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1. Introduction

Discourse analysis helps us in understanding how real people use real language, as opposed to studying artificially created sentences. It is therefore of immediate interest to language teachers because we need to consider how people use language when we design teaching materials, or when we engage learners in exercises and activities aimed at making them proficient users of their target language, or when we evaluate published materials before deciding to use them.

Regarding analysis of spoken language, one influential approach is that developed at the University of Birmingham by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), whose research initially concerned the structure of discourse in school classrooms. They found in the language of traditional native-speaker school classrooms a consistent pattern of the three-part exchange (McCarthy, 1991).

In Japan, the Ministry of Education introduced new School Course Guidelines in middle and high schools in April 1992 and 1994 in order to encourage communicative reforms (Ministry of Education, 1994). According to the Guidelines, the fundamental aims of foreign language education is to foster communication skills and international understanding. In order to meet the demand, the development of aural/oral communicative ability of middle and high school students has been targeted, and this has become the most important role of English teachers, especially native English speaking teachers (Klevberg, 2000).

Under these circumstances, especially in language schools, traditional classes where the teacher is in front of the class 'teaching' and teachers and pupils speak according to very fixed perceptions of their roles, have been considered old-fashioned, and lessons for a small number of students in a free atmosphere have been appreciated. It is of great interest to analyze a classroom discourse in this kind in order to improve teaching materials, or to make learners proficient users of their target language.

The aims of this report are: firstly to analyze a discourse in a small class for Japanese middle school students with a Canadian teacher, a native English speaker, using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model, secondly to demonstrate how easy/difficult it was to fit the data to their categories, and thirdly to indicate possible reasons why the difficulties arose.

2. Literature review

Historically, the British work has principally followed structural-linguistic criteria, on the basis of the isolation of units, and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse (McCarthy, 1991). One important study was carried out by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), who developed a model for the description of teacher-pupil talk based on a hierarchy of discourse units. They found in the language of traditional native-speaker school classrooms a pattern of three-part exchanges, where the teacher made the initiation and the follow-up move, while pupils were restricted to responding moves (Coulthard, 1985; McCarthy, 1991).

In contrast, the emphases of American discourse analysis have been upon the close observation of the behaviour of natural data, such as in the studies by Goffman (1979) and Jefferson (1978) regarding conversational norms, turn-taking and other aspects of spoken interaction (McCarthy, 1991).
In Japan, a shift in teaching from that which is totally grammar-based and teacher-centered to that which is needs-based and learner-centered has been gradually occurring (Rausch, 2000) and many studies have demonstrated Japanese students' strong preference for Japanese use in classrooms (Nishimura, 1995; Burden, 2000; Klevberg, 2000). This has brought some doubts on an official policy of "No Japanese" in classrooms, and discourse analysis in Japan has been performed with a focus on codeswitching (CS) in classrooms (Hosoda, 2000). The Jefferson system is designed to represent dynamics of turn taking such as overlaps, gaps, pauses, and audible breathing, and characteristics of speech delivery such as stress, enunciation, intonation, and pitch (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). This system is widely used in the field of discourse analysis to present accurate version of transcription which is considered to be necessary in order to study CS by way of an interactional sociolinguistic approach. Concomitantly, Sinclair and Coulthard's categories are used to describe the function of acts (Hosoda, 2000). By examining a close transcription obtained with these two systems, Hosoda (2000) reported that most of the teacher's CS occurred in four contexts: (1) Explaining prior target language utterances; (2) Defining unknown words; (3) Giving instructions; and (4) Providing positive and negative feedback. Such research supports the use of the mother tongue as a bridge between languages to provide a more efficient, comprehensible and comfortable learning environment. The chief pedagogical implication of this research is that in EFL classes with students whose proficiency in the targeted language and motivation are low, CS into the first language may allow the teacher to enhance the flow of interaction in the targeted language. In classroom discourse with students of this kind, acts proposed by Sinclair et al., such as 'loop', 'nomination', 'prompt' and 'clue' (Coulthard, 1985; McCarthy, 1991), and 'marked proposal' in Francis and Hunston's definition of acts (1992), are expected to appear, because when a teacher does not get a response or gets a wrong answer to an elicitation, she/he can start again by repeating or rephrasing the question, or move on to another pupil. An discourse element for these teacher's acts is called 'bound initiation' (Ib), and it may be bound in ways of 're-initiation', 'listing', 'reinforce' or 'loop'. An exchange which reactivates an element in another exchange instead of repeating it or rephrasing it, is called 'bound exchange', contains single or a few Ib slots (Coulthard, 1985; Coulthard and Brazil, 1992; Francis and Hunston, 1992).

In this study, a segment of discourse in a small class for Japanese middle school students was transcribed only using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model. Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) reported difficulties in analysing long utterances of a teacher such as a long 'comment' of the follow-up move and lengthy informing moves due to their somewhat pre-theoretical nature. The other obstacles they noted were the absence of the unit exchange - a unit that had proved crucial in the consideration of multi-party talk, and the lack of an adequate description of intonation in Sinclair and Coulthard's model. The importance of intonation analysis in the pursuit of communicative purpose was also mentioned by Brazil (1992). Ease and difficulties in fitting the data to Sinclair and Coulthard's categories were also analyzed in this report.
3. Methods

The data analyzed for this study are based on approximately 35 minutes taken from a 60-minute cassette tape-recorded EFL class. The author was in the classroom to observe non-verbal acts.

3.1 Class

The class was 60-minute general English class at a private language school. It is held once a week on Wednesdays from 7pm to 8pm. The lesson examined can be divided into two parts. The first part was around 25 minutes and in this part, the teacher and the students talked about things that happened during the week and their plans for the next day, which happened to be a national holiday. In the second part, the students played a word game, a crossword game of applying the words opposite to the given words. The teacher spent about 5 minutes on explaining how to play, and went out of the room and let the students play for about 10 minutes by themselves. Then he came back to the room and helped the students in finding words and checked the students' answers written on their work sheets for around 10 minutes. The segments of the students playing the game by themselves and most of the segments of the teacher checking the students' work sheets were not transcribed because the students talked among their Japanese classmates in Japanese exclusively and no teacher-student interactions occurred.

It was not a traditional school classroom where the teacher was in front of the class 'teaching', and teachers and pupils spoke according to very fixed perceptions of their roles. The students sat in a half circle with the teacher in the middle, and the atmosphere in the classroom was very relaxed. At present, this kind of general English class can be considered as a typical English class for middle school students at private language schools in Japan.

3.2 Subject

The subjects were 13-year old, first-grade middle school students. They were five in total and two of them were boys. They started studying English in April, 2000 and have been studying English for about 7 months at their middle schools and the private language school at the point of recording.

3.3 Teacher

The teacher was a Canadian, a native English speaker, and he has been teaching in Japan at this private language school for about 8 months.

3.4 Analysis of the Data

The recorded discourse was transcribed and analyzed using the Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' (Initiation-Response-Feedback) model for an exchange, a move and an act (1975). A total of 35 exchanges consisting of 165 utterances was identified, and the results of the analysis are shown in Table 1 (Appendi
4. Results

4.1 Analysis of the classroom discourse using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model

Table 1 (Appendix 1) is the transcription of the recorded discourse and the result of discourse analysis using Sinclair and Coulthard's model. In Table 1, the Japanese switches from English are given in italics, and idiomatic translations are provided in parentheses. Also # represents an act which does not exactly fit in Sinclair and Coulthard's categories (see Discussion). 'Greeting' exchanges were observed in 8.6% (3/35) of total exchanges.

4.1.1 Analysis of the classroom discourse for TPT structure

The results of discourse structure analysis for Teacher-Pupil-Teacher (TPT) sequences are shown in Table 2. Although the classroom atmosphere was very relaxed, the teacher initiated exchanges accounted for about 86% of the total exchanges and the TPT sequence appeared to be the major sequence (51.4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-initiate</th>
<th>Number of exchanges</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-initiate</td>
<td>Number of exchanges</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| T           | 1   | 2.85 |
| TP          | 3   | 8.6  |
| TPT         | 18  | 51.4 |
4.1.2 Analysis of the classroom discourse using the 'IRF' model

The results of discourse structure analysis using Sinclair and Coulthard's Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model are shown in Table 3. The discourse structure had a great discrepancy but IRF (25.7%), IR/IbRF (11.4%) and IR (8.6%) were observed at relatively high rates. It is noteworthy that structures with a bound initiation (IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF+IR/IbRF) accounted for 51.4% (=2.86+11.4+2.86X3+20.0+8.6). R/I in Table 3 means the response and initiation elements in one utterance, and 14.3% of the total exchanges contained R/I structure at second place.

Table 3 An analysis of the classroom discourse for IRF structure
(N=35, total numbers are in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse element</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R/F/IbRF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R/F/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R/F/IbRF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R/IbRF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R/IbRF/FIbRF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I R/IbRF/IbRF/IbRF</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: T: Teacher, P: Pupil
---

(20.0)
I R/I F
I R/I Ib
I R/I F Ib
I R/I R F
I R/I R Ib R
1
1
1
1

(5) 2.86
2.86
2.86
2.86
2.86

(14.3)
I Ib R
I Ib R F
I Ib Ib R F
I Ib R Ib R F
I Ib Ib R/I R/Ib R F
1
2
1
1

(7) 2.86
5.7
5.7
2.86
2.86

(20.0)
Ib R F
Ib Ib R F
1
2

(3) 2.86
5.7

(8.6)

Abbreviations)  I: Initiation, R: Response, F: Feedback, Ib: Bound Initiation

---

5. Discussion

5.1 Discourse features agreed with Sinclair and Coulthard’s findings

The discourse analysis by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) is for classroom sit
uations where the teacher exerts the maximum amount of control over the structure of the discourse (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Coulthard, 1985; McCarthy, 1991). The class examined in this report was a small class of Japanese pupils where the pupils were not subject to formal or restrictive circumstances. The teacher obviously aimed at teaching communicative English through the conversations on everyday topics, and he also employed a task-based teaching method, one of the student-centred teaching methods, in the classroom. Despite that, there were some features observed which agreed with Sinclair and Coulthard's findings on discourse structure.

5.1.1 Teacher-initiated exchanges dominate

The utterances of the teacher and the pupils showed a one-to-one correspondence, and the pupils only spoke when they were asked to in most of the cases. This is probably because: (1) Japanese students have been disciplined not to speak in classes without a teacher's direction, (2) the attitude of Japanese pupils towards speaking English in front of other pupils are often negative because they fear making mistakes, and (3) the pupils simply cannot speak due to their poor English ability.

5.1.2 TPT pattern over 50%

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) found that a TPT sequence is a regular sequence in the classroom discourse. Table 2 shows that around 51.4% of the total exchanges analyzed had a TPT pattern. The reasons why the TPT pattern accounted for over 50% would be the same as those listed in 5.1.1.

5.2 Discourse elements differed from Sinclair-Coulthard's proposals

5.2.1 Discourse structures which depart from TPT-sequence

Pupil-initiated exchanges were observed in 14.3% of the total exchanges. On one occasion, the pupil even ignored the teacher's inquiry and initiated the exchange (line 6 in Table 1). There were 'direct' acts of the pupil which were addressed to the teacher (lines 6 and 166). This probably happened because the class observed was relatively small and the lesson was carried out in a very relaxed atmosphere. The teacher sometimes tried to relax the pupils by telling some jokes.

5.2.2 Discourse elements departed from Sinclair-Coulthard's 'IRF' model

5.2.2.1 Exchange structures departed from bound initiation over 50%

It is noteworthy that the structures with bound initiation, which do not exactly follow Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' pattern, accounted for more than 50% (Table 2). Bound initiation by the teacher was observed when he needed to clarify his preceding utterance, to persuade the pupil to speak with a 'prompt' act, and to give the pupil 'clue', or 'marked proposals' implying a particular answer. The reasons why bound initiation was observed frequently may be: (1) pupils' poor English ability, and (2) characteristics of Japanese pupils described below.

The class was intended for second language acquisition of middle school students aged 13 years old who have just started studying English 7 months ago. Needless to say, they could not understand the teacher's utterances fully, and they did not speak English well.
Japanese pupils are normally quiet in class and respond non-verbally unless they are asked to speak. Negative attitudes towards speaking English have been regarded as one of the characteristics of Japanese pupils (Greer, 2000). Some of them even have fear in making mistakes and feel guilty when a teacher points out their mistakes (Greer, 2000).

5.2.2.2 Over 14% of exchanges with R/I at second place

In Sinclair and Coulthard's model, 'eliciting', 'informing' and 'directing' moves occur only at the initiation of exchange structure. In the classroom discourse observed, moves which could be described as 'eliciting' (lines 16, 50, 117 and 167), 'informing' (line 4) or 'directing' (line 4) occurred at second place as responses as well. This probably happened because the lesson was carried out in a relaxed atmosphere and exchange boundaries were not very clear. There was F/Ib existed at the third place (exchange No. 21). Also, R/Ib at the fourth place with R/I at the fifth place in an I-Ib-Ib-R/I-R/Ib-R/F structure (exchange No. 9) was observed. It would be necessary to introduce a new category of move for this kind.

5.2.3 Discourse elements which do not fit into Sinclair and Coulthard's categories

5.2.3.1 'Greeting' exchanges observed

Exchanges of 'greeting' were observed in 8.6% of total exchanges. This is probably because an atomosphere in the classroom was relaxed and the teacher tried to create a friendly atomosphere by exchanging greetings with his students. The exchange 'greet' does not occur in Sinclair and Coulthard's model (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975).

5.2.3.2 Acts with codeswitching

Codeswitching (CS) by the teacher (English -> Japanese) frequently occurred in the classroom in order to make sure that the pupil understood his utterances (lines 36, 51, 57, 59, 70, 91 and 144 in Table 1). He also used Japanese to comfort and cheer up the student who made a mistake in English (line 90 in Table 1). CS by the students was also observed (lines 6 and 125). Historically, the Sinclair-Coulthard analysis was proposed for classes of English native speakers, and CS was not included in the model. The idiomatic English translations of the student's act in line 6 can be categorized as 're-initiation', and the act in line 125 should be classified as 'inform'. Teacher's acts in lines 59 and 70 can be considered 're-initiate' acts and the one in line 144 would be an 'inform' act when translated into English. Other discourse acts of the teacher with CS, appear like 'evaluation' (line 36), 'reply' (line 51) or 'accept' (line 90), but at the same time, they had the function of 'confirm' because the teacher uttered them to make sure the student understood his utterances. Furthermore, the teacher's acts with CS often have the function to create a comfortable atmosphere for the student as was obvious for the act in line 90.

5.2.3.3 Acts with multiple functions

On some occasions, the pupils' answers were only a few English words (lines 6, 47, 71 and 98), or in Japanese (lines 10), or incorrect English sentences (lines 83). These utterances were then followed by the teacher's utterances, which may be categorized into 'accept' since the teacher basically repeated what the student intended to say. However, this teacher's act had more important roles to 'evaluate' students' English and to 'inform' the student of correct English sentences, and it cannot be considered simply an 'accept' act. The reason may be the fact that any teacher's English uttered in th
The classroom has the function of 'informing' correct English to students.

5.2.3.4 Acts which are not related to preceding utterances

Sometimes, the pupils could not understand or misunderstood what the teacher had said and their acts completely deviated from the teacher's intention (lines 4 and 116). These acts might not fit into Sinclair-Coulthard's categories. The same could be said for the teacher's utterance when the pupil reacted to the teacher's acts in Japanese, which was not completely understood by the teacher. The teacher's following utterances turned out to be unrelated to the preceding student's utterances (lines 119, 122 and 126), and might not exactly be categorized by Sinclair and Coulthard's discourse functions.

5.2.3.5 Acts of 'confirmation' inserted in a long monologue

There was a long monologue by the teacher in an informing exchange (lines 128-144). In this exchange, he often inserted the word 'OK' with a rising intonation in his explanation to make sure the pupils understood his explanation step by step (lines 134, 136, 139 and 142). 'OK' could be an 'accept' act in Sinclair-Coulthard's categories but in this case, it was rather similar to 'confirmation'. Since the Sinclair and Coulthard I-R-F analysis lacks an adequate description of intonation, it is difficult to transcribe and categorize an utterance like 'OK' accurately.

6. Conclusions

The results revealed some characteristics of classroom discourse with Japanese students which are summarized in Table 5. It should be concluded that Sinclair and Coulthard's model can be used in analyzing classroom discourses with Japanese students but their categories might require reconsideration mainly due to poor English proficiency of students, learning attitudes of Japanese students and codeswitching frequently occurring in the classroom. Some of the acts were not categorized into a single function class of Sinclair and Coulthard's, but their functions can be described by multiple use of the function classes proposed.

Conversations under situations such as teacher talk and doctor-patient talk show some points in common, that is, it is easy to predict who will speak when, who will ask and who will answer and so on (Coulthard, 1985; McCarthy, 1991). The study indicates that a close transcription of the classroom discourse
urse can not be obtained by categorizing utterances according to only Sinclair and Coulthard's categories because their model lacks adequate description of intonation. In this sense, their 'IRF' model might be more suitable to analyze written materials. From these points of view, Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model can be expected to be applicable in analyzing dialogues of nurse-patient talk in textbooks for student nurses. So far, discourse analyses of neither nurse-patient talk in English in Japan nor dialogues of English textbooks for Japanese student nurses have been published. Detailed discourse analysis of nurse-patient talk in English in Japan is necessary to demonstrate natural use of English in this situation, but one should expect that these conversations are highly confidential and it may be difficult to obtain permission to use them as study materials. The results in this report suggest a bound initiation occurs frequently in a Japanese students' classroom discourse and is observed in an IRIbRF exchange structure most frequently.

It is of great interest to analyze dialogues of nurse-patient talk in textbooks for student nurses using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model, and to compare results with the findings obtained in this study focusing on natural language use, in order to design or evaluate teaching materials for student nurses.
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Table 5 Features of the classroom discourse in comparison with Sinclair and Coulthard's proposals and possible reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreements</th>
<th>Possible reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+One-to-one correspondence of the utterance of T and P.</td>
<td>Students' negative attitudes towards speaking English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+T-initiate exchanges are dominant (85.7%).</td>
<td>Poor English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+TPT pattern is major (51.4%).</td>
<td>Japanese students are disciplined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' negative attitudes towards speaking English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreements</td>
<td>Possible reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+P-initiated exchanges are observed (14.3%)</td>
<td>A small class in a relaxed atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Discourse structures with Ib account for over 50%.</td>
<td>Poor English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative attitudes towards speaking English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A small class in a relaxed atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers intention to create a friendly atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A classroom atmosphere is relaxed and exchange boundaries are not clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difficulties in fitting Possible reasons
+Often, the function of an act where codeswitching occurs, is multiple.
+Act with multiple functions
Act which is not related to preceding utterances

Act of 'confirmation' inserted in long monologue of informing exchange by a teacher. <-Students' poor English proficiency

Codeswitching has multiple roles

<-Teachers' utterance in English itself has function of informing students of correct English.

<-Poor English proficiency of students

Poor Japanese proficiency of the teacher

<-Poor English proficiency of students

Lack of adequate description of intonation

References

Brazil, D. 1992. 'Speaking English or talking to people'. Adapted from a lecture given at Sophia University, Tokyo in January 1992.


Appendix 1

Table 1 An analysis of the classroom discourse using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model. (A total of 35 questions were analyzed.)
Ex.No Ln.
No Dialogue
   (CS) el Exchange Move Act
1 1
2 T: Hallow.
P: Hallow. I
R Greeting Opening
Answering greeting
re-greeting

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 T: How are you doing?
P: Isu ikko. [One chair]
T: Han?
P: {CS}Isu [chair], chair, one chair.
T: Oh, you need one more chair.

T: Two more?
P: Uun [No], one.
Shiori yasumi. [Shiori is absent.]

T: Oh, Shiori is having a vacation.
   Year, OK,
   one more.
   I'll be right back.

((The teacher went out of the classroom and comes back with a chair. The students are talking about Shiori in Japanese.))

P: Shiori is rest, rest.
T: She is resting?

P: Yeah.
T: She is resting tonight.
I
R/I
R
Ib
R
I
R
F

I
R/I
R
F
Eliciting
Informing

Bound

Informing

Opening
Informing/Directing
Eliciting
Informing
Answering
T: So, Yukiko, how are you doing?
P: Un? [Yeah?]
T: How are you?
P: I'm fine.
T: Good.
R
Ib
R
F
Greeting

Framing
Opening
Eliciting
Answering
Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up
marker
nomination
greeting/starter
loop
re-initiation
re-greeting
accept

T: What's new?
P: No, no.
T: Nothing is new?
P: Test, test.
T: Tomorrow? You have test tomorrow?
P: Next.....
T: Next week?
P: [(nods)]
T: Next week.
(CS) Raishuu. [Next week.]

T: What test?
P: Uuuuuun. [Well......]
T: Math?
P: Everything.
T: Everything?
    Oh, it's your finals.
Follow-up

Eliciting
Answering
Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up
starter
inform
re-initiation
inform
inquire

inquire
inform
cue
(non-verbal)
accept
ev#

inquire
reply
m.pr
reply
accept
comment

9 42
43
44
45

46
47
48 T: Do you have the same,
Mari?
   Final test? Next week?
P: Konshuu nannte iu? [How do you
   say 'Konshuu' in English?]
T: This week?
P: This week. Friday.
T: On Friday.
I
Ib
Ib
R/I

R/Ib
R
F Eliciting

Eliciting Opening
Framing
Eliciting
Eliciting

Informing
Answering
Follow-up starter
T: Well, tomorrow, I'm going to Hiroshima with my friend.

P: Friend?

T: (CS) Watashi no tomodachi [My friend], yeah.

I'm going to Hiroshima, for taking the er... ferry boat and we're going to the Mtsuyama Kankou-ko, and we take the ferry boat to Hiroshima.
It should be fun.
So,
Thursday, tomorrow is a holiday for me.
(CS) Yasumi. [Holiday.]

T: Is that holiday for you, tomorrow?
(CS) Asuha yasumi? [Is it holiday tomorrow?]
Toshimi?
P: Yes.
T: Yeah?
You are very lucky.

R/I
F

Ib

I
Ib

Ib
R
F Informing
Informing

Framing
Informing

Eliciting

Framing
Answering
Follow-up starter
inform
inquire
reply#
aside
inform

comment
marker
inform
inform#
inquire
re-initiation
nomination
reply
accept
comment
12

13 64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71

T: What are you doing tomorrow?
P: We have no school tomorrow.
T: Ah, that's good.
You have no school tomorrow.

P: Un. [Yeah.]

T: What are you going to do tomorrow?
   {CS} Asuha nani wo shimasuka? [What are you going to do tomorrow?]

P: Shopping.

T: You're going shopping tomorrow.

((One student has just arrived.))
T: Hi, Mayumi,
    You look very tired.
    How are you doing?
    Are you OK?
P: Yeah, OK.
T: Good, good.

I

R
F

Greeting

Eliciting

Opening

Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up

greeting
comment
greeting
eliciting
reply
accept
15

16

17 79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
T: What's new, Mayumi?

P: I, friend....

T: Your friend? What about your friend?

P: Go to the Ohkaido.

T: You went to the Ohkaido.

T: With your friend?

P: ((nods))

T: OK.

T: You say, I went to the Ohkaid with my friend.

P: Ah, Gomen nasai. [I'm sorry.]

T: Daijyoobu. [That's OK].

No problem.

I
Informing

Answering

Acknowledging

Follow-up

starter

nomination
inform
m.pr/prompt

inform

ev#

m.pr
(non-verbal)
accept
direct
reply
accept
comment

18

19

20

21

22

23

24
T: (CS) Itsu? [When?] When?
   When did you go?
   Last weekend?
P: Last... Last... Sunday.
T: Last Sunday.
OK, good.

T: Was it fun?
P: Movie, movie.
T: You watched a movie!

T: What movie did you watch?
   What was the name?
P: Yonimo kimyoona monogatari.
   [The strangest story in the world
   (the title of the movie)]
T: Who is in the movie?
P: E? [Huh?]
T: The name?

T: Who is in the movie?
   Actor, actress? Who is the actress?
P: Tamori. (The name of Japanese
   actor)
T: Oh,
   it's Japanese movie.
T: Was it good? Did you like it?
   Yeah?
P: U......m.
T: You don't know.
   It's OK.

P: Charley's angel.
T: Charley angels?
P: Ga mitakatta no. [That I wanted to
   see.]

T: You watched it?
P: Mitakatta. [I wanted to see it.]
T: Hunnn. Really?

T: Did you like it?
   No?
P: Chigau, [That is different from
   what I meant.]
   mitakoto nai. [ I have never seen it.]
   {CS} I don't know.
T: You don't know if it's good.
   OK, that's all right.
   I
Eliciting

Eliciting

Eliciting

Bound
Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up

Eliciting
Answering

Informing
Informing
Follow-up

Acknowl'ing inquire#
m.pr
clue
inform
accept
evaluation

inquire
inform
accept#

inquire
m.pr
inform

inquire#
loop
clue

re-initiation
m.pr
inform

accept
comment

inquire
prompt
reply
evaluation
accept

inform#
reply/inquire
reply/inform

inquire#
reply
accept/inquire

inquire
prompt
reply
inform
inform
T: So, now, we will play a word game. Here you go.
So, what you have to do is to look up the word from the bottom.
OK? These are opposites, opposites, OK?
For examples, smooth to rough,
yes, no, opposites,
OK?
fast, byuuun....,
slow ((the teacher took a few slow steps))........
OK?
soft, like a rabbit or cat, soft.
[CS] simple, kantan [easy].

P:       OK? OK? ((the student is holding
          up a dictionary))
T:       Dictionary?
P:       Look?
T:       OK.
          If you need.

I

R
Ib
R
  Opening
Informing
Eliciting
Framing
Informing

Framing
Informing

Eliciting
Informing
Eliciting
Informing

Eliciting
Informing

Answering
Eliciting

 starter
 direct
 starter
 marker
 direct

 confirm
 inform
 confirm
 inform

 confirm
 inform
 inform
 (non-verbal)
 confirm
 inform
 inform

 inquire
 reply/inquire
 re-initiate
 accept
 direct/
 comment
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P: Suiito no hantai, bitaa? [The opposite of sweet is bitter?].
    Bitaa chokotte iu yan? [We say bitter chocolate, don't we?]
T: Sweet, bitter,
    that's right.
T: How about 'loud'?
P: Fine, fine!
T: Loud, fine?
    You see loud ((the teacher raises up his voice.))
    the opposite is quiet.
    Loud or quiet.
T: Strong?
P: Wakatta! [I got it!] weak!
T: Strong, weak
T: So, erm,
    any more questions?
P: Wakannnai yooooo. [I don't understand.]
Eliciting

Eliciting

Eliciting

Opening
Eliciting

Eliciting
Informing
Eliciting
Informing
Answering
Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up
Informing

Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up

Framing
Eliciting
Answering

Eliciting
Answering/Eliciting
Eliciting

Eliciting
Answering
Follow-up

Framing
Informing
Answering
Follow-up
inquire
inform
reply
evaluation
inquire
inform
evaluation
clue
inform
inform
inquire
inform
accept
Notes)

1. The Japanese switches are given in italics, and idiomatic translations are provided in parentheses.
2. # represents an act which does not exactly fit in the Sinclair and Coulthard's categories (see Discussion).

Abbreviations)