

Application of the Sinclair and Coulthard Discourse Model to a Korean University English Conversation Course

Sarah Jones

MA TESOL / TEFL

Module 4

July, 2009

4, 388 words

SD/09/04 Record one of your (or a colleague's) English classes, and transcribe part of your data.

Make an analysis of the transcribed data, using Sinclair and Coulthard's model, at the level of exchange, move, and act (Sinclair, J. and M. Coulthard, 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: OUP).

Comment on how easy / difficult it was to fit your data to the categories and the usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding classroom communication.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Review of Literature	3
2.1 Classroom Discourse	3
2.1.1 Questions and Feedback.....	4
2.2 Discourse Analysis	4
2.2.1 Sinclair and Coulthard Model	5
2.2.1.1 Level of Exchange.....	5
2.2.1.2 Level of Move.....	6
2.2.1.3 Level of Act.....	6
2.3 IRF Model Problems and Adaptations.....	7
3. Lesson Data and Classroom Interaction.....	7
4. Problems and Difficulties of Analysis.....	8
4.1 Teacher Specific Qualities	8
4.1.1 Paralinguistic and Nonverbal Features of Communication.....	9
4.1.2 Act Boundaries	10
4.2 Problematic Questions	11
4.2.1 Questions as Directives or Requests.....	11
4.2.2 Labeling and Placement of Questions.....	13
4.3 Act Labeling Problems	14
4.3.1 Student Response in a Teacher Inform.....	14
4.3.2 Multiple Participants in an Exchange	16
5. Summary and Conclusion.....	17
References	19
Appendix 1: Classroom Lesson Transcript	21
Appendix 2: Classroom Discourse Analysis	27

1. Introduction

An understanding of classroom spoken discourse can be a valuable tool in preparing second language learners for real-life language interactions. Analyzing classroom discourse can show the proportion of teacher-talk to that of ‘real’ communication by assessing teacher and student output (McCarthy, 1991). Awareness of components of interaction can improve classroom spoken discourse and pedagogy by encouraging teacher decision-making in the classroom.

For this paper, I video-taped and transcribed a university conversation class consisting of five college-aged, Korean students and a female Canadian teacher with the intent to analyze, evaluate, and comment on the University of Birmingham Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992) model of classroom discourse. From here on in this paper, the model will be referred to as IRF, meaning the Initiation-Response-Feedback method. Though this is a low level class, it is hoped that the small size will promote quality exchanges for IRF coding. I am interested in exploring the usefulness and deficiencies of this two-party discourse model with my multi-party data. Specifically, I wish to investigate features that may be lacking from the Sinclair and Coulthard model, treatment of complex exchanges, and student difficulties within these interactions. The relationship between classroom discourse and real world discourse will also be addressed.

For this paper, I will start with a review of literature available on the IRF model, followed by a brief description of my methods of analysis. Then, I will reflect on the helpfulness and difficulties of this model toward understanding classroom communication. All samples in this analysis (Appendix 2) are taken from my transcription (Appendix 1). This paper seeks to analyze classroom interaction at the level of exchange to distinguish its purpose and focus on genuine communication versus student production of teacher targets (Hewings, 1992).

2. Review of Literature

To better understand this analysis, a look at classroom discourse and discourse analysis, specifically the original IRF model, is needed. Also, problems and adaptations to the model will briefly be addressed.

2.1 Classroom Discourse

Discourse, language in use, varies depending on the field of study. A teacher’s discourse is the way in which they use language to get things done (Sinclair and Brazil, 1982). Classroom discourse is unique in its setting due to the unequal power

relationship between teacher and student. Teachers tend to control the lesson, dominate in interactions, and initiate exchanges. Typical discourse includes the teacher asking a question, one or more pupils responding, and the teacher evaluating that response (Nunan, 1999). Aspects of natural discourse, such as turn-taking, intonation, and exchanges are altered in a classroom setting (McCarthy, 1991). Turn-taking is predetermined and primarily teacher-controlled within the classroom (Brazil, 1995). Teachers, in their dominating role, also tend to use more tonal units with prominent syllables more frequently to highlight important information. This is unnatural when compared to real communication intonation.

2.1.1 Questions and Feedback

In any discourse, the function of the language is evaluated in terms of the participants, roles and settings (McCarthy, 1991). Specific to the classroom, teachers frequently ask questions to which they already know the answer (known as display questions) rather than those they do not (reference questions). Though these ‘unreal’ questions serve to check learners’ progress on language forms and knowledge, many of these questions fail to appear in conversations outside of the classroom (Seedhouse, 1996). Nunan (1987) sees this lack of genuine communication a flaw within classroom lessons.

In both display and reference questions teachers provide feedback to the pupils’ responses, usually on form, which also does not occur in natural adult-to-adult communication. In real world exchanges, feedback occurs after the purpose of the exchange has been achieved (McCarthy, 1991). Conversely, as a teaching tool, feedback in classrooms can take place at any point within a teacher-student exchange, regardless of whether the exchange has been completed. Furthermore, students receive little practice in feedback and its various styles (*Ibid.*). Initiation-Response-Feedback is thus an unnatural structure in natural discourse. The follow-up move is considered obligatory and expected in classroom exchanges but not in real-world communication (D. Willis, 1992; Francis and Hunston, 1992). Nonetheless, Seedhouse (1996) considers EFL classroom discourse to be institutional, and as such, successful in its purpose of learning English.

2.2 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis, the search for coherence in language, looks at the function and form of written or spoken language. In the teaching field, Halliday (1961, cited in Brazil, 1995) used a ranking scale to show how language is interlinked grammatically.

His development of a rank scale demonstrated the hierarchical relationship between a sentence and a morpheme. Essentially, this scale allows units to be given a rank and each unit is comprised of the structure of the units in the rank below (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992). The lowest rank unit is without a defined structure. According to Halliday (1961, cited in Brazil, 1995), the lowest unit of rank, the morpheme, builds a word; words create a group; groups make a clause; and clauses construct sentences.

2.2.1 Sinclair and Coulthard Model

Halliday's rank scale was adopted by Birmingham researchers Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992) who adapted it to help define their descriptive classroom two-party discourse model. They used language functions for their rank scale, consisting most broadly of lessons, then transactions, which are comprised of exchanges, further classified by moves, and lastly identified by acts. The scale can be expressed as follows:

LESSON ↔ TRANSACTION ↔ EXCHANGE ↔ MOVE ↔ ACT

The *lesson* rank was later eliminated, as a structural statement for defining transactions was undetermined (Coulthard, 1985). The IRF model consists of four levels of classification; the lowest rank comprised of twenty-two recognized acts.

2.2.1.1 Level of Exchange

Teachers use discourse to tell things to their learners, motivate their learners to do things, get their learners to say things, and evaluate the things their learners do (Sinclair and Brazil, 1982). Exchanges can thus be differentiated by these functions and separated into teaching or boundary (organizational) exchanges. Teaching exchanges are classified as *free*: informing, directing, eliciting, and checking; or *bound*: re-initiation, listing, reinforcement, and repeat. Bound teaching exchanges contain a more complex structure as they are attached to the preceding exchange and always initiated by an eliciting move (Malouf, 1995). Though exchanges are predominately initiated by the teacher, learners can also initiate elicit or inform exchanges.

Boundary exchanges help frame lessons and transitions between teacher exchanges. A boundary exchange consists a framing move to signal that the discourse is about to change direction and sometimes occurs with a focusing move. These moves help structure transactions. A framing move indicates a boundary and a focusing move tells the class what will occur next.

2.2.1.2 Level of Move

Moves consist of a head act, with optional starter, pre-head, and post-head acts (Malouf, 1995). Sinclair and Coulthard found classroom discourse to contain rigidly structured sequences which allowed them to classify typical classroom exchanges into three basic moves: “an *initiation* by the teacher, followed by a *response* from the pupil, followed by *feedback* to the pupil’s response from the teacher” (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992, p.3). The feedback move has since been acknowledged as a follow-up move and will be labeled so in this paper (Sinclair and Brazil, 1982; Coulthard and Brazil, 1992). This three move IRF exchange was originally termed by Coulthard as Opening, Answering, and Follow-up moves. These can be seen in the following example:

[Example A]

(Opening Move)	09	T:	[Abridged] Oh, that's the same as my style. Flip a coin, catch it, and over. Now, what do we call this?
(Answering Move)	10	all:	Heads.
(Follow-up Move)	11	T:	Heads. Heads. Okay.

(Appendix 1)

Though exchanges usually follow the IRF model, various move combinations are possible; however, an initiation is always the first move. For example, a teacher inform exchange includes a pupil response (IR), and a teacher usually provides feedback on a student inform exchange (IF). Bound exchanges expand the IRF model. Re-initiation (ii) involves seeking clarification (realized by prompt, nomination, or clue) from the same or another student after hearing the wrong response and ends with a follow-up. This gives a structure of IRF(Ib)RF (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992). Other bound exchanges include listing, reinforcing, and repeating.

2.2.1.3 Level of Act

The lowest rank of classroom discourse is the individual act, expressed by clauses or single words (Malouf, 1995). The functions of these twenty-two acts in the IRF model vary (Appendix 2). In an Initiation structure, elicitation, directive, and informative opening moves correspond with acts of the same label which in turn dictate answering acts of reply, react, and acknowledge respectfully. The three part elicitation exchange in Example A demonstrates an opening move elicit, followed by a reply act and an accept act in the follow-up move by the teacher. Example B demonstrates

analysis at all three levels:

[Example B]			
(Opening Move)	15	T:	[Abridged] Alright, so I ask ohh... AhnHan (nominate) , what time do you watch TV on the weekend? (elicit)
(Answering Move)	16	S1:	I usually watch TV one hour. For one hour. (reply)
(Follow-up Move)	17	T:	Ahh. (accept)

(Appendix 1)

2.3 IRF Model Problems and Adaptations

Though Sinclair (1992) denies a collective Birmingham spoken discourse model, his original work with Coulthard (1975) stimulated further developments within the field. Various researchers encountered problems with coding as well as deficiencies with coding types. J. Willis (1992) adjusted the original model to account for the two uses of language; using language as the means and object of instruction (termed Outer and Inner language). Francis and Hunston (1992) also differentiated between exchanges, organization and conversational, and found the three-part exchange restricting. The problem with a single code having two functions, known as double labeling or multiple coding, has also been discussed (Francis and Hunston, 1992; Sinclair, 1992; Tsui, 1992; D. Willis, 1992). Coding difficulties concerning the follow-up move of an elicit exchange as well as modifications for answering moves have been presented (D. Willis, 1992). Malouf (1995) has also highlighted the issue of multiple participants in an exchange.

Ultimately, it is how the teacher designs and manages the class that will dictate the ease and difficulty in IRF coding. With this awareness, I set out to understand a colleague's use of classroom discourse and her management of teacher-talk versus natural interaction. The next section will highlight the class context along with the study and application of the IRF model.

3. Lesson Data and Classroom Interaction

According to Hymes (1974, cited in Coulthard, 1985), every speech event needs background data on interaction-related components. In this section, the recording method, transcription, and model application will be briefly explained.

A more intimate classroom setting with fewer students was chosen for the

possibility of finding more two-person interactions. A colleague volunteered her class which consisted of five junior and senior boys. Their level placement, determined by the university assessment exam, was Level 1 (the lowest sophomore level). The level of the students suggested that teacher guidance and interaction would be high. The recorded segment involved students first, playing a speaking game, and second, previewing textbook vocabulary. I anticipated that the teacher's board game interaction and the book lesson would be a proper context for IRF coding to occur.

First, students made and answered board game questions intended to review a previous lesson on daily routine. Two student groups were created and the teacher monitored between them. Second, the teacher transitioned the lesson to a new chapter in the textbook which focused on prepositions of place. The teaching methodology was communicative, with a focus on assessing student knowledge of previous grammar targets, so both display and reference questions were utilized. The lesson gave the teacher mastery over the class and provided many examples of the rigid IRF model.

The class was video-taped to better distinguish between the five student voices. Though this method can be invasive, Francis and Hunston (1992) support video-recording as the most effective way to capture all features of interaction. Listening to the video during transcription brought up the first problem with the Sinclair and Coulthard model, a lack of nonverbal act labels (see Section 4.1.1). Watching the video helped distinguish between speakers and gave clarification during transcription. The data transcription starting from the beginning of class was 23 minutes and 45 seconds. The class teacher then watched the video and made additional changes. The amended classroom transcription is provided as Appendix 1.

Focusing on the level of exchange, move, and acts, the analysis of the model is Appendix 2. I will now discuss in more detail the difficulties I discovered in applying the IRF model to my transcribed data.

4. Problems and Difficulties of Analysis

The IRF model was successful overall, providing a strong base for understanding basic classroom discourse structure. Still, labeling difficulties did occur with regard to: particular teacher idiosyncrasies, questions and question functions within the discourse, and exchanges failing to fit within the typical IRF model. These labeling problems will be further explored in this section.

4.1 Teacher Specific Qualities

The first difficulties to arise in the analysis of this classroom discourse pertain to

unique patterns of the teacher. During transcription and analysis two teaching features proved repeatedly challenging. This teacher used an overabundance of both body language and the word ‘okay’ during her lesson. Deciphering these aspects of her teaching method proved critical to understanding her classroom discourse; yet, created problems for the Sinclair and Coulthard model.

4.1.1 Paralinguistic and Nonverbal Features of Communication

Speech both in and out of class is full of gestures and sounds not classified by the IRF model. This model provides one structure for non-linguistic acts which functions as an answering move attached to a directive. This created a problem during transcription and analysis; specifically, the lack of proper nonverbal features for teacher initiation moves. This teacher’s body gestures could not be included in the analysis without redefining *elicit* and *clue* as verbal or nonverbal.

In the following example, the teacher demonstrated prepositions of place to elicit vocabulary. The elicitation was a non-linguistic gesture and sufficiently served to stimulate student responses.

[Example C]

Initiation	130	T:	[Abridged] (gesture, nonverbal) (el)
Reply	131	S3:	Below. (rep)
Follow-up	132	T:	Below, (acc)
Initiation (b)			or... (gesture, nonverbal)(cl)
Reply	133	S2:	Down. (rep)
Reply	134	S1:	Beneath. (rep)
Follow-up	135	T:	Beneath. (acc)
Reply	136	S4:	At the bottom. (rep)
Follow-up	137	T:	Hmm...at the bottom. (acc) Okay, or, under. (com)

(Appendix 1)

Starting with the nonverbal gesture in line 130 above, the re-initiation (ii) bound exchange is structured IRFIbRRFRF, where Ib was both a verbal and nonverbal clue. The analyst can infer from the context the elicitation, but without explanation, the opening move of the exchange is unexpressed in the analysis. Francis and Hunston (1992) address these exchanges by recognizing implied elements as “heard” and understood to be present. They further adopt a principle for consistency which states

“unrealized elements are understood if and only if what follows in the discourse is consistent with that interpretation” (Ibid., p.155). These preposition gestures are obligatory to the start of the exchange and must be properly included. I labeled such gestures as elicit or clue, though they were nonverbal.

4.1.2 Act Boundaries

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) list several key words that indicate lesson boundaries: *right*, *well*, *okay*, *alright*, *now*, and *good* (p.3). These words function as marker acts to separate lesson stages. When head of a framing move, they are accompanied by falling intonation and a silent stress (Ibid., p.13). ‘Okay’ is a word also used to check the progress of the lesson or its completion (Ibid., p.19). This teacher used the word ‘okay’ an excessive sixty times. Identifying her intent of this word between initiation discourse markers, a follow-up accept act, or simply a filler word was extremely time consuming and frustrating.

[Example D]

(Follow-up Move)	5	T: Okay. (acc) It's your schedule. What you usually do. (com)
(Framing Move)		Okay^. (m)
(Opening Move)		For example, my routine (s): I usually wake up at 6. I usually eat yogurt for breakfast. I usually come to Dongguk at 8. Okay. Routine. (i)
(Framing Move)		Alright^. (m)
(Opening Move)		So, to play this game let's have a look at this game board. (ms) Okay, you guys share. (s) [distributes game]...Okay, so, let's look at the instructions. (d)
(Framing Move)		Okay^. (m)
(Opening Move)		First, ah, YuCheol, could you read the first instruction? (n, el)

(Appendix 1)

In this excerpt, the teacher has used ‘okay’ in various ways:

- to accept a student response in a follow-up move, *Okay, It's your schedule. What you usually do*
- to frame her next opening move, *Okay*[^]

- as a filler word, *Okay. Routine*
- as part of a starter act, *Okay, you guys share*
- as part of a direct act, *Okay, so, let's look at the instructions*
- as another framing move before an elicitation exchange, *Okay^ First, ah, YuCheol...*

After the framing move, with the marker ‘alright’ and a slight pause, a directive move occurred. ‘Okay’ was used to indicate the start act, directing attention to the handout, and also to further focus the directive. Intonation was a key factor in determining the intention of the word ‘okay’ by the teacher. Hewings (1992) argues that an accurate interpretation of utterances in discourse demands analysis of intonational characteristics. Other uses were combined with a higher intonation, indicating a tag question meant to check the students’ comprehension. The low level of the class could contribute to the frequent amount of comprehension checks.

4.2 Problematic Questions

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) state that though elicitations are always realized by questions the reverse is not necessarily true. They elaborate by stating that “questions occur at many other places in discourse but then their function is different, and this must be stressed” (Ibid., p.14). I had difficulty defining the function and placement of questions in the IRF model.

4.2.1 Questions as Directives or Requests

Questions that request a linguistic response are known as elicitation questions (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992). Although Sinclair and Coulthard claim a directive is realized by a command, some elicitation questions are disguised teacher directives. Tsui (1992) distinguishes between questions as directives and questions as requests. According to her, questions can be directive in function with a verbal response while requests demand a nonverbal response. Thus, when this teacher said, “So, gentlemen, do you have a coin?” she was requesting the nonverbal action of students retrieving coins (Appendix 1). J. Willis (1992) labels directive questions Direct: verbal, as they instruct the student to say rather than do something. She associates Direct: verbal questions with the IRF teacher direct exchange (Ibid.). Examples E, F, and G demonstrate questions meant as directives:

[Example E]

(Opening Move)	13	T:	[Abridged] Second direction, can you read it please, HoJae? (el)
(Answering Move)	14	S4:	Ask your partner two or three questions with the words in the space on what time, where, who with, how, why, what. (rep)
(Follow-up Move)	15	T:	Okay. [Abridged] (acc)

(Appendix 1)

[Example F]

(Opening Move)	26	T:	Okay, so you have to decide which question you want to ask. (s) For example, can you ask this question? (el)
(Answering Move)	27	S5:	What time is you watching TV? (rep)
(Follow-up Move)	28	T:	Close. (e) [Abridged]

(Appendix 1)

[Example G]

(Opening Move)	55	T:	Can you explain nutrition in English? (el)
(Opening Move)	56	S1:	Nutrition meaning is contain many vitamin... (i)
(Answering Move)	57	S3:	Ohh. [nod, laugh] (ack)

(Appendix 1)

From an analysis perspective, Malouf (1995) criticizes limiting each act to a single move type in the IRF model. Confusion existed in labeling the above opening utterances as elicitation or directive questions. This was supported and answered by J. Willis with her Direct: verbal classification. Francis and Hunston (1992) concur that being unable to use multiple coding is resolved as this model approaches discourse on a moment-to-moment basis with regard to the effect of each utterance on the discourse, not the participants.

Though the students' answers to the questions in Examples E-G could be in the affirmative or negative, they understood the questions functioned as directives. I labeled these initiating questions according to Tsui (1992), who claims that directive questions are a verbal exchange and should be labeled as elicitations. Student 4 and Student 5 replied with the expected response in the first two instances (Examples E and F), so I labeled their responses as replies. In Example G, the teacher asked a reference question,

so I labeled line 56 as a new exchange with an opening student inform move. Student 3 then acknowledged Student 1.

In another example, the teacher asked Student 2, “Could you read the first instruction?” to which the student replied “Yes” (Appendix 1, 05-08). Though the student then proceeded to follow the directive, the question was first answered regarding his ability. This politeness of language implies that turning an imperative into a question can confuse the student. In another part of the discourse, the teacher asked Student 5, “Can you make a sentence?” and the student replied “I usually meet friends on school” (Appendix 1, 73-74). Here, the question was clearly interpreted as a command. This might indicate class rapport, as well as students’ experience in understanding teacher expectations, could help eliminate question confusion. Individual English levels of these students could also contribute to these discrepancies.

These examples correspond to a problem discussed by J. Willis (1992) concerning Inner and Outer classroom language. Simply, Outer language deals with the framework of the lesson and Inner language consists of the target forms being taught. In the examples above, Student 2 regarded the teacher’s question as being Outer language but Student 5 considered it Inner. J. Willis (1992) explains how students are able to recognize Outer from Inner language. These distinctions include the role of the teacher, student deduction of exchanges with no explicit boundaries, structure and length of the initiating move, and paralinguistic features, intonation, and kinesics (*Ibid.*). However, this ability can become complicated for learners when the teacher disguises commands or requests as elicitations, thus keeping intentions vague.

4.2.2 Labeling and Placement of Questions

Three exchanges in this discourse started with an opening elicitation move followed by a question in the response move. In Examples H and I a student asked a question to the teacher during the answering move while Example J shows the teacher responding to a student’s elicitation question with a question.

[Example H]

(Opening Move)	05	T:	[Abridged] Okay. First, ah, YuCheol, could you read the first instruction? (el)
(Answering Move)	06	S2:	Where is it? (rep)
(Follow-up Move)	07	T:	Here. (com)

(Appendix 1)

[Example I]

(Opening Move)	45	S3:	What kind of dinner...on Wednesday? (el)
(Answering Move)	46	S1:	Wednesday? (rep)
(Follow-up Move)	47	T:	Wednesday. (com)

(Appendix 1)

[Example J]

(Opening Move)	52	S3:	What is nutritious? (el)
(Opening Move)	53	T:	Do you know nutrition? (el)
(Answering Move)	54	S3:	No, I don't. (rep)

(Appendix 1)

The distinction of classroom discourse from other spoken discourse forms lies in its structure and key dominant speaker, the teacher. With teachers leading initiation and follow-up moves, as in the IRF model, students are often limited to response moves. Sometimes, students' replies are questions seeking clarification on the proceedings of the lesson (Example H) or pronunciation (Example I). I kept the student questions in the answering move within one IRF exchange containing elicitation, reply, and comment.

With these pre-established participant roles, dominance is also evident through intonation (Brazil, 1995). In Example J, the intent of the teacher's reply is to verify understanding of the word "nutrition." To do this, the teacher started a new exchange to reassume control using a rise in intonation as she asked the reference question, "Do you know nutrition?" The student returned control of the conversation to the teacher, evident by the intonation used. Thus I labeled Example J as two separate initiating exchanges, an opening student elicit move followed by an opening teacher elicit move and student response. All questions were directed to the teacher, placing the student in a subordinate role.

4.3 Act Labeling Problems

Sinclair and Coulthard define their acts in relation to who is making the utterance; nevertheless, I found difficulty in separating acts as specific to teacher or student. Multiple participants complicated exchanges by making them more complex.

4.3.1 Student Response in a Teacher Inform

In the IRF model, an utterance can potentially foresee a response from a participant (Malouf, 1995). Yet the expected response was sometimes unpredictable. In

teacher inform exchanges, students usually acknowledged their understanding verbally (or through a nod) without teacher follow-up. In this class, several students would repeat certain words spoken during the inform exchange. The teacher would sometimes acknowledge these utterances.

[Example K]

(Opening Move)	11	T:	[Abridged] And then the number side you call tails. (i)
(Answering Move)	12	S1,S4:	Tails. (spoken same time as Teacher) (rep)
(Follow-up Move)	13	T:	Okay. [Abridged] (acc)

(Appendix 1)

In Example K, I labeled the student response as a reply to the teacher inform since it was preceded by a teacher accept (also see Appendix 1, 49-51). In this low-level class context, teacher guidance and reassurance was more prominent. However, if the teacher failed to follow-up on a student's responding move during her inform, then the student's repetition was for self-benefit. Sinclair and Coulthard describe comments or questions meant only for the teacher and not addressed to the class as an aside. Still, any participant in an exchange can utter a side comment, such as repeating new vocabulary, so I reclassified an aside as possible for teachers and students.

[Example L]

(Opening Move)	34	T:	Okay, so on the weekend. (i)
(Answering Move)	35	S5:	On the weekend. (z)

(Appendix 1)

[Example M]

(Opening Move)	83	T:	We would add an -s. Okay. Because there are many Tuesdays in a month. (i)
(Answering Move)	84	S2:	On Tuesdays? On Tuesdays. Okay. (z)

(Appendix 1)

Examples L and M show that students comprehended key vocabulary while neither exchange was followed-up by the teacher. I labeled these student responses as asides, meant solely for themselves. Breen (2001, cited in Candlin and Mercer, 2001) mentions that teacher reformulation can occur as a follow-up move. However, the

answering moves above model student comments that fit my interpretation of a student aside. The student is placing emphasis on these words by imitating them, possibly to reinforce new vocabulary. The fact that not all students made asides in these instances indicates their low-level of English as well as individual learning strategies.

4.3.2 Multiple Participants in an Exchange

The IRF model is designed for two participants, the speaker and the receiver of information. Both Sinclair (1992) and D. Willis (1992) mention the role of initiator in an exchange and their control of prospection, which is the opportunity to steer a discourse. Any given utterance depends on more than just the structure of initiation; how participants regard the discourse is also significant. Multiple participants complicated this analysis. In large classroom settings, teachers can use specific methods, such as nomination, bid, or cue, to target a particular pupil for an exchange. In smaller settings, though these acts may be unnecessary, multiple participants can still confuse exchanges. In my data, the teacher specifically addressed a question to Student 5, but Student 2 responded.

[Example N]

(Opening Move)	36	T:	So, who are you asking? (el)
(Answering Move)	37	S2:	Me. (rep)

(Appendix 1)

Though this exchange fits into the analysis, it highlights a participant problem with the IRF model. When the teacher speaks, there are often multiple listeners. Even if the teacher is addressing a particular pupil, peripheral students can potentially disrupt a two-person exchange, as Student 2 did in Example N. In a low-level class, students tend to focus on the teacher for guidance even when the teacher is working with someone else. Malouf (1995) recommends using Clark and Carlson's (1992) Informative Hypothesis to address this predicament in discourse analysis. This hypothesis states that speech acts are directed toward all potential hearers and only indirectly at individual listeners. With all hearers filling a different audience role, such as speaker, addressee, and overhearer, discourse analysis can be applied to multiple parties.

With the board game activity in which this data was based, students asked questions to other students while the teacher, as overhearer, interjected corrections. This complicated the analysis and expanded the IRF coding. Though only two participants joined linguistically in the exchange, all potential listeners shared in the interaction.

Students also broke the IRF model when asking a clarification question to the teacher or a peer. Conversely, this small setting allowed students to fill a teaching role when helping their lower-leveled peers.

5. Summary and Conclusion

With my transcription of a Korean university English conversation course, I have applied the Sinclair and Coulthard classroom discourse model. Analyzing my colleague's small class has given me great insight into classroom communication. Video-taping the class assisted in subsequent data coding by distinguishing between the five male voices and providing understanding of non-linguistic aspects of discourse. The unique qualities of the teacher complicated my analysis. Though her communication patterns can be explained by her background (Canadian teacher with an undergrad theatre degree), both her use of body language and the word 'okay' had to translate within the IRF model. Intonation and nonverbal cues played an important role in this classroom discourse.

The IRF model limits the function of questions and therefore limits their intentions. To respond accordingly, students must infer question meanings from each situation. Students do not always follow the IRF model and can misinterpret a teacher's intentions. These skills of exchange negotiation, though different from natural discourse, could be more explicitly taught to help better negotiate real-world exchanges. With the teacher constantly interjecting follow-up comments, students repeatedly relinquished dominance to the teacher regardless of the activity. However, other problems that commonly occur in natural discourse, such as turn-taking, were not overly apparent in this classroom setting.

This IRF model between two participants uses a descriptive rank scale. However, with any class size larger than one pupil, the complexity of multi-party discourse must be considered. Essentially all teacher utterances are informative and as such, multiple students are listening, regardless of to whom the utterance may be directed (Malouf, 1995). Though the small class size kept IRF coding manageable, the two-person model was difficult to maintain. This study expanded the Sinclair and Coulthard model and further work could better accommodate multiple participant roles.

Though these university conversation courses are intended to promote a communicative language approach, the ratio of teacher-talk to real communication proved to be drastically imbalanced. This could be due to these low-level learners and their need for strong guidance. By appreciating teacher and student output, teachers can better prepare their learners for real world discourse. This can be done by focusing on

exchange negotiation and turn-taking through nonverbal cues and intonation, or practicing the role of dominance in interactions. The application of this analysis confirms some deficiencies with the IRF model but also highlights the potential of empowering teachers in decision-making and in promoting awareness of classroom processes.

References

1. Brazil, D. (1995) **Classroom and spoken discourse**. Birmingham: The Centre for English Language Studies.
2. Breen, M. (2001) “Navigating the discourse: on what is learned in the language classroom.” In Candlin, C., and Mercer, N. (2001) **English language in its social context**. Oxon: Routledge. p.306-322.
3. Clark, H., and Carlson, C. (1992) “Hearers and speech acts.” In Malouf, R. (1995) **Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse**. [online]. Available from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.8.4024> [Accessed 02 May 2009].
4. Coulthard, M. (1985) **An introduction to discourse analysis**. New edition. London: Longman.
5. Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge.
6. Coulthard and Brazil (1992) “Exchange structure.” In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.50-78.
7. Halliday, M.A.K. (1961) “Categories of the theory of grammar,” In Brazil, D. (1995) **Classroom and spoken discourse**. Birmingham: The Centre for English Language Studies. p.34-52.
8. Hewings, M. (1992) “Intonation and feedback in the EFL classroom.” In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.183-196.
9. Hymes, D. (1974) “Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach.” In Coulthard, M. (1985) **An introduction to discourse analysis**. New edition. London: Longman. p.33-58.
10. Francis, G., and Hunston, S. (1992) “Analysing everyday conversations.” In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.123-161.
11. Malouf, R. (1995) **Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse**. [online]. Available from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.8.4024> [Accessed 02 May 2009].
12. McCarthy, M. (1991) **Discourse analysis for language teachers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Nunan, D. (1987) Communicative language teaching. **ELT Journal**. 41/2, 136-145.
14. Nunan, D. (1999) **Second language teaching and learning**. Boston: Heinle and

Heinle Publishers.

15. Seedhouse, P. (1996) Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. **ELT Journal**, 50/1, 16-24.
16. Sinclair, J. (1992) "Priorities in discourse analysis." In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.79-88.
17. Sinclair, J., and Brazil, D. (1982) **Teacher talk**. Oxford University Press.
18. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) **Toward an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils**. Oxford University Press.
19. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) "Toward in analysis in discourse." In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.1-34.
20. Tsui, A. (1992) "A functional description of questions." In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.89-110.
21. 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**. London: Routledge. p.111-122.
22. Willis, J. (1992) "Inner and outer: spoken discourse in the language classroom." In Coulthard, M. (ed) (1992) **Advances in spoken discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. p.162-182.

Appendix 1: Classroom Lesson Transcript

- 01 T: First of all. We're going to play a routine's game. Do you remember what routine means?
- 02 S1, S4: Yes.
- 03 T: What does it mean?
- 04 S1: Schedule...for a day. A day.
- 05 T: Okay. It's your schedule. What you usually do. Okay. For example, my routine: I usually wake up at 6. I usually eat yogurt for breakfast. I usually come to Dongguk at 8. Okay. Routine. Alright. So, to play this game let's have a look at this game board. Okay, you guys share... [distributes game]...Okay, so, let's look at the instructions. Okay. First, ah, YuCheol, could you read the first instruction?
- 06 S2: Where is it?
- 07 T: Here.
- 08 S2: Yes. Needed one coin and two place markers. Flip a coin heads go two spaces tails won go one space.
- 09 T: Okay. So, gentlemen, do you have a coin? ... (get up/ get coins)...Now, does anybody know how to flip a coin? Show me. (body action) ...ahh. Oh, that's the same as my style. Flip a coin, catch it, and over. Now, what do we call this?
- 10 all: Heads.
- 11 T: Heads. Heads. Okay. The picture, sometimes it's a head. Like on the 100 won, okay. Or a picture. And then the number side you call tails.
- 12 S1,S4: Tails. (spoken same time as T)
- 13 T: Okay. Alright. So, for heads, if you flip heads you go two spaces, for tails one space. Okay. So, for example, I flip it, I get tails, one space. Second direction, can you read it please, HoJae?
- 14 S4: Ask your partner two or three questions with the words in the space on what time, where, who with, how, why, what.
- 15 T: Okay. So, let's look at the first box. It says weekend, watch TV. Okay. Maybe I want to ask my partner a question. Okay, so I might just say what time. But maybe I forget the grammar. So, in my book on page 26...we have the first grammar point here. What. do. you. do. after school. Okay. So, I can use this grammar. So, I can say, what time do you watch TV on the weekend. Okay, I can use this to help me. Alright,

so I ask ohh...AhnHan, what time do you watch TV on the weekend?

16 S1: I usually watch TV one hour. For one hour.

17 T: Ahh. What time

18 S1: What time. I usually watch 9 o'clock.

19 T: Okay. So, I usually watch what? I usually watch.

20 S1: I usually watch...

21 T: TV. And the preposition with time is...at.

22 S1: at.

23 T: Um-hmm. Okay. So, if you want to ask for how long, okay, I could ask you, how long do you watch TV on the weekend?

24 S1: I usually watch TV for two hour.

25 T: Okay. Two hours. Okay, so that's two questions I asked him. Two or three questions. Okay. Then, the next person's turn. Okay. You can use these style of questions, or you can think of others, no problem. Okay. And as you see, at the bottom here we have game English okay. I start, you start. Okay. So, umm...let's have a group of three, you three gentlemen, and you two gentlemen, you can play together. Okay?
Alright. Let's go. [students talking]

(Teacher moves to the first group of three students)

26 T: Okay, so you have to decide which question you want to ask. For example, can you ask this question?

27 S5: What time is you watching TV?

28 T: Close. Let's look here. What time..

29 S5: What time do you watching TV?

30 T: Watch.

31 S5: (Korean) watch.

32 T: Okay. And then we have the day here, so we say...

33 S5: Wednesday?

34 T: Weekend. Okay, so on the weekend.

35 S5: On the weekend.

36 T: So, who are you asking?

37 S2: Me.

38 T: Okay. One more question.

39 S5: Where do you watch TV on Sunday. On weekend?

40 T: Okay.

41 S2: I usually watch TV ah in one of my friend's house.
42 T: Umm...one of your friend's houses.
43 S2: Because I don't have at TV.
44 T: Ohh. I see.

(Teacher moves to the second group of two students)

45 S3: What kind of dinner...on Wednesday?
46 S1: Wednesday?
47 T: Wednesday.
48 S1: I ate kimchi bokeumbap. Very delicious. And bokeumbap can be very nutrition.
49 T: Hmm...it's very nutritious. Nutritious.
50 S1: Nutritious.
51 T: Nutritious.
52 S3: What is nutritious?
53 T: Do you know nutrition?
54 S3: No, I don't.
55 T: Can you explain nutrition in English?
56 S1: Nutrition meaning is contain many vitamin...
57 S3: Ohh. (nod, laugh)
58 T: But nutrition, okay, is like a noun. Nutritious would be like an adjective.
Nutritious food. Okay.
59 S3: [mumble] (nod)
60 T: Do you eat nutritious food?
61 S3: No. (laugh)
62 T: Uh-oh.
63 S3: Who...uh...who eat dinner with...who? Wednesday.
64 T: Okay. Let's look here again. So we have who..
65 S3: Do you...ahh. Who do you have dinner with on Wednesday?
66 S1: I'm...I ate a lot in my room.
67 T: Okay. Now, before you were okay. You could say who do you eat dinner with? Okay. Or who do you have dinner with, okay, no problem.
And since this is a routine, this is almost every week, right? So, you would say I eat dinner with my family. Or, I eat dinner alone. If you use the past tense, I ate dinner, that is not routine. Okay? That is one time.
Okay.

68 S1, S3: (Nod) [students talk]

(Teacher moves back to the first group of three students)

69 S2: Where do you meet your friends on Tuesday? Where.

70 S5: [long pause]

71 T: Where do you meet them? Where?

72 S5: [whispered school in Korean] School.

73 T: Okay. So one more time. Can you make a sentence?

74 S5: I usually meet friends on school.

75 T: At

76 S5: At school.

77 T: Okay.

78 S2: How long do you meet your friends on Tuesday?

79 T: Now, because this is a routine, okay, it's like every Tuesday. Right?

80 S2: Yeah.

81 T: So. We would say Tuesdays.

82 S2: Uh-hmm.

83 T: We would add an s. Okay. Because there are many Tuesdays in a month.

84 S2: On Tuesdays? On Tuesdays. Okay.

85 S5: Half. Half hour.

86 T: Okay. So, umm, the answer. I usually meet friends for a half hour on Tuesdays.

87 S5: I usually meet friends for a half hour on Tuesdays.

(Teacher moves to the group of two students)

88 S3: What do you have dinner on Friday? What do you have...

89 T: For...

90 S3: For dinner on Friday. What do you have for dinner on Friday.

91 S1: I usually eat at 7. I, I have not specific food name. It is different about...situation.

92 T: Okay, I understand.

93 S3: Is it delicious?

94 S1: Yes, it's very delicious.

95 T: Do you disagree?

96 S3: I disagree.

- 97 S1: My taste...taste is unexpensive.
- 98 S3: Cheap.
- 99 S1: Cheap.
- 100 T: The cost is. The taste is? The taste is cheap? The taste is...
- 101 S1: Inexpensive.
- 102 T: Ahh. Okay.
- 103 S1: Not royal. Royal.
- 104 T: It's not a king's meal.
- 105 S1: Proletariat. I'm a proletariat.
- 106 S3: Who do you have dinner with on Friday?
- 107 S1: I have dinner with my friends.
- 108 T: Okay. We're going to stop. Even though you're not finished. Okay, if you want I can give you the game and you can play after class.
- 109 all S: Ahh.
- 110 T: Alright. Everybody turn to page 32. Hee Yong, what is the title of Unit 6?
- 111 S5: Where...where does it go?
- 112 T: Yes. Where does it go. Okay. So, you will be talking about locations. Let's review. Where is my pencil?
- 113 S3: Sherry pencil...
- 114 S1,S3: On your hand.
- 115 T: Okay. Yeah. Where is it?
- 116 S4: In your hand?
- 117 T: Yes. In your hand. (Teacher nonverbal action, no linguistic question)
- 118 S3: By your hand.
- 119 T: Yes. Or? (Teacher nonverbal gesture)
- 120 S3: Beside.
- 121 T: (action) This is beside. (repeated first nonverbal gesture)
- 122 S1: In front of.
- 123 T: In front of your hand. And?
- 124 S3: In back of.
- 125 T: Yeah. Back or behind. (action, nonverbal)
- 126 S2: Beside.
- 127 S4: Next to.
- 128 T: Beside, next to. Beside. (action, nonverbal)
- 129 S2: Up. Above.

130 T: Above. Or? Over. (action, nonverbal)
131 S3: Below.
132 T: Below, or...(action, nonverbal)
133 S2: Down.
134 S1: Beneath.
135 T: Beneath.
136 S4: At the bottom.
137 T: Hmm...at the bottom. Okay, or, under.
138 S1: Ohh...under. (laugh)
139 T: Okay, we have several options, okay? Alright.

[Stop 23:45 min]

Appendix 2: Classroom Discourse Analysis

Classroom Analysis			
Initiation	Response	Feedback	Ex.
Opening Move (Elicit) First of all, we're going to play a routine's game. (ms) Do you remember what routine means? (el)	Answering S1: Yes. (rep)		1
Opening Move (Elicit) What does it mean? (el)	Answering S1: Schedule...for a day. A day. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc) It's your schedule. What you usually do. (com)	2
Framing Move Okay^*. (m)			3
Opening move (Inform) For example, my routine (s): I usually wake up at 6. I usually eat yogurt for breakfast. I usually come to Dongguk at 8. Okay. Routine. (i)	Answering [nods] (ack)		4
Framing Move Alright^*. (m)			5
Opening Move (Direct) So, to play this game, let's have a look at this game board. (ms) Okay, you guys share. (s) Okay, so, let's look at the instructions. (d)	Answering [distributes game] (rea)		6
Framing Move Okay^*. (m)			7
Opening Move (Elicit) First, ah, YuCheol, could you read the first instruction? (n, el)	Answering S2: Where is it? (rep)	Follow-up Here. (com)	8

	Answering S2: Yes. (rep) Needed one coin and two place markers. Flip a coin heads go two spaces tails won go one space. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	9
Opening Move (Elicit) So, gentlemen, do you have a coin? (el) [request]	Answering [get coins] (rea)		10
Framing Move Now^ (m)			11
Opening Move (Direct) Does anybody know how to flip a coin? (s) Show me. (d)	Answering S4: [flips coin] (rea)	Follow-up ahh. (acc) Oh, that's the same as my style. Flip a coin, catch it, and over. (com)	12
Framing Move Now^ (m)			13
Opening Move (Elicit) What do we call this? (el)	Answering S all: Heads. (rep)	Follow-up Heads. Heads. Okay. (acc)	14
Opening Move (Inform) The picture, sometimes it's a head. Like on the 100 won, okay. Or a picture. (com) And then the numbers side you call tails. (i)	Answering S1, S4: Tails. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	15
Framing Move Alright^ (m)			16
Opening Move (Inform) So, for heads, if you flip heads you go two spaces, for tails one space. (s) So, for example, I flip it, I get tails, one space. (i)	Answering [nod] (ack)		17

Framing Move Okay^.(m)			18
Opening Move (Elicit) Second direction(s), can you read it please, HoJae? (n, el)	Answering S4: Ask your partner two or three questions with the words in the space on what time, where, who with, how, why, what. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	19
Focusing Move So, let's look at the first box. (ms) It says weekend, watch TV. (com)			20
Opening Move (Inform) Okay^.(m) Maybe I want to ask my partner a question. (ms) Okay, so I might just say what time. (cl) But maybe I forget the grammar. So, in my book on page 26...we have the first grammar point here. (s) What do. you. do. after school. Okay, so I can use this grammar. So, I can say, what time do you watch TV on the weekend. (i) Okay, I can use this to help me. (com)	Answering (ack)		21
Opening Move (Elicit) Alright, so I ask ohh... AhnHan, what time do you watch TV on the weekend? (n, el)	Answering S1: I usually watch TV one hour. For one hour. (rep)	Follow-up Ahh. (acc)	22
Opening Move (Clue) What time (cl)	Answering S1: What time. I usually watch TV 9 o'clock. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	23
Opening Move (Clue) So, I usually watch what? I	Answering S1: I usually watch... (rep)	Follow-up TV. (com)	24

usually watch. (cl)			
Opening Move (Clue) And the preposition with time is...at. (cl)	Answering S1: at. (rep)	Follow-up Um-hmm. Okay. (acc)	25
Opening Move (Elicit) So, if you want to ask for how long, okay, I could ask you, how long do you watch TV on the weekend? (el)	Answering S1: I usually watch TV for two hour. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. Two hours. (acc)	26
Focusing Move Okay, so that's two questions I asked him. (s) Two or three. Okay. Then the next person's turn. (ms)			27
Focusing Move Okay^. (m) You can use these styles of questions, or you can think of others, no problem. (ms)			28
Framing Move Okay^. (m)			29
Opening Move (Inform) And as you see (s), at the bottom here we have game English okay. (i) I start, you start. (com) Okay. (z)			30
Focusing Move So^. (m), umm...let's have a group of three, you three gentlemen, and you two gentlemen, you can play together. (ms)			31
Framing Move Okay? (ch) Alright^. (m)			32
Opening Move: Direct Let's go. (d)			33

Opening Move (Elicit) Okay, so you have to decide which question you want to ask. (s) For example, can you ask this question? (el)	Answering S5: What time is you watching TV? (rep)	Follow-up Close. (e)	34
Opening Move (Clue) Let's look here. (s) What time...(cl)	Answering S5: What time do you watching TV? (rep)		35
Opening Move (Clue) Watch. (cl)	Answering S5: (Korean) Watch. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	36
Opening Move (Clue) And then we have the day here, so we say... (cl)	Answering S5: Wednesday? (rep)	Follow-up Weekend. (acc)	37
Opening Move (Inform) Okay, so on the weekend. (i)	Answering S5: On the weekend.(z)		38
Opening Move (Elicit) So, who are you asking? (el)	Answering S2: Me. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	39
Opening Move (Prompt) One more question. (p)	Answering S5: Where do you watch TV on Sunday. On weekend? (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	40
	Answering S2: I usually watch TV ahh in one of my friend's house. (rep)	Follow-up Umm...one of your friend's houses. (acc)	41
Opening Move (S Inform) S2: Because I don't have a TV. (i)		Follow-up Ohh. I see. (com)	42
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: What kind of dinner...on Wednesday? (el)	Answering S1: Wednesday? (rep)	Follow-up Wednesday. (com)	43
	Answering S1: I ate kimchi bokeumbap. Very delicious. And	Follow-up Hmm... (T acc)	44

	bokeumbap can be very nutrition. (rep)		
Opening Move (Inform) It's very nutritious. (i)	Answering S1: Nutritious. (rep)	Follow-up Nutritious. (acc)	45
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: What is nutritious? (el)			46
Opening Move (Elicit) Do you know nutrition? (el)	Answering S3: No, I don't. (rep)		47
Opening Move (Elicit) Can you explain nutrition in English? (el)			48
Opening Move (S Inform) S1: Nutrition meaning is contain many vitamin... (i)	Answering S3: Ohh. [nod, laugh] (ack)	Follow-up But nutrition, okay, is like a noun. Nutritious would be like an adjective. Nutritious food. (con)	49
Framing Move Okay^.			50
Opening Move (Elicit) Do you eat nutritious food? (el)	Answering S3: No. [laugh] (rep)	Follow-up Uh-oh. (com)	51
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: Who...uh...who eat dinner with...who? Wednesday. (el)			52
Opening Move (Clue) Let's look here again. (s) So we have who...(cl)	Answering S3: Do you...ahh. (rep)		53
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: Who do you have dinner with on Wednesday? (el)	Answering S1: I'm...I ate a lot in my room. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. (acc)	54
Framing Move Now^. (m)			55
Opening Move (Inform) Before you were okay. You could say who do you eat dinner with? Okay. Or who do you	Answering [nod] (ack)		56

<p>have dinner with, okay, no problem. (con)</p> <p>And since this is a routine, this is almost every week, right? (com)</p> <p>So, you would say I eat dinner with my family. Or, I eat dinner alone. If you use the past tense, I ate dinner, that is not routine. (i)</p> <p>Okay? (ch)</p> <p>That is one time. Okay. (con)</p>			
<p>Opening Move (s Elicit)</p> <p>S2: Where do you meet your friends on Tuesday? (el) Where. (cl)</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S5: no response [long pause]</p>		57
<p>Opening Move (Elicit)</p> <p>Where do you meet them? (el)</p> <p>Where? (cl)</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S5: [whispered school in Korean] School. (rep)</p>	<p>Follow-up</p> <p>Okay. (acc)</p>	58
<p>Opening Move (Elicit)</p> <p>So one more time. (d) Can you make a sentence? (el)</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S5: I usually meet friends on school. (rep)</p>		59
<p>Opening Move (Clue)</p> <p>At. (cl)</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S5: At school. (rep)</p>	<p>Follow-up</p> <p>Okay. (acc)</p>	60
<p>Opening Move (s Elicit)</p> <p>How long do you meet your friends on Tuesday? (el)</p>			61
<p>Opening Move (Elicit)</p> <p>Now, because this is a routine, okay, it's like every Tuesday. (i)</p> <p>Right? (el)</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S2: Yeah. (rep)</p>		62
<p>Opening Move (Inform)</p> <p>So. We would say Tuesdays. (i)</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S2: Uh-hmm. (ack)</p>		63
<p>Opening Move (Inform)</p> <p>We would add an -s. Okay.</p> <p>Because there are many</p>	<p>Answering</p> <p>S2: On Tuesdays? On Tuesdays. Okay. (z)</p>		64

Tuesdays in a month. (i)			
Opening Move (s Inform) S5: Half. Half hour. (i)		Follow-up Okay. (acc)	65
Opening Move (Inform) So, umm. The answer. (con) I usually meet friends for a half hour on Tuesdays. (i)	Answering S5: I usually meet friends for a half hour on Tuesdays. (z)		66
Opening Move (Elicit) S3: What do you have dinner on Friday? (el) What do you have... (cl)			67
Opening Move (Clue) For...(cl)			68
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: For dinner on Friday.(s) What do you have for dinner on Friday. (el)	Answering S1: I usually eat at 7. (rep) I, I have not specific food name. It is different about...situation. (com)	Follow-up Okay, I understand. (com)	69
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: Is it delicious? (el)	Answering S1: Yes, it's very delicious. (rep)		70
Opening Move (Elicit) Do you disagree? (el)	Answering S3: I disagree. (rep)		71
Opening Move (s Inform) S1: My taste...taste is unexpensive. (i)	Answering S3: Cheap. (s rep)	Follow-up S1: Cheap. (s acc)	72
Opening Move (Elicit) The cost is. (com) The taste is? The taste is cheap? (el) The taste is... (cl)	Answering S1: Inexpensive. (rep)	Follow-up Ahh. Okay. (acc)	73
Opening Move (s Inform) S1: Not royal. Royal. (i)		Follow-up It's not a king's meal. (com)	74
Opening Move (s Inform)			75

S1: Proletariat. I'm a proletariat. (i)			
Opening Move (s Elicit) S3: Who do you have dinner with on Friday? (el)	Answering S1: I have dinner with friends. (rep)		76
Framing Move Okay^.(m)			77
Opening Move (Inform) We're going to stop. (ms) Even though you're not finished. (com) Okay, if you want I can give you the game and you can play after class. (i)	Answering S all: Ahh. (ack)		78
Framing Move Alright^.(m)			79
Opening Move (Direct) Everybody turn to page 32. (d)	Answering (rea)		80
Opening Move (Elicit) Hee Yong, what is the title of Unit 6? (el)	Answering S5: Where...where does it go? (rep)	Follow-up Yes. (e) Where does it go. (acc)	81
Framing Move Okay^.(m)			82
Opening Move (Elicit) So, you will be talking about locations. (ms) Let's review. (s) Where is my pencil? (el)	Answering S3: Sherry pencil... (rep) S1, S3: On your hand. (rep)	Follow-up Okay. Yeah. (acc)	83
Opening Move (Elicit) Where is it? (el)	Answering S4: In your hand? (rep)	Follow-up Yes. (e) In your hand. (acc)	84
Opening Move (Elicit) [Teacher gesture] (el)	Answering S3: By your hand. (rep)	Follow-up Yes. (e)	85
Opening Move (Clue) Or? [Teacher gesture] (cl)	Answering S3: Beside. (rep)	Follow-up This is beside. (com)	86
Opening Move (Elicit) [Teacher gesture] (el)	Answering S1: In front of. (rep)	Follow-up In front of your hand. (acc)	87

Opening Move (Clue) And? (cl)	Answering S3: In back of. (rep)	Follow-up Yeah. Back or behind. (acc)	88
Opening Move (Elicit) [Teacher gesture] (el)	Answering S2: Beside. S4: Next to. (rep)	Follow-up Beside, next to. (acc)	89
Opening Move (Elicit) [Teacher gesture] (el)	Answering S2: Up. Above. (rep)	Follow-up Above. (acc) Or? Over. (com)	90
Opening Move (Elicit) [Teacher gesture] (el)	Answering S3: Below. (rep)	Follow-up Below. (acc)	91
Opening Move (Clue) Or? [Teacher gesture] (cl)	Answering S2: Down. S1: Beneath. (rep)	Follow-up Beneath. (acc)	92
	Answering S4: At the bottom. (rep)	Follow-up Hmm...at the bottom. (acc) Okay, or under. (com)	93
	Answering S1: Ohh...under. [laugh] (rep)	Follow-up Okay. We have several options, okay? (com)	94
Framing Move Alright^.. (m)			95

[Stop 23:45 min]