THE APPLICATION OF EXCHANGE THEORY TO

INTERNET RELAY CHAT

By

Jeffrey Mark Hatter

A dissertation submitted to
The School of Humanities
of the University of Birminghmam
in part fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Teaching English as a Foreign/Second Language (TEFL/TESL)

Supervisor: Dr. Susan Hunston

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2IT
England

Submitted January 2002

ABSTRACT

This paper attempted to apply Exchange Theory to data recorded from an Internet Relay Chat (IRC) environment.   IRC displays a unique blend of features found in of written and spoken communication.   Previous research of Exchange Theory focused on spoken discourse, within the classroom, and in everyday conversation.

An appropriate environment in which to record IRC was found, and two hours of data was recorded.   The recordings were initially subjected to conversational analysis in order that topic-units could be distinguished.   Unique features were discovered as topics were not observed to change among participants in one conversation.   Rather, topic change coincided with participant change.

Exchange theory was then applied, further reducing the topic-units.   Exchanges with a similar structure to those in spoken conversation were observed.   However, because of the large number of participants, some adaptations had to be made.   One concern was multiple responses by different participants to an initiation.   This was managed by including all of the responses in one exchange.   The application of Exchange theory was not completely successful as a large number of incomplete exchanges were found.

CONTENTS

1.   INTRODUCTION

In many cultures, communication has comfortably entered a new arena, in which the participants engage each other over telephone lines with the use of their Personal Computer.   Devices such as 'email' and 'Internet message boards' and 'chat rooms' have become relatively commonplace venues that allow people, from all reaches of the globe, to communicate.   Furthermore, Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) programs instruct students of English as a second or foreign language on how to effectively access these environments and communicate using English.   In many cultures, one might be hard pressed to find an individual who does not possess at least one email account.   Entering a 'virtual' chat room and bantering with people from Sydney, Rome, Tokyo or New York, for example, all while interfacing from London, has become unexceptional.   Yet, is the *way* people are communicating any different?

Tannen (1984) describes *conversational style* as all of the devices one uses, and the choices one makes, when involved in a conversation.   Each person holds her own style, and nobody can claim a lack of style, for this is style in of itself.   However, Tannen (1984: 9) does specifically state that conversational style is ' a way of talking'. When a person engages another within a chat room, are they talking?   The answer would appear to be negative because the medium is writing rather than speech.   Yet, when users are conversing within a virtual chat room, they are using devices similar to those used while talking.   The combined utilization of these devices with orthographic, or 'written' discourse strategies, has created an evolving form of communication labeled Internet Relay Chat.

At first glance, Internet Relay Chat (IRC) appears chaotic and without structure. As multiple participants interact within a given 'chat room', actual strings of conversation seem to be non-existent.   Furthermore, participants communicate using symbols, 'emoticons' and varying fonts and colors.   It would appear to be unwieldy to utilize a system of analysis derived from classroom discourse structures, in such an environment.   Yet, if the content is recorded and analysed, patterns begin to develop. When the discourse is manipulated, conversations appear.   A further application of categories, such as *moves* or *exchanges*, reveals that this type of discourse could be analysed in such a way, though not without complications.

Researchers have studied IRC for its various sociological, ethnological and linguistic traits and patterns (Abdullah: 1998, Altun: 1998, Cochenour and Rezabeck: 1995, Flanagan: 1999, Garcia and Jacobs: 1999, Ginther and Liu: 1999a, Hara: 2000,

Holmes: 1995, Simpson: 1999).   Often the analysis involved specific environments in which all participants were working towards a common goal (i.e. a distance learning virtual classroom).   Interactions in such an environment have been quantitatively, or more commonly, qualitatively analysed for patterns such as participant gender or race (Huang: 1998, Johnson: 1995).   Methods of analysis have also been created. Comparisons of IRC to Face-to-Face (FtF) communication that have noted similarities and differences in the outcomes and techniques for communicating have been made. This is true not only for IRC, but also other forms of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) (Etzioni and Etzioni: 1999, Ginther and Liu: 1999b).

This dissertation will draw from research on CMC and from the field of spoken discourse analysis.   The proposal of the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) structure in 1975 by Sinclair and Coulthard revealed what appeared to be at first a system of discourse unique to the classroom.   Contrary to prior beliefs that exchanges consist solely of pairs of elements (Initiation and Response), Sinclair and Coulthard added a third, though not compulsory, element called *Feedback* or *Follow-up.*   In their classroom research, they found that teachers, after initiating a question to a student, and further receiving a response, often gave a follow-up response.   This was typically in the form of a positive or negative comment upon the student's performance.   With time, it was found that this system of discourse could be applied outside of the classroom as well (Coulthard: 1985, Francis and Hunston in Coulthard: 1992, Stubbs: 1983). However, in discourse such as everyday conversation, this type of 'performance feedback' that is found in classroom research is rare.   Rather, follow-up responses in the form of acknowledgements that display understanding, sympathy, emotional reactions can be observed.

This dissertation will endeavor to take a system of analysis based on the IRF structure and apply it to IRC.   Using Conversational Analysis, strings of conversation (transactions) will be extracted from raw data taken from an IRC environment.   These transactions will then be further broken down into smaller units that comply with the IRF structure (exchanges and moves).   Patterns found within the discourse will be displayed, and the causes of the patterns will be explored.   Throughout this paper, the problems that are encountered will also be presented and discussed.   Finally, the successful and unsuccessful results of the application of exchange theory will be shown.

It is hoped that through this analysis, similarities between spoken discourse, and IRC, can be found.   If so, it might be useful in the field of TESL/TEFL.   Similar features between the two mediums would further support the use of virtual communication environments for exposing students to language in context.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Exchange Theory

This paper will use a 'rank scale' to categorize discourse within IRC.   This is similar to the 'linguistic description' presented by Halliday (1961) to create categories defining grammatical and phonological structure.   Halliday's scale begins with the smallest unit, morpheme, and works up to the sentence, the last analysable unit in the scale.   Each unit in the scale is defined by its function within larger units, as well as its own internal structure.   For example, a word consists of a series of morphemes, and its function is to be combined with other words to create a phrase.   Similar distinctions can be found in the rank scale introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 19-24) to describe classroom discourse.   After considerable analysis outside of the classroom (Coulthard and Brazil: 1981, Francis and Hunston: 1987), it was established that the smallest unit of the scale is an *act,* followed by the *move, exchange,* and *transaction.* These units of linguistic description have the same function as Halliday's, as the smaller units realize the larger ones, and the internal structure of each unit is made up of units from the level below.

In the research conducted by Sinclair and Coulthard, the purpose was to analyse classroom discourse.   The *lesson* was described as the largest unit in the scale. No structures were ranked higher, as, although a series of lessons were thought to comprise a syllabus, there was no recognizable description of a lesson itself beyond a series of exchanges marked by frames.   Exchanges themselves were originally thought to consist of two moves, similar to *adjacency pairs* (see Sacks as cited by Coulthard: 1985).   Instead, a three-part sequence consisting of an *initiation* by the teacher, then a *response* by the student, followed by *feedback* by the teacher, was identified.   This sequence was believed to be a result of the type of discourse that occurs within the classroom.   For example, teachers often ask questions of students for which they already know the answers.   They offer feedback either as a positive endorsement of the student's answer, or as further reinforcement to persuade the student to give the correct answer (Coulthard, 1985: 125).   The absence of feedback was often perceived by the students as the result of an incorrect answer.   Of course there were exceptions that relied on the type of initiation given by the teacher.   For example a 'teacher direct' exchange was discovered to consist of an initiation, followed by a non-verbal response from the students, with optional feedback from the teacher (see Stubbs, 1985: 133).

Returning to the topic of spoken discourse analysis outside the classroom, there

are four ranks in the structure of the 'Analysis of Everyday Conversation' as described by Francis and Hunston (1987). As was listed above, but in reverse order, they consist of the *transaction*, *exchange, move* and *act*. Below, each rank will be discussed individually.

2.1.1 Transactions

The transaction is the largest unit in the Francis and Hunston scale. Coulthard and Brazil as cited in Coulthard (1992:58) state:

> *The unit at the highest rank in a particular level is one which has a structure that can be expressed in terms of smaller units, but which does not itself form part of the structure of any larger units.*

Therefore, should the transaction be considered the largest unit in the scale? Francis and Hunston actually identify *interaction* as the largest unit. This unit is not analysable as, although it does have identifiable parts (transactions), it does not realize a larger unit. Conversely, transactions do realize interactions. Yet, transactions themselves have not been categorized into different types, as their internal structure has yet to be determined. According to Francis and Hunston (1992: 139) a transaction must, at the minimum, contain one exchange. Also, it can be composed of an infinite number of exchanges, and possess optional frames that bind it. Hence, in their analysis, and the one posed in this paper, and although it is labeled a 'less than satisfactory unit than those lower down on the rank scale' (Francis and Hunston, 1992: 140), the transaction is labeled the largest *identifiable* but not *analysable* unit in the scale.

In spoken conversation, transactions can be identified by *frames* that signal a change of topic. These frames can take the form of a greeting or summons, or are identifiable lexically in the form of words such as, 'OK', 'well', 'right', 'now', 'good' (Coulthard, 1985: 123). Also, frames can be recognized by a change in intonation that is 'high falling' and 'followed by a short pause' (ibid.). It should be noted that not all transactions are identifiable by frames. Francis and Hunston (1992: 140) define a transaction as a 'topic-unit' and state that 'the identification of a transaction boundary should be consistent with considerations of topic'.

2.1.2 Exchanges

Four 'minimal interactional categories' are described by Stubbs (1985: 136) within an exchange; initiate (I), respond (R), respond-initiate (R/I), and follow-up (F). These elements are distinguished by their ability to be *predicted* or *predicting* (Stubbs, 185: 138). An initiation is predicting in that its appearance will require a response to form a complete exchange. Therefore a response is predicted. Follow-up is neither, as it is not obligatory, nor does its existence predict the following move. In other words, a follow-up move may be followed by another follow-up move, or the initiation of a new exchange. Moreover, the possible number of occurrences within an exchange is infinite. Finally R/I, although optional, is both predicted and predicting as it can be predicted by I, and is always followed by R (Francis and Hunston, 1992:136). Thus all conversational exchanges have the structure given below:

$$I \ (R/I) \ R \ (F^n)$$

The parentheses are used to indicate that R/I and F are optional.

A distinction should be made between follow-up within the classroom, and that which is found outside. Teacher-elicited follow-up, as discussed above, provides positive endorsement or further reinforcement to a student's answer. This type of follow-up usually only exists inside the classroom. Follow-up outside the classroom differs in that a participant in a conversation acknowledges the prior utterance, and possibly elaborates on it.

In the description by Stubbs (1985: 136) of the characteristics of the elements of an exchange, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 120) are quoted as stating that 'each utterance is classified or interpreted in the light of the structural predictions, if any, set up by the preceding utterance'. Similar to adjacency pairs in the reliance of the first pair part on the second pair part, a response will always be subject to what was initiated prior. If not, then the utterance is not a response.

Exchanges are separated based on their structure and function into two categories. There are four Organizational Exchanges labeled Boundary, Structuring, Greet and Summon. Boundary exchanges are distinct from the other organizational exchanges in that they are realized by one element, a framing move. The other three exchanges all have an obligatory two-move structure. Conversational Exchanges include Elicit, Inform, Direct, Clarify, Repeat and Re-initiation. The structure of these exchanges was discussed above. Their function and the moves that realize them will be discussed below.

5

2.1.3   Moves

Exchanges are realized by *moves*.   Moves are defined by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) as the structural elements of exchanges.   They are identifiable in terms of class, and Sinclair and Coulthard (1992: 21) state that 'each of these moves has a different function'.   Francis and Hunston (1992), based on Sinclair's and Coulthard's classifications in their analysis of Classroom Discourse, have identified eight classes of moves.   Three of the move classes, labeled *framing, opening* and *answering* realize Organizational Exchanges.   Their purpose is to signal the beginning or ending of a conversation.   The move types *eliciting, informing, directing, clarifying* and *acknowledging* are found in Conversational Exchanges.   These moves are distinct from organizational moves in that they do not serve to organize conversation.   Their purpose is to request information or actions, provide information, and to acknowledge prior utterances.

Moves are limited in the position that they may occupy in an exchange. Regarding moves found in Organizational Exchanges, framing and opening moves are always I, and answering moves are R.   Conversational Exchange moves are more varied.   Eliciting and directing moves are always I.   Informing moves can exist as I or R.   Clarifying moves take the initiating position of a bound-elicit Clarify exchange, which is labeled I^b.   Finally, acknowledging moves can be R or F, but never I.

2.1.4   Acts

The smallest unit of measurement in spoken discourse is the *act*.   It is similar to the morpheme only in its place on the rank scale.   Unlike the morpheme however, the act is realized 'at the level of grammar and *lexis'* (my italics) (Francis and Hunston, 1992: 128).   There are thirty-two 'acts of everyday conversation' (ibid.)   These acts are an attempt to cover all aspects of possible conversation at its smallest analysable level.   They are often distinguished by their pitch.   In other words, two or more acts that serve the same function might display polarity resulting from the high or low key of their pitch.   Finally, acts are bound to the same restrictions of position in the exchange as the moves that they realize.   For example, an *inquire* act, which realizes an elicit move, can only be found at I.

2.2   Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC)

Since the advent of *Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC),* linguists and sociologists have found the Internet to be a fruitful location to conduct research. Various studies can be found regarding the use of CMC in second language education (Green: 2000, LeLoup and Ponterio: 2000, Holliday: 1999, Sierra: 1999, Chan: 1997, Huang: 1998).   The issue of gender is another popular topic regarding *email, Internet Relay Chat (IRC)* and *computer conferencing* (Engle: 1999, Soukup: 1999, Lemon: 1999, Jaffe et al: 1999, Flanagan: 1999).   Various models and techniques have been proposed for the analysis of on-line communication (Hara: 2000, Ginther and Liu: 1999a).   Virtual classrooms have been created and often student-student, as well as student-teacher communication is carried out utilizing email.   Many studies focus on the differences in production and communication strategies within these environments from those in a real classroom (Engle: 1999, Lee: 2000, Johnson: 1995).   Comparisons outside the classroom exist as well.   Researchers have conducted comparative studies between CMC and Face-to-Face (FtF) communication and the use of (or lack of) non-verbal cues (Cochenour and Rezabeck: 1995), politeness (Simmons: 1994, Abdullah: 1998), verbal strategies (Ginther and Liu: 1999b), and turn-taking strategies (Garcia and Jacobs: 1999).

Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) is divided into two categories: *asynchronous* and *synchronous*.   Asynchronous CMC involves the use of email, electronic bulletin boards, or discussion lists.   Following the sending of a message, the intended reader may not immediately receive the asynchronous communication. Furthermore, it may be days before a response is sent and received.   Synchronous communication on the other hand is found within 'virtual chat rooms', and is termed *Internet Relay Chat*.

In IRC, messages are 'posted', or typed by participants and sent immediately to a common screen shared by other users at different computers.   Responses can be sent forthwith, if so desired, and conversations can be held between individuals or groups of people.   Garcia and Jacobs (1999) debate the term *synchronous CMC,* preferring the title *quasi-synchronous CMC (QS-CMC)*.   They state the difference between the two being that 'although posted messages are available synchronously to participants, the message production process is available only to the person composing the message' (p. 339).   Thus, in this paper, all IRC communication will be referred to as QS-CMC.

Wilkins (1991) as cited in Johnson (1995: 8) calls non-asynchronous CMC a 'traditionally oral activity - interactive discourse - now in graphic form.'   Abdullah (1998) refers to CMC as 'electronic discourse' and comments on its uniqueness in

combining orthographic and verbal communication, calling it a 'written talk.' Davis and Brewer (1997) as cited in Abdullah (ibid.) call this written talk 'writing that stands in place of voices.' They further comment on the characteristics of verbal behaviour such as 'repetition, direct address, disfluencies, and markers of personal involvement' that can be found in QS-CMC. Yet turn-taking and discourse fillers, such as 'uh' or 'er' are often absent. Users communicating in asynchronous CMC are allowed time for 'planning', which gives the communication an orthographic look. This type of planning is absent in FtF. QS-CMC finds itself in the middle, where utterances are more spontaneous than asynchronous, yet planning is greater than in true FtF communication. Finally, upon examining a corpus of CMC, Yates (1997) as stated in Abdullah (ibid.) found that in terms of lexical density, CMC more closely mimics written than spoken language (whether or it was asynchronous or QS-CMC was not stated).

CMC has been criticized for its lack of non-verbal cues and depersonalization when compared to FtF communication (Sproull and Kiesler: 1991). A 'cues-filtered –out' theory was presented (Kim: 2000). It claims that due to the lack of social and physical cues in CMC, users become 'anti-normative' and 'uninhibited'. Dubrovsky et al. (1991) as cited in Ginther and Liu, 1999a: 9) distinguish non-verbal or 'social context' cues as *static* (person's appearance) or *dynamic* (person's behaviour). Ginther and Liu (ibid.) found when groups worked to reach a common goal within the QS-CMC environment, members did become less inhibited as well as equally represented within the group. In the same study, which compared two modes of CMC analysis, participants were found to have increased intimacy with other members within the QS-CMC environment. Walther (1996) debates the legitimacy of 'cues-filtered-out' stating that a long-term examination of interaction reveals participants displaying more personal awareness, and submission to 'in-group' norms such as favoritism.

Participants in QS-CMC may overcome the lack of non-verbal cues by using *emoticons*. 'Emoticons are visual cues formed when ordinary typographical symbols that when read sideways represent feelings or emotions' (Cochenour and Rezabeck, 1995: 371). They use the following symbol ':-)' as an example of an emoticon that displays happiness or pleasure. In fact, when the above combination is typed in the current software being used by this writer, the following symbol appears: ☺. These emoticons are not restricted to QS-CMC, and can be found in most any CMC environment. Cochenour and Rezabeck (1995) state that emoticons are functional just as facial expressions are important to FtF conversation. The use of emoticons has been

found to be subject to situation formality, peer modeling, age, gender and experience of the CMC participant.

2.3   Conversation Analysis (CA)

> *CA holds that talk is 'locally managed', meaning that its patterns and structures result from what people do as they go along rather than from their being compelled to follow a course of action that has been determined in advance.*   (Cameron, 2001:90)

From the quote above, using IRF structure in combination with traditional conversation analysis would appear to be mixing two schools of thought.   Cook (1989) reports that conforming discourse to an IRF structure is seen by many as an analysis of conversation as a 'finished product', whereas traditional CA views 'discourse as a developing process' (p. 52).   This paper proposes that CA can be used to describe the ongoing discourse, breaking it into 'topic-units'.   Then the 'finished product' can be categorized using IRF.

Cameron (2001: 87) describes conversation(al) analysis (CA) as a study of 'talk-in-interaction.'   She suggests that this is due to the ability of CA to analyze a multitude of 'spoken' data, and that it is not limited to general conversation alone.   For example, Conner-Linton (1993) used his knowledge of CA to advise his acquaintances on how to improve their client relations by adjusting the discourse of their business calls. Cameron distinguishes CA from pragmatics in that, rather than focus on the implied meaning of an utterance, CA is concerned with what follows.   If the following utterance displays understanding of the previous one, such as a question followed by an answer, then in 'properly ordered talk', patterns occur.

CA is embedded in the theories of 'turn-taking' (Sacks et al.: 1974). Turn-taking involves a 'speaker' and a 'hearer'.   Garcia and Jacobs (1999) argue that, in QS-CMC there exists 'writers' and 'readers'.   They further state that turn-taking certainly exists in QS-CMC.   Yet because of the dynamics of IRC, there are systematic differences between it and that of oral communication.   Notably, message production occurs separately from message transmission in QS-CMC (p.346-347).   Furthermore, the sender of a message can observe other participants' utterances before submitting her message.   This is very different than oral communication where once an utterance begins, it is immediately observed by the hearer.   In QS-CMC, an utterance can be adjusted and the readers are not aware of it.

In IRC, all messages are posted, and there is no competition for next postings. Interruptions and simultaneous postings are impossible, as each posting is displayed in the order it is received. Therefore, what is known as'speaker selection' would be better described as 'potential next poster' (ibid.: 350). A writer can select the next writer, but multiple postings can potentially occur before the reader is able to respond. A reader can self-select, although she may not be the only participant doing so, and might observe her posting being preceded by or followed by another self-selecting writer. Finally, the initial writer may continue only if she observes no other writers contributing. However, in such a case, it is not certain that another participant is not self-selecting.

CA was born from ethnomethodology, and retains some of its concepts. 'CA distrusts linguistic categorizations of the functions of particular words or expressions' (Schiffrin,1994: 234). Specific words or phrases are believed to gain meaning through the context in which they are spoken, or put another way, their relation with prior and post-utterances (See Tannen (1984) and her reference to *framing*). Yet, worldly information such as setting, social standings of participants, and personal attributes play little or no part in CA. Schiffrin (p. 235) goes on to state that rather than focusing on what the participants 'know', a conversation analyst would be concentrating on 'the events that occur during the conversation.' These 'events reflect and realize practical knowledge' (ibid.).

Finally, adjacency pairs provide a framework on which conversation analysts can rely. They give linguistic insights (relevance) to utterances. Furthermore, 'adjacency pairs reflect the local nature of conversational structure' (Schriffin, 1994: 237). That is, they create 'assumed relevance' to the point that the second pair part need not make an attempt to identify that it is responding to the first pair part. Also, Coulthard (1985: 70) cites Sacks and his explanation that the absence of a second pair part is both 'noticeable and noticed', thus displaying the dependence of one upon the other.

Adjacency pairs can come in the form of highly predictable combinations such as 'greeting-greeting' or 'question-answer'. The former pair is possibly more predictable than the latter, in that greetings are typically limited in their response. The answers to questions can be varied, but unless an answer is provided, or further clarification requested (see Schegloff's (1972) work on 'insertion sequences' or Jefferson's (1972) analysis of 'side sequences'), there is a noticeable absence. Other first-pair types, such as proposals, offer the hearer a choice, which allows the second pair-part to be composed of a 'preferred' or 'dispreferred' response (Cameron, 2001: 97). Cameron explains that a preferred response is typically 'brief and unelaborated', unlike

dispreferred, responses which tend to be longer and begin with discourse markers.   The term 'preference' does not refer to the desirability of one response or another by the speaker, but rather that there is proof of the existence of a formal pattern regarding response types to proposals.

2.4   Cohesion and Coherence

Utterances derive meaning through context.   What is stated at the moment somehow relates to what was uttered before, and should affect what is stated after. This is true semantically as well.   The concept of *cohesion* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4) is one that 'refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as text.'   'Text' refers to 'any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole' (p.1).   Cohesion is achieved through the use of 'cohesive devices' or 'cohesive ties'.   There are grammatical (reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction) and lexical cohesive devices (lexical cohesion).   Of these devices, the most frequently used and possibly the most easily identifiable is *reference*.   Reference items are those that 'make reference to something else for their interpretation.'(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 31)   The purpose of this is to create cohesion in a text, and this is done by keeping a 'continuity of reference' (ibid.).

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 37) list three types of reference; personal (person, i.e. he, she), demonstrative (proximity, i.e. this, that) and comparative (similarity/identity, i.e. better, same).   These reference types may be bound by the text (endophoric) or situational, referring to something outside of the text (exophoric). Endophoric reference is again broken down into two types.   This breakdown depends on whether the reference points back in the text (anaphoric) or forward in the text (cataphoric).

Grice introduced the importance of relevance in conversation when he proposed his four 'maxims'.   Specifically, the category of 'Relation' simply states that one should 'be relevant' (Grice, 1989: 27).   This paper will focus on local relevance, or 'pertinence…to an immediately prior utterance' (McLaughlin, 1984: 37).   The difference between relevance and *coherence* is that relevance is between pairs of utterances, whereas coherence 'is a characteristic of a sequence of utterances taken as a unit or whole' (ibid.).

3. DATA COLLECTION AND ORGANIZATION

In this chapter, the collection and organization of data will be displayed. Section 3.1 focuses on the environment in which the data was recorded, and how that environment was selected. This is followed in Section 3.2 by a description of the variables and conditions that were set in the recording of the data. Section 3.3 concentrates on how the topic-units, or transactions, were identified within the discourse. Section 3.4 will display some of the cohesive devices that were used to maintain topic within a transaction. Finally in Section 3.5, the process of identifying and labeling exchanges taken from analysed transcripts will be described. All of the examples are taken from the recordings of IRC for this paper. Those that are labeled (e.g. Transcript 1) can be found in the Appendix.

3.1 Finding an Environment

The data for this analysis was collected in a virtual chat environment within America Online (AOL). All persons with an AOL account can access this AOL Chat environment. After typing in her user name and password, or 'logging on', a subscriber can enter AOL Chat. At this point the user is situated in a lobby. This is the initial virtual room that all users wishing to chat must enter through. It is here that a user can choose her desired room. The rooms are divided into categories (e.g. Arts & Leisure, News, Sports, Finance, Romance, to name a few). After a category is chosen, another list appears, showing the names of rooms and how many users are situated in each room. By clicking on a room title, a user enters and is announced to the room.

At this point, the user is faced with a large screen. This screen displays scrolling lines that are sporadically moving from the bottom to top. Each line contains a user's name followed by each of his or her postings. The lines scroll up quickly or slowly, depending on the number of users and the amount of conversation. To the right is a smaller screen that displays a list of the current participants in the room. Profiles of users are available from those who have chosen to provide one. Finally, at the bottom is a 'staging area' fifty-eight characters long. It is here that postings can be typed by the user. However, they cannot be viewed by the other members of the room until the user presses the enter key. After pressing the enter key, a user's utterance is posted, and can be seen by every other member in the room. The staging area is then cleared, and the user can begin typing a new utterance at anytime.

12

The room Outdoor Golf was chosen as the environment to be observed. After considerable 'lurking' (Simpson: 2000), or casually observing in different rooms, it was found that Outdoor Golf was the most conducive room for analysis. This was evidenced by the discovery that in most of the other rooms, very few actual 'conversations' were taking place. Instead, random insults, comments, questions regarding age or sex and attempts to disrupt communication appeared to be the norm.

Outdoor Golf had a more focused group of participants. Upon entering the room, many people were greeted, strings of conversations could be observed and very little profanity and sex play occurred. Also, those who tried to disrupt the environment soon gave up as the regular members would ignore them, or make it known that they were unwanted. It was apparent that there were some regular members who communicated with each other on a first name basis. In other words, regular users tended to address each other by their true first names, rather than by their nickname, or 'nick' (Simpson: 2000). Topics were of a friendly semi-personal nature, and often did not involve golf. 'Semi-personal' implies that participants were asking about the health and well being of family members, the status of gardens or home repairs and general questions about each other's daily life.

3.2   Recording Discourse

Ten to twenty minute pieces of 'chat' discourse were recorded at a time, for a total of approximately two hours. It was decided that rather than recording two sixty-minute segments, the shorter segments would display discourse from various participants, each using their unique 'style' (Tannen: 1984). This in turn would add to the overall analysis. However, because the recording often started in the middle of a conversation or conversations, much of the data in the beginning of each recording could not be accurately analysed. This was due to the lack of reference with prior discourse. It was then decided to lengthen the recordings from 10 to 20 minutes. Another variable was the number of participants. A recording was never started if fewer than eight, or more than fifteen, participants were in the room. It was thought that fewer participants might not display the difficulty in maintaining an analysis of a large body of people, and more than fifteen would be unmanageable. It should be noted that, if the number of participants dropped below, or rose above, these limits during the recording, the recording was allowed to continue.

The recording method used was relatively simple. Lines were highlighted and then 'cut and pasted' within a word processing environment (Microsoft Word). These lines included the user name, his or her posting and messages announcing entry or exit.

After the recordings were extracted and saved into Word, they were analyzed for conversations. Using various CA techniques, strings of conversation were initially color-coded, and then numbered for later analysis. In this way the log of discourse was kept in its natural state, while conversations could be identified throughout. Finally, concerns of privacy regarding the recording conversations without consent were resolved by shortening the nicknames of the participants to only two letters.

3.3 Transcript Analysis

Initially, as the transcripts were analysed, links between postings were sought. These links were sometimes as short as two postings in length, or much longer, involving multiple participants. Also, gaps between linked postings, where conversations by other members occurred, were quite common. Therefore, what initially appeared to be the beginning of a new conversation, might, upon referring back in the transcript, be the resumption of a prior topic. Once the beginning of a topic was identified, the conclusion was not always apparent. The conversations seemed to 'die out' in the sense that there were no identifiable endings. Rather, it was found that the starting of a new conversation by one or member of a past conversation signaled the possible conclusion of the prior topic.

It should be noted that the elements 'topic' and 'conversation' are very similar in meaning. Unlike FtF interaction, where a conversation often consists of multiple topics, the transcripts here displayed conversations typically consisting of one topic. Topic change usually constituted conversation change, in that participants switched along with the topic. As Francis and Hunston (1992:140) state: 'We do not propose here to go into the thorny question of 'topic', which must remain a pre-theoretical and intuitive notion.' To avoid confusion, any sequence of postings that are considered to be coherent, cohesive, or contain relevance will be labeled a 'transaction'.

Topic change involved at least one of two conditions. The most common condition was topic change that coincided with participant change, creating a new transaction. The other condition, topic change involving the same participants, could also constitute a new transaction. However, this occurrence was rare, due in part by the lack of ability to use intonation and the absence of frames. In other words, participants were either unable, or preferred not to, give signals that they a wanted to begin a new topic with their conversational partner(s).

3.4 Identification of Cohesive Devices

In this section, the technique for observing the continuation of a topic will be displayed. It was discussed in Chapter 2 that CA focuses on information given within the discourse. Preceding, and following, responses orient utterances within the conversation. Grammatical cohesion facilitates orientation. Three types of grammatical cohesion exist; *substitution, ellipsis*, and *reference*. Substitution and ellipsis are relations on a grammatical level and will not be discussed (For more on this distinction, see Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 6). However, examples of reference, which involves relations on a semantic level, will be examined. Reference is identified by three types; *personal, demonstrative*, and *comparative*. Only examples of personal and demonstrative reference will be given below, as occurrences of comparative references were rarely observed.

Example 3A

        26   JL: Regina who is silverymoon

        27   Bp: why??

    * 28   Bu: lol mfg...now a sophomore :)

        29   JL: He was in here this morning and knew me

        30   JL: and he said you would fill me in

        31   Bp: knew you?

        32   JL: yes

        33   JL: I dont know him

        34   Bp: I dont know how he knows you, sorry

        35   JL: LoL

Personal reference uses pronouns to refer to items in prior utterances. In example 3A, every line was linked except for line 28 (which is marked with an asterisk). Personal reference was used throughout. Only in line 26 were proper nouns used (Regina, Silverymoon). Lines 29, 30 and 34 used the pronoun 'he' to identify Silverymoon, and 'him' was used in line 33. The pronoun 'me' was used to represent the initiator of the conversation (JL). Both participants used 'You' to identify one another. In line 30, the use of 'you' pointed to the participant Bp, who then replied: 'knew you?' which pointed back at JL. The two participants appeared to have a clear idea of what the other one was talking about, even when using the same words to identify different people.

Incidents of demonstrative reference were less prevalent than personal throughout the transcripts of IRC. Demonstrative reference involves proximity and can be identified by the use of determiners or the adverbs 'here' and 'there'. As was described above, these devices can point within the discourse or outside.

Example 3B (Transcript 1)

⟶   67   Bp: you could go to prom if an upper classman asked, right, gal?

⟶   68   Go: yup

      69   Online Host: MO has exited the room.

      70   Online Host: Tr has exited the room.

⟶   71   Go: but that was last night also

Example 3B was taken from the middle of a string of discourse. In line 67 a question was asked regarding 'prom'. In line 71 Go answered the question stating 'but that was last night also'. In this case 'that' represented 'prom'.

Example 3C (Transcript 3)

⟶   28   Wh: are you alright this morning?   you are so quiet

      29   Online Host: CO has entered the room.

⟶   30   Je: yeah Im fine....dang kids are fighting AGAIN

Example 3C displays demonstrative reference outside the discourse. Line 28 was the first line in the start of a new topic. The reference by Wh to 'this morning' did not refer to any past discourse, but rather it clarified to the reader (Je) that the topic was the morning of today, as opposed to yesterday, or tomorrow.

A feature of demonstrative reference unique to IRC was observed. Holmes (1995: 212) distinguishes two types of 'deictic' expressions within IRC. He states that one type identifies the participant's 'physical location', and the other the 'location in the virtual space of the computer network'. An example of each type is displayed below.

In example 3D, the topic of the exchange (lines 23 and 27) was the physical location of the two participants. This was apparent due to the topic of the conversation, which was the weather, and the mention of 'PA', the abbreviation for Pennsylvania, a state located in the eastern United States. The posting in line 27 displayed the desire by Tr for sunny weather at her location (which was unknown at the time).

Example 3D (Transcript 1)

⟶ 23 Bp: Kimm, I am in PA, and it is sunny here, for once

24 Online Host: Go has entered the room.

25 Sk: <played MOn-Wed--Yesterday--headed to the casino for 2 days

26 Go: Im going golfing today yayayayay!!!!!!1

⟶ 27 Tr: wish it was sunny here

Conversely, example 3E displays an example of the second type of deictic expression.   The question posed by Go in line 31 refers not to the physical location of AG, but rather her existence in the chat room.   Participants never displayed confusion in recognizing which type of reference had been posted.

Example 3E

⟶ 31 Go: AG, you still around in here

32 Ga: lol..

33 Go1:   man, long time no see

34 Ga: Mariners'..

⟶ 35 AG: Hello Angel

3.5   Attaching Labels

Transcript 2 from the Appendix will be used to display some points in the label attaching process, and can be used for reference.   Also, reference to Analysis 2 in the Appendix will show the post-analysis of Transcript 2.   Examples 3F, 3G and 3H can all be found in Transcript 2.

Unlike the initial recording of transcripts and identification of transactions using number-coding, the second analysis categorized smaller units of discourse. Similar to the system of analysis devised by Francis and Hunston (1992), the transactions were broken down into exchanges and moves.   Exchanges were numbered per their existence within in each transaction.   Exchanges and moves were also labeled by name (e.g. Elicit, Informing). Acts were not labeled as the purpose of the analysis was to attempt to create a system of exchange.   This could be done without labeling acts.

Three transactions were found in Transcript 2.   As stated in Francis and Hunston (1992: 134), an *opening move* has the function to 'initiate a conversation.' The third line of the transcript was identified as the beginning of the first transaction, and was analysed as an opening move.   Because it was the third line of the transcript, it

was not certain whether this was truly the beginning of a new topic. It could have been the continuation of an ongoing topic. Yet, its position was at the beginning of the analysis, and was a question that was directed at the room. Therefore, it was labeled as an opening move of a Structuring exchange. However, a problem existed in line 6, as seen in example 3F, where Bi gave follow-up to the answering statement given by Ti.

Example 3F (Transcript 2)

3	Bi:	What kind of balls do you gentlemen hit?	*Initiation*
4	Bi:	Callaway? Titleist?	
5	Ti:	titleist pro v1	*Response*
6	Bi:	They sell out	**Follow-up*

Francis and Hunston (ibid.) describe an opening move as being the initiating move in a S*tructuring exchange*. Like G*reet* and *Summon* exchanges, which share its purpose of 'organizing' conversation, Structuring exchanges are an obligatory two-part exchange consisting of two elements; *initiation* and *response*. Yet this structuring exchange in Example 3F consisted of a third part that was ambiguous to the analyst. Because of the delay of responses within the data, it was possible that the element in line 6 was given in response to a prior posting. Or it may have been a comment by Bi to further expand upon his postings in lines 3 and 4. In this analysis, it was accepted as follow-up. This was due in part to the lack of evidence stating that such follow-up was impossible. Francis and Hunston state that initiation and response are 'obligatory', but do not specifically state that a third element is impossible. Finally, if Ti had uttered a response to the statement in line 6, then 'They sell out' could have been analysable as the initiation of a new exchange.

The series of exchanges in Example 3G were identified as incomplete I*nform* exchanges. Lines 8, 9, 11 and 12 provide information, yet they lack a response required for them to be the first half of a complete exchange. The frequency of incomplete exchanges will be discussed in Section 5.4.

Example 3G (Transcript 2)

8	Ra:	I GOT A WHOLE BOX	*Initiation*
9	Bi:	I like the Callaways reds	*Initiation*
10	Online Host:	Tr has entered the room.	
11	Ti:	sometimes use pro 90s or 100s	*Initiation*

12   Bi: DT 100 superspins are sweet   *Initiation*

13   Bi: ANy of you hit the Taylor Made balls when they came out????

Rather than respond to the initiation line 8, Bi chose to give his own information. Ti followed suit in line 11, and Bi initiated another statement in line 12. Although all four postings were relevant in that they had focused on the same subject, they lacked structural ties. Information was provided as it related to the topic, but not to the previous posting. Therefore all four of these moves were analysed as initiating moves in incomplete Inform exchanges.

Ambiguity was common in postings labeled as responses. The placement of statements following initiations could not be relied upon to support the prior move. Because of the recognizable delay in message posting, it was possible that a response that appeared to be follow-up to an immediately prior move, actually existed in reaction to an posting some lines back.

Example 3H (Transcript 2)

13   Bi: ANy of you hit the Taylor Made balls when they came out????   *Initiation A*

14   Bi: the liquid one   lol   those where erratic

15   Online Host: Sh has entered the room.

16   Online Host: Tr has exited the room.

17   Ra: PRO V1 RULE   *Initiation B*

18   Ti: never hit one   *Response A*

19   Sh: hey room

20   Ra: I SUGGEST THEM FOR EVERYONE

21   Bi: They are erratic   i dont suggest them   *Response B*

22   Sh: the Pro VI suck   *Response B*

23   Ti: there a good ball rat   *Response B*

24   Ra: SOFT FEEL GREAT SPIN AND CONTROL ON THE GREEN   *Initiation C*

25   Bi: Rat everyone knows the proV1 is good   *Response C*

26   Bi: It has good distance

In Example 3H, Exchanges A and B overlap. Initiation A was displayed in lines 13 and 14. It must be noted here that an posting displayed over multiple and successive lines may denote different possibilities. For example, Bi might have realized after posting line 13 that he wanted to be more specific, as well as give his

opinion prior to other responses.   He might also have decided to split the statements, as there were a limited number of characters one could type for each posting.   Rather than having to stop in mid-statement, he might have chosen to place the latter half in the next line.

Line 18 was labeled a response to Initiation A as evidenced by the use of substitution ('one').   Although line 17 preceded the response in Initiation A, it was considered a new initiation, and was labeled as Initiation B.   Line 20 was a continuation of the posting in line 17.   Line 21 was labeled as a response to Initiation B.   There were two features to support this.   Firstly, Bi had stated that 'they' were erratic, agreeing with the use of 'them' by Ra.   Secondly, he had repeated the word 'suggest'.   However, the response to Initiation C was peculiar.   After claiming in line 21 that the Pro V1 was 'erratic' and that he did not 'suggest them', Bi stated that 'everyone knows the pro V1 is good'.   This apparent change of opinion opened the possibility that the posting 'They are erratic' in line 21 possibly could have been a correction for the misspelling in line 14, or perhaps he was trying to emphasize the point by repeating it.   Questions and uncertainty often arose throughout the analysis, resulting in multiple changes over time by the analyst.

4.   TRANSACTIONAL UNDERTAKINGS

In this chapter, resulting patterns of discourse that were found in the analysis will be identified.   Specifically, they will be patterns that were seen to begin transactions.   Examples taken from the data will also be given.

Because of the absence of frames and intonation in IRC, a term used to describe a change in topic was considered, and the term *transactional undertaking* was created.   Participants did not finish and begin new topics as might be observed in a FtF conversation.   Rather, topics were often initiated, or undertaken, by greetings caused by the entry into the chat room of a new participant.   In addition, topics were undertaken when participants changed conversational 'partners'.   This occurred when an outsider directed a question, statement, or greeting at the participant of an ongoing conversation.   The closure of the prior conversation relied on the members of that conversation, as participants were observed engaging in multiple conversations concurrently.   Finally, there were occurrences of topic change that did not involve greetings.   These involved a participant issuing forth some piece of information, unrelated to the prior topic, in the expectation of a response.   Therefore, because of the lack of identifiable transactional terminations, and of the existence of pattern signals of transactional undertaking, the analysis focused on how transactions were begun.   Two patterns were identified as *greeting* and *non-greeting transactional undertakings*.

4.1   Transactional Undertaking as a Greeting

Transactions were sometimes undertaken by participants using Opening moves. Opening moves, as defined by Francis and Hunston (1992: 134), have the function of 'initiat[ing] a conversation'.   Opening moves can also be 'used in the rituals of greeting and leave-taking' (ibid.: 129).   In this section, opening moves will only be observed for their function as a greeting.   A greeting was a highly visible signal of the beginning of a new transaction.   Rarely were greetings posted between participants of whom at least one had not recently entered the room.   In other words, greetings were used by new participants to greet the room, or for those new participants to be greeted. Hence, greetings were identified as *new participant-initiated* or *new participant-focused.*

4.1.1 New Participant-Initiated Greetings

Upon entering a room, a new participant could choose to either greet a particular member, or the room. Example 4A displays a new participant greeting another member.

Example 4A

⟶   43   Online Host: Sm has entered the room.

     44   AG: yes it is

     4

     45   Ma: how bout dem reds !!!!

     5

     46   Gk: goodnite all   6

     47   AG: Hello Linda

     7

     48   Jp: packing!!!!   ?

     49   Go: hey Jill   8

⟶   50   Sm   Hi Aurora   7

     51   Ma: r they on a streak or what ?

     5

     52   AG: me streaking?

     5

Sm entered the room in line 43. He appeared to recognize AG as someone he knew, because he greeted her in line 50. The true first name of AG is Aurora. AG was not recorded responding to the greeting by Sm. This could be due to the current involvement of AG in a conversation. However, this was unusual as participants displayed the ability to monitor multiple conversations. Therefore the reason for not returning this greeting is unclear.

Example 4B displays a new participant greeting the room. This was a much more common observation. When greeting the room, participants often used the title 'room' or 'all' to address all participants (e.g. 'Hey room!', 'Good Morning All.'). The participant named Go, in line 64, did not use this title to address the room.

Example 4B

⟶   61   Online Host: Go has entered the room.

     62   Bp: it gets expensive, Janet

     63   Me: I got a plan alright lol

→   64   Go: heyheyhey

        →   65   Sk: gallllllllllllllllllllllllllllll85

        →   66   Bp: hi Ash

        →   67   Me: hello Gal

        →   68   Go: whats up'?

        →   69   JL: Hi Ash

        70   Hi: you are referring to a wire, I hope...   lol

        71 Bp: LOL

        72 Online Host: JL has exited the room.

        73 MA: yep   lol

        →   74 Dc: hey gal

        75 Online Host: Re has exited the room.

        →   76 Go: james taylor is da best!!!!!!!!!!!!!!11

In example 4B, Go entered the room in line 61 and greeted the room in line 64. She received many responses (lines 65, 66, 67, 69, 74) and even responded to them (line 68).   In line 76 she proceeded to make a statement.   This in turn started a transaction involving 27 lines of discourse and multiple members.   Therefore, her greeting was observed as the signal of a transactional undertaking, or the start of a transaction, although that topic was limited to only greetings.   This transaction ended when Go started a new one with her declaration in line 76 (see Section 4.2.2).

4.1.2   New Participant-Focused Greetings

In example 4C below, lines 45, 49 and 53 were identified as new participant-focused greetings.   Members of the room were first informed that a new participant, Mi, had entered the room in line 43.   The three new participant-focused greetings in lines 45, 49 and 53 were posted by three different members.   Mi in turn responded to the first greeting in line 48, and then to the second one in line 50.   A response to the greeting in line 53 was not observed.   This was likely a result of the question Mi posed after his greeting to KI.   KI responded, and the transaction continued.   It was because of this question that the transaction continued.   If KI in line 52 offered this information without any prompting, this would then be identified as the beginning of a new transaction.

23

Example 4C

43 ► Online Host: Mi has entered the room.

    44 Xx: thanks

► 45 NJ: hi mizzzzz

    46 Xx: i dunno   we are getting rained out

    47 PD: MIKE DID GET ANY OF THAT RAIN LAST WEEK

► 48 Mi: hi NJ

► 49 KI: Mizuno man hey buddy

► 50 Mi: hi 18...how are you?

    51 PD: THAT WAS DUMPING 3-4 IN

► 52 KI: i just ordered some irons

► 53 Ir: hi miz

    54 MF: GOT 4 INCHES

► 55 Mi: which ones?

4.2   Non-Greeting Transactional Undertakings

Non-greeting transactional undertakings were identified as the beginnings of transactions that involved the addressing of a participant without the use of a greeting. This pattern of undertaking typically involved addressing someone who had not just entered the room.   This pattern of undertaking was broken into two categories; *questioning* and *declaring*.

4.2.1   Questioning Undertakings

Questioning undertakings were more common than other non-greeting types. Two versions were observed.   The first one was labeled *participant addresses another*. Here the addresser stated the name of the addressee and then followed it with a question The name used was often the user's true name and not his or her nickname.   Such is the case in example 4D.

Example 4D

    6   AG: lol

    7   AG: Johnson send me a pic please?

► 8   LI: Jill why so quiet tonight

    9   Ji: i am?

    10 Ma: yes u r

    11 Ji: just ready to call it an evening, kinda tierd

Line 8 displays the beginning of a topic, which received an immediate response in line 9.   This undertaking led to a short discussion with other members about how late it was and their desire to go to sleep. This initial exchange (lines 8-10) was somewhat unique in that the discourse between the two participants was uninterrupted by postings from other conversations.   Questions posed in this fashion, with the addressee's name stated either before or after the question, were always answered.

The lack of punctuation in line 8 should be noted.   Even without the use of a question mark, Ji understood the posting to be a question.   She used punctuation in her attempt to clarify the validity of the question.   Also, in line 7, an unrelated question displayed the use of punctuation.   The patterns of use and non-use were unclear, but participants generally appeared to understand the meaning of a posting, with or without punctuation.

The second type of questioning undertaking was labeled *participant questions the room*.   Here a general question was asked of all members of the room.   Three response types were labeled including: *solitary, multiple* and *zero response*.   Examples of the first two will be given.   An example of zero response will not be shown due to the non-undertaking of a topic that resulted when an addresser was not acknowledged.

Example 4E
Solitary response:

⟶   161   Dc: does anyone want to iron my clothes for me?

      162   AG: Je

      163   Wi: hi AG, sittin pretty here, and u?

      164   Online Host: Bp has entered the room

      165   Go: Yes Aurora

      166   Online Host: WI has exited the room

      167   JE: hi   everyone

      168   Wi: hey wedge, how are ya?

      169   Dc: regggggg

      170 AG: same thing I just got back

⟶   171 Go: sure wedge send them over

      172 Go: lol

In example 4E, line 161 displayed a question by Dc addressing the room.   The participant in line 168, nicknamed Wi, greeted Dc, but did not recognize his question

(Wi had entered the room 10 lines prior to line 161).   Line 171 displayed the only response to the question posed by Dc.   Note that the use of 'wedge' in line 168 and 171 refer to part of the nickname of Dc.

Example 4F (Transcript 3)
Multiple response:

⟶　　97　CO: anyone know what to take to get rid of a cold

　　　　98　VO:　　　　　how old r they now jenn?

　　　　99　VO:　　　　　c ya wawa

　　　　100 Je:　vod..who?

　　　　101 CO:　like a persistent cough

⟶　　102 Li:　Come, if I had that answer, I'd be RICH lol

⟶　　103 Je:　nyquil works

　　　　The question elicited in line 97 of example 4F by CO received two responses from two different participants (lines 102 and 103).   Li in line 102 addressed CO before giving a comment.   Je in line 103 did not, but gave an answer by recommending medicine for a cold.   Again, a question mark was not used in the posting of the question.

4.2.2　Declaring Undertakings
　　　　The second category of non-greeting transactional undertaking was labeled declaring.   Two types were observed, labeled *enthusiastic* and *negative declarations*. An enthusiastic declaration displayed members attempting to start conversations by typing an announcement or emphatic statement, often with exclamation points, use of all capitals, or other methods to display enthusiasm.   Below is an example.

Example 4G
Enthusiastic declaration

⟶　　234 Wo: i made a 350yd hole in 1

　　　　235　AG: I had Hot Flashes all day

⟶　　236　Wo: yaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

　　　　237　Go: bye Aurara

⟶　　238　Hi:　　　　congrat Wooley

　　　　239　AG:Bye Donna

　　　　240　Go: Reg, greg   and wedge

$\longrightarrow$ 241   Wo: thanx

242   Go: night

$\longrightarrow$ 243 Bp: my big news is I made a birdie yesterday, LOL

Line 234 of example 4G displayed a participant (Wo) describing a recent achievement.   In line 236 he followed it with what appeared to be a cheer of exuberance.   Line 238 displayed another participant (Hi) congratulating Wo.   Wo thanked Hi in line 241.   Then in line 243 a third participant (Bp) described her achievement, which related to the original statement in line 234.   From here the conversation continued among the three, plus another member (Ge), about the accomplishment of Bp.   Thus the topic, it could be labeled 'the day's golf achievements', was opened by Wo and his enthusiastic declaration, and then continued by Bp.

A second type of declaring undertaking was labeled *negative declarations*. This type was identifiable by the existence of negative or insulting comments. Responses varied from complete disregard to a group verbal attack.   These postings were usually made in the form of a statement, and would be followed by another declaration a few lines down, whether there was a response or not.   The purpose did not appear to be to provide any information, but rather to shock or irritate.   For example, in one transcript, a participant, after making a negative declaration, exited the room before he could read the multitude of responses regarding his choice of words.

Example 3H displays a negative declaration made by Mt in line 47.   This was followed by another one by Mt in line 51, and then a response to it in line 52 by Wa. As was typically the case, the response by Wa was negative as well, using a non-verbal gesture of sorts indicating that he had hung up a telephone.   The declarations by Mt were recognizable because of the use of all capital letters.   This is usually considered rude within the chat environment, and is compared to a person yelling.

Example 4H (Transcript 3)

Negative declarations

$\longrightarrow$ 47   Mt: I JUST BELCHED AND IT SMELLS LIKE SAUCE

48   Wh: Gyp   ^5

49   CO: why do they wait til you get on the phone?

50   Gy: get a big super water soaker

$\longrightarrow$ 51   Mt: AND I AM FAT AND NUDE

$\longrightarrow$ 52   Wa: Mtn how lovely <click

The identification of this type is possibly the least conventional. Other declarations were identified by a participant's choice of lexis. In the occurrence of a negative declaration, the analyst relied on the responses of other members to categorize it as negative. If there had been no response, then the topic was not identified as undertaken. If the response had been positive, then an analyst did not identify the undertaking as negative, even if he believed it to be.

5. ANALYSIS OF EXCHANGES

The following sections will focus primarily on the data after it had been analysed using Exchange Theory.   Identification of exchange types within IRC will be displayed as well as some of the problems that were encountered during the analysis. The three most common exchanges found in the data will be discussed in Section 5.1 (Inform), Section 5.2 (Elicit) and Section 5.3 (Greet).   Limited space and the relatively low number of occurrences do not allow for a full discussion of Direct and Clarify exchanges.   Finally Section 5.3 will focus on incomplete exchanges as almost 25% of the exchanges within the analysis were found to be incomplete.   All of the examples are taken from the analysis of IRC for this paper.   Those that are labeled (e.g. Analysis 1) can be found in the Appendix.   Furthermore, a description of the symbols and abbreviations used in the examples are located in the Appendix.

5.1   Inform Exchanges

Inform exchanges are comprised of an informing move at I (or Initiation), followed by an acknowledging move at R (Response).   Informing moves 'offer information' (Francis and Hunston, 1992: 135) whereas acknowledging moves 'provide positive or negative follow-up' (ibid.).   Example 5A displays a two-part inform exchange.

Example 5A (Analysis 1)

8	Bp:	the shade I really like are	informing	I	Inform	2
9		the coral ones				
10	MA:	yes Coral are nice	acknowledging	R		

Here the acknowledging move displayed positive follow-up as MA agreed with the opinion of Bp.

Inform exchanges, like all conversational exchanges, can also carry a third element, F (Follow-up), which is not limited to one utterance.   Unlike I, which is *predicting*, and R which is *predicted* (Stubbs, 1983: 138), F is neither.   In an Inform exchange, F is also realized by an acknowledging move.   Example 5B displays a three-part Inform exchange.

Example 5B (Analysis 1)

43	Bp:	I drive through that way	informing	I	Inform	13
44		enroute to Indiana, Trim				
45	Tr:	just a small town packa	acknowledging	R		
46	Bp:	the world is full of em, Trim	acknowledging	F		

Tr appeared to be attempting to terminate the conversation. Her general lack of enthusiasm about the fact that Bp frequents her town was a good indicator of her desire to do so. If this was true, she was successful, as this was the last exchange of the transaction. In line 46, Bp did not offer any new information, nor did she elicit information. Instead, she supported the acknowledging move in line 45.

Inform exchanges existed in the analysis with multiple moves in the F position. The number of follow-up moves that are allowed within an exchange is infinite. This is true as long as the participants continue to support or display lack of support for prior statements within the exchange. Example 5C displays an Inform exchange between two participants. Although PG acknowledged the informing move made by JS, he objected to it. This is followed by two more objections, both of which acknowledge each other.

Example 5C (Analysis 3)

244	JS:	if Fuzzy could get away	informing	I	Inform	50
245		with it,				
246		he might have called				
247		him a Nigger				
248		you know Fuzzy,				
249		its all in a joke				
250	PG:	That's a whole	acknowledging	R		
251		nother topic.				
252	JS:	no it isnt	acknowledging	F		
253	PG:	Yes it is	acknowledging	F		

Although the type of multiple follow-up, as displayed in Example 5C, is common in FtF conversation, it was rarely found in the data. More commonly, multiple follow-up occurred when more than two participants were involved in an exchange. Example 5D is an example of this. Here, the exchange displayed an

informing move at I.   Three participants, in lines 22-27, acknowledged the statement, one of them twice.   These four moves were all labeled R as they acknowledged I in line 20.   Line 28, posted by the initiator of the exchange, acknowledged the responses, and was therefore labeled F.   This style of organizing moves by multiple participants was found to be the most efficient.

Example 5D (Analysis 5)

20	Gd:	I was so wild in the 70's	informing	I	Inform	3	3
21		hehhe					
22	Le:	baaaad boy	acknowledging	R			
23	Ta:	you're kidding GD......	acknowledging	R			
24		lol					
25	Jp:	It was really wild.	acknowledging	R			
26		I was like Four?					
27	Le:	livin does that to ya, lol	acknowledging	R			
28	Gd:	mellow man now	acknowledging	F			
29		lol					

Follow-up is identifiable in its reference to a response or another follow-up, not to the initiation.   In Example 5E, four acknowledging moves were identified.   The first one was labeled a response to the initiation.   The second move, posted by a third participant, was also labeled R because of its acknowledgement not of the previous response, but of the initiation in line 100.   Line 106 was labeled F, as it was posted by a fourth participant, acknowledging the response by Ta.   Finally, in line 107, the acknowledgement by Ta of the previous follow-up directed at her, was also labeled F.

Example 5E (Analysis 5)

100	Kn:	3/4ths of people that golf	informing	I	Inform	16
101		are pretty BAD! LOL				
102	Ta:	I'm in that 3/4.....	acknowledging	R		
103		lol				
104	Gd:	some days are bad...	acknowledging	R		
105		some not so bad				
106	Le:	me too Tammy, lol	acknowledging	F		
107	Ta:	but it's fun	acknowledging	F		

5.2 Elicit Exchanges

An Elicit exchange is distinctive from an Inform.   The initiating move serves to seek or 'elicit' information.   The response must always be an informing move, as an acknowledging move has the function of supporting prior moves, not providing information.   Example 5F displays an Elicit exchange between two participants.

Example 5F

62	JL:	Heidi - did you get that job	eliciting	I	Elicit	15	7
63	He:	janet i should hear on or about tuesday	informing	R			
64	JL:	Good Luck	acknowledging	F			
65	He:	thanks!	acknowledging	F			

Line 62 displayed a question and information was provided in line 63.   Line 64 supported the response in 63, and line 65 acknowledged the follow-up in 64.

Similar to Inform exchanges, multiple participants created exchanges that often had several responses.   Often eliciting moves were directed at a certain member of the group.   Occasionally other members took it upon themselves to give their information as well.

Example 5G (Analysis 4)

117 Ma:	goodnight sexy	answering	R	
118 LI:	who you callin sexy/	eliciting	I	Elicit
119 AG:	lol	informing	R	
120	me			
121 Ma:	u of course	informing	R	
122 LI:	awwww	acknowledging	F	
123	yea ok matt			
124	lol			

In Example 5G, LI initiated an eliciting move directed at Ma regarding his statement in the preceding exchange.   The first participant to answer was AG, even though the question had not been directed at her.   It appeared to be an attempt at humor. Ma responded, and then follow-up came from LI, the initiator of the question.   This analysis was difficult because firstly, the initial response was made by someone outside

the conversation.   Then the follow-up was directed at the second response, of whom the eliciting move was targeted.   The first response was not acknowledged.   Including both informing moves, in the order they were posted, was the most efficient way to display the data for two reasons.   The initial response could not be left out of the analysis, as it contributed to the exchange.   Also, it could not be placed separately as there would be no initiation to precede it.

This same type of multiple response, which is displayed in Example 5H, occurred when questions were elicited to the room.

Example 5H (Analysis 5)

89	Jp:	We are talking about	eliciting	I	Elicit	14
90		badmitton, aren't we?				
91	Le:	yes, it's a baaaad game	inform	R		
92	SC:	NO GOLF YOU IDIOT	inform	R		
93	Gd:	no Jph...	inform	R		
94		you mean bad golf lol				
95	Jp:	Shit,	acknowl	F		
96		I must be in the				
97		wrong room				

Jp elicited a tag question and received three responses.   Lines 92 and 93 displayed negative responses, whereas line 91 was positive.   Although the content of follow-up in line 95 would appear to acknowledge the negative responses, all three were grouped together.   This example demonstrates the difficulty in maintaining structure. The informing move in line 91 was a response to the eliciting move preceding it.   Yet the follow-up by Jp did not coincide with the affirmative response by Le, but rather the two negative response in lines 92 and 93.   Although the polarity of the response was different than the other two, it could not be analysed outside of the exchange and had to be included within it.

5.3   Greet Exchanges

Unlike Inform and Elicit exchanges, which are conversational, Greet exchanges are labeled as organizational, with the function 'to greet or take leave' (Francis and Hunston, 1992: 137).   They are identifiable as consisting of an opening, followed by an answering move.   However, a common feature found of Greet exchanges within data was a 'three-part greeting'.   Often upon entering a chat room,

new participants initially greeted the room, and then waited for others to either reply or initiate a greeting.   Furthermore, because rooms were occupied by more than two participants, the number of greeters of the new participant was not limited to one (see Section 4.1).   Data taken from Transcript 1 will be displayed first in the explanation of the anomaly of the three-part greeting.

Example 5I (Transcript 1)

⟶   6   Online Host: Tr has entered the room.

          7   Bp: the shade I really like are the coral ones

          8   MA: right after they flowers fall off Reg..trim them way back

⟶   9   Tr: hi room

         10 MA: yes Coral are nice

⟶   11   Bp: hi trim

⟶   12   Sk: <wavin to Kimm

⟶   13   Tr: hi Bp

In line 6 from example 5I above, the entrance of Tr into the room was announced.   In line 9 she greeted the room.   In line 11 Bp replied to her greeting.   Sk in line 12 also greeted Tr in a way unique to IRC.   The use of < denotes an action by the participant.   In a sense this person was using a non-verbal cue to signal a greeting. One who reads this script can imagine the participant actually waving at Tr.   Finally in line 13, Tr responded to the greeting by Bp.   If line 12 is ignored for the moment, this exchange could be analysed like this:

    Tr: Hi room

    Bp: Hi trim

    Tr: hi Bp

Francis and Hunston (1992) in their analysis limit a greeting to two moves, Initiation and Response.   How can their system be adapted to the above sequence? One possibility would be to make the initial greeting incomplete (line 9), the second posting an initiation of a Greet exchange (line 11) and the third a response (line 13). Unfortunately the motivation behind the greeting by Bp is unknown.   Did she respond to the announcement of the entrance of Tr in line 6, or to her greeting in line 9?   If the former is true, then the suggested analysis above of an initial incomplete Greet exchange would be appropriate, as Bp was assumed to be initiating an opening move

based on her knowledge of the entry into the room by Tr, not as a response to line 9.   If the latter is assumed, then the posting by Bp must be labeled a response to the initiation by Tr in line 9.

Perhaps more evidence can be found by the greeting, or reply-greeting (ibid.: 134), given by Sk.   As was stated above, Sk used a device unique to IRC that enabled him to use non-verbal cues, in this case waving.   If the postings were to be lined up in isolation, they would look like this.

Tr: Hi Room

Sk: <wavin to Kim

Now a two-part greeting exists, but a rather unusual one.   The initiating move addressed the room.   As Cameron (2001:96) proposes that interaction involves 'adjacent utterances in which the second utterance is not just related to the first but functionally dependent on it.'   If this is true then the posting (or action) by Sk served as a response to the greeting by Tr.   An alternative analysis would conclude that Sk was initiating an opening move by simply waving at Tr after she was announced to have entered the room.   Thus the move by Sk would be labeled the opening move of an incomplete exchange.

There is a major problem to all of this analysis.   These were not 'adjacent utterances' in that they did not follow each other in the list of postings.   In fact, the action by Sk followed the greeting by Bp, so adjacency does not exist between the moves made by Tr and Sk.   Yet the dynamics of IRC are such that the two utterances must be considered adjacent based on the fact of the functional reliance of the second utterance upon the first.   Therefore the analysis of this greeting sequence can be seen in Example 5J.

Example 5J

18	Tr:	hi room	opening	I	Greet	4	2
19	Bp:	hi trim	answering	R			
20	Sk:	<wavin to Kimm	answering	R			
21	Tr:	hi Bpacka	answering	F			

Tr initiated a greeting in line 18 to which both Bp and Sk replied in lines 19 and 20 respectively.   Furthermore, Tr responded to the greeting by Bp in line 21, which was a response to the initial greet by Tr.   Therefore line 21 was labeled as an

answering move giving follow-up.   This is an unconventional structure as it is a three-part Greet exchange.   Yet the dynamics of the chat room are such that with multiple participants, the labeling of exchanges with more than one response is most efficient.   This efficiency carries over into the existence of a follow-up move in the Greet exchange.   Without it, the analyst would have to label a move, such as the one in line 21, that is clearly a response, as the initiation of an incomplete exchange.

5.4   Incomplete Exchanges

When analysing the data using exchange theory, the occurrence of an incomplete exchange was not uncommon.   As discussed in Section 2.1.2, an initiation is *predicting* and a response *predicted*, but both are obligatory.   Within Exchange Theory I cannot exist without an R, and an R is always subject to I preceding it.   Thus 'the minimum number of moves in an exchange is two' (Francis and Hunston, 1992: 147).   Any exchange with less than two moves was labeled incomplete.   This would include questions without answers, information without acknowledgement and greetings without returned greetings.   An exception is a Direct exchange.   This exchange is initiated by a request for action, and the completion of the action is the response. Therefore a verbal, or posted, response may not exist.

Seven hundred and nine total exchanges were coded from all of the transcriptions.   Twenty three percent of these, or 166 incomplete exchanges, were found.   Postings at the beginning or end of a recording that could not be referenced were not labeled incomplete.   Francis and Hunston (ibid.) suggest that what follows decides the label or intent of the analysed element.   They use the example of an eliciting move followed by an informing move followed by another eliciting move. The second eliciting move is de facto an initiation of a new exchange and not follow-up on the prior.   Had the second eliciting move taken the form of a statement, it would likely be follow-up, though not predicted.

5.4.1   Incomplete Inform exchanges

Incomplete instances of all types of conversational exchanges were found. Incomplete Inform exchanges were the most common.   Example 5K displayed a series of informing moves, in which none of them received a response.

Example 5K (Analysis 2)

6	Ra:	PRO V1 ARE GOOD	informing	I	Inform	2	
7		BALLS	(incomplete)				
8		I GOT A WHOLE BOX					

9	Bi:	I like the Callaways reds	informing	I	Inform	3	
			(incomplete)				

10	Ti:	sometimes use pro	informing	I	Inform	4	
11		90s or 100s	(incomplete)				

12	Bi:	DT 100 superspins are sweet	informing	I	Inform	5	
			(incomplete)				

13		ANy of you hit the Taylor	eliciting	I	Elicit	6	
14		Made balls when they					
15		came out????					
16		the liquid one					
17		lol					
18		those where erratic					
19	Ti:	never hit one	informing	R			

The four incomplete Inform exchanges were initiated by three different participants. The move in Exchange 3 was not labeled as follow-up, as although it supported the prior move, it gave information as well. If for example, the posting in line 9 began with the 'Yes', then this would be a response, the second half of Exchange 2. Any new information following it would be the initiation of Exchange 3.

There was relevance between the postings as they were talking about golf balls. Yet the posting in Exchange 3 did not acknowledge the move before it. Rather it set up its own initiation, which was again left incomplete as the next participant provided new information. It was not until exchange 6, where Bi followed his own initiation (incomplete Exchange 5) with an eliciting move, that an exchange was completed. Exchange 6 was coded as complete as Ti responded to the question.

Example 5K demonstrates how multiple participants posted informing moves that were not acknowledged. Due to the unique dynamics of IRC, it was possible that other members were making statements at the same time, but their comments had

scrolled by due to a high rate of discourse among participants. Some participants followed their own informing move with an eliciting or other type of conversational move, not allowing for a response.

5.4.2 Incomplete Elicit Exchanges

Elicit exchanges were sometimes labeled incomplete. The causes for their being incomplete were similar to those of inform exchanges. For example, transactional undertaking by the intended respondent might have left questions from the prior topic-unit unanswered, as Example 5L demonstrates.

Example 5L

57	JL:	I got burned yesterday-	informing	I	Inform	13	6
58		while planting the garden					
59	Go:	wow	acknowledging	R			

| 60 | Go: | how you do that | eliciting | I | Elicit | 14 | |
| 61 | | you in your swimsuit | (incomplete) | | | | |

| 62 | JL: | Heidi - did you get that job | eliciting | I | Elicit | 15 | 7 |

Here JL began a new topic before answering the question posed by Go. In fact, the question that initiated the new topic was directed at another member. It should be noted that this exchange existed at the end of the recording and a responding move could have been made later. However, the move by JL in line 62 clearly left the prior conversation to start a new one with another member.

Incomplete elicit exchanges occurred when then the elicitation was directed at one participant who was identified (Example 5M), or to an unidentified participant (Example 5M).

Example 5M (Analysis 1)

| 50 | Su: | ma do you like golf | eliciting | I | Elicit | 15 |
| | | | (incomplete) | | | |

Example 5N (Analysis 4)

| 131 | Ba: | No golf talk tonight? | eliciting | I | Elicit | 47 |
| | | | (incomplete) | | | |

Both types appeared to be a result of various factors, which were difficult to decipher, as the analyst did not interview the participants. There did appear to be a group hierarchy of sorts, in which some members were well known as regulars in the room. Their elicitations were always responded to. Those that did not appear to be well known were sometimes ignored, and their postings went unacknowledged or unanswered. Occasionally, participants entered the room and became undesirables, resulting from their making disparaging remarks regarding topics or other members. These participants were typically ignored.

5.4.3   Incomplete Greet Exchanges

Greet exchanges, which are organizational, were quite common within the analysis. These exchanges are realized by an opening move followed by an answering move. An opening move not responded to by an answering move was labeled incomplete. Greet exchanges include both greeting and leave-taking utterances.

Like incomplete elicit exchanges, various types of incomplete greet exchanges were found.

Participant greeting another member:

Example 5O (Analysis 4)
| 86 | Ma: | hi angel | | opening | I | Greet | 28 | 10 |
| | | | (incomplete) | | | | | |

Participant greeting the room:

Example 5P (Analysis 2)
| 20 | Sh: | Hey room | greeting | | I | Greet | 7 |
| | | | (incomplete) | | | | |

Participant exiting the room:

Example 5Q (Analysis 4)
| 70 | Gk: | goodnite all | opening | I | Greet | 20 | 6 |

Opening moves of Greet exchanges were not always immediately followed by an answering move. Yet these moves were not necessarily labeled incomplete.

Because of the delay in response by the intended receiver of the greeting, identification of that receiver was difficult. The sequence in Example 5R displays such confusion. The participant named AG had entered the room just prior to this sequence. The entire sequence was categorized as one transaction. It was a series of greet exchanges among various members, focusing on two newly arrived participants. Part of the transaction focusing on the second participant (Exchanges 48-51) has been removed in this sample.

Example 5R

| 148 Go1: | hey there Aurora | opening | I | Greeting | 43 |
| | | | | (incomplete) | |

| 149 Dc: | aggggggggg | opening | I | Greeting | 44 |
| 150 AG: | I am, back | answer | R | | |

| 151 Ge: | HI AG | opening | I | Greet | 45 |
| 152 AG: | Hey Gets | answer | R | | |

| 153 AG: | Hey Golfers and golferettes | opening | I | Greet | 46 |
| 154 Go3: | hey | answer | R | | |

| 155 Mi: | Hi Ag | opening | I | Greet | 47 |
| 156 AG: | Dicky Poo | answer | R | | |

| 171 AG: | Donna | opening | I | Summon | 52 |
| 172 Go1: | Yes Aurora | answer | R | | |

In line 148 of Example 5R Go1 observed the entrance of AG and elicited an opening move as a greeting. This was followed by four more greetings, three of which were directed at the same participant (AG), but elicited by different members. Each exchange was completed by an answering move. Exchange 46 displayed AG greeting the room and receiving a response from a participant. Exchange 52 showed yet another opening move, this time initiated by AG, the past receiver of greetings. The participant she was addressing was Go1, the individual who had elicited the opening move of the incomplete Greet exchange 43. If not for the response by Go1, the posting 'Donna' would be analysed as a response to the greeting in exchange 43. Yet,

40

Go1 responded to the posting as if it had been a summons 'Yes Aurora'.   The intent of the posting by AG was unknown, but it had been analysed as an opening move of a Summon exchange due to the response by Go1.

6. CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to apply Exchange Theory to discourse collected from an Internet Relay Chat environment. The research by Francis and Hunston of applying exchange theory to everyday spoken conversation, of which this paper pulled much of its support, focused on two-party interactions (also see Stubbs: 1983). Furthermore, the original research facilitated by Sinclair et al. analysed teacher-fronted classroom interaction. Unlike these environments, the chat room observed in this study involved multiple participants, and gave control to no one participant. Also, the mode of communication is orthographic, but displays features of spoken discourse. As a result, distinctions unique to IRC were displayed.

Initially, recordings were analysed for the existence of transactions, or topic-units. The identification of cohesive devices, specifically the use of reference by participants, aided in the analysis. A feature unique to Internet Relay Chat was recognized in the identification of personal reference in the data. Because participants reside in a virtual environment within the chat room, the use of the word 'here' to display demonstrative reference was identified to have two meanings. It could refer to the physical location of the participant, or her location within the virtual chat room. No evidence was found displaying confusion by the participants regarding which type of reference was being used.

The analysis of transcripts identified patterns in the starting, or undertaking, of transactions by participants within the chat room. Two categories of undertakings were found. The first was identifiable by its use of greetings to begin transactions. These greetings could either be initiated by participants already in the room, or by a newly joining member. It was found that the number of participants involved in conversations fluctuated as they changed topics by changing partners. Furthermore, The chat room was constantly being entered and exited, and participants monitored this. Therefore every entry into the room posited an opportunity for a new transaction to begin.

The second type of undertaking that was found did not involve greetings. Rather, these postings sought either to offer or request information. Transactions were sometimes commenced when a participant gave some new piece of information, often which related to them, or had some emotional significance. Occasionally, these postings were negative, but often had the same effect as they caused other members to comment. Furthermore, questions were posed to start transactions. These

undertakings rarely involved newly-entered participants. Also, they were often directed at participants already involved in a conversation. In the chat room, participants could engage in multiple conversations. Thus members were not inhibited from directing a question at someone who was already involved in a discussion with other participants.

Problems arose in the initial identification of transactions within the transcripts. Postings were sometimes ambiguous, and judgement relied on the analyist. Post-analysis interviews might have allowed some of the vague postings to be more accurately understood. As this did not occur, prior and past postings had to be scrutinized in an attempt to accurately place the unclear ones. This type of scrutiny is common in any discourse analysis, but the multiple participants, incidents of participants 'jumping' topics and the overlapping alignment of the postings, made this a demanding analysis. Some postings could not labeled at all, rendering the posting without a label and unusable.

Exchanges were supported by all types of moves except for framing. For example, the function of an eliciting move is to 'elicit information' (Francis and Hunston, 1992:135), and resides at I in an Elicit exchange. Complete Elicit exchanges within the data displayed at least two moves, in which the question in I was followed by information in R. No occurrences of a question in I followed by acknowledgement in R were found. Furthermore, when clarification was needed, participants used devices such as the posting of another eliciting move, creating a Clarify exchange, to understand the meaning of the question before answering. As shown in the data, participants displayed many of the same patterns of conversation at the level of moves and exchanges that they would if they were face to face or on the telephone.

For the purpose of analysing overlapping strings of conversation, postings had to be manipulated into an order that would conform to the IRF structure. This manipulation displayed a rather unreal picture of the interaction. The postings in the analysis were displayed as moves, and were aligned so that initiating moves preceded their responses, which in turn preceded any possible follow-up moves. In the original recording of the transcripts, this alignment rarely existed. A new exchange was often started, or for that matter many exchanges were completed, before an earlier one had been finished. Also, participants were engaging in multiple conversations. This led them to stagger their postings, jumping from conversation to conversation. As they were not face to face, they could occupy themselves with activities other than communicating or monitoring the scrolling discourse of the room. Upon returning their focus on the chat room, participants could, at any time, scan the record of earlier

discourse, and comment on or question earlier topics.   This could lead to a separation of minutes between moves.   It is because of these conditions that some manipulation had to be accepted.

The limitations of any exchange state that there may only be one initiation, one response and optional follow-up, which has an infinite number of possible occurrences. From the analysis presented in this paper, occurrences of multiple responses were displayed within one exchange.   An alternate technique, one where each displayed exchange was limited to one response, was not discovered.   Therefore, in the occurrence of multiple responses from distinct participants, all of the responses were displayed together within the exchange.   It should be noted that this was not an attempt to allow for multiple responses within one exchange, but rather to efficiently show that an initiation may have multiple responses from different participants.

Under the same basis of efficiency, the acceptance of a three-part greeting was proposed.   In many cases, confusion occurred in the analysis as to which greeting was to be labeled as the initiating move of a Greet exchange.   Often newly entered participants greeted the room, leading to multiple responses by other participants. Follow-up occurred when the original initiator of the first greeting replied to those greetings.   Yet, again, that individual might not have acknowledged everyone that greeted him.   Therefore, the initial greeting of the room could not be labeled as incomplete, leaving the one-on-one greetings to be two-part.   Instead, all greetings responding to a greeting to the room were collectively labeled response moves.   Any following greetings posted by the initiator for individual responders were labeled follow-up.

A large number of incomplete exchanges were displayed.   In a sample analysis given by Francis and Hunston (1992: 157-161) of a telephone conversation, 20%, or 10 out of 50 exchanges were labeled incomplete.   That is approximately 5% fewer occurrences than were identified in the data analysing IRC for this paper. Incomplete occurrences of all types of exchanges were found.   Again, it appeared that because of the dynamics of the chat room environment, initiations did not receive responses.   This could be contributed to the same conditions that created the overlapping of exchanges.   Also, initiations posted to the entire room, rather than a specific participant, could easily be ignored by other members.   As the data seems to show, the participants did not appear to always be compelled to respond to an initiation, as they were not face to face, nor one on one.

Finally, the application of Exchange theory to IRC has implications for the study of English as a Foreign or Second Language.   Students of ESL/EFL can use IRC

as a valuable resource for exposure to naturally occurring language.   A student could record the data, as was done in this study, and analyse it, noting patterns.   Furthermore, students can engage other participants in the room.   The quasi-synchronous communication used in this chat room provided interaction displaying many features found in conversational discourse.   A student would have to be aware of the differences, and the unnatural scrolling of postings.   Also, by noticing the lack of framing moves in IRC, a student could more clearly understand the significance of framing moves and intonation.   IRC could also be used as a kind of stepping stone into full interaction with native speakers.   Within the chat room, a student can expose herself to all of the language, and participate at her leisure, thus removing much of the stress encountered by second language learners when not engaging in their native tongue.   Finally, samples of IRC can be accessed by teachers of ESL/EFL.   These samples can be used to facilitate language learning techniques such as Data-driven Learning (Johns: 1991), Consciousness-Raising (Rutherford: 1987) and discourse analysis (McCarthy: 1991).

APPENDIX

Transcript 1

Line Name	Posting	Transaction number
1 MA:	white are pretty too Reg..look real nice mixed with other colors	1
2 Sk:	Ms BP	
3 Bp:	right, but my pink ones didnt seem to take	1
4 MA:	aahh	1
5 Sk:	Oh my!!!!!!!!!!!	
6 Online Host:	Tr has entered the room.	
7 Bp:	the shade I really like are the coral ones	1
8 MA:	right after they flowers fall off Reg..trim them way back	1
9 Tr:	hi room	2
10 MA:	yes Coral are nice	1
11 Bp:	hi trim	2
12 Sk:	<wavin to Kimm	2
13 Tr:	hi Bp	2
14 Online Host:	Su has entered the room.	
15 Bp:	well, mag...I would need to get some new ones	1
16 MA:	i see	1
17 Tr:	waiting for the rain too stop	3
18 Su:	golf is so boring	4
19 Sk:	where ya from Kimm ?	3
20 Tr:	ohio	3
21 MA:	so is reading your scroll Friek	4
22 Bp:	ski, are ya playing today?	5
23 Bp:	Kimm, I am in PA, and it is sunny here, for once	3
24 Online Host:	Go has entered the room.	
25 Sk:	<played MOn-Wed--Yesterday--headed to the casino for 2 days	5
26 Go:	Im going golfing today yayayayay!!!!!!1	5
27 Tr:	wish it was sunny here	3
28 Bp:	how nice for you	5
29 Su:	MA do you like golf	4

30 MA:	hello Gal	6
31 Sk:	<clappin for Gal85-before she gets bumped offline-again	5
32 Bp:	LOL	5
33 Su:	i'm not a gal	7
34 Tr:	want to play 9 holes if the rain stops	3
35 Bp:	where in ohio are you, Kimm??	3
36 Sk:	Supr---do you wanna be ?	7
37 Go:	hi :)	6
38 Bp:	LOL, ski	7
39 Sk:	<wavin to Gal85	6
40 Tr:	i,m from fremont and i,m phil	3
41 Online Host:	Su has exited the room.	
42 Go:	we had our semi formal last night	6
43 Go:	lol	6
44 Bp:	not familiar with Fremont	3
45 Bp:	did you get semi dressed, gal?	6
46 MA:	only half dressed Gal ? lol	6
47 Tr:	between toledo and sandusky	3
48 Sk:	Gal--were you 'shirts' or 'skins" ?	6
49 Go:	you jinxed me!	6
50 Online Host:	Re has exited the room.	
51 MA:	Reg..we are thinking alike this a.m. lol	6
52 Bp:	northern part, Trim?	3
53 Go:	my comp froze!	?
54 Bp:	scary, huh, Mag??	6
55 Tr:	yes	3
56 MA:	booooo!!	?
57 Go:	be nice!	6
58 Sk:	Gal--what the hell else is new?	8
59 Go:	natta just went to the dance and had some people over after	8
60 Tr:	later bye	
61 Bp:	I drive through that way enroute to Indiana, Trim	3
62 MA:	i guess Friek left to change into his girlie clothes hahahah	
63 Tr:	just a small town packa	3
64 Sk:	Gal--whens the FORMAL dance ?	8
65 Bp:	the world is full of em, Trim	3

66	Go:	well im only a sophmore they only have a "semi formal' next year we have the prom	8
67	Bp:	you could go to prom if an upper classman asked, right, gal?	8
68	Go:	yup	8
69	Online Host:	MO has exited the room.	
70	Online Host:	Tr has exited the room.	
71	Go:	but that was last night also	8
72	Sk:	<clappin for next years prom for Gal85	8
73	Bp:	my niece went to prom all three years	8
74	Bp:	mag, how old is your daughter??	8
75	Go:	kewl	8
76	MA:	9	8
77	Online Host:	Si has entered the room.	
78	Bp:	you will be dealing with this stuff soon enough, LOL	8
79	Sk:	BP's niece is/was a popular girl	8
80	MA:	i know i know ...soon enough oh no !!!	8
81	Si:	morning all	9
82	Sk:	MAG---get ready, PAL !!!!!!!!!!!!	8
83	Go:	its not that bad mag	8
84	Bp:	hey, Mike	9
85	Go:	:)	8
86	Si:	hi regina	9
87	Bp:	golfing today??	9
88	MA:	not letting her go anywhere ..already bought new locks lol	8
89	Si:	no taking ashley to the boardwalk	9
90	Bp:	sounds fun	9
91	Bp:	you have had enough golf lately, LOL	9
92	Si:	ive had enough golf for a couple days	9
93	Go:	ne1 wanna go running with me this mornin?	10
94	Bp:	do my laps for me, Gal	10
95	MA:	lets go Gal..i'm ready !!	10
96	Si:	well at least a day	9
97	Sk:	Gal--I'll follow you---------in the car	10
98	Go:	k	10
99	Online Host:	Ag has entered the room.	
100	Bp:	ya playing tomorrow, Mike??	9

101 Sk: AGHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH64   11

102 Si: yes   in a best ball   9

103 Go: i gotta do two and a half miles this morn when i get to it lol   10

104 Ag: Morning all :)   11

105 Bp: cool,that takes the pressure off   9

106 Online Host: Ag has exited the room.

107 Go: i signed up for a state junior match with my friend thats best ball   9

108 Bp: hit for the fences mike, LOL   9

109 MA: aaahh   make it an even three Gal...go for it !!   10

110 Bp: oops, brief appearance by adele, LOL

111 Si: i always do   lol   9

112 Online Host: Ag has entered the room.

113 Sk: WB--------------aghhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh64

114 Go: well i have a "route"   10

115 Bp: Mag, silvery has witnessed my great prowess on a golf course

116 Sk: have a seat   !!!!!!!!!!!!!!

117 Ag: okay....who does not want me in here?

118 Bp: and lived to tell, LOL

Transcript 2

Line	Name	Posting			Transaction number
1	Ti:	riffel shafts			
2	Bi:	Just switched over to them			
3	Bi:	What kind of balls do you gentlemen hit?			1
4	Bi:	Callaway? Titleist?			1
5	Ti:	titleist pro v1		1	
6	Bi:	They sell out		1	
7	Ra:	PRO V1 ARE GOOD BALLS	1		
8	Ra:	I GOT A WHOLE BOX		1	
9	Bi:	I like the Callaways reds		1	
10	Online Host:	Tr has entered the room.			
11	Ti:	sometimes use pro 90s or 100s		1	
12	Bi:	DT 100 superspins are sweet		1	
13	Bi:	ANy of you hit the Taylor Made balls when they came out???? 1			
14	Bi:	the liquid one lol those where erratic		1	
15	Online Host:	Sh has entered the room.			
16	Online Host:	Tr has exited the room.			
17	Ra:	PRO V1 RULE		1	
18	Ti:	never hit one		1	
19	Sh:	hey room		1	
20	Ra:	I SUGGEST THEM FOR EVERYONE			1
21	Bi:	They are erratic i dont suggest them		1	
22	Sh:	the Pro VI suck		1	
23	Ti:	there a good ball rat		1	
24	Ra:	SOFT FEEL GREAT SPIN AND CONTROL ON THE GREEN		1	
25	Bi:	Rat everyone knows the proV1 is good		1	
26	Bi:	It has good distance		1	

27	Sh:	the proV is not a ball for amatures	1
28	Sh:	well some	1
29	Online Host:	TP has entered the room.	
30	Bi:	I have used it	1
31	Sh:	its good for some but others its a really bad ball	1
32	Bi:	I like the Callaway reds	1
33	Online Host:	Dr has entered the room.	
34	Online Host:	Bo has entered the room.	
35	Sh:	i like the blues more	1
36	Bi:	hard feel	1
37	Online Host:	Dr has exited the room.	
38	Online Host:	Bo has exited the room.	
39	Ti:	not sso good for putting big	1
40	Bi:	Pick it up putt a dt 90	1
41	Ti:	lol	1
42	Sh:	big are you good?	2
43	Bi:	Not today	2
44	Ti:	big what do you play off ?	2
45	Ra:	IM GOOD FOR 14 A 73 FOR MY BEST ON 18 HOLES	2
46	Bi:	what do you mean	2
47	Ti:	handicap ?	2
48	Bi:	o	2
49	Bi:	12-14	2
50	Bi:	not good	2
51	Ti:	how old are you ?	2
52	Online Host:	Go has entered the room.	
53	Bi:	ive been chili dipping like 3 times a round	2
54	Online Host:	Me has entered the room.	
55	Bi:	25	2
56	Online Host:	Go has exited the room.	
57	Ti:	its still a good handicap mate	2
58	Bi:	yeah its okay but keep in mind I play like 5 course religously	2
59	Sh:	what about you tin?	3
60	Online Host:	Me has exited the room.	
61	Bi:	So my putts are in all the time since I know the greens	2
62	Ti:	what shady ?	3

63	Bi:	tin whats yours	3
64	Sh:	your good?	3
65	Ti:	3	3
66	Sh:	*you	3
67	Bi:	Wow	3
68	Sh:	really?	3
69	Sh:	thats really good	3
70	Ti:	yeah	3
71	Bi:	YOu have all teh fades and all that crazy stuff going	3
72	Sh:	i can barley break 40	3
73	Bi:	on 9	3
74	Sh:	yea	3
75	In:	im hittin the callaway blue cubes and luv em hit em farther than pro	1
76	Online Host:	So has entered the room.	
77	Online Host:	Am has entered the room.	
78	Ra:	SHADY THAT AINT BAD	3
79	Online Host:	So has exited the room.	
80	Ti:	big itry not to just keep it simple	3
81	Online Host:	Li has entered the room.	

Transcript 3

Line	Name	Posting	Transaction number
1	Wa:	LOL OMy I agree	?
2	KS:	no Lin	?
3	Wh:	Gyp LOL	?
4	VO:	happy pill?	?
5	Wa:	OMy then let's off Steve Case	?
6	Wh:	Jenn so what do you think will happen at work?	1
7	Online Host:	Ma has exited the room.	
8	Li:	<~ has a poem Doug wrote when he	2
9	Gy:	<--taking happy pills this week only	?
10	Li:	was like 23 that says something about	2
11	Li:	my eyes look like limpid pools and my	2
12	KS:	she just has to learn that with a child she can't do	?
13		EVERYTHINZG SHE wants to	?
14	Li:	hair like spun gold lol	2
15	Wh:	Lin dang how sweet	2
16	OM:	<chuckle> Steve Case doesn't bother me.	?
17	Wa:	LOL Lin he wrote me the same one	2
18	Li:	Kris, thats the ONLY poem he wrote me LOL	2
19	Online Host:	ND has exited the room.	
20	KS:	lol Laura	2
21	Li:	LMAO Laura	2
22	VO:	must have been related to rumpelstilkskin	2
23	Je:	Kris ...I dunno....the boss says he doesnt wanna lose me	1
24	Je:	will just have to wait and see	1
25	Wh:	keep me posted ok?	1
26	Online Host:	My has entered the room.	
27	Je:	i will	1
28	Wh:	are you alright this morning? you are so quiet	3
29	Online Host:	CO has entered the room.	

30	Je:	yeah Im fine....dang kids are fighting AGAIN	3
31	Wh:	ohhhh lol	3
32	Je:	and I've got a Dr appt in a bit	3
33	Online Host:	Mt has entered the room.	
34	Online Host:	Sl has entered the room.	
35	VO:	yikes	3
36	Online Host:	Sl has exited the room.	
37	KS:	brb	?
38	Wh:	dont they know not to get you mad???	3
39	VO:	get the rope jenn...lol	3
40	Gy:	spray kids down with garden hose works every time	3
41	CO:	how do you get kids to quit fighting	4
42	Je:	lol kris obviously not	3
43	Wh:	<~~would never want to piss off jenn	3
44	Wh:	rofl	?
45	Je:	lol	3
46	Wa:	Comeaux :: sell one	4
47	Mt:	I JUST BELCHED AND IT SMELLS LIKE SAUCE	5
48	Wh:	Gyp ^5	?
49	CO:	why do they wait til you get on the phone?	3
50	Gy:	get a big super water soaker	4
51	Mt:	AND I AM FAT AND NUDE	5
52	Wa:	Mtn how lovely <click	5
53	Gy:	sneak up to kids	4
54	Gy:	soak them	4
55	Je:	Mtn.....{S stfu	5
56	Li:	I used to let my kids fight when they	4
57	Wh:	Mtn {S snertgun	5
58	Li:	were younger.. they sure did learn	4
59	Li:	"problem solving skills" that way..	4
60	Li:	they get along great now lol	4
61	Wa:	BBL Hugs and smiles Have a great day gang	6
62	Online Host:	Ma has entered the room.	
63	Mt:	AND MY PENIS IS RED	5
64	Je:	bye wawa	6
65	Wh:	bey wawa	6

66	Wh:	bye even	6
67	Gy:	MTN boy im soo sory the NURSE dropped you on your head	5
68	Wh:	wb ((((((May*))))))	?
69	Ma:	aCCCCKKKKKKKK	?
70	Li:	{{Laura}}}}}}}	?
71	Wa:	{S Jammy	?
72	Ma:	thanks cody *	?
73	Li:	wb May	?
74	Je:	Mtn...so go tell someone that cares	5
75	Online Host:	Wa has exited the room.	
76	Wh:	{S jammy2	?
77	Mt:	I NEED TO BEAT MY MEAT	5
78	OM:	Mtn....there are few less questions we need ever ask you, now.	5
79	Je:	wb amy	?
80	Gy:	and the aliens left that probe up your AAAAA	5
81	Ma:	bye wawa	6
82	Wh:	oh my	5
83	Mt:	AND SPEW	5
84	Ma:	thanks linnie	?
85	Li:	LOL GYP	5
86	Wh:	Gyp is having the power surges again	5
87	CO:	you mean tenderize it	5
88	Je:	Mnt...your mommy is gonna be mad at	5
89		you when you lose her AOL acct	5
90	Gy:	yah I DO LOVE CUT AND PASTE	5
91	Gy:	cut and paste YEHWAW	5
92	Li:	JennJenn, she wont know, too busy working the local corner lol	5
93	Je:	lin LOL	5
94	Mt:	JENN, LIKE I HAVE NOT HEARD THAT BEFORE,	5
95		WANNABE AOL COP	5
96	Gy:	MOmmmmmy i dont know why Aol turned off my puter????	5
97	CO:	anyone know what to take to get rid of a cold	7
98	VO:	how old r they now jenn?	8
99	VO:	c ya wawa	6
100	Je:	vod..who?	8
101	CO:	like a persistent cough	7

102 Li:	Come, if I had that answer, I'd be RICH lol			7	
103 Je:	nyquil works			7	

Description of abbreviations and symbols

e.s.	element of move structure
exch	exchange type
ex	exchange number
tr	transaction number
I	Initiation
R	Response
F	Follow-up
R/I	Response/Initiation
I^b	Bound-elicit exchange initiation
▅▅▅▅▅▅	Exchange boundary
··············	Bound-elicit exchange boundary
≣≣≣≣≣	Transaction boundary

Analysis 1

Line of dialogue	move	e.s	exch	ex	tr
1 MA: white are pretty too Reg..	informing	I	Inform	1	1
2 look real nice mixed with					
3 other colors					
4 Bp: right,	acknowledging	R			
5 but my pink ones					
6 didnt seem to take					
7 MA: aahh					
8 Bp: the shade I really like are	informing	I	Inform	2	
9 the coral ones					
10 MA: yes Coral are nice	acknowledging	R			
11 MA: right after they flowers	inform	I	Inform	3	
12 fall off Reg..					

56

13		trim them way back						
14	Bp:	well, mag...						
15		I would need to get some	acknowledging	R				
16		new ones						
17	MA:	i see	acknowledging	F				

18	Tr:	hi room	opening	I	Greet	4	2
19	Bp:	hi trim	answer	R			
20	Sk:	<wavin to Kimm	answer	R			

21	Tr:	hi Bp	opening (incomplete)	I	Greet		5

22	Tr:	waiting for the rain	opening	I	Structure	6	3
23		too stop					
24	Sk:	where ya from Kimm ?	eliciting	I	Clarify	7	
25	Tr:	ohio	informing	R			

26	Bp:	Kimm,					
27		I am in PA, and it is sunny	informing	I	Inform	8	
28		here, for once					
29	Tr:	wish it was sunny here	acknowledging	R			
30		want to play 9 holes					
31		if the rain stops					

32	Bp:	where in ohio are you,	eliciting	I	Elicit	9	
33		Kimm??					
34	Tr:	i,m from fremont	informing	R			
35		and i,m phil					

36	Bp:	not familiar with	eliciting	I[b]	Clarify	10	
37		Fremont					
38	Tr:	between toledo and	informing	R			
39		sandusky					

40	Bp:	northern part, Trim?	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	11	
41	Tr:	yes	informing	R			

42	Tr:	later bye	greeting (incomplete)	I	Greet	12	

43	Bp:	I drive through that way	informing	I	Inform	13	
44		enroute to Indiana, Trim					
45	Tr:	just a small town packa	acknowledging	R			
46	Bp:	the world is full of em, Trim	acknowledging	F			

47	Su:	golf is so boring	opening	I	Structure	14	4
48	MA:	so is reading your scroll	answering	R			
49		Friek					

50	Su:	magcrow do you like golf	eliciting (incomplete)	I	Elicit	15	

51	Bp:	ski, are ya playing today?	opening	I	Structure	16	5
52	Sk:	<played MOn-Wed—	answering	R			
53		Yesterday--headed to the					
54		casino for 2 days					

55	Go:	Im going golfing today	informing	I	Inform	17	
56		yayayayay!!!!!!1					
57	Bp:	how nice for you	acknowledging	R			
58		LOL					
59	Sk:	clapping for Gal85-	acknowledging	R			
60		before she gets					
61		bumped offline again.					

62	MA:	hello Gal	opening	I	Greet	18	6
63	Go:	hi :)	answering	R			

64	Sk: <wavin to Gal85	opening (incomplete)	I	Greet	19	
65	Go: we had our semi formal	opening	I	Structure	20	
66	last night					
67	lol					
68	Bp: did you get semi	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	21	
69	dressed, gal?					
70	MA: only half dressed Gal ?	eliciting	Ib	Clarify		
71	lol					
72	Sk: Gal--were you 'shirts'	eliciting	Ib	Clarify		
73	or 'skins" ?					
74	Go: be nice!	informing				
75	MA: Reg..we are thinking	eliciting	I	Elicit	22	
76	alike this a.m. lol					
77	Bp: scary, huh, Mag??	informing	R			
78	Su: i'm not a gal	informing	I	Inform	22	7
79	Sk: Supr---do you wanna be ?	elicit	R/I		23	
80	Bp: LOL, ski	(incomplete)				
81	Sk: Gal—	eliciting	I	Elicit	24	8
82	what the hell else is new?					
83	Go: natta	informing	R			
84	just went to the dance and					
85	had some people over after					
86	Sk: Gal—	eliciting	I	Elicit	25	
87	whens the FORMAL dance ?					
88	Go: well im only a sophmore	informing	R			
89	they only have a					
90	'semi-formal'					
91	next year we have the prom					

92	Bp:	you could go to prom if an	eliciting	I	Elicit	26	
93		upper classman asked, right,					
94		gal?					
95	Go:	yup	informing	R			
96		but that was last night also					
97	Sk:	<clappin for next years prom	acknowledging	F			
98		for Gal85					

99	Bp:	my niece went to prom all	informing	I	Inform	27	
100		three years					
101	Go:	kewl	acknowledging	R			
102	Sk:	BP's niece is/was a popular	acknowledging	R			
103		girl					

104	Bp:	mag, how old is your	eliciting	I	Elicit	28	
105		daughter??					
106	MA:	9	informing	R			

107	Bp:	you will be dealing with this	informing	I	Inform	29	
108		stuff soon enough, LOL					
109	MA:	i know i know ...soon	acknowledging	F			
110		ennough oh no !!!					
111	Sk:	MAG---get ready, PAL !!!!	acknowledging	F			
112	Go:	its not that bad mag	acknowledging	F			
113	Go:	:)					

114	MA:	not letting her go anywhere ..	informing	I	Inform	30	
115		already bought new locks	(incomplete)				
116		lol					

117	Si:	morning all	opening	I	Greet	31	9
118	Bp:	hey, Mike	answering	R			
119	Si:	hi regina	?				

120	Bp:	golfing today??	eliciting	I	Elicit	32	

121 Si:	no	informing	R		
122	taking ashley				
123	to the boardwalk				
124 Bp:	sounds fun	acknowledging	F		

125 Bp:	you have had enough	eliciting	I	Elicit	33
126	golf lately, LOL				
127 Si:	ive had enough golf	informing	R		
128	for a couple days				
129	well at least a day				

130 Bp:	ya playing tomorrow,	eliciting	I	Elicit	34
131	Mike??				
132 Si:	yes	informing	R		
133	in a best ball				
134 Bp:	cool,that takes the	acknowledging	F		
135	pressure off				

136 Go:	i signed up for a state	informing	I	Inform	35
137	junior match with my				
138	friend thats best ball	(incomplete)			

139 Bp:	hit for the fences mike,	opening	I		36
140	LOL				
141 Si:	i always do lol	answering	R		

142 Go:	ne1 wanna go running with	opening	I	Structure	37	10
143	me this mornin?					
144 Bp:	do my laps for me, Gal	answering		R		
145 MA:	lets go Gal..i'm ready !!	answering			R	
146 Sk:	Gal--I'll follow you---------	answering		R		
147	in the car					
148 Go:	k	acknowledging	F			

149 Go:	i gotta do two and a half	informing	I	Inform	38
150	miles this morn when i				

151		get to it lol		
152	MA:	aaahh	acknowledging	R
153		make it an even three Gal…		
154		go for it !!		
155	Go:	well i have a "route"	acknowledging	F

Analysis 2

Line of dialogue		move	e.s	exch	ex	tr
1	Bi: What kind of balls do	opening		I	Structure	
	1 1					
2	you gentlemen hit?					
3	Callaway? Titleist?					
4	Ti: titleist pro v1	answering	R			
5	Bi: They sell out	acknowledging	F			
6	Ra: PRO V1 ARE GOOD	informing	I	Inform	2	
7	BALLS					
8	I GOT A WHOLE BOX	(incomplete)				
9	Bi: I like the Callaways reds	informing	I	Inform	3	
		(incomplete)				
10	Ti: sometimes use pro	informing	I	Inform	4	
11	90s or 100s	(incomplete)				
12	Bi: DT 100 superspins are sweet	informing	I	Inform	5	
		(incomplete)				
13	ANy of you hit the Taylor	eliciting		I	Elicit	6
14	Made balls when they					
15	came out????					
16	the liquid one					
17	lol					
18	those where erratic					
19	Ti: never hit one	informing	R			
20	Sh: Hey room	greeting	I	Greet	7	

21	Ra:	PRO V1 RULE	informing	I	Inform	7
22		I SUGGEST THEM FOR				
23		EVERYONE				
24	Bi:	They are erratic	acknowledging	R		
25		I dont suggest them				
26	Sh:	the Pro VI suck	acknowledging	R		
27	Ti:	there a good ball rat	acknowledging	R		

28	Ra:	SOFT FEEL GREAT SPIN	informing	I	Inform	8
29		AND CONTROL ON				
30		THE GREEN				
31	Bi:	Rat everyone knows the	acknowledging	R		
32		proV1 is good				
33		It has good distance				

34	Sh:	the proV is not a ball for	informing	I	Inform	9
35		amatures				
36		well some				
37	Bi:	I have used it	acknowledging	R		

| 38 | Sh: | its good for some but others | informing | I | Inform | 10 |
| 39 | | its a really bad ball | (incomplete) | | | |

| 40 | Bi: | I like the Callaway reds | informing | I | Inform | 11 |
| 41 | Sh: | i like the blues more | acknowledging | R | | |

| 42 | Bi: | hard feel | informing (incomplete) | I | Inform | 12 |

| 43 | Ti: | not sso good for putting big | informing (incomplete) | I | Inform | 13 |

| 44 | Bi: | Pick it up putt a dt 90 | informing | I | Inform | 14 |
| 45 | Ti: | lol | acknowledging | R | | |

46	In:	im hittin the callaway	informing		I	Inform	
		15					
47		blue cubes	(incomplete)				
48		and luv em hit em farther					
49		than pro v					

50	Sh:	big are you good?	eliciting	I	Elicit	17	2
51	Bi:	Not today	informing	R			

52	Ra:	IM GOOD FOR 14 A 73	informing	I	Inform	18
53		FOR MY BEST ON 18	(incomplete)			
54		HOLES				

55	Ti:	big what do you play off ?	eliciting	I	Elicit	19

56	Bi:	what do you mean	eliciting	I[b]	Clarify	20
57	Ti:	handicap ?	eliciting	R/I		
58	Bi:	o	informing	R		
59		12-14				
60		not good ive been chili				
61		dipping like 3 times a				
62		round				
63	Ti:	its still a good handicap	acknowledging	F		
64		mate				
65	Bi:	yeah its okay	acknowledging	F		
66		but keep in mind I play				
67		like 5 course religously				
68		So my putts are in all				
69		the time since I know				
70		the greens				

71	Ti:	how old are you ?	eliciting	I	Elicit	21
72	Bi:	25	informing	R		

73	Sh:	what about you tin?	opening	I	Structure	22	3

74	Ti:	what shady ?	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	23
75	Sh:	your good?	eliciting	R/I		
76	Sh:	*you	(incomplete)			

77	Bi:	tin whats yours	eliciting	R/I		
78	Ti:	3	informing	R		
79	Bi:	Wow	acknowledging	F		
80	Sh:	really?	acknowledging	F		
81		thats really good				
82	Ti:	yeah	acknowledging	F		

| 83 | Bi: | YOu have all teh fades | informing | I | Inform | 24 |
| 84 | | and all that crazy stuff going | (incomplete) | | | |

| 85 | Sh: | i can barley break 40 | informing | I | Inform | 25 |
| 86 | Ra: | SHADY THAT AINT BAD | acknowledging | R | | |

| 87 | Bi: | on 9 | eliciting | I | Elicit | 26 |
| 88 | Sh: | yea | informing | R | | |

| 89 | Ti: | big itry not to just | informing | I | Inform | 27 |
| 90 | | keep it simple | | | | |

Analysis 3

Line of dialogue		move	e.s	exch	ex	tr
1	Ma: how often to you play	eliciting	I	Elicit	1	1
2	golf X12?					
3	X1: AS MUCH AS	informing		R		
4	POSSIBLE					
5	Ma: that's nice.	acknowledging		F		
6	what's your handicap	eliciting	I	Elicit	2	
7	now?					
8	X1: DONT KNOW	informing		R		
9	NO: hey x12 PINE LAKES	informing	I	Inform	3	
10	X1: WHERE IS PINE	eliciting	R/I	Elicit	4	
11	LAKES					
12	NO: in mytle beach	informing		R		
13	old fashioned ,					
14	beautiful course					
15	X1: WHAT IS IT CLOSE 2	eliciting	I	Elicit	5	
16	NO: close to the center	informing		R		
17	of the golf strip					
18	PG: Speaking of golf					
19	courses,					
20	I am attempting to	informing	I	Inform	6	2
21	get a membership	(incomplete)				
22	at Augusta National					

67

23	Br:	I wish that Tiger would	informing		I	Inform	
		7 3					
24		espouse his Asian					
25		heritage as well and					
26		should have stuck					
27		up for Fuzz					
28	JS:	i wouldnt have	acknowledging	R			
29		"stuck up" for Fuzzy					

30	PG:	What did Fuzzy do/	eliciting	I	Eliciting	8
			(incomplete)			

31	Br:	Zoeller is extremely	informing	I	Inform	9
32		funny and that was just				
33		his nature				
34	JS:	Brain, I dont care	acknowledging	R		
35		how "funny" you are,				
36		in this day and age you				
37		dont call a grown				
38		man "boy"				

39	JS:	and his Asian heritage	informing	I	Informing	10
40		is not what you see		(incomplete)		
41		when you see tiger				
42		you know he is Thai only				
43		because you see his mother				

44	PG:	Oh, I remember that.				
45		Wasn't that like 2	eliciting	I	Elicit	11
46		years ago?				
47	JS:	about 2 years, yes	informing	R		
48		actually 4 years age				
49		in 1997				

50	JS:	Black people didn't happen	informing	I	Inform	12

51		to find that "funny".				
52	PG:	Come on	acknowledging	R		

53	PG:	I stand by fuzzy	informing	I	Inform	13
54	JS:	you would	acknowledging	R		

55	PG:	No, listen,				
56		I will tell you why	informing (incomplete)	I	Inform	14

57	JS:	but KMart didnt	informing (incomplete)	I	Inform	15
58		and thats what counted,				
59		and I couldnt have been				
60		more pleased				

61	PG:	Don't want to get any				
62		one that is African				
63		American in here mad				
64		at me....				
65		I have many African				
66		American students				
67		You ask him if he does				
68		drugs and he might				
69		get mad				
70	PG:	You ask him if he has 16	informing	I	Inform	
71		a big penis,				
72		and he will agree.				
73	X1:	LOL	acknowledging	R		
74	KI:	PGA LOL	acknowledging	R		
75	JS:	I would like to meet the	acknowledging	R		
76		black man you asked				
77		that question to				

78	JS:	As I stated before,	informing	I	Inform	17
79		all is fine and dandy,	(incomplete)			

80		but you dont call a				
81		grown black man, "boy"				

82	PG:	People need to calm down.	informing	I	Inform	18
83		Life is just to short to be				
84		so tense	(incomplete)			

85	JS:	The black men who	informing	I	Inform	19
86		happen to be my friends,				
87		would kick your bigoted				
88		butt				
89		plain and simple				

90	PG:	But ya know.....				
91		Tiger isn't just AM	informing	I	Inform	20
92		He even says that				
93	JS:	NO ONE IS JUST	acknowledging	R		
94		AFRICAN AMERICAN				
95		OR WHITE OR ASIAN				

96	PG:	He counts all of his races	informing		I	Inform 21
97		and backrounds in it.				
98	JS:	No he doesnt count		acknowledging	R	
99		"all" races				
100		he doesnt count white,				
101		he cant				

102	PG:	And he doesn't like to	informing	R	Inform	22
103		be referred to as just				
104		black				
105	JS:	black and Thai	acknowledging	R		
106	PG:	Yes	acknowledging	F		

107	PG:	and I think something	informing	I	Inform	23
108		else				

109 PG: I forget

| 110 JS: | no one is just black or | informing | I | Inform | 24 |
| 111 | white or asian | (incomplete) | | | |

---

112 PG:	But the point is.....				
113	people need to just	informing	I	Inform	25
114	tkae it easy.	(incomplete)			
115	But the point is.....				
116	people need to just				
117	tkae it easy.				

---

118 PG:	I can see why Tiger	informing	I	Inform	26
119	got mad.				
120 JS:	Tiger didnt really get	acknowledging	R		
121	mad,				
122	the comment was				
123	just stupid				
124 PG:	Yes,	acknowledging	F		
125	but then again, if that				
126	was me				
127	I would just let it go.				
128 *PG:	Exactly				

---

129 JS:	You dont call a black	informing	I	Inform	27
130	man "boy",				
131	i dont care how				
132	"funny" you are				
133	trying to be				

---

134 X1:	TIGER IS	informing	I	Inform	28
135	COBLAISAN				
136 KI:	X-12 i heard him	acknowledging	R		
137	say that too				

| 138 Bs: | what was the | eliciting | I | Elicit | 29 |

139	comment to tiger	(incomplete)			

140 NO:	piss on this racial	informing	I	Inform	30
141	bullshit				
142 X1:	THANK U NOD	acknowledging	R		

143 JS:	I know white people	informing	I	Inform	31
144	dont want to face the				
145	fact that Tiger is black				
146	but when you look at				
147	Tige				
148	Tiger you know				
149 PG:	LOL, come on JS::				
150	We ALL know	acknowledging	R		
151	Tiger is black				

152 JS:	You cant miss it,	informing	I	Inform	32
153	thats why they come it				
154	with these other races				
155	for him				
156 PG:	I know	acknowledging	R		

157 JS:	but hes black and	informing	I	Inform	33
158	nothing you can do or				
159	say will ever change				
160	that fact				
161 Bs:	tiger is not "black".	acknowledging	R		
162	no so called				
163	african-american can				
164	relate to him.				
165	I know that JS::.				

166	But see,				
167	he is more than black	informing	I	Inform	34
168	He is also Asian.				
169 KI:	that is because he is	acknowledging	R		

170	head and hells above				
171	every other golf in the				
172	world				

173 JS:	But one thing blacks	informing	I	Inform	35
174	can relate to, is kicking				
175	a lily white field of men's				
176	behind				
177	and Tiger does that,				
178	time and time again				

179 PG:	I give Fuzzy a break	informing	I	Inform	36
180	though.				
181	If you think about it,				
182	24 y.o. is a boy.				
183 KI:	he isnt 24	acknowledging	R		
184 PG:	I know	acknowledging	F		

185 KI:	he is 25!	informing	I	Inform	37
186 PG:	At the time he was	acknowledging	R		
187	23				

188 CM:	he's a golfer from a	informing	I	Inform 38	
189	culture you don't get				
190 PG:	It's disrespect to call	acknowledging	R		
191	Tiger that yes.				

192 JS:	PGA, as i stated before,				
193	Fuzzy understands,	informing	I	Inform	39
194	that 21 isnt a boy				

195 CM:	i'm a women golfer	informing	I	Inform 40	
196	men don't get me				
197	sometimes				

198 PG:	sorry	acknowledging	R		

---

199 *KI:	yeah u r right				

---

200 Bs:	i am white and love	informing	I	Inform	41
201	woods.				
202	he's my favorite athlete				
203	right now.				
204	but no way is he a				
205	brotha				

---

206 JS:	it took millions of his	informing	I	Inform	42
207	own money to do that				
208	but he understood				
209	tiger was 21 years old				
210	when the comment				
211	was made				

---

212 X1:	WHAT HAS FUZZY	eliciting	I	Elicit	43
213	DONE SINCE THEM				
214	COMMENTS?				
215	NOTHING				
216 JS:	not a thing, ain't life grand..	Informing	R		
217	lol				

---

218 CM:	i don't understand you	informing	I	Inform	44
219	stupidity				
220 PG:	OK,				
221	well more the reason	acknowledging	R		
222	to say boy.				

223	But listen,				
224	all in all,				
225	Tiger wasn't hurt	informing	I	Inform	45
226 JS:	one more reason for a	acknowledging	R		
227	white man to say boy,				

228	and i understand taht				
229	that				

230 PG:	I think Tiger needs to	informing	I	Inform	46
231	focus more on those	(incomplete)			
232	death threats he gets				
233	than use the color of his..				
234	skin to his advantage				
235	every change he gets				

236 JS:	i have lived in this	informing	I	Inform	47
237	country all my life,				
238	and i didnt do it blind				
239	folded or deaf				

240 CM:	change the subject	directing (incomplete)	I	Direct	48

241 X1:	IAM WHITE AND I	informing	I	Inform	49
242	THINK TIGER IS	(incomplete)			
243	AWESOM				

244 JS:	if Fuzzy could get away	informing	I	Inform	50
245	with it,				
246	he might have called				
247	him a Nigger				
248	you know Fuzzy,				
249	its all in a joke				
250 PG:	That's a whole	acknowledging	R		
251	nother topic.				
252 JS:	no it isnt	acknowledging	F		
253 PG:	Yes it is	acknowledging	F		

254 PG:	Don't use that now.	directing	I	Direct	51
255 JS:	but if you say so	acknowledging	R		

| 256 CM: | JS:: it's not all a joke | informing | I | Inform | 52 |

257 JS:	its just as if you called	informing	I	Inform	53
258	him a Nigger				
259 PG:	Boy and the N word	acknowledging	R		
260	are 2 different				
261	subjects				
262 JS:	sure it is,	acknowledging	F		
263	today a boy and				
264	tomorrow a Nigger				
265 PG:	NO IT IS NOT.	acknowledging	F		

| 266 | Come on, | | | | |
| 267 | the word Nigger is racial | informing | I | Inform | 54 |

268 JS:	whats the big deal?	eliciting	R/I	Clarify	55
269 PG:	the word BOY is age	informing	R		
270 JS:	no,	acknowledging	F		
271	in this country, unless				
272	are not of this country,				
273	a degrading remark to				
274	black men for dec				
275	decades, DECADES,				
276	was to call men boys				

277 Bs:	it kills me when black	informing	I	Informing	56
278	people are like				
279	"tiger's one of us".				
280	no he isn't.				

281 CM:	i can't beleive a golf chat	informing	I	Inform	57
282	room would be soooooooo				
283	removed from ideals of golf				

| 284 JS: | he is black, | informing | I | Inform | 58 |

285	thats for certain				
286 PG:	He isn't BLACK.	acknowledging	R		
287	HE HATES being called				
288	BLACK.				
289	He is asian and african				
290	american				
291 JS:	yeah right	acknowledging	F		
292	when you see Tiger,	informing	I	Inform	59
293	you can dream and wish,				
294	andhope he is white,				
295	but he isnt				
296 PG:	I don't think he is wite	acknowledging	R		
297 JS:	ok..	acknowledging	F		
298 PG:	I don't care what	informing	I	Inform	60
299	color he is.				
300 JS:	yeah right	acknowledging	R		
301	ok				
302 PG:	I don't.	informing	I	Inform	61
303 JS:	yeah	acknowledging	R		
304	ok				
305	i understand				
306 PG:	I knew you would	acknowledging	F		
307 JS:	yeah right	acknowledging	F		
308 X1:	SHUT UP ABOUT	directing	I	Direct	62
309	WHITE AND BLACK				
310	AND TALK ABOUT				
311	GOLF				

Analysis 4

Line of dialogue			move	e.s	exch	ex	tr
1	AG:	Felly yoo hoo	opening	I	Summon	1	1
2	Ga:	Aurora..	answering	R			

| 3 | AG: | There she is | informing | I | Inform | 2 | |
| 4 | Ga: | sorry.. | acknowledging | R | | | |

| 5 | AG: | Felly | opening | I | Summon | 3 | |
| 6 | | Felly | (incomplete) | | | | |

| 7 | Jp: | hey where did you go!!!!!! | eliciting | I | Elicit | 4 | |
| 8 | Ga: | Mariners game is on.. | informing | R | | | |

9	AG:	she was lofting with	eliciting	I	Elicit	5	
10		whom Felly?					
11		lol					
12	Ga:	lol..	informing	R			
13		Mariners'..					
14		lol..					

15	AG:	Johnson send me a pic	directing	I	Direct	6	2
16		please?					
17		I will send you one back					
18	Gr:	Miss I don't have one on file	behaving	R			
19		I'm sorry					

20		Now if you send me					
21		a camera....					

22	LI:	Jill why so quiet tonight	eliciting	I	Elicit	7	3

....

23	Ji:	i am?	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	8	
24	Ma:	yes u r	informing	R			

25	Ji:	just ready to call it	informing	I	Inform	9
26		an evening,				
27		kinda tierd				
28	LI:	i hear that,,,,,,	acknowledging	R		
29		thinking of joining				
30		the bed myself				
31	Ma:	yes getting late	acknowledging	R		
32		itll be tomorrow in				
33		2 minutes				
34		or will that be today ?				

35	Go:	AG, you still around in here					
36		man, long time no see	opening	I	Greet	10	4
37	AG:	Hello Angel	answering	R			

38	Go:	how are you	eliciting	I	Elicit	11
39	AG:	great here	informing	R		
40		Thanks				

41	Go:	AG, is this the only room	eliciting	I	Elicit	12
42		you hang in?				
43	AG:	yes it is	informing	R		

44	Go:	ok AG<				
45		i get it,	informing	I	Inform	13
46		you are too goood to				
47		talk to me				
48	AG:	I was talking to you Angel	acknowledging	R		

49		chilli out					

50	Go:	forget it AG,,,,,,, i	informing	I	Inform	14	
51		dont want to talk to you now					
52		i dont need you anymore					
53		i have lots of others who					
54		will talk to me					
55	AG:	lol	acknowledging	R			
56	Go:	lol	acknowledging	F			
57	AG:	be my guest Angel	acknowledging	F			

58	LI:	geez aurora,,,,	eliciting	I	Elicit	15	
59		what the heck are you doing	(incomplete)				
60		to people in here lol					
61		lol					

62	Go:	ok ag,	eliciting	I	Elicit	16	
63		which motel are we	(incomplete)				
64		guest in??					

65		AG,,,,,,,,,,,					
66		see im talking ot you again	informing	I	Inform	17	
			(incomplete)				

67	Ma:	how bout dem reds !!!!	eliciting	I	Elicit	18	5
68		r they on a streak or what ?					

69	AG:	me streaking?	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	19	
			(incomplete)				

70	Gk:	goodnite all	opening	I	Greet	20	6
			(incomplete)				

71	AG:	Hello Linda	opening	I	Greet	21	7
72	Sm:	Hi Aurora	answering	R			

73	Go:	hey Jill	opening	I	Greet	22	8
74	Ji:	Hi Golf	answering	R			

75	Go:	hi Jill, how are you?	eliciting	I	Elicit	23	
76	Ji:	great,	informing	R			

77		yourself?	eliciting (incomplete)	I	Elicit	24

78	Gr:	Aurora ten dollars if you	opening	I	Structure	25	9
79		remember my first name					
80	Ma:	BILL	answering	R			
81	AG:	Will					

82	Gr:	times up	informing (incomplete)	I	Inform	26

83	Gr:	Double or nothign..				
84		What's my favorite song?	eliciting	I	Elicit	27
85	Ma:	the penis song	informing	R		

86	Ma:	hi angel	opening (incomplete)	I	Greet	28	10

87	Sm:	Hi Jill	opening	I	Greet	29	11
88	Ji:	Hi linda	answering	R			

89		(sister)	informing	I	Inform	30
90		lol				
91	Sm:	lol	acknowledging	R		

92	Jp:	calling it a night guys,	opening	I	Structure	31	12
93		gotta back					
94	AG:	maybe I should go to bed	answering	R			

95	Jp:	nite all	opening	I	Greet	32

96 AG:	NIte Jeff	answering	R		
97	NIte Jennifer				
98 Jp:	nite ag	?			

99 Go:	nite ag	opening	I	Greet	33
100 AG:	NIte Angel	answering	R		

101 LI	well im off to bed myself	opening	I	Greet	34
102	night aurora	(incomplete)			

103 Jp:	nite Galf	opening	I	Greet	35
104 Ga:	Nite Jeff	answering	R		
105	Nite.. Jen				

106 LI:	night JILL	opening	I	Greet	36
107 Ji:	sleep well	answering	R		
108 LI:	thank you jill				

109 Go:	nite everyone	opening (incomplete)	I	Greet	37

110 LI:	see ya galf	opening (incomplete)	I	Greet	38

111 Gr:	Aurora we love you	informing	I	Inform	39
112	except Johnson				

113 AG:	Nite Felly	opening	I	Greet	40

114 Go:	:0)	?			

115 LI:	night matt	opening	I	Greet	41
116 AG:	NIte Matt	opening	I	Greet	42
117 Ma:	goodnight sexy	answering	R		

118 LI:	who you callin sexy/	eliciting	I	Elicit	43

119 AG:	lol	inform	R		
120	me				
121 Ma:	u of course	informing	R		
122 LI:	awwww	acknowledging	F		
123	yea ok matt				
124	lol				

125 Ma:	u too agc	informing (incomplete)	I	Inform	44

126 Gr:	NIte Linda	opening	I	Greet	45
127 Sm:	nite Aurora	answer	R		

128 AG:	{s Penis	?			

129 Ga:	who's leaving?	eliciting (incomplete)	I	Elicit	46
130	i'm lost				

131 Ba:	No golf talk tonight?	eliciting (incomplete)	I	Elicit	47

132 Gr:	Saygood night Aurora	directing	I	Direct	48
133	the song is downloaded				
134 AG:	NIte Will	behaving	R		

135 Gr:	Thank you	opening	I	Structure	49
136 AG:	it was a pleasure	answering	R		

Analysis 5

Line of dialogue	move	e.s	exch	ex	tr	
1 Jo: ohh, I got this new	informing			I	Inform
1 1					
2 spalding ball,					
3 wow its way better than that					
4 pro v 1 ball Ive heard of					
5 Jp: Stop it Joe.	acknowledging	R			
6 Your'e killing					
7 my sponsorship					
8 Jo: haha,	acknowledging	F			
9 Im kiddin, but I did find a					
10 spalding tonight					

11 Ta: do u like Sam Cook?	eliciting	I	Elicit	2	2
12 songs					
13 Gd: Sam Cook was so smooth	informing	R			
14 nice					
15 Fa: lol, Tammy,					
I still have	informing	R			
16 albums somewhere					
17 Ta: I like it all	acknowledging	F			
18 SC: NO BUT I HEARD HIS	?				
19 WIFE CAN COOK					

20 Gd: I was so wild in the 70's	informing	I	Inform	3	3
21 hehhe					

84

22	Le:	baaaad boy	acknowledging	R			
23	Ta:	you're kidding GD......	acknowledging	R			
24		lol					
25	Jp:	It was really wild.	acknowledging	R			
26		I was like Four?					
27	Le:	livin does that to ya, lol	acknowledging	R			
28	Gd:	mellow man now	acknowledging	F			
29		lol					

30	Fa:	Gd.....					
		you remember the 70's....	eliciting	I	Elicit	4	
31		hehehe....someone has to					
32		remember them for me...					
33		ehehe					
34	Gd:	sigh...					
35		such nice memories	informing	R			

36	Kn:	I remember 50's	informing	I			
37	Gd:	:-))))) omg	acknowledging	R			
38	Jp:	I can't remember 2000	acknowledging	R			

39	SC:	ANY KNOW WHY	eliciting	I	Elicit	4	5
40		DR.PEPPER COMES IN					
41		A BOTTLE?					
42	Gd:	tell us SC	informing	R			

| 43 | SC: | HIS WIFE DIED!!! | informing | I | Inform | 5 | |
| 44 | | LOL LOL LOL LOL | (incomplete) | | | | |

45	Ta:	here's my favorite......					
46		Brown eyed girl......	informing	I	Inform	6	6
47		Jimmy Buffet					
48	Gd:	that's a good one	acknowledging	R			
49	Le:	Hey, I like that one too	acknowledging	R			
50	Ta:	thank goodness I	acknowledging	F			
51		downloaded this stuff					

52		off Napster.....lol					

53	Jp:	Brown eyed girl?					
54		Isn't that a Van Morrison	eliciting	I	Elicit	7	
55		tune?					
61	Gd:	lots of artists recorded it Jph	informing	R			
62	Ta:	yep	acknowledging	F			

56	Fa:	Cat's in the cradle	informing	I	Inform	8	
57		and the silver spoon,					
58		little boy blue and the man					
59		and the moon					
60	Le:	Oh I like that one too Di	acknowledging	R			

63	Fa:	Sheila I saw him at a free	informing	I	Inform	9	
64		concert in a park just outside	(incomplete)				
65		Philly in the 70's					

66	Tw:	GOLF SUCKS	informing	I	Inform	10	7
67	Gd:	vacuum cleaners suck	acknowledging	R			
68	Jp:	Stop two tiny,	acknowledging	R			
69		your'e hurting all our feelings.					
70	Le:	Don't knock it till you tried it	acknowledging	R			

71	Ta:	Gd.....					
72		can't seem to get mine to	informing	I	Inform	11	
73	Gd:	lol Tammy heheh	acknowledging	R			
74	Ta:	lol....	acknowledging	F			

75		.no one to work it for me	informing	I	Inform	12	
76	Gd:	get a Kirby then Tammy	acknowledging	R			
77	Ta:	got the Rainbow	acknowledging	F			
78	Gd:	ok lol	acknowledging	F			
79	Ta:	lol	acknowledging	F			
80	Le:	over the rainbow?	acknowledging	F			
81	Gd:	Somewhere?	acknowledging	F			

82	Gd:	lol	acknowledging	F		
83	Ta:	lol	acknowledging	F		
84	Le:	yep, lol	acknowledging	F		

85	Jp:	Besides, we are talking	informing	I	Inform	13
86		about badmitton				
87	SC:	OH BADMITTON	acknowledging	R		
88		THERE'S A REAL GAME				

89	Jp:	We are talking about	eliciting	I	Elicit	14
90		badmitton, aren't we?				
91	Le:	yes, it's a baaaad game	informing	R		
92	SC:	NO GOLF YOU IDIOT	informing	R		
93	Gd:	no Jph...	informing	R		
94		you mean bad golf lol				
95	Jp:	Shit,	acknowledging	F		
96		I must be in the				
97		wrong room				

| 98 | Ta: | no, poker is the game.... | informing | I | Inform | 15 |
| 99 | | lol | | | | |

100	Kn:	3/4ths of people that golf	informing	I	Inform	16
101		are pretty BAD! LOL				
102	Ta:	I'm in that 3/4.....	acknowledging	R		
103		lol				
104	Gd:	some days are bad...	acknowledging	R		
105		some not so bad				
106	Le:	me too Tammy, lol	acknowledging	F		
107	Ta:	but it's fun	acknowledging	F		

| 108 | SC: | I CAN'T EVEN | informing | I | Inform | 17 |
| 109 | | PLAY MINI-GOLF | (incomplete) | | | |

| 110 | Fa: | got to go, ride is here.... | | | | |
| 111 | | later all... | opening | I | Greet | 18 | 8 |

112	behave hehehe				
113 Gd:	k				
114	you too Di...	answering	R		
115	been fun				
116	later				
117 Le:	by Di,	answering	R		
118	nice chattin with ya				

119 Ta:	she left in a hurry	informing (incomplete)	I	Inform	19

120 Gd:	I have to run myself....				
121	bye Tammy	opening	I	Greet	20
122 Ta:	bye Gd	answering	R		

123 Ta:	have a good one	opening	I	Greet	21
124 Gd:	you too	answer	R		

125 Gd:	bye Lucy	opening	I	Greet	22
126 Le:	by Fella	answering	R		

127 Gd:	bye Knck	opening	I	Greet	23
128 Kn:	u2	answering	R		

129 Jp:	Bye, GD	opening (incomplete)	I	Greet	24

130 Kn:	I think they should					
131	have a rule........					
132	if you can't get it on	informing	I	Inform	25	9
133	the green in at least					
134	5 shots.					
135	PICK IT UP!!!!!!!!!!					
136 Le:	yep,	acknowledging	R			
137	I'll drink to that one					

138 Kn:	Some people want	informing	I	Inform	26	
139	their money's worth					
140 Ta:	lol	acknowledging	R			

141 Kn:	Hacker's heaven........	informing	I	Inform	27	
142	12 o'clock tee time	(incomplete)				
143	Stay out late/					
144	keep the 19th hole open					
145	as late as possible					

146 Le:	Hope it's not going to be	opening	I	Structure	28	
147	hot where you are.					

148 SC:	YOU HIT THE BALL	informing	I	Inform	29	
149	300YDS,THEN YOU					
150	WALK TO THE BALL,					
151	TO PUT IN A CUP,					
152	BUT IF YOU MISS					
153	BUMMER	(incomplete)				

154 DO:	anyone from CT?	eliciting	I	Elicit	30	10
155 Kn:	I used to live in Ct	informing	R			

156 DO:	where are you now?	eliciting	I	Elicit	31	
157 SC:	I LIVE IN WINDSOR	informing	R			
158	"Bama					

159	play Keney park?	eliciting	I	Elicit	32	
160 Ta:	we went there last year	informing	R			
161	hot place					

162 Kn:	or Millbrook?	eliciting	I	Elicit	33	
163 Ta:	place called Eufaula, AL	informing	R			

164 Jp:	My liver is shriveling	informing	I	Inform	34	11

165	from the booze intake	(incomplete)					
166	last night						

167 Ru:	were tiger at in this		eliciting	I	Elicit	35	12
168	tourment						
169	is he leading						
170 Jp:	Please refrain from		informing	R			
171	winston cup, Rusty						

172 SC:	I OFTEN GO TO	informing	I	Inform	36	13	
173	THE GHO						
174	I GET TIRED						
175	WATCHING THEM						
176 Kn:	I used to go to GHO/	acknowledging	R				
177	pass out at the 18th.............						
178	LOL						

179 SC:	SOME OF THOSE		informing	I	Inform	37
180	PEOPLE WEAR	(incomplete)				
181	SOME UGLY CLOTHES					

182 Kn:	"Last BLAST at	informing	I	Inform	38	
183	Wethersfield" 1983..........	(incomplete)				
184	booze/booze/booze/					
185	Monday-Sunday/LMAO					

186 Le:	Tammy does your husband	eliciting	I	Elicit	39	14	
187	play golf too?						
188 Ta:	yes.......	informing	R				
189	we don't get to play						
190	often as we like						
191 Le:	us either,		acknowledging	F			
192	but I'm addicted						

193 Ta:	and most of time....					
194	I don't like playing w/ him…	informing	I	Inform	40	

90

195	Lol	(incomplete)			

196	u play together?	eliciting	I	Elicit	41
197 Le:	yep,	informing	R		
198	I make him laugh even				
199	when he doesn't want too				
200 Ta:	lol	acknowledging	F		

201 Le:	that's where the
202	lucy comes in

References

Abdullah, M. H., (1998) 'Electronic Discourse: Evolving Conventions in Online Academic Environments'. *ERIC Digest.* ERIC#: ED422593.

Altun, A. (1998) 'Interaction Management Strategies on IRC and Virtual Chat Rooms'. In: SITE 98: Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference (9th, Washington DC, March 10-14, 1998). ERIC#: ED42117.

Cameron, D. (2001) *Working With Spoken Discourse.* London: SAGE Publications.

Chan, M. (1997) 'No Talking, Please, Just Chatting: Collaborative Writing with Computers'. Paper contributed to the Teaching in the Community Colleges Online Conference, 'Innovative Instructional Practices''. (1st, Kapiolani Community College, April 2-4, 1996). http://leahi.kcc.hawaii.edu/org/tcc. ERIC#: ED415836.

Cochenour, J. and Rezabeck, L. (1995) 'Emoticons: Visual Cues for Computer-Mediated Communication'. In 'Imagery and Visual Literacy: Selected Readings from the Annual Conference of the International Visual Literacy Association (26th, Tempe, AZ, October 12-16, 1994)'. ERIC#: ED380096.

Conner-Linton, J. (1993) 'The Problem of Solutions: Two cautionary Cases for Applying Conversation Analysis to Business'. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 4(2): 271-282.

Cook, G. (1989) *Discourse*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* Longman Group UK.

Coulthard, M. and Brazil, D. (1992) 'Exchange Structure', in Malcolm Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (eds.) (1981) *Studies in discourse analysis.* London: Routledge

Engle, R. (1999) 'Analysis of E-Mail Mediated Instructional Conversations: Employment of Sociolinguistic Conversational Mapping Techniques'. ERIC#: ED437921.

Etzioni, A. and Etzioni, O. (1999) 'Face-to-Face and Computer-Mediated Communities, A Comparative Analysis'. *Information Society* 15(4): 241-248.

Flanagan, M. (1999) 'Practicing Stereotypes: Exploring Gender Stereotypes Online'. In: SITE 99: Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference (10th, San Antonio, TX, February 28-March 4, 1999). ERIC#: ED432235.

Francis, G. and Hunston, S. (1992) 'Analysing everyday conversation', in Malcolm Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Garcia, A. C. and Jacobs, J. B. (1999)'The Eyes of the Beholder: Understanding the Turn-Taking System in Quasi-Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication'. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 32(4): 337-367.

Ginther, D. and Liu, Y. (1999a) 'A Comparison of the Task-Oriented Model and the Social-Emotion-Oriented Model in Computer-Mediated Communication'. Paper presetned at the Southwestern Psychological Association Conference (45th, Albuqurque, NM, April1-3, 1999). ERIC#: ED437924.

Ginther, D. and Liu, Y. (1999b) 'How To Achieve Better Impressions in Computer-Mediated Communication?'. ERIC#: ED437035.

Green, S., Ed. (2000) 'New Perspectives on Teaching and Learning Modern Languages'. *Modern Languages in Practice* 13. ERIC#: ED439617.

Grice, P. (1975) 'Logic and conversation'. in Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.) *Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press.

Grice, P. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words.* USA: Harvard College.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1961) 'Categories of the theory of grammar'. *Word* 17: 241-92.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English.* UK: Longman.

Hara, N. (2000) 'Visualizing Tools to Analyze Online Conferences'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000). ERIC#: ED442845.

Holliday, L. (1999) 'Challenging Questions about E-mail for Language Learning'. *ESL Magazine.* 2(2): 14-15.

Holmes, M. (1995) 'Naming Virtual Space in Computer-Mediated Conversation'. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 52(2): 212-221.

Huang, S. (1998) 'Differences in the Nature of Discussion between Peer Response Sessions Conducted on Networked Computers and Those Conducted in the Traditional Face-to-Face Situation'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Writing98 Conference (Poitiers, France, July 2-4, 1998). ERIC#: ED423686.

Jaffe, J. M., Lee. Y., Huang ,L and Oshagan, H. (1999) 'Gender Identification, Interdependence, and Pseudonyms in CMC: Language Patterns in an Electronic Conference'. *Information Society.* 14(4): 221-34.

Jefferson, G. (1972) 'Side sequences'. in Sudnow, D. (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction.* New York: Free Press.

Johns, T.F. (1991) 'From Printout to Handout: Grammar and Vocabulary Teaching in the Context of Data-driven Learning'. Johns, T. F. and King, P. (eds.) *Classroom Concordancing.* Birmingham University English Language Research Journal Vol. 4.

Johnson, J. (1995) 'Computer-Mediated Classroom Discourse as Linguistic Intervention: A Pragmatic Analysis of Topic, Coherence, and Choreography'. Paper presented at the Annual Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition (14th, University Park, PA, July 12-16, 1995). ERIC#: ED391181.

Kim, J. (2000) 'Social Interaction in Computer-Mediated Communication'. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science.* 26(3): 15-17.

Lee, I. (2000) 'Factors Affecting Learners' Discourse Participation in a Computer Conferencing'. ERIC#: ED439698.

LeLoup, J. and Ponterio, R. (2000) 'Enhancing Authentic Language Learning Experiences through Internet Technology'. *ERIC Digests.* ERIC#: ED442277.

Lemon, H. (1999) 'Discourses of Power: Feminine Centers of Electronic Discourse Communities'. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English (Denver, CO, November 18-23, 1999). ERIC#: ED436012.

McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

McLaughlin, M. (1984) *Conversation: How Talk is Organized.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing. Rezageck, L. and Cochenour, J. (1995) 'Emoticons: Visual Cues for Computer-Mediated Communication'. In Imagery and Visual Literacy: Selected Readings from the Annual Conference of the International Visual Literacy Association (26th, Tempe, AZ, October 12-16, 1994). ERIC#: ED380096.

Rutherford, W. (1987) *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.* UK: Longman Group.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation'. *Language* 50: 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1972) 'Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place'. in Sudnow, D. (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction.* New York: Free Press.

Schriffin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Sierra, J. (1999) 'Real Linguistic Experiences Using Chat Sessions or Videoconferencing'. ERIC#: ED427526.

Simmons, T. (1994) 'Politeness Theory in Computer-Mediated Communication: Face Threatening Acts in a 'Faceless' Medium'. ERIC#: ED381005.

Simpson, C. (1999) 'Internet Relay Chat'. ERIC Digest. ERIC #: ED425743.

Simpson, C. (2000) 'Internet Relay Chat'. *Teacher Librarian* 28(1): 18-20.

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse.* London: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1992) 'Towards an analysis of discourse.' in Malcolm Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Smith, M. (1997) 'Penetrating 'Symbolspeak': Reading the Images of Public Discourse'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (48th, Phoenix, AZ, March 12-15, 1997). ERIC#: ED413603.

Soukup, C. (1999) 'The Gendered Interactional Patterns of Computer-Mediated Chatrooms: A Critical Ethnographic Study'. *Information Society* 15(3): 169-76.

Sproull, L., and Kiesler, S. (1991) *Connections: New Ways of Working in the Networked Organization.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tannen, D. (1984) *Conversational Style: analysing talk among friends.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Walther J. (1996). 'Computer-Mediated Communication: Impersonal, Interpersonal, and Hyperpersonal Interaction'. *Communication Research* 23, 3-43.