008 Commercial

<http://kr.youtube.com/watch?v=92B8s9l37Jc&feature=related>

The phrases written on the board were:

*(on the left)*

We will go to [cloud shape blank]

because we want to [cloud shape blank]. (written in red)

*(on the right)*

What will you do this summer? (written in blue)

I will... (written in black)

I want to... (written in black)

I’m going to... (written in black)

I plan to... (written in black)

**Transcription:**

T: (teacher rings bell three times) Here we go. Pretty good! (teacher rings bell two times) Let's check. Today is a special day. Special day. Do we have any volunteers? (raises hand) 누구하고 싶어요? Who wants to do it? (raises hand) Any...(sees one student raising hand for some other reason) ... yeah. Did you raise your hand? (laughs) Oh ... blue stick ... oh I'm sorry, no blue stick. No volunteer, no blue stick. Okay, let's see, student number (picks a random student number on a chopstick) ...

RS: Two!

T: Three (points at student).

RS: Oh yeah, yeah.

T: Table number ...

RS: Four! Four! Four!

T: Two ... Table number two.

RS: (several students speaking some undistinguishable Korean)

T: (counts musically) 1, 2, 3 (points) And student number six, table number..

RS: Yeah, five, five, three, six!

T: ...one (picks a second student and table number). There you are. So let's all together practice one time. Practice one time. (Takes something undistinguishable from a student, possibly a note)

RS: Oh.

T: Yeah...after class.

RS: What will you do... (calls out).

T: Let's all together practice one time (points to sentence on board) "What will you do this summer?" 시작.

C: "What will you do this summer?"

T: "I will go to the beach."

C: "I will go to the beach."

T: Alright and we'll say 'ready go'.

C: 'Ready go'.

S1: What will you do this summer?

S2: I will go to the beach.

T: Go to the beach ... okay, good.

S2: What will you do this summer?

S1: I want to sleep.

T: I will go to ...

S1: Sleep.

T: Sleep, alright, excellent (starts clapping, some students join in clapping). Good... good! We're going to check one more time, one more time... Student number (points) seven (picks stick and makes a sound like 'ch-ch')

RS: Thank you.

T: Student number seven, table number five (counts musically while pointing) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

RS: (laughing)

T: And, student number two (points), table number (sees student playing with fan) oh, no, shh... table number...

RS: Three?

T: Four ... table number four (points). So let's say 'ready go'.

C: 'Ready go'.

T: (points to student to go first)

S3: What will you do this summer?

S4: I want to go [home? – undistinguishable from video-recording]. What will you do this summer?

S3: I will ... (looks around) swimming (looks at teacher)

T: I will ...

S3: in the pool.

T: go swimming in the pool...alright, excellent, good (claps, class claps). Good job on your pair work, we're all finished your pair work...we're going to do a quick group activity here...good work, good work. Let's take a look...

## Appendix 2: Archive of the Skype Chat

JAM

7/2/08 10:05 AM

hey tomasz

TM

7/2/08 10:06 AM

oi!

7/2/08 10:06 AM

where y'at?

JAM

7/2/08 10:06 AM

at home - heading out pretty soon

TM

7/2/08 10:07 AM

to work?

7/2/08 10:07 AM

it's just a half-day for me

JAM

7/2/08 10:07 AM

over to Changwon to meet my former boss  
for lunch

TM

7/2/08 10:07 AM

that's cool that your school's letting you  
entirely

JAM

7/2/08 10:07 AM

it is a nice gesture

7/2/08 10:08 AM

baduke (spelling?) tomorrow's not so  
good for me

TM

7/2/08 10:08 AM

alright

7/2/08 10:08 AM

whaddya up to then?

JAM

7/2/08 10:08 AM

maybe tonight or Friday

7/2/08 10:09 AM

meeting a korean friend for dinner  
tomorrow, and then I have class

TM

7/2/08 10:09 AM

tonight is a big old nay for me

JAM

7/2/08 10:09 AM

no worries

7/2/08 10:09 AM

friday evening or the weekend then =

7/2/08 10:10 AM

maybe a good strong saturday afternoon  
coffee and a game

TM

7/2/08 10:10 AM

alright, let's discuss

7/2/08 10:10 AM

Friday could be good too

7/2/08 10:11 AM

fuckiing jesus christ

7/2/08 10:11 AM

school's starting to change it's shit

JAM

7/2/08 10:11 AM

??

TM

7/2/08 10:12 AM

I asked if I could take off on the weekend

7/2/08 10:12 AM

the 19th

7/2/08 10:12 AM

they said yes

7/2/08 10:12 AM

they may be remaking all my travel plans  
now?

7/2/08 10:12 AM

retards

7/2/08 10:13 AM

fucking hell

7/2/08 10:14 AM

I asked them already weeks ago to clear  
my plans

JAM

7/2/08 10:15 AM

ah - I see

TM

7/2/08 10:15 AM

holy fucking shit

JAM

7/2/08 10:19 AM

alright - I'm out - ttyl

TM

7/2/08 10:19 AM

yep