

AN APPLICATION OF THE  
SINCLAIR AND COULTHARD (1975)  
METHOD OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Paul Raine

September 2010

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) method of discourse analysis</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Overview	4
1.2 Principles	4
1.3 The rank scale	5
1.4 Exchanges	6
1.5 Moves	8
1.6 Acts	9
<b>2. An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of analysis</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Teaching context	10
2.2 The lesson transcript	11
2.3 Selecting a part of the lesson transcript to analyze	11
2.4 Understanding the analysis	11
<b>3. Limitations of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) discorsal categories</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 Using the S&C (1975) method to analyze pair and group work interactions	12
3.2 Using the S&C (1975) method to analyze whole class interactions	12
3.2.1 <i>A feedback move can apply retrospectively to several previous answering moves</i>	12
3.2.2 <i>A drill is a new kind of exchange</i>	13
3.2.3 <i>Elicits can be elicited</i>	14
<b>4. Is the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of analysis useful for understanding classroom communication?</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 A summary of previous findings	15

<b>4.2 Evaluation of previous findings in the light of current findings</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>4.2.1 Lack of account for non-linguistic elements of discourse</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>4.2.2 Lack of account for intonation</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>4.2.3 Lack of account for code-switching</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>4.2.4 Lack of account for “social, cultural, political, and historical” influences</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>4.2.5 Lack of account for interactive choice</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>4.2.6 Lack of account for the learning process and learner uptake</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>4.2.7 The S&amp;C (1975) method of analysis as a measure of communicativeness</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>4.2.8 The widespread adoption of the S&amp;C (1975) method of analysis</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>4.2.9 The S&amp;C (1975) method of analysis as a measure of feedback, discourse control, talking-time and preferred markers</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>4.2.10 Is it worth taking the time to apply the S&amp;C (1975) method of analysis?</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>21</b>

## **Introduction**

In the first part of this paper, I present a short discussion and delineation of the method of discourse analysis proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) – hereafter referred to as the S&C (1975) method of analysis. In the second part, I detail my methodology in applying the S&C (1975) method of analysis to a transcript of one of my English lessons. In the third part, I discuss the limitations of the S&C (1975) method of analysis, with particular reference to the difficulties I encountered in applying the specified discursal categories to my classroom data. In the fourth part, in consideration of both my own, and numerous previous applications of the S&C (1975) method of analysis, I evaluate the usefulness of it for understanding communication in the classroom. Finally, I offer some concluding thoughts on the S&C (1975) method of analysis and the application of it in the current line of inquiry.

### **1. Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) method of discourse analysis**

#### **1.1 Overview**

Paramount among the questions Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) had in mind when they started to develop their method of discourse analysis was whether there was any linguistic evidence for units of discourse above the clause or utterance. They resolved to analyze spoken discourse in an attempt to find such evidence. ‘Desultory conversation’ was dismissed as a suitable object of analysis because it was “perhaps the most sophisticated and least overtly rule-governed form of spoken discourse” (1975, p.4).

Instead, the authors decided to focus on “a form of discourse which had more structure and direction” (1975, p.5). The form of discourse they chose was classroom discourse. The method of analysis they developed, it was claimed, was able to “cope with most teacher/pupil interaction inside the classroom” (1975, p.6).

#### **1.2 Principles**

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) were guided by four principles in developing their system of analyzing discourse: the categories or labels of discourse had to be finite; they also had to be clearly defined; the descriptive system had to be comprehensive; and there had to be at least one combination of labels that was not permissible.

The presence of these principles helped lend a scientific and logical advantage to their system of analysis. The first principle prevented them from inventing new categories for every single element of discourse which would merely have created “the illusion of classification” (1975, p.15). The second principle went some way to ensure disambiguity in the classification process. The third principle stipulated that if too many discursal elements were thrown into a ‘ragbag’, then the description must fail. The fourth attempted to ensure the description was one which would reveal meaningful patterns and not just random combinations of discursal elements.

### **1.3 The rank scale**

The S&C (1975) method of analysis is based on a “rank scale”. This is a system of hierarchical organization whereby linguistically identifiable elements of discourse combine to form larger elements which in turn combine to form larger elements until no larger element of discourse can be linguistically determined.

In the S&C (1975) method of analysis, the largest element of classroom discourse is the ‘lesson’, although the authors admitted that “there [was] little point in labeling the lesson as a unit” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.60) because, in much the same way as paragraphs can be made up of any order of sentence types, lessons could be made up of any order of their constituent elements, ‘transactions’. The authors also expressed doubts about the ability of the concept of ‘transactions’ to “stand up to detailed investigation” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.56)

Due to these reasons, and limitations of time and space, the main focus of this paper will be on the subsequent three ranks of classroom discourse identified in the S&C (1975) analysis: *exchange*, *move* and *act*. The types of exchange, move and act, and the hierarchical relationship between them, are summarized in *Table 1*, below.

Class of exchange	Class of move	Class of act
teaching	opening	(marker) (starter) elicit* direct* inform* check* (prompt) (clue) (cue) (bid) (nomination)
	(answering)	acknowledge* reply* react* (comment)
	(follow-up)	(accept) (evaluate) (comment)
boundary	framing	marker* silent stress*
	focusing	(marker) (starter) meta-statement* conclusion* (comment)
<p><b>Key:</b> Parentheses denote optional elements. Asterisks denote core elements. Where there is more than one core element, at least one of them is required to be present, with the exception of the framing move, where both core elements are required.</p>		

**Table 1**

*The hierarchical relation and types of exchanges, moves and acts as defined by the S&C (1975) method of discourse analysis*

#### 1.4 Exchanges

Two classes of exchange are defined; *boundary* exchanges and *teaching* exchanges. According to the S&C (1975) method of analysis, boundary exchanges are used to signify the beginning or end of what is considered by the teacher to be a discrete part (transaction) of the lesson, whilst teaching exchanges are used to deliver the pedagogic content of the lesson, and are characterized by the four main functions of informing, directing, eliciting and checking.

A further eleven sub-categories of teaching exchanges are also distinguished; six of which are *free* exchanges and five of which are *bound*. The latter type of exchange depends on the former type, and cannot occur in isolation: “the function of bound exchanges is fixed because they either have no initiating move, or have an initiating move without a head, which simply serves to reiterate the head of the preceding free initiation” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.49). The classes, subclasses, notations, functions, and structure of the exchanges in terms of moves are summarized in *Table 2*, below.

Class of exchange	First sub-class of exchange	Second sub-class of exchange	Function of the exchange	Structure of exchange in terms of moves
Boundary	N/A		to signify the start of a new stage (transaction) in a lesson	(FO) (FO)
Teaching	Free	Teacher inform (Inform)	to convey information to the pupils	I (R)
		Teacher direct (Direct)	to direct pupils to do (but not say) something	I R (F)
		Teacher elicit (Elicit)	to elicit a verbal response from a pupil	I R F
		Pupil elicit (P-Elicit)	to elicit a verbal response from the teacher	I R
		Pupil inform (P-Inform)	to convey information to the teacher	I F
		Check (Check)	to discover how well pupils are getting on	I R (F)
	Bound	Re-initiation (i) (Re-initiation)	to induce a response to a previously unanswered elicitation	I R I <sup>b</sup> R F
		Re-initiation (ii) (Re-initiation)	to induce a correct response to a previously incorrectly answered elicitation	I R F (I <sup>b</sup> ) R F

Class of exchange	First sub-class of exchange	Second sub-class of exchange	Function of the exchange	Structure of exchange in terms of moves
		Listing (Listing)	to withhold evaluation until two or more responses are received to an elicitation	I R F (I <sup>b</sup> ) R F
		Reinforce (Reinforce)	to induce a (correct) response to a previously issued directive	I R I <sup>b</sup> R
		Repeat (Repeat)	to induce the repetition of an response	I R I <sup>b</sup> R F
<p><b>Key:</b> I - initiation (opening move), R - response (answering move), F - feedback (follow-up move), FR - frame (framing move), FO - focus (focusing move). The framing and focusing moves are both optional, but one or the other must occur in order to constitute a boundary exchange. In the structure column: parentheses denote an optional element; I<sup>b</sup> indicates the iteration of I two or more times. In the second subclass of exchange column, the notation of the exchange, as appearing in the analyzed transcript, is provided in parentheses.</p>				

**Table 2**

*The classes, sub-classes, notations, and functions of exchange, and their structures in terms of moves, as defined by the S&C (1975) method of discourse analysis*

### 1.5 Moves

A move is “the smallest free unit although it has a structure in terms of acts” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.23). Five classes of moves are identified and described: *framing* and *focusing* moves, which realize boundary exchanges; and *opening*, *answering* and *follow-up* moves, which realize teaching exchanges.

Framing moves consist of a closed set of words, such as “well” or “OK”, which signify that a new part of the lesson is about to begin. Focusing moves consist of meta-statements pertaining to what the next part of the lesson will be about. Opening moves “cause others to participate in an exchange” by “passing on information, directing an activity or eliciting a fact”. Each opening move is followed by an answering move, which is “an appropriate response in the terms laid down by the opening move” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.45). Follow-up moves are subsequent to answering moves, and their purpose is to “let the pupil know how well he/she has performed” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.48)

Table 3, below, summarizes the notations and functions of the moves identified in the S&C (1975) method of analysis

Move type	Notation	Function
framing move	FRAME	to signify the beginning of a new part (transaction) of the lesson
focusing move	FOCUS	to summarize what the next part (transaction) of the lesson will be about
opening move	OPENING	to cause others to participate in an exchange
answering move	ANSWERING	to respond appropriately to an opening move
follow-up move	FOLLOW-UP	to let pupils know how well they have performed (in their answering move)

**Table 3**

*A summary of the notations and functions of the moves identified in the S&C (1975) method of analysis*

### 1.6 Acts

Acts are “typically one free clause, plus any subordinate clauses” but may also be constituted by “single words or groups” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.23). Table 4, below, summarizes the notations and functions of the twenty-two different acts identified in the S&C (1975) method of analysis.

Type of act	Notation	Function
silent stress	^	to emphasize a marker
marker	m	to mark (transaction) boundaries in the discourse
starter	s	to “prime” pupils for a correct response to an initiation
elicitation	el	to request a linguistic response
check	ch	to ascertain whether there are any problems preventing successful progress of the lesson
directive	d	to request a non-linguistic response
informative	i	to provide information
prompt	p	to prompt a response to a previous directive or elicitation

Type of act	Notation	Function
clue	cl	to provide additional information to help students respond to a previous directive or elicitation
cue	cu	to evoke an appropriate bid
bid	b	to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse
nomination	n	to call on or give permission to a pupil to contribute to the discourse
acknowledgment	ack	to show that an initiation has been understood
reply	rep	to provide a linguistic response appropriate to a previous elicitation
react	rea	to provide a non-linguistic response to a previous directive
comment	com	to provide additional information relating to a previous informative
accept	acc	to indicate that a reply or reaction was appropriate
evaluate	el	to positively or negatively evaluate a previous reply
silent stress	^	to highlight a marker
meta-statement	ms	to help students follow the future structure of a lesson
conclusion	con	to help students understand the past content of a lesson
loop	l	to elicit the repetition of a student reply
aside	z	includes any elements of discourse intended not intended to elicit a reply or reaction, such as the teacher “thinking out loud” or talking to himself.

**Table 4**

*A summary of the functions and notations of the acts identified in the S&C (1975) method of analysis*

## **2. An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of analysis**

### **2.1 Teaching context**

An audio recording was made of one of my 75-minute group English lessons. There were five student participants, and I was the sole teacher. Informed consent was obtained from each of the students for the purposes of recording the lesson, analyzing the transcript, and producing a paper

detailing the whole process. The students were all native Japanese speakers with an elementary level of English. The linguistic notion of the lesson was “abilities” and the theme was “super heros”.

## **2.2 The lesson transcript**

A transcript of the entire lesson is presented in *Appendix 1*. Parts of the lesson (lines 74, 131, and 274) involved students communicating with each other in groups and pairs. Where this occurred, it has been noted in the transcript, but the content of these interactions was not recorded, transcribed, or analyzed. Some of the reasons for this were pragmatic, e.g. only having one recording device, and time and space being limited. The main reason, however, was that the S&C (1975) method of analysis was designed with whole class interactions in mind. This point is further discussed below (Part 3).

## **2.3 Selecting a part of the lesson transcript to analyze**

The part of the transcript chosen to be subject to the S&C (1975) method of analysis ranges from lines 132 to 274, inclusive. This section was chosen because it is constituted by a series of whole class interactions in which I was either addressing the students as a whole, or addressing individual students in front of the whole class.

## **2.4 Understanding the analysis**

In my analysis of the transcript, Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) analytical notation (see *Tables 2, 3 and 4*, above) was followed as closely as possible. NV is used to denote a non-verbal contribution, and a description of the action is included in parentheses. Exchanges are presented horizontally across the page. Each free exchange is terminated by a solid horizontal line. Bound exchanges are denoted with dotted line. Opening, answering and follow-up moves are presented vertically down the page. Framing and focusing moves are noted in the opening move column, due to lack of space. Acts are presented after each move. Every new act is presented on a new line. Transaction boundaries are labelled as such. Question marks appear where none of Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) discoursal categories seemed appropriate for classifying an act or exchange.

To follow the analyzed transcript, one should read down the opening move column until a solid or dotted line is reached, and then read across to the final “act” column, then return to the left of the page and repeat from the next row. The full analysis is presented in *Appendix 2*.

### **3. Limitations of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) discoursal categories**

#### **3.1 Using the S&C (1975) method to analyze pair and group work interactions**

One of the biggest criticisms of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) discoursal categories is that they can only be applied to those portions of classroom discourse which take place between teachers and students in whole class interactions, but they "cannot handle... pupil/pupil interaction in project work, discussion groups, or the playground" (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.6). For this reason, the parts of the lesson noted in the transcript (*Appendix 1*) on lines 74, 131, and 274 were outside the scope of the S&C (1975) discoursal categories.

#### **3.2 Using the S&C (1975) method to analyze whole class interactions**

In my lessons, I try to adopt a communicative approach to teaching English. However, with elementary level Japanese learners of English, I have sometimes found that true 'communicative activities' such as those involving an emphasis on interaction in the target language, negotiation of meaning, and use of authentic materials (Nunan 1991) are beyond the ability of the students. Often, I have found myself leading more traditional, whole class, teacher-fronted interactions structured around the secure and familiar *initiation, response, feedback* sequence (Cullen 2002).

However, even in the portion of the transcript representing a series of these more traditional interactions (lines 132 to 274), which was chosen to be analyzed because of its *prima facie* amenability to the S&C (1975) method of analysis, I encountered some difficulties fitting parts of the dialogue into the prescribed categories. What follows is a discussion of some of the difficulties I encountered, and suggestions as to how they might be overcome.

##### *3.2.1 A feedback move can apply retrospectively to several previous answering moves*

In *Transaction B: Exchange 5* we can observe that what would otherwise be part of the listing exchange started in *Transaction B: Exchange 4*, becomes something uncategorizable using the standard S&C (1975) method of analysis. This is due to the absence of a follow-up move, which, according to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p.55) is a required element of a listing exchange. Neither can this exchange be classified as an elicit, as elicits also require compulsory feedback moves. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.51)

It is suggested that what is actually happening in *Transaction B: Exchange 5* is that the feedback move required for both an elicit exchange and a listing exchange is withheld until *Transaction B:*

*Exchange 6*, when it is provided in the form of the *evaluate* act “OK. Very good”. This evaluation applies retrospectively to all the previous pupil *reply* acts which went without evaluation or acceptance.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) consider it to be “deviant to withhold feedback continually” and claim that students “cannot see the point of [the teacher’s] questions” if feedback is so withheld (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.51). In *Transaction B: Exchange 5*, however, the default expectation is reversed. The students assume their answers to be correct in the absence of re-elicitation; and their assumptions are validated by the final, retrospective *evaluate* act, provided in the follow-up move of *Transaction B: Exchange 6*.

In order to deal with this situation, it would be necessary to modify the definition of the listing exchange so that, as long as the exchange is terminated with a final follow-up move, there does not need to be a follow up move after every answering move in the series.

### 3.2.2 A drill is a new kind of exchange

*Transaction C: Exchanges 2-14* are also difficult to categorize with Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) standard discursual categories. The type of linguistic behavior occurring here is commonly known as *drilling*. Despite focusing on more traditional, teacher-fronted interactions, the S&C (1975) method of analysis neglects to provide an exchange category specifically for drills. Moreover, drill sequences do not fit easily into any of Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) existing categories.

In *Transaction C: Exchange 2*, there occurs what might be classified as a direct exchange but for the absence of an answering move, which is a necessary element of a direct exchange according to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p.50). We might have classified the act occurring in the opening move of *Transaction C: Exchange 2* as a starter, and merged *Exchange 2* with *Exchange 3*. However, a starter is merely a prelude to a direct or an elicit act, and I will argue that the act occurring in *Exchange 3* constitutes neither of these.

As for *Exchanges 3-14*, what we observe in the analyzed transcript is a language drill. We might have classified these exchanges as directs, i.e. directing the students to repeat the words or phrases spoken by the teacher. However, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p.50) explicitly state that the answering move of a direct exchange can only contain a *non-verbal* response.

It is also problematic to suggest that these exchanges be classified as elicits, as they do not feature follow-up moves, which are compulsory in elicit exchanges (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.51). Listing exchanges are incompatible for the same reason.

It is suggested that, in order to deal with this kind of sequence, a new type of exchange category is necessary. This new kind of exchange would be called a drill exchange, and would consist of an opening move and a compulsory answering move. The head of the opening move would be a new kind of act; a 'drilling act' (i.e. the word or phrase the teacher wishes the students to repeat). There could also be an optional starter before the drilling act, which would account for the act occurring in the opening move of *Transaction C: Exchange 2*. Its purpose would be to inform the students of the start of a drilling sequence.

The head of the answering move would be a reply act, restricted to the exact word or phrase uttered by the teacher in the opening move. Any other word or phrase would be unacceptable. The follow-up move would not occur until the last iteration of the drill series, when it would be compulsory, and constituted by an *evaluate* or *accept* act, in order to denote the end of the drill, and satisfactory performance of it, as seen in the follow-up move of *Transaction C: Exchange 14*.

### 3.2.3 Elicits can be elicited

The third area of difficulty encountered when trying to apply the discursial categories specified by the S&C (1975) method of analysis was when the teacher in my analyzed transcript attempted to "elicit an elicit".

This peculiar kind of exchange is exemplified by *Transaction G: Exchanges 2 and 3*. It is reminiscent of the drilling exchange discussed above. However, it differs in the respect that the opening, answering and follow-up moves are all compulsory. The opening move consists of a starter, an elicit and a prompt. The starter signifies that the teacher intends to elicit an elicit; the elicit is the question the teacher wishes the students to repeat (in the same sense as a drill); and the prompt serves both to synchronize the students repetition, and demand that it is produced forthwith.

This exchange cannot be construed as a direct because the reply is verbal. Neither can it be construed as an elicit because the answering move contains what appears to be an elicit (an 'elicited elicit'), which is not permitted under the standard S&C (1975) method of analysis. Furthermore, the follow-up move contains a reply, also proscribed by the original S&C (1975) specification.

One might argue that the answering move of *Transaction G: Exchange 2* should be modified to constitute the opening move of a subsequent exchange as a pupil elicit. However, the counter-argument would be that this would cause problems for the original teacher elicit in the opening move of *Exchange 2*, which would lose its compulsory answering move. Furthermore, the student elicit is utterly dependent on the previous teacher elicit, and it would therefore be illogical to assign it to the head of its own opening move.

In a subsequent development of the original S&C (1975) method of analysis, Coulthard and Brazil (1992) proposed a new kind of move, which deals with the situation described above. The move was called a “response/initiation” move, and it allowed a participant to respond to an elicitation while simultaneously eliciting the next response. In order to deal with “elicited elicits”, this modification could be adopted.

#### **4. Is the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of analysis useful for understanding classroom communication?**

##### **4.1 A summary of previous findings**

The S&C (1975) method of analysis has been prolifically applied by consecutive generations of University of Birmingham masters students, and it is expedient to include here some of the conclusions previously drawn as to its usefulness in understanding classroom communication.

*Table 5*, below, summarizes the conclusions drawn in previous applications of the S&C (1975) method of analysis, and whether they are positive (+) or negative (-) in relation to the usefulness of the method. It also attributes the conclusion to the Birmingham MA author and the TEFL or linguistics writer they were citing (if applicable).

<b>Conclusion</b>		<b>Birmingham MA author</b>	<b>Cited author</b>
(-) The S&C (1975) method of analysis does not sufficiently account for:	non-linguistic elements of discourse	Atkins (2001)	Francis and Hunston (1992)
		Siegel (2008)	N/A
	intonation	Takakubo (2001)	N/A
	code-switching	Takakubo (2001)	N/A

Conclusion		Birmingham MA author	Cited author	
	“social, cultural, political, and historical” influences	Siegel (2008)	Kumaravadivelu (1999)	
	interactive-choice (i.e. the way “interlocutors adapt to each others’ immediate contributions”)	White (2003)	Nunn (2001)	
	the learning process and learner uptake	Siegel (2008)	Kumaravadivelu (1999)	
(+)	The S&C (1975) method of analysis can help us assess whether and to what extent a lesson is communicative	White (2003)	McDonough and Shaw (1993)	
		Umemoto (2004)	N/A	
		Atkins (2001)	McCarthy (1991)	
(+)	The S&C (1975) method of analysis has been widely and successfully employed by TEFL and linguistics professionals	Farooq (2000)	D. Willis (1995) (among others)	
(+)	The S&C (1975) method of analysis allows us to objectively measure:	the amount of teacher feedback	White (2003)	N/A
		who is controlling the discourse	Umemoto (2004)	N/A
		the ratio of student-to-teacher talking time	Umemoto (2004)	N/A
			Rose (Unknown)	N/A
the teacher’s preferred choice of frame markers	Suter (2002)	N/A		
(-)	The S&C (1975) method of analysis is time consuming...	(+) ...but it is worth expending the time applying it	Rose (Unknown)	N/A
		(-) ...and it is <i>not</i> worth expending the time applying it (in communicative lesson contexts)	White (2003)	N/A

*Table 5*

*A list of conclusions drawn in previous applications of the S&C (1975) method of analysis by  
Birmingham MA students*

As we can see above, the S&C (1975) method of analysis has been subjected to a wide range of both criticisms and praise when it has been applied in the past. I would like to add my own conclusions to the above, noting where relevant my agreement or disagreement with previous assessments of the usefulness of the S&C (1975) method of analysis for understanding classroom communication.

## **4.2 Evaluation of previous findings in the light of current findings**

### 4.2.1 Lack of account for non-linguistic elements of discourse

I agree that the S&C (1975) method of analysis fails to account sufficiently for non-linguistic elements of discourse, or in Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) terms, non-verbal acts. However, I do not see this as a major flaw, as the nature of the non-verbal act can be easily noted in parenthesis (as was done in my analyzed transcript) and then analyzed according to existing categories.

### 4.2.2 Lack of account for intonation

I also agree that the S&C (1975) method of analysis fails to account sufficiently for intonation. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) talk about the ambiguity of utterances and how a single utterance can be alternately construed as a declarative, interrogative or imperative depending on the situation and the grammatical form of the clause. They propose three rules for interpreting such utterances, none of which mention intonation as an important factor (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.32).

Intonation is, however, an important factor in relation to an utterance such as "Gundam can't climb building?" which occurs in my analyzed transcript (*Transaction F: Exchange 6*). This utterance could be construed as both a declarative (informative) or interrogative (elicitation).

It is only by virtue of the rising intonation that the interlocutor is able to judge exactly how the utterance is to be construed. This is dealt with in the transcript with a question mark, so it is not such a major obstacle to analyzing the dialogue using the S&C (1975) method. However, one could envisage other kinds of intonation which lack convenient orthographical representation, and which the S&C (1975) method of analysis fails to account for.

### 4.2.3 Lack of account for code-switching

I also agree that code-switching is overlooked by the S&C (1975) method of analysis. Although it does not occur in the portion of the lesson transcribed and analyzed for this paper, it has definitely occurred in other of my teacher-fronted, whole-class lessons. However, I suspect it occurs markedly less frequently in whole-class interactions than in pair or group work between the students themselves. Since the S&C (1975) method of analysis is not intended for these kinds of interactions, it is not such a serious flaw that it fails to account for code-switching.

#### 4.2.4 Lack of account for “social, cultural, political, and historical” influences

It is hard to disagree with the claim that the S&C (1975) method of analysis fails to account sufficiently for “social, cultural, political, and historical” influences – however, it is even harder to envisage a method of discourse analysis that *could* account for these factors. Ethnographic methods of analysis such as participant observation, interviews, or questionnaires would seem more suitable for capturing this kind of data.

#### 4.2.5 Lack of account for interactive choice

I’m not entirely sure whether I agree with the claim that the S&C (1975) method of analysis fails sufficiently to account for interactive choice. The possible reactions to any given utterance are necessarily constrained. If it were not so, the S&C (1975) method of analysis would simply reveal random combinations of discursal elements, and not, as intended, meaningful patterns.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) do state on several occasions that other options to the ones specified are theoretically possible; they are just not expected. To stray from the specified reactions is to “break the rules of discourse” (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, p.50) We can accept this as a reasonable stance, although at the same time conceding that perhaps the S&C (1975) categories leave slightly too little room for maneuver.

#### 4.2.6 Lack of account for the learning process and learner uptake

A similar response to that given above (4.2.4), can be given to the criticism that the S&C (1975) method of analysis does not sufficiently account for the learning process and learner uptake. It is hard to imagine a method of discourse analysis that *could* account for these factors. Again, different methods, for example interviews and pre- and post-testing might better avail us of this kind of data.

#### 4.2.7 The S&C (1975) method of analysis as a measure of communicativeness

The S&C (1975) method of analysis is like litmus test for whether or not a lesson is communicative. It is, self-admittedly, ill-suited to more communicative interactions. A researcher who had particular difficulties in fitting his transcribed data into Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) categories might not be completely presumptuous in concluding that the analyzed lesson was a communicative – or at least, not a traditional, teacher-fronted – one.

#### 4.2.8 The widespread adoption of the S&C (1975) method of analysis

The S&C (1975) method of analysis certainly appears to have been oft adopted by respected TEFL and linguistics researchers. However, we should be cautious about how much weight we allow this fact to lend to the argument of whether the S&C (1975) method of analysis is useful for understanding classroom communication in our *own* contexts.

#### 4.2.9 The S&C (1975) method of analysis as a measure of feedback, discourse control, talking-time and preferred markers

The S&C (1975) method of analysis can help us objectively measure feedback, discourse control, talking time and the teacher's preferred markers. However it might be quicker and easier to employ a slimmed down version of the S&C (1975) method of analysis to accomplish such tasks. For measuring teacher feedback, we need simply go through a transcribed lesson and count the occasions on which a teacher administers feedback without the need to apply a full S&C (1975) analysis. Likewise for counting speaker nominations and ascertaining a teacher's preferred markers.

A lesson need not even be transcribed in order to ascertain the ratio of student-to-teacher talking time: all that is required is two stopwatches, one which starts and stops with student contributions, and the other with contributions from the teacher.

#### 4.2.10 Is it worth taking the time to apply the S&C (1975) method of analysis?

Whether it is worth expending the time to apply the S&C (1975) method of analysis depends on the reason for which it is applied. It may be beneficial, to some extent, for achieving the aims discussed above (4.2.7 and 4.2.9) notwithstanding the foregoing criticisms leveled at the method (4.2.1-4.2.6).

In my context, I already knew that my lessons were not entirely communicative due to difficulties arising from student comprehension and motivation. For the same reason, I knew the teacher controlled the discourse, gave regular feedback, and spoke for the majority of the time – at least

during whole class portions of the lesson. I could see no reason to find out what the teacher's preferred transaction markers were.

## **Conclusion**

Two kinds of paradox were encountered while conducting the present application of the S&C (1975) method of analysis. The first was the well-documented phenomenon, observer's paradox, where the objects of observation behave slightly differently because they are aware of the fact they are being observed. The other kind was 'researcher's paradox'. Because the teacher of the lesson and the researcher were one and the same person, i.e. myself, I was constantly thinking about, whilst teaching, whether what I was about to say would fit snugly into Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) discoursal categories. This may have influenced what was actually said in the lesson, and consequently changed the structure of the discourse. This phenomenon might be avoided in future research if another teacher's lesson were analyzed as opposed to one's own.

## **Bibliography**

- Atkins, A. (2001). "Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model in a one-to-one classroom: an analysis." Retrieved September 2010, from [http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Atkins\\_4.pdf](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Atkins_4.pdf).
- Coulthard, M. and D. Brazil (1992). Exchange Structure. Advances in spoken discourse analysis. M. Coulthard. London, Routledge: 50-78.
- Cullen, R. (2002). "Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move." ELTJ **56**(2): 117-127.
- Farooq, M. U. (2000). "Examining a male teacher's attention in a mixed-sex EFL Japanese high school classroom based on the Sinclair-Coulthard model." Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/fardiss.pdf>.
- Francis, G. and S. Hunston (1992). Analysing everyday conversation. Advances in spoken discourse analysis. M. Coulthard. London, Routledge: 123-161.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). "Critical classroom discourse analysis." TESOL Quarterly **33**(3): 453-484.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse analysis for language teachers. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, J. and C. Shaw (1993). Materials and Methods in ELT, Blackwell.
- Nunan, D. (1991). "Communicative tasks and the language curriculum." TESOL Quarterly **25**(2): 279-295.
- Nunn, R. (2001). "Language learning across boundaries: negotiating classroom rituals." Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume5/ej18/ej18a1/>.

- Rose, J. (Unknown). "Analysing Spoken Discourse in the EFL classroom using Sinclair and Coulthard Model." Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/janerose.pdf>.
- Siegel, J. (2008). "Using Sinclair and Coulthard's Spoken Discourse Model." Retrieved September 2010, from [http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/Siegel\\_SDUsing\\_Sinclair\\_\\_\\_Coulthard\\_s\\_spoken\\_discourse\\_model\\_in\\_a\\_one-on-one\\_children\\_s\\_lesson.pdf](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/Siegel_SDUsing_Sinclair___Coulthard_s_spoken_discourse_model_in_a_one-on-one_children_s_lesson.pdf).
- Sinclair, J. M. and R. M. Coulthard (1975). Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. London, OUP.
- Suter, C. (2002). "Analysing Spoken Discourse in the EFL classroom." Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/suter4.pdf>.
- Takakubo, F. (2001). "Characteristics observed in Japanese students' classroom discourse by using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model." Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Fumie4.pdf>.
- Umemoto, M. (2004). "Analyzing a One-on-one Advanced Conversation Lesson using Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Model." Retrieved September 2010, from [http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Umemoto\\_4.pdf](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Umemoto_4.pdf).
- White, A. (2003). "The application of Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF structure to a classroom lesson: analysis and discussion." Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/AWhite4.pdf>.
- Willis, J. (1995). Caught in the act: using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy. Advances in spoken discourse analysis. M. Coulthard. London, Routledge: 111-122.

# Appendix 1: The full lesson transcript

## Lesson Transcript

### Details

This lesson transcript represents 75 minutes of teaching time. There were five Japanese student participants, all of an elementary level of English. There was one teacher-researcher. The lesson took place at a technical college in Kanagawa, Japan, in July 2010. When used by the teacher, the students names have been changed to protect anonymity. The contributions of individual students are not distinguished. The textbook utilized for the first part of the lesson (lines 4-131) was the 4th edition of *English Firsthand Success* by Helgesen, Brown & Wiltshire, published by Pearson Longman.

### Legend

Symbol	Signification
T:	a verbal contribution belonging to the teacher-researcher
P:	a verbal contribution belonging to any individual student
Ps:	a verbal contribution belonging to any combination of students (i.e. a choral drill)
NV	a non-verbal contribution
...	an ellipsis in an utterance due to reformulation or hesitation
Heh	nervous laughter
	simultaneous speech
()	commentary on non-verbal aspects of the lesson

#	Transcript	
1	P:	Is that iPhone 4?
2	T:	It is, yes. Yeah. I... I er... preordered
3	T:	OK, erm... let's start. Can you look at page... er... eighty. Page eighty.
4	P:	(NV: opening books)
5	T:	Please listen and er touch the picture
6	(CD player starts. Unit 9. "She can really sing". Preview. Abilities. "Can you do a magic trick?". Tapescript plays.)	
7	T:	So I want you to ask me can you... something... so... can you do a magic trick?. One, two, three

#	Transcript	
8	Ps:	Can you do a magic trick?
9	T:	Yes, a little. Can you show me?
10	Ps:	Can you show me?
11	T:	Sure (NV: doing a magic trick)
12	Ps:	(NV: laughing)
13	T:	OK? Amazing. Next one. Can you do math well? One, two, three.
14	Ps:	Can you do math well?
15	T:	Erm, no. Not at all. Next picture. One, two, three.
16	Ps:	Can you speak English?
17	T:	Yes, very well. Can you show me?
18	Ps:	Can you show me?
19	T:	Erm... heh heh heh. Hello, my name is Paul. I'm from England. My hobby is playing tennis. Goodbye!
20	Ps:	(NV: laughing)
21	T:	Heh heh heh. Next picture. One, two, three.
22	Ps:	Can you sing well?
23	T:	Er, yes, a little. Can you show me? One, two, three.
24	Ps:	Can you show me?
25	T:	Er, no. Not now. Heh heh heh. Next picture. One, two, three.
26	Ps:	Can you balance?
27	T:	Er, yes. One, two, three.
28	Ps:	...show... me...
29	T:	Can you show me?
30	Ps:	Can you.. can you show me?
31	T:	Sure (NV: balancing a textbook on his head) OK?
32	Ps:	(NV: laughter)
33	T:	Easy. That's very easy. Erm, next picture. One, two, three.

#	Transcript	
34	Ps:	Can you swim?
35	T:	Er, yes. A little.
36	Ps:	Can you show me?
37	T:	No. Not now. Next. One, two, three.
38	Ps:	Can you use a computer program?
39	T:	Erm, what computer program? What computer program? Koichi.
40	P:	Erm, computer system?
41	T:	Mmm. Erm. Program name.
42	P:	Erm.
43	T:	Program name.
44	P:	Program name?
45	T:	Mm.
46	P:	Erm.
47	T:	Example, Microsoft Excel
48	P:	Word.
49	T:	Word. Er, yes. Very well.
50	Ps:	Can... you show me?
51	T:	Do you have a computer?
52	Ps:	(NV: laughter)
53	T:	No? Not now. Heh heh. Erm, next one. One, two, three.
54	Ps:	Can you play a musician/musical instrument?
55	T:	Yes, I can play guitar. (NVA: hand gesture)
56	Ps:	Can you show me?
57	T:	Do you have a guitar?
58	Ps:	No.
59	T:	OK. So, not now. Next. One, two, three.

#	Transcript	
60	Ps:	Can you play a video game?
61	T:	Erm, what video game? Daiki, what video game?
62	P:	Erm.
63	T:	Video game name.
64	P:	Erm... erm... video game...
65	T:	Mm. For example, erm, Super Mario World.
66	P:	Mmm. Erm. Err. Kirby.
67	T:	Kirby?! Heh heh. Kirby. Kirby, er, no. I can't play Kirby. Next, erm. Can you name five Japanese prime minister? One, two, three.
68	Ps:	Can you name five Japanese...
69	T:	Prime ministers
70	Ps:	Prime ministers.
71	T:	Er, yes. Kan, Hatoyama, Aso, Fukuda, Abe, Koizumi. That's six.
72	Ps:	Ohh.
73	T:	OK. I want you to, er, practise these conversation. OK? Together. Erm, you can change the last for your original idea. And video game and computer program please ask question. What video game? What computer program? OK? So, er, (NV: designating groups with gesture) two and three. Question, answer, question, answer, question, answer. Please start now.
74	(Students split into one group of two and one group of three. They practise asking and answering questions about abilities, as demonstrated by the teacher.)	
75	T:	Finished? Finished?
76	Ps:	OK.
77	T:	OK?
78	Ps:	Mmm.
79	T:	You can... let's continue to the next page. Please listen and check the answer for each question. Listen and check the answer.
80	(Tapescript. Listening. "Yes I can". )	

#	Transcript	
81	T:	So, number one. Question, can he play a musical instrument. Answer, yes a little. Question, can she play a musical instrument? Answer, yes. Number two. HIRO, question. HITOSHI, answer.
82	P:	Can... he swim?
83	P:	Yes
84	T:	And?
85	P:	Can she swim?
86	P:	No.
87	T:	OK. And number three question (NV: nominate student with gesture) answer (NV: nominate student with gesture)
88	P:	Can he... sing karaoke?
89	P:	No
90	P:	Can she sing karaoke?
91	P:	Yes
92	T:	Number 4, question (NV: nominate student with gesture) answer (NV: nominate student with gesture)
93	P:	Can he use the internet?
94	P:	Yes I can
95	T:	Oh. I?
96	P:	Ah. Yes..
97	P:	He
98	P:	He can
99	P:	Can she use the internet?
100	P:	No, she can't
101	T:	OK, number 5, question (NV: nominate student with gesture) answer (NV: nominate student with gesture)
102	P:	Can he do math?
103	P:	Yes, a little
104	P:	Can she... can she do math?

#	Transcript	
105	P:	Yes, she can.
106	T:	Yes, OK. And number six. Question (NV: nominate student with gesture), answer (NV: nominate student with gesture).
107	P:	Can he speak Spanish?
108	P:	No he can't
109	P:	Can she speak Spanish?
110	P:	Yes, a little.
111	T:	Yep. Very good. Err, please listen again and check the answer for number two, number two.
112	(Tapescript. Listening. "Yes I can")	
113	T:	So, number one. Question, when did she learn to play guitar. Answer, when she was a kid. Two, AKIRA, question, DAICHI, answer.
114	P:	Why doesn't she swim?
115	P:	Because she afraid of the water.
116	T:	OK. Question (NV: nominate student with gesture), answer (NV: nominate student with gesture).
117	P:	Why doesn't he want to go to karaoke?
118	P:	Because he has a terrible voice.
119	T:	Yep. Next.
120	P:	Where does he use the internet?
121	P:	At school.
122	T:	Yep, and number five.
123	P:	Why is she good at math?
124	P:	Because her mom is a math teacher.
125	T:	Yep, and number six.
126	P:	Where did she learn Spanish?
127	P:	She studied in Mexico.
128	T:	Yes! Very good. All correct. Erm, next is about you. Please listen and write your answer.

#	Transcript	
129	(Tapescript. "About you". Students listen and write answers to questions stated in the tapescript.)	
130	T:	OK. A and B. A is speaking, B is listening. You are B, I am A. I can play a musical instrument, the guitar. I can swim. I can sing quite well. I can't do math well. I can play taiko-tatsujin very well. Please read your answers and listen to your friend answers. OK. Two (NV: assigning a group with a gesture) three (NV: assigning a group with a gesture) Start.
131	(Students read the sentences they have written to each other in the groups designated by the teacher.)	
132	T:	So on this paper, you can see some super heros. Some Japanese and some other super heros. I want you to write the names under each picture. Please do that now.
133	Ps:	(NV: writing the names of the super heros under the pictures provided)
134	T:	OK. Let's check the answers. First picture. (NV: nominating student with gesture)
135	P:	Mario.
136	T:	Yep. Next.
137	P:	Link
138	T:	OK.
139	P:	Anpanman.
140	T:	OK
141	P:	Doraemon
142	T:	OK.
143	P:	Gundam.
144	T:	OK
145	P:	Erm, superman.
146	P:	James Bond
147	P:	Spiderman
148	P:	Green goblin
149	T:	OK. Very good. Do you.. do you all know green goblin?
150	Ps:	No

#	Transcript	
151	T:	No? Heheheh. Have you seen the Spiderman movie?
152	Ps:	Yes.
153	T:	He is Spiderman's errr... enemy.
154	Ps:	Ohhhh.
155	T:	Yeah. Erm, rival. Yeah. Spiderman fights the green goblin and the green goblin dies, at the end of the movie. Right?
156	Ps:	Mmm.
157	T:	So that's the green goblin.
158	T:	(NV: handing out worksheets) Oh sorry. OK. Please listen and repeat. Fly.
159	Ps:	Fly
160	T:	Jump high
161	Ps:	Jump high
162	T:	Use a sword
163	Ps:	Use a sword
164	T:	Climb buildings
165	Ps:	Climb buildings
166	T:	Fight well
167	Ps:	Fight well
168	T:	Time travel
169	Ps:	Time travel
170	T:	Kill people
171	Ps:	Kill people
172	T:	Shoot a gun
173	Ps:	Shoot a gun
174	T:	Throw bombs
175	Ps:	Throw bombs
176	T:	Spin webs

#	Transcript	
177	Ps:	Spin webs
178	T:	Help people
179	Ps:	Help people
180	T:	Change his head
181	Ps:	Change his head
182	T:	Mmm. So please look at this paper, and tell me what action is this (NV: miming flying)
183	P:	Flying
184	T:	OK. How about this one. (NV: miming spinning webs)
185	P:	Spin webs.
186	T:	Very good. Spin webs. How about this one. (NV: miming using a sword)
187	P:	Use a sword
188	T:	Yep. How about this one. (NV: miming climbing a building)
189	P:	Climb buildings
190	T:	Yep. Good! How about this one (NV: miming fighting)
191	P:	Fight well
192	T:	OK. How about this one (NV: miming shooting a gun)
193	P:	Shoot a gun
194	T:	OK. How about this one (NV: miming throwing a bomb)
195	P:	Throw bombs
196	T:	OK. How about this one (NV: miming helping someone)
197	P:	Help people.
198	T:	Very good.
199	T:	How about this one (NV: miming changing his head)
200	P:	Change his head
201	T:	Very good. How about this one (NV: miming getting into a drawer - <i>N.B. Doraemon time travels by getting into a drawer</i> )

#	Transcript	
202	P:	Time travel
203	T:	Very good! Time travel. How about this one. (NV: miming jumping high)
204	P:	Jump high
205	T:	Very good. And this one. (NV: miming strangling someone)
206	P:	Kill people.
207	T:	OK. OK. Good. Good job. Right. (NV: handing out worksheets) Now here is each superhero's name and here is a ability. So Batman can fight well. Batman can't time travel. So, for each superhero, I want you to write can, can't, can't, can, can't, can, can't, all the way. So Batman can fight well, Batman can't time travel, Link can something, Link can't something. OK? So match, erm, each of the er abilities from this paper on this page. Er, talking is OK. Please help your friend. Three (NV: designating a group with a gesture) and two (NV: designating a group with a gesture) Please start now.
208	(NV: matching the abilities and heros as directed)	
209	T:	OK, let's check the answers. Batman can fight well, but he can't time travel. Link (NV: nominating student with gesture)
210	P:	Link can use a sword. Link can't spin webs.
211	T:	OK. Gundam. (NV: nominating student with gesture)
212	P:	Can shoot a gun... shoot a gun.. gun. Can't climb..err..
213	P:	Buildings
214	T:	Buildings. Gundam can't climb buildings. Is that right? Is that OK?
215	P:	Can't climb a building
216	T:	Gundam can't climb building? No? No?
217	Ps:	Erm.
218	T:	Maybe? Yes, no, maybe?
219	P:	Maybe.
220	T:	Maybe! OK. We'll say he can't climb buildings. James Bond. MAKOTO.
221	P:	James Bond can shoot a gun. James Bond can't change his head.
222	T:	Yep. Spiderman.

#	Transcript	
223	P:	Spiderman can spin webs. Spiderman can't kill people.
226	T:	Erm, Spiderman can't kill people. Is that true?
227	P:	He killed green goblin.
228	T:	Yeah.
229	T:	Well he didn't he.. he.. had a fight with the green goblin and the green goblin's.. was it.. invention.. heheh.. killed green goblin. But spiderman kind of killed green goblin. So, I think he can kill people.
230	T:	Erm. Green goblin.
231	P:	Green goblin can fight well. Green goblin can't spin webs.
232	T:	Yep. Anpanman.
233	P:	Anpanman can change his head. Anpanman can't time travel
234	T:	Uh-huh. OK. Mario
235	P:	Can jump high. Can't err.. climb buildings.
236	T:	Hmmm. Hmmm. Imagine this is a wall and this is Mario (NV: using fingers to demonstrate Mario running up a wall)
237	T:	Right? Yes?
238	P:	Mmm.
239	T:	Umm. Run up a building! OK? Not climb. I suppose Mario runs up a building, not climb.
240	Ps:	Mmm.
241	T:	OK, OK. Mario can't climb buildings. Doraemon.
242	P:	Doraemon can time travel, can't jump high.
243	T:	Yep, and superman
244	P:	Superman can fight well. Superman can't spin webs.
245	T:	Yep, OK. Now I'm thinking of a superhero in my head, and I want you to ask me questions. Can he... fly? One, two, three.
246	Ps:	Can he fly?
247	T:	Yes, he can fly. Next question.
248	P:	Ummm, can he... shoot a gun.

#	Transcript	
249	T:	No, he can't shoot a gun.
250	P:	(Indecipherable)
251	T:	Huh? One more?
252	P:	(Indecipherable. Student states superhero name not on the worksheet provided by the teacher)
253	T:	It's from the paper.
254	P:	Oh!
255	T:	Sorry, yes. It's a superhero from this paper.
256	P:	Superman.
257	T:	No.
258	P:	Oh.
259	P:	Can he.. er.. jump high?
260	T:	Yes, he can jump high.
261	P:	Can he use a sword?
262	T:	No, he can't use a sword.
263	P:	Can he help people?
264	T:	Yes, he can help people.
265	P:	Can he time travel?
266	T:	No, he can't time travel.
267	P:	Can he... climb buildings?
268	T:	Hmmmm. I think yes. MAKOTO thinks no.
269	T:	Answer?
270	Ps:	Mario.
271	T:	Mario, yes, Mario. Mario can fly, right?
272	Ps:	Mmm.
273	T:	Yeah? OK? I want you to practise this game. Lets have two and three. In the three two people ask questions one person answer. OK. DAICHI you and start. And AKIRA, you can start.

#	Transcript
274	(Students practise the game demonstrated by the teacher in the groups designated.)

## Appendix 2: The analyzed transcript

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
<b>A</b>	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	So ^	<b>FRAME</b>	m			
2	Inform	on this paper, you can see some super heros. Some Japanese and some other super heros.	i				
3	Direct	I want you to write the names under each picture. Please do that now.	s d	NV (writing the of the super heros under the pictures provided)	rea		
<b>B</b>	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	OK. ^	<b>FRAME</b>	m			
		Let's check the answers.	<b>FOCUS</b>	ms			
2	Elicit	First picture. NV ( <i>nominates student with gesture</i> )	el n	Mario	rep	Yep	acc
3	Elicit	Next.	p	Link	rep	OK	acc
4	Listing			Anpanman	rep	OK	acc
				Doraemon	rep	OK	acc
				Gundam	rep	OK.	acc
5	?			Erm, superman	rep		

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
				James Bond	rep		
				Spiderman	rep		
6	Listing			Green goblin	rep	OK. Very good.	e
7	Check	Do you.. do you all know green goblin?	ch	No	rep	No? Heheheh.	e
8	Check	Have you seen the Spiderman movie?	ch	Yes.	rep		
9	Inform	He is Spiderman's errr... enemy.	i	Ohhhh.	ack		
10	Inform	Yeah. Erm, rival.Yeah.	i				
11	Inform	Spiderman fights the green goblin and the green goblin dies, at the end of the movie.	i	Mmm.	ack		
12	Check	Right?	ch	Mmm.	rep		
<b>C</b>	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	So that's the green goblin. <b>FOCUS</b>  NV ( <i>handing out worksheets, drops one</i> )  Oh sorry.  OK. ^ <b>FRAME</b>	con   z  m				
2	?	Please listen and repeat.	?				

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
3	?	Fly.	?	Fly	?		
4	?	Jump high	?	Jump high	?		
5	?	Use a sword	?	Use a sword	?		
6	?	Climb buildings	?	Climb buildings	?		
7	?	Fight well	?	Fight well	?		
8	?	Time travel	?	Time travel	?		
9	?	Kill people	?	Kill people	?		
10	?	Shoot a gun	?	Shoot a gun	?		
11	?	Throw bombs	?	Throw bombs	?		
12	?	Spin webs	?	Spin webs	?		
13	?	Help people	?	Help people	?		
14	?	Change his head	?	Change his head	?	Mmm.	?
<b>D</b>	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	So ^	<b>FRAME</b>	m			
2	Elicit	please look at this paper, and tell me what action is this NV ( <i>miming flying</i> )	el	Flying	rep	OK.	acc

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
3	Elicit	How about this one. NV ( <i>miming spinning webs</i> )	el	Spin webs.	rep	Very good. Spin webs.	e
4	Elicit	How about this one. NV ( <i>miming using a sword</i> )	el	Use a sword	rep	Yep.	acc
5	Elicit	How about this one. NV ( <i>miming climbing a building</i> )	el	Climb buildings	rep	Yep. Good!	e
6	Elicit	How about this one NV ( <i>miming fighting</i> )	el	Fight well	rep	OK.	acc
7	Elicit	How about this one NV ( <i>miming shooting a gun</i> )	el	Shoot a gun	rep	OK.	acc
8	Elicit	How about this one NV ( <i>miming throwing a bomb</i> )	el	Throw bombs	rep	OK.	acc
9	Elicit	How about this one NV ( <i>miming helping someone</i> )	el	Help people.	rep	Very good.	e
10	Elicit	How about this one NV ( <i>miming changing his head</i> )	el	Change his head	rep	Very good.	e
11	Elicit	How about this one NV ( <i>miming getting into a drawer</i> )	el	Time travel	rep	Very good! Time travel.	e
12	Elicit	How about this one. NV ( <i>miming jumping high</i> )	el	Jump high	rep	Very good.	e
13	Elicit	And this one. NV ( <i>miming strangling someone</i> )	el	Kill people.	rep	OK. OK. Good. Good job.	e

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
E	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	Right. ^	<b>FRAME</b>	m			
2	Inform	NV ( <i>handing out worksheets</i> )  Now here is each superhero's name and here is an ability. So Batman can fight well. Batman can't time travel.		i			

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
3	Direct	<p>So, for each superhero, I want you to write can, can't, can't, can, can't, can, can't, all the way.</p> <p>So Batman can fight well, Batman can't time travel, Link can something, Link can't something. OK?</p> <p>So match, erm, each of the er abilities from this paper on this page. Er, talking is OK.</p> <p>Please help your friend.</p> <p>Three</p> <p>NV (<i>designating a group with a gesture</i>)</p> <p>and two</p> <p>NV (<i>designating a group with a gesture</i>)</p> <p>Please start now.</p>	<p>s</p> <p>s</p> <p>s</p> <p>s</p> <p>s</p> <p>s</p> <p>s</p> <p>d</p>	<p>NV (<i>matching the abilities and heros as directed</i>)</p>	<p>rea</p>		
<b>F</b>	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	<p>OK, ^</p> <p>let's check the answers.</p>	<p><b>FRAME</b></p> <p><b>FOCUS</b></p>	<p>m</p> <p>ms</p>			

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
2	Elicit	Batman can fight well, but he can't time travel.  Link  <i>NV (nominating student with gesture)</i>	s  el  n	Link can use a sword. Link can't spin webs.	rep	OK.	acc
3	Elicit	Gundam. <i>NV (nominating student with gesture)</i>	el n	Can shoot a gun... shoot a gun.. gun. Can't climb..err..	rep		
4	P-Inform	Buildings	i			Buildings. Gundam can't climb buildings.	e
5	Check	Is that right? Is that OK?	ch	Can't climb a building	rep		
6	Check	Gundam can't climb building? No? No? Maybe? Yes, no, maybe?	ch	Maybe.	rep	Maybe! OK.	e
7	Inform	We'll say he can't climb buildings.	i				
8	Elicit	James Bond.  MAKOTO.	el  n	James Bond can shoot a gun. James Bond can't change his head.	rep	Yep.	acc
9	Elicit	Spiderman.	el	Spiderman can spin webs. Spiderman can't kill people.	rep		
10	Re-initiate (ii)	Erm, Spiderman can't kill people. Is that true?	el	He killed green goblin.	rep	Yeah.	acc

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
11	Inform	Well he didn't he.. he.. had a fight with the green goblin and the green goblin's.. was it.. invention.. heheh.. killed green goblin. But spiderman kind of killed green goblin. So, I think he can kill people.	i				
12	Elicit	Erm. Green goblin.	el	Green goblin can fight well. Green goblin can't spin webs.	rep	Yep.	acc
13	Elicit	Anpanman.	el	Anpanman can change his head. Anpanman can't time travel	rep	Uh-huh. OK.	acc
14	Elicit	Mario	el	Can jump high. Can't err.. climb buildings.	rep		
15	Re-initiate (ii)	Hmmm. Hmmm. Imagine this is a wall and this is Mario. NV ( <i>using fingers to demonstrate Mario running up a wall</i> ) Right? Yes?	cl	Mmm.	ack	Umm. Run up a building! OK? Not climb.	e
16	Inform	I suppose Mario runs up a building, not climb.	i	Mmm.	ack		
17	Inform	OK, OK. Mario can't climb buildings.	i				
18	Elicit	Doraemon.	el	Doraemon can time travel, can't jump high.	rep	Yep,	acc
19	Elicit	and superman	el	Superman can fight well. Superman can't spin webs.	rep	Yep, OK.	acc

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
<b>G</b>	<b>TRANSACTION BOUNDARY</b>						
1	Boundary	Now ^	<b>FRAME</b>	m			
2	?	I'm thinking of a superhero in my head, and I want you to ask me questions.  Can he... fly?  One, two, three.	s  el  p			Can he fly?	?  Yes, he can fly. ?
3	?	Next question.	?	Ummm, can he... shoot a gun.	?	No, he can't shoot a gun.	?
4	P-Elicit	<i>(Indecipherable)</i>	el	Huh? One more?	l		
5	P-Elicit	<i>(Indecipherable. Student states superhero name not on the worksheet provided by the teacher)</i>	el				
6	Re-initiate (ii)	It's from the paper.	cl	Oh!	ack	Sorry, yes.	e
7	Re-initiate (ii)	It's a superhero from this paper.	cl	Superman.	rep	No.	e
8	P-Elicit	Oh. Can he.. er.. jump high?	el	Yes, he can jump high.	rep		
9	P-Elicit	Can he use a sword?	el	No, he can't use a sword.	rep		
10	P-Elicit	Can he help people?	el	Yes, he can help people.	rep		
11	P-Elicit	Can he time travel?	el	No, he can't time travel.	rep		

#	EXCHANGE TYPE	OPENING	ACT	ANSWERING	ACT	FOLLOW-UP	ACT
12	P-Elicit	Can he... climb buildings?	el	Hmmmm. I think yes. MAKOTO thinks no.	rep		
13	Elicit	Answer?	el	Mario.	rep	Mario, yes, Mario.	e
14	Check	Mario can fly, right? Yeah? OK?	ch	Mmm.	rep		
15	Direct	I want you to practise this game.  Lets have two and three. In the three two people ask questions one person answer.  OK. DAICHI you and start. And AKIRA, you can start.	s  s  d	<i>NV (Students practise the game demonstrated by the teacher in the groups designated.)</i>	   rea		