

Centre for English Language Studies
Postgraduate programmes, Open Distance Learning
MA TEFL/TESL ODL

Applying the Sinclair and Coulthard model of discourse analysis to a student-centered EFL classroom.

Author **Matthew Cockayne, 2010**
Tutor **Mark de Boer**
Date **January**
Module 4 **Spoken Discourse**

SD/10/04

Record one of your (or a colleague's) English classes, and transcribe part of your data. Make an analysis of the transcribed data, using Sinclair and Coulthard's model, at the level of exchange, move and act (Sinclair, J. and M. Coulthard, 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: OUP³). Comment on how easy/difficult it was to fit your data to the categories and the usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding classroom communication.

You are not expected to obtain a copy of this original work to do the assignment; there are many good secondary sources describing and discussing Coulthard and Sinclair's work, including some of your set books.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	4
2. The Sinclair and Coulthard model	5
2.1 The rank scale	6
2.2 Exchanges and moves	7
2.3 Moves and acts	9
3. The data	12
4. Analysis	14
4.1 Participant roles	15
4.2 Back-channeling	18
4.3 Collaborative learning and scaffolding	18
4.4 Drills	21
4.5 Broken rules of DA: The ignored I-move in an eliciting exchange	23
5. Implications	26
5.1 Usage in the creation of materials and materials testing	26
5.2 Use in student evaluation and counseling	28
5.3 Uses in teacher training and personal professional development	28
6. Conclusion	29
7. References	31
8. Appendix	35

1. Introduction

Sinclair and Coulthard's (S&C) 1975 method of discourse analysis (DA) has been described as 'a litmus test for whether or not a lesson is communicative' (Raine, 2010, p. 19). The S&C model is not designed to handle 'pupil/pupil interaction in project work' (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 6) and lessons which neatly fit into the S&C model tend to be 'overtly teacher-based' (Macedo, 2000, p. 14). Therefore, data taken from a student-centered classroom should not easily fit into the S&C model, and adaptation of the original model would become necessary for analysis to proceed.

In this paper, this author will attempt to apply the S&C method of DA to a transcribed recording of an ELT lesson. Modifications and complementary models will be considered in order to allow for the S&C model to be adapted to more easily and usefully suit the context of the data. The necessity of such adaptations will signal that the data was taken from a student-centered, communicative ELT environment, unlike that for which the S&C model was originally created to analyze.

How, and to what extent the S&C model is or could be usefully applied in the ELT field will also be investigated, with particular regard to this author's professional needs, and the development and testing of ELT materials.

2. The Sinclair & Coulthard model

In the 1970's, Sinclair and Coulthard set out to investigate the 'organization of linguistic units above the rank of clause,' and explore the intermediary levels of language 'between context and phonetic substance (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 1).

The S&C model has served as a 'starting point' for DA and a 'basis for more current models' of DA (de Boer, 2007, p. 7), and 'certainly appears to have been oft adopted by respected TEFL and linguistics researchers' (Raine, 2010, p. 19). However, Raine (ibid, p. 19) warns of the danger of allowing the strong reputation and tradition of usage of the S&C model to sway the opinions of individual researchers such as this author on whether it is 'useful for understanding classroom communication in our *own* contexts'.

It is worth noting that Sinclair and Coulthard applied their original model to data taken from teacher-lead primary school classroom settings in the 1970's. This type of data was chosen because it represented 'a more simple type of spoken discourse' (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 6) than other, less structured varieties of interaction, such as that of the more 'communicative' modern-day EFL classroom from which the data analyzed in this paper is taken. As a result of these narrow beginnings, many modifications of the original S&C model have been proposed (Francis and Hunston, 1992; de Boer, 2007). Willis (1992, p. 112) cites further examples of how 'the description has been developed and diversified' in Coulthard and Montgomery (1981), Brazil

(1975, 1978a, 1978b), Coulthard and Brazil (1979), Burton (1980), and Ventola (1987). These diversifications cater to data collected from less rigidly-structured discourse genres than those chosen by Sinclair and Coulthard for their 1975 analysis.

There have been several criticisms of language classrooms whose discourse fits too neatly into the S&C three-stage model. de Boer (2009) cites Chaudron (1988), Long & Sato (1983), Ohta (2001), and Wells (1999) to argue that such discourse is heavy on teacher *display* questions, where the teacher knows the answer, but merely wants to know whether the student can correctly answer. This is counterproductive as their overuse deprives students of the opportunity for meaningful communication (Thornbury, 2000, cited in de Boer, 2009).

2.1 The rank scale

The S&C model employs a hierarchical system, modeled on Halliday (1961). The highest rank is *lesson*, which is made up of ‘an unordered series of transactions’ (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 25). Due to the lack of restriction on the order of transactions in a lesson, analysis of this rank is moot. It would be impossible to arrive at a structural statement from such pursuit as ‘ordering varies from teacher to teacher’ (ibid, p. 60).

Sinclair and Coulthard state that their work on the rank of transaction was insufficient to make its analysis a major part of their study. This leaves

exchange as the highest rank useful for scrutiny. Exchanges are made up of *moves*, which are, in turn, made up from *acts*. It is these three ranks which this paper will focus on.

2.2 Exchanges and moves

Sinclair and Coulthard identify two types of exchange in classroom discourse; *boundary exchanges* and *teaching exchanges*. Boundary exchanges signal the transition from one section of the lesson to the next and are initiated by the teacher, whereas teaching exchanges are where questions are asked and answered, and feedback given on answers. Tables 1 and 2 below are taken from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p. 26) and show the possible structures of these exchange types. In the left hand side column, letters in parentheses represent the labeling symbols for the elements of structure. In the middle column, symbols in parentheses are not obligatory components of the structure, whereas symbols that are not in parentheses are required. The numbering in parentheses in the right hand column is the S&C reference label for each class of move in their model.

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of move
Frame (Fr)	(Fr) (Fo)	Fr: Framing (III.1)
Focus (Fo)		Fo: Focusing (III.2)

Table 1: Rank III: Exchange (boundary)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of move
Initiation (I)	I (R) (F)	I: opening (III.3)
Response (R)		R: answering (III.4)
Feedback (F)		F: follow-up (III.5)

Table 2: Rank III: IRF Exchange (teaching)

As seen in Tables 1 and 2 above, there are five main classes of moves in the S&C model; *framing* and *focusing* moves, which realize boundary exchanges; and *opening*, *answering*, and *follow-up* moves, which realize teaching exchanges. As elements of structure, these are labeled *I*, *R*, and *F* and the S&C model is often referred to having an IRF, three-part structure.

Framing moves ‘indicate boundaries in the lesson’ and focusing moves are ‘metastatements about the discourse’ Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p. 22), i.e. these moves signal the transition from one stage of the lesson to the next and provide information about the different stages of the lesson respectively.

Teaching exchanges can be further divided into eleven sub-categories; six ‘free’ and five ‘bound’ exchanges (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 49). Bound exchanges are tied to previous free exchanges, which they refer back to. These sub-categories can be found in Tables 3 and 4 below, which are based on Raine (2010, p. 7).

Sub-class of exchange	Structures	Function of exchange
Teacher inform (Inform)	I (R)	to convey information to the pupils
Teacher direct (Direct)	I R (F)	to elicit a non-verbal response from the pupils
Teacher elicit (Elicit)	I R F	to elicit a verbal response from a pupil
Check (Check)	I R (F)	to discover how well students are getting on and identify any problems
Pupil elicit (P-Elicit)	I R	to elicit a verbal response

		from the teacher
Pupil inform (P-Inform)	I F	to convey information to the teacher

Table 3: Sub-categories of free exchange

Sub-class of exchange	Structures	Function of exchange
Re-initiation (i) (Re-initiation)	I R Ib R F	to induce a response to a previously unanswered question
Re-initiation (ii) (Re-initiation)	I R F (Ib) R F	to induce a correct response to a previously incorrectly answered elicitation
Listing (Listing)	I R F (Ib) R F	to withhold evaluation until two or more responses are received to an elicitation
Reinforce (Reinforce)	I R Ib R	to induce a (correct) response to a previously issued directive
Repeat (Repeat)	I R Ib R F	to induce a repetition of a response

Table 4: Sub-categories of bound exchanges

2.3 Moves and acts

Moves are made up of acts, which are ‘the lowest rank of discourse’ (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 27) and are ‘similar to morphemes (...) in grammar’ (ibid, p. 23) in that they cannot be divided into smaller elements. Table 5 below is based on Raine (2010, pp. 9-10) and summarizes pages 35 to 44 of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

Act	Notation	Function	Reference #
marker	m	to mark (transaction) boundaries in the discourse	IV.1
silent stress	^	to emphasize a marker	IV.11
starter	s	to prime pupils for a correct response to an initiation	IV.2
elicitation	el	to request a linguistic response	IV.3.1
check	ch	to ascertain whether there are any problems preventing successful progress of the lesson	IV.3.2
directive	d	to request a non-linguistic response	IV.3.3
informative	i	to provide information	IV.3.4
prompt	p	to prompt a response to a previous directive or elicitation	IV.4.1
clue	cl	to provide additional information to help students respond to a previous directive or elicitation	IV.4.2
bid	b	to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse	IV.5.2
cue	cu	to evoke an appropriate bid	IV.5.1
nomination	n	to call on or give permission to a pupil to contribute to the discourse	IV.5.3
acknowledgment	ack	to show that an initiation has been understood	IV.6
reply	rep	to provide a linguistic response appropriate to a previous elicitation	IV.7.1
react	rea	to provide a non-linguistic response to a previous directive	IV.7.2
comment	com	to provide additional information relating to a previous informative	IV.8
accept	acc	to indicate that a reply or reaction was appropriate	IV.9
evaluate	e	to positively or negatively evaluate a previous reply	IV.10
meta-statement	ms	to help students follow the future	IV.12.1

		structure of a lesson	
conclusion	con	to help students understand the past content of a lesson	IV.12.2
loop	l	to elicit the repetition of a student reply	IV.13
aside	z	includes any elements of discourse intended not intended to elicit a reply or reaction, such as the teacher thinking out loud or talking to himself	IV.14

Table 5: Types of acts, notation, and function

Tables 6 to 10 below are reproduced from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, pp. 26-7) and show the structures of the five main types of move and the classes of acts of which they comprise.

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
signal (s) pre-head (pre-h) head (h) post-head (post-h) select (sel)	(s) (pre-h) h (post-h) (sel) (sel) (pre-h) h	s: marker (IV.1) pre-h: starter (IV.2) h: system operating at h; choice of elicitation, directive, informative, check (IV.3) post-h: system operating at post-h; choice from prompt and clue (IV.4) sel: ((cue) bid) nomination (IV.5)

Table 6: Rank IV: Move (opening)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
pre-head (pre-h) head (h) post-head (post-h)	(pre-h) h (post-h)	pre-h: acknowledge(IV.6) h: system operating at h; choice of reply, react, acknowledge (IV.7) post-h: comment (IV.8)

Table 7: Rank IV: Move (answering)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
pre-head (pre-h)	(pre-h) (h) (post-h)	pre-h: accept (IV.9)
head (h)		h: evaluate(IV.10)
post-head (post-h)		post-h: comment (IV.8)

Table 8: Rank IV: Move (follow-up)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
head (h)	hq	h: marker (IV.1)
qualifier (q)		q: silent stress (IV.11)

Table 9: Rank IV: Move (framing)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
signal (s)	(s) (pre-h) h (post-h)	s: marker (IV.1)
pre-head (pre-h)		pre-h: starter (IV.2)
head (h)		h: system operating at h; choice from metastatement or conclusion (IV.12)
post-head (post-h)		post-h: comment (IV.8)

Table 10: Rank IV: Move (focusing)

3. The data

The data was taken from an intermediate-level adult media English lesson, conducted in a private language school in Japan, using materials based on issue 144 of 'The latest news in English' (Chigasaki Press, 2009). Three recordings were made of lessons from this class (Author, 2010) and analyzed using tally sheets and a stopwatch as part of an action research project on to increase student-student interaction and topicalization, and improve the communicativeness of teacher talk through changes in materials and teaching procedures. The data presented in this paper is taken from the first of these recordings.

While the original study showed this lesson to be less successful than the consequent lessons, it was chosen for two practical reasons. Firstly, word-for-word transcription was much more feasible due to the fact that only two students were present. Furthermore, these students were easily contacted to gain permission for a second study to be carried out, whilst some participants in the subsequent lessons would have proven more difficult to contact. Permission from the Education Department and School Director was also obtained for this second study to be conducted and relayed in this paper.

The two students in this study will hereby be referred to as P1 and P2. Their names, when used in the transcript have been changed to *Katie* (P1) and *James* (P2). A third student is referred to, but was not present for the lesson from which the data presented in this paper was collected. This student's name has been changed to *P3*, and also granted permission for the data to be used in this paper.

P1 is a Chinese national in her thirties, working as an HR manager in a Japanese automobile parts manufacturing company. She has formerly worked as a Chinese language teacher in Japan. She is fairly fluent in Japanese and likes to learn Japanese from her Japanese classmates.

P2 is an engineer in the same company as P1 and is a Japanese national in his forties. He is fairly fluent in Chinese, which he also takes lessons in at the language school where this data was collected. He also likes to take the

opportunity to learn Chinese from P1.

The teacher (T) is a native English speaker and is also the researcher. T has conversational Japanese, but no Chinese language ability, which may account for the amount of inaudible utterances in the transcript. Although the teacher is also the researcher, *researcher's paradox* (Raine, 2010, p. 20) is avoided, as the current analysis was not planned at the time of recording.

4. Analysis

The typical IRF structure could be found in several sections of the data and the S&C model easily applied. An example can be found between lines 309 and 312 of the transcription, which is typical of traditional teacher-fronted classroom activity.

- 309 T Okay ... I'm gonna give you ... I'm not gonna use the timer. I'm gonna clean the board. It's a race to see who's finished first and when I'm finished, we'll check. Okay?
(Teacher cleans whiteboard and students match vocabulary to definitions on the handout)
- 310 T Oh. Before I'd started, you'd finished?
- 311 P2 Yes.
- 312 T Wow. Let me check.
(Teacher checks students' answers)

Table 11 shows lines 309-12 analyzed using the S&C model. Boundary exchanges are in green and labeled either 'Frame' or 'Focus' according to the move type. Teaching exchanges are in black. This data fits quite neatly into the 1975 system. One point of ambiguity, however is whether lines 310-12

represent a check or an elicit. This author chose to label the exchange as a check.

Exchange	Opening (I)	Act	Answering (R)	Act	Follow-Up (F)	Act
Frame	Okay^	m/q				
Focus	I'm gonna give you ... I'm not gonna use the timer. I'm gonna clean the board. It's a race to see who's finished first and when I'm finished, we'll check.	ms				
Check	Okay?	ch	NV (No reaction from students indicates no problems)	rep		
Frame	Oh^	m/q				
Elicit	Before I'd started, you'd finished?	el	Yes	rep	Wow	e
Direct	Let me check	d	NV (students allow teacher to check their work)	rep		

Table 11: Analysis of lines 309-12; typical IRF structure

4.1 Participant roles

Kumaravadivelu (1993) promotes a classroom dynamic where the teacher and students take on more equal roles as participants in the lesson. In this spirit, the classroom from which the data in the paper was taken strives towards a more 'communicative' dynamic, with students being 'active, not

just reactive' (ibid, p. 12). All participants are able to request information, initiate conversation, direct one another, and give replies to other participants' inform moves regardless of whether they are the teacher or a student.

There has been criticism of the S&C model in that it 'fails to account for this role-changing' (White, 2003, p. 6). White (ibid, p. 8) suggests adding to the taxonomy of moves by adding a 'teacher reply'. This author would suggest the removal of the words *teacher* and *pupil* from all description and labeling, such as can be seen in Table 5, which uses Raine's (2010) descriptions of the functions of acts, or the taxonomy of exchanges in Sinclair and Coulthard (pp. 49-56). The words *teacher* and *pupil* could be replaced with *participant* or omitted completely to eliminate distinction between, for example, *teacher inform* and *pupil inform*. This would allow for a system of analysis flexible enough to describe more student-centered EFL classrooms. Classrooms that do not require this adaptation could be said to be more teacher-lead.

Lines 152-163 of the transcript show how students can ask each other questions and give each other feedback, which contravenes the S&C description of *pupil elicit* (ibid, p. 52) but not that of *teacher elicit*. Table 12 (below) shows an analysis of this section of the data using the S&C model without restriction on participant roles. Here, students can be seen to elicit responses from one another, give feedback, and make a direct act; evidence of a more student-centered classroom environment.

- 152 T (distributing handouts) Good. Let's use these to warm up. I don't think P3's coming.
- 153 P2 Have you ever been Tokyo Tower?
- 154 P1 No.
- 155 P2 No?
- 156 P1 No.
- 157 P2 Eh. Have you ever visit ... Tokyo?
- 158 P1 Yes.
- 159 P2 Ohhh.
- 160 P1 Several times.
- 161 P2 || Ohhh.
- 162 P1 No. Don't ask me why. (laughter)
- 163 P2 || Eh.

Exchange	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-Up	Act
Frame	Good ^	m/q				
Focus	Let's use these to warm up. I don't think P3's coming.	ms com				
Elicit	Have you ever been Tokyo Tower?	el	No	rep		
Repeat	No?	l	No	rep	Eh	e
Elicit	Have you ever visit ... Tokyo?	el	Yes	rep	Ohhh	e
Inform	Several times	i			Ohh	e
Direct	No Don't ask me why (laughter)	m d com	Eh NV (does not ask 'why')	rep		

Table 12: Analysis of lines 152-163, showing fluidity of participant roles

4.2 Back-channeling

In the analyses represented so far in both Table 11 and Table 12, all of the acts in the F moves are labeled as *evaluate*, in line with the Sinclair and Coulthard's stipulation that the mandatory *head* of the follow-up must be 'evaluate' (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 27). However, their function is somewhat different from that of 'commenting on the quality of the reply, react, or initiation' (ibid, p. 43). Instead, they serve to show that the reply, react, initiation, or direct has been heard and understood, as well as showing some emotive response, such as surprise in line 312, to the content of the previous participant's contribution. Rather than evaluating a fellow participant's contribution's relevance, these moves serve to show active listening in the *back channel* (Duncan, 1973, cited in Coulthard, 1985, p. 69) and encourage further interaction as well as serving an important phatic role in relationship building and maintenance. To allow for this type of behavior, this author would like to propose a new act label for back-channeling, which can be realized by any participant's contribution in the follow-up, or even the answering move, as in line 163. This *back-channel* act would be labeled [bc].

4.3 Collaborative learning and scaffolding

As the S&C model is not designed to handle 'pupil/pupil interaction in project work' (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 6) a third exchange type, the *V-task exchange*, is proposed by de Boer to cater for 'collaborative learning and scaffolding' (de Boer, 2007, p. 8). This behavior is desirable in

the EFL classroom, as students maximize their learning opportunities by utilizing all participants as resources from which to access new language. Furthermore the students are learning 'how to learn' (de Boer, 2009, p. 42) and can use this skill outside the classroom to become more autonomous learners. The possible structures of the V-task exchange are shown in the table below.

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of move
Initiate (V-I)	V-I (V-R) ((V-R) (V-F)) _n (V-F)	V-I: Opening
Respond (V-R)		V-R: Answering
Feedback (V-F)	V-I (V-R)	V-F: Follow-up

Table 13: V-task exchange

Evidence of scaffolding can be found throughout the data presented in this paper. Two instances can be found in the first thirteen lines:

- 1 P1 Er... My family moved to new house ... so this is the first time for me to ... go ... [inaudible] ... Chin- ... new house
- 2 P2 || Uh-huh
- 3 P1 Yeah. And in ... our house er ... the small gar- garden
- 4 P2 Oh, really?
- 5 P1 Yeah. And my parents do ... doing ... it ... my parents my parents are do- doing gar- ga- ga- garden garden gardening garden
- 6 P2 Gardening
- 7 P1 Gardening. Yeah.
- 8 P2 Okay. So ...
- 9 P2 So you ... I- I suppose you ... felt ... ah
- 10 P1 Felt?
- 11 P2 Felt. Feel. Felt. Felt.
- 12 P2 You felt ah... happy to see the your new hou- new house. But I suppose also ... mmm ... you ... you ... had ... er ... some memories [inaudible] your old house.
- 13 P1 Mmmm.

Exchange	Opening (V-I)	Act	Answering (V-R)	Act	Follow-Up (V-F)	Act
V-exchange	my parents are do- doing gar- ga- ga- garden garden gardening garden	cal	gardening	vrep	gardening yeah	acc e

Table 14: Analysis of lines 5-7

Lines 5-7 represent the first V-exchange in the data. Although P1 does not ask for the English directly, this author interprets her stumbling as a ‘call’ (ibid, p. 12); a request for scaffolding. The reasons for this interpretation are:

- a) the intonation and non-verbal gestures of P1
- b) the reoccurrence of similar patterns throughout the data

Lines 10 – 13 also represent a V-exchange. P1’s initiation could have been interpreted as a loop, but context suggests another *call*.

Exchange	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-Up	Act
V-exchange	Felt?	cal	Felt. Feel. Felt. Felt.	vrep		
Re-initiation (i)	You felt ah... happy to see the your new hou- new house. But I suppose also ... mmm ... you ... you ... had ... er ... some memories [inaudible] your old house.	cl			Mmmm	acc

Table 15: Analysis of lines 10-13

The students initiated phatic interaction from the beginning of the lesson without any stimuli from the teacher or materials. The unprompted, student-topicalized opening lines of the transcript begin with P1 sharing some family news. According to Seedhouse, ‘if the teacher does not introduce any pedagogical purposes, the speech event cannot be considered a L2 lesson’ (1995, p. 10). However, in this extract from the data, L2 development is taking place through collaborative learning and this behavior is typical of the maximization of unplanned learning opportunities so important to a meaningful communicative classroom interaction (Kumaravadivelu, 1993).

4.4 Drills

Raine (2010) points to the fact that the S&C model does not account for ‘an exchange category specifically for drills’ (p. 13) and calls for such a ‘drill exchange’ with a ‘drilling act’ as a head (ibid. p. 14). Lines 301-308 from the data illustrate such an exchange. The teacher is modeling the pronunciation of the target vocabulary for the students to repeat.

301	T	Mmmm. Please repeat ... for the vocabulary ... commemorative.
302	P1/2	Commemorative.
303	T	Author.
304	P1/2	Author.
305	T	Transmit.
306	P1/2	Transmit.
307	T	Exceed.
308	P1/2	Exceed.

Exchange	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-Up	Act
Focus	Please repeat ... for the vocabulary	s ms				
Drill	Commemorative	dm	Commemorative.	dr		
	Author.	dm	Author.	dr		
	Transmit.	dm	Transmit.	dr		
	Exceed.	dm	Exceed.	dr	Okay	e

Table 16: Analysis of a drill exchange

Rather than one *drilling act*, this author proposes a range of drilling acts. The analysis in Table 16 features two kinds of drilling act: the *drill model* [dm] and the *drill repeat* [dr]. However, different kinds of drills will feature different drilling acts. The type of drilling represented in Table 16 focuses on pronunciation. Audiolingistic grammar drills would require different act labels. The imaginary grammar drill in Table 17, below, features *drill clues* [dcl] and *drill replies* [drep].

Exchange	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-Up	Act
Frame	Right^	m/q				
Focus	I say she ... swim you say she can swim	ms				
Drill	She ... swim	dcl	She can swim	drep		
	They ... fly	dcl	They can fly	drep	Very good	e

Table 17: Analysis of a drill exchange

In Tables 16 and 17, no student errors occurred. If they had, further drilling moves would have been encountered, such as *drill re-initiates* and *drill loops*, and *drill clues* of a scaffolding nature.

4.5 Broken rules of DA: The ignored I-move in an eliciting exchange

Simply because a system of analysis requires or rules out certain behaviors does not mean these rules must be followed. Participants always have the free will to behave in any way they choose. If the rules are broken, it simply means that behavior has deviated from the standard, or accepted pattern. Sinclair and Coulthard suggest that it would be 'cheeky' of a student to provide the teacher with feedback in a 'pupil elicit' (1975, p. 52). This may be true in most situations in a primary school environment, but consider this imaginary interaction:

P Please, Miss. What does this word say?

T It says xylophone.

P Oh, I see. Thank you.

Here, the student is not being cheeky at all.

Lines 176-181 of the data represent an instance where P2 does not reply to an initiating move in an eliciting exchange, but simply changes topic not only by initiating an eliciting exchange himself, but firstly making a boundary exchange in the form of a framing move:

176 P1 Yeah ... and er you can s- ... you can see Tokyo bi- big there?

177 P2 Hmm. Ah. Okay. By the way mmm have you ever visit Nagoya TV Tower?

178 P1 No.

179 P2 No. Mmmm. Are you interested ... in (laughter) tower?

180 P1 No (laughter)

181 P2 Eh hh (laughter)

This is unusual because of the notable omission of a reply, the *second pair*

part of an *adjacency pair* (Sacks, 1967, cited in Coulthard, 1985, pp.69-70), the *first pair part* being P1's question. Following a question with a question is also in breach of the first of Grice's *conversational maxims* (1975, cited in Coulthard, 1985, p. 31): 'be relevant'. As Sacks (*ibid*) points out, this can often cause offence, but in this case probably does not cause major offence, as P2 appears to be making a mistake. At worst, it is assumed not to have been paying full attention to P1.

Line 179 of this excerpt is of particular interest. de Boer states that, 'in a dialog which has meaning, the dialog has more interconnectivity and individual questions and answers could not be understood if they were isolated' (2009, p. 12). He cites an extract from Prabhu (1987, p. 126) as an example of a traditional S&C IRF interaction which is not optimally meaningful due to the questions all being display-type and coming from the teacher and the fact that any of the IRF sequences could be isolated and understood out of context.

S&C Move	Participant(s)	
I	Teacher (T)	This is Brindavan Express which goes from Madras to Bangladore. Where does it stop on the way?
R	Students (S)	Katpadi.
F/I	T	Katpati and ...
R	S	Jolarpet
F/I	T	Jolarpet, yes. What time does it leave Madras?
R	S	Seven twenty-five a.m
F/I	T	Seven twenty-five...
R	S	...a.m.

F/I	T	Yes, seven twenty-five a.m. What time does it arrive in Bangalore?
------------	---	--

Table 18: Excerpt from Prabhu (1987) cited in de Boer (2009)

This is why line 179 takes on such significance. If isolated, the laughter at the fact that the students are embarking on a lesson based on a handout entitled ‘Tokyo Tower Celebrates 50th Anniversary’ distributed only seconds earlier would be inexplicable. Further humor is derived through reference to P1’s statement that she is not interested in towers, by repetition of the question in line 188. This humor would be lost if taken out of context, as would that of P2’s intimation that she only visited the tower to appease her Japanese friend, insinuating a Japanese obsession with towers after P1 had demonstrated considerable knowledge on the subject.

180	P1	No (laughter)
181	P2	Ehhh (laughter)
182	P1/2	(laughter)
183	P1/2	Mmmm.
184	P1	No.
185	T	Are there any famous ones in China?
186	P2	Ah. In in Shanghai.
187	P1	Ahhh. There are maybe ... I remember ... maybe there are two tower. You can go mi- middle of the tower and the top of the tower. I only go to the (laughter) middle of tower.
188	P2	Are you ... (laughter) interested in towers?
189	P1	No. (laughter) [inaudible] I ... go to there with my Japanese friend.
190	P2	(laughter)

5. Implications

In order to satisfactorily apply the labeling system of the S&C model to the data, several modifications to the system were applied:

- distinctions between participant roles were abandoned to allow for a more ‘communicative’ dynamic (Kumaravadivelu, 1993)
- back-channeling was accounted for by the introduction of a new act label
- de Boer’s (2007) V-task exchange was adopted in order to monitor collaborative learning and scaffolding
- a drill exchange was created at the suggestion of Raine (2010) to allow for the inclusion of a very common type of EFL classroom interaction
- breaking of the system’s rules was tolerated and used to highlight a breakdown in communication

5.1 Usage in the creation of materials and materials testing

That these adaptations were made suggests that the data collected was from a more student-centered, if not communicative EFL classroom than a more traditional one in which Socratic lines of questioning were abound. If this is true, and a lack of communicativeness of EFL classrooms can be measured by the extent to which their discourse neatly fits the original S&C model, then there must be implications for materials writing and testing. Below is a vocabulary exercise from the lesson detailed in this paper.

Vocabulary 1

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1) commemorative (adj.) | a) to send |
| 2) author (n) | b) writer |
| 3) transmit (v) | c) in memory of a special event |
| 4) exceed (v) | d) to be greater than/more than |

Vocabulary Comprehension 1

In pairs, fill the blanks and discuss the following questions. You may need to change the grammar form of the above words.

- 1) Who is your favourite _____? Why? What kinds of novels do they write?
- 2) In Japan, TV stations will stop _____ the analogue signal in 2011. This means everyone has to buy a digital TV set before then. Why are they doing this? Is it a good idea?
- 3) Have you ever _____ the speed limit when driving your car? Why? Have you ever received a speeding ticket from the police?
- 4) Have you ever attended a _____ event or visited a _____ landmark?

This author (2010) conducted an action research project in order to gauge the communicativeness of the interaction in the lesson from which the data presented in this paper was gathered and subsequent lessons, where adjustments were made to the teaching practices as well as the materials in order to boost communicativeness. A contrastive analysis using the S&C model between the interaction stimulated by the vocabulary exercise above and that of the vocabulary exercise reproduced below from the third lesson of the 2010 study would be beneficial in deciphering whether progress had been made.

Vocabulary II

With a partner, look at the following words. Do you know any of them? If not, what do you think they mean? You can find them on page 77 in the text. If you have time, try to make sentences using them.

melancholy	Marxism	debauchery
unveiled	riddled with guilt	empathize
wealthy	affluent	punctuations

Of particular use would be the V-task exchange adaptation, as the adaptation was made with a mind to encouraging scaffolding and negotiation of meaning.

5.2 Use in student evaluation and counseling

The S&C model could prove useful for analysis of students' communicative strengths and weaknesses. An example would be the miscommunication that occurred in lines 176-9 of the data, where an elicit exchange initiating move from P1 was followed by a boundary framing move by P2, rather than a reply. This kind of unusual and possibly offensive behavior could be highlighted in student feedback. Moreover, the V-task exchange could be used to highlight and encourage, peer-scaffolding and attempts to access new language.

5.3 Uses in teacher training and personal professional development

Analyzing one's own lesson by means of the S&C model has helped this author understand the data more thoroughly than in the previous analysis. Merely transcribing the recording word for word helped raise consciousness about the underlying functions behind the spoken data. The 2010 study employed a quantitative notation system which did not take account for

‘pedagogical purposes and contexts’ (Seedhouse, 1995, pp. 27-8), but the application of a DA model allows the analyst better to understand *why* certain teacher choices and interaction patterns occur, rather than simply *whether* and *to what extent* these occur.

Suter suggests a ‘possibility for teacher training programs to include discourse analysis for the benefit of raising trainees’ (2002, p. 16). However, whilst certificate programs may benefit from this, it may not be practical for programs aimed at preparing novice teachers for the EFL classroom, such as those provided by the institution at which the lesson detailed in this paper took place and by whom this author is employed. This is on the grounds of the time-consuming nature of such an exercise (White, 2003; Raine, 2010). However, it may be of benefit for visiting teacher trainers to have experience in such activity to enlighten classroom observations.

6. Conclusion

Francis and Hunston’s (1992) model is a prime example of how the S&C model can be usefully adapted to a broader range of discourse genres and analysis needs, highlighting how feedback is an optional element outside of the traditional, teacher-lead IRF classroom interaction pattern. This was one of several further features of the data which illustrate how the lesson diverged from the IRF model, but reach beyond the scope of this paper.

If the S&C model is, indeed, a litmus test for the communicativeness of EFL classrooms, the data presented in this paper can certainly be said to be communicative. This author was able comfortably to fit the data into the model only after several adaptations and complementary models had been introduced. Applying the original S&C model to the data would have proven very problematic. However, that these modifications could be so easily applied is testament to the S&C model's flexibility and adaptability to new DA data and research needs, and will therefore be of use to many discourse analysts for years to come.

7. References

- Brazil, D.C. (1975). *Discourse intonation*. Discourse analysis monograph no. 1. Birmingham: ELR.
- Brazil, D.C. (1978a). *Discourse intonation*. Discourse analysis monograph no. 2. Birmingham: ELR.
- Brazil, D.C. (1978b). *Investigation of discourse intonation*. Final report to SSRC on research project HR3316/1.
- Burton, D. (1980). *Dialogue and discourse*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms. Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chigasaki Press (2009). *Chigasaki method latest news in English monthly no. 144*.
- Cockayne (Unpublished assignment). *Reducing teacher talk time and improving the quality of teacher talk: A classroom research project*. (Birmingham University TEFL/TESL ODSL Module 1 assignment), 2010).
- Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (1975). *Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Harlow: Longman.
- Coulthard, M. (1992). *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M & Brazil, D.C. (1979). *Exchange structure*. Discourse analysis monograph no. 5. Birmingham: ELR.
- Coulthard, M. & Montgomery, M.M. (1981). *Studies in discourse analysis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- de Boer, M. (Unpublished assignment). *A discourse model for collaborative learning: The discourse of scaffolding and social interaction in the V-task*. (Birmingham University TEFL/TESL ODSL Module 4 assignment, 2007).
- de Boer, M. (Unpublished assignment). *Discourse analysis of peer scaffolding and language development*. (Birmingham University TEFL/TESL ODSL dissertation, 2009).
- Dunn, W.E., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and Krashen's i+1: Incommensurable constructs; Incommensurable theories. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 411-442.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Francis, G. and S. Hunston (1992). Analysing everyday conversation. Advances in spoken discourse analysis. In M. Coulthard, *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 123-161). London: Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.) *Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1961). Categories of the theory of grammar. *Word* 17, 241-292.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing Learning Potential in the Communicative Classroom. *ELT Journal* 47, 5, 12-21.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Socio-cultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teacher's questions. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Macedo, A. R. (2000). *Classroom and spoken discourse & phonology*. Retrieved

- January 2011, from
<http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/macedo4.pdf>.
- Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Inc.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raine, P. (2010). *An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of discourse analysis*. Retrieved January 2011, from
http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/raine_sinc-coul.pdf.
- Sacks, H. (MS). *Aspects of the sequential organisation of conversation*.
- Sacks, M. (1967-71). Mimeo lecture notes.
- Seedhouse, P. (1994). Linking Pedagogical Purposes to Linguistic Patterns of Interaction: The Analysis of Communication in the Language Classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 32, 4, 303-320.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Suter, C. (2002). *Analysing spoken discourse in the EFL classroom*. Retrieved January 2011, from
<http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/suter4.pdf>.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Toward an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2000). A dogma for EFL. *IATEFL Issues*, 153, 24-28.
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum. Awareness, autonomy, authenticity*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

- Ventola, E. (1987). *The structure of social interaction*. London: Pinter.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Willis, J. (1992). Caught in the act: using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy. In *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. (pp. 111-122). M. Coulthard (ed.). London, Routledge.
- White, A. (2003). *The application of Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF structure to a classroom lesson: analysis and discussion*. Retrieved January 2011, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/AWhite4.pdf>.

8. Appendix: the full transcription

Legend	
Symbol	Signification
P1:	Verbal contribution from pupil 1
P2:	Verbal contribution from pupil 2
T:	Verbal contribution from the teacher
...	Pause in verbal language production
	Simultaneous speech
()	Commentary on non-verbal activity
{ }	Commentary on verbal contributions
[inaudible]	Utterance in indecipherable due to pronunciation or recording quality
-	Incomplete word
<i>Italicized</i>	Japanese language

Transcript		
1	P1	Er... My family moved to new house ... so this is the first time for me to ... go ... [inaudible] ... Chin- ... new house
2	P2	Uh-huh
3	P1	Yeah. And in ... our house er ... the small gar- garden
4	P2	Oh, really?
5	P1	Yeah. And my parents do ... doing ... it ... my parents my parents are do- doing gar- ga- ga- garden garden gardening garden
6	P2	Gardening
7	P1	Gardening. Yeah.
8	P2	Okay. So ...
9	P2	So you ... I- I suppose you ... felt ... ah
10	P1	Felt?
11	P2	Felt. Feel. Felt. Felt.
12	P2	You felt ah... happy to see the your new hou- new house. But I suppose also ... mmm ... you ... you ... had ... er ... some memories [inaudible] your old house.

13	P1	Mmmm.
14	P2	Which do you prefer?
15	P1	I like new house.
16	P2	Why?
17	P1	Because ... er ... old house is small. Was small. Small house. Now, new house is big house. I like big one.
18	P2	Mmmm.
19	P1	... And er ... mmm ... the ... in the ... I don't know how to say. In ah... There are a lot of people live there.
20	T	Horses?
21	P1	There are a lot of building.
22	T	Building?
23	P1	A lot of apartment build-.
24	T	Oh, buildings. Mmmm. Mmmm.
25	P1	Buildings. Buildings.
26	P2	Around your house?
27	P1	Around my house. And there are a lake. And er ... small park. Mmmm.
28	P2	Mmmm.
29	P1	Very, very good. And there ah ... ah ... mmm ... security very good.
30	P2	Ahhh.
31	P1	Ten people [inaudible] ... watching ... er ... the ... whole
32	T	Area?
33	P1	Area.
34	T	Neighborhood?
35	P1	Yeah.
36	T	Mmmm.
37	P2	So ... Ah. To check ah ... the ... Google Earth after this lesson. So could you please. Er. May I ask the ... house's address ... in China?
38	P1	Address?
39	P2	(laughing) [inaudible]
40	P2	I envy your er ... your ... goo- good location [inaudible]
41	P1	It's er ... countryside... Ou- my- Our old house is in city. It's a very, very crowd. And this now in er ... countryside. And the new neighbors is er ... the new ... the neighbors' age is same with my parents.
42	T	Mmmm. The new neighbors?

43	P1	The new neighbors.
44	T	Mmmm.
45	P1	There are a lot of topics to ... to ... to ... to discussion. To talk.
46	T	Yeah.
47	P1	They are same topic [inaudible]
48	T	We can say ... erm ... This's a good piece of vocabulary, actually. Let's say, erm ...(writing on whiteboard)
49	T	The new neighbors... (writing on whiteboard) The-
50	T	Ooh, James, your choice. British or American?
51	P2	(laughter)
52	T	Or you, there, then.
53	P1	American.
54	T	American. Okay.
55	T	The new neighbors ...(writing on whiteboard) are ... the ... how can we say? The...
56	P1	Same.
57	T	The same...(writing on whiteboard)
58	P1	Mmmm. Age.
59	T	Age. (writing on whiteboard)
60	P1	With.
61	T	(7 second pause) As.
62	P1	Ah, as.
63	T	As.
64	P1	Oh, the same.
65	T	Mmmm.
66	P1	Ah.
67	P2	Mm. As.
68	T	So the same ... as.
69	P1	Mm.
70	T	Mmmm.
71	P2	So ...er... the e- end of the (Teacher is writing on whiteboard)
72	T	(writing on whiteboard) [inaudible]
73	P2	Ahhh.
74	T	Okay? Mmmm.
75	P2	Same age.

76	T	So ...(writing on whiteboard) they have a lot in common.
77	P2	Ah. Okay.
78	T	Mmmm. This is quite nice, actually, it's ... we- we're using the same as, which is a good set, useful grammar. And we're also using ... this ... have a lot in common. Or have ... something in common.
79	P2	Mmmm.
80	T	Mmmm. Oh, it seems really nice. I bet they're happy.
81	P1	Yes. And very quiet. Quieter.
82	T	Mmmm.
83	T	So, you said the countryside is quiet. The city is ...
84	P1	Loud.
85	T	Loud? We can say the music is loud.
86	P1	Mm. Er. Noisy.
87	T	Noisy. That's right. Yes ... Good.
88	P1	[inaudible]
89	T	Nothing? Really? Are you sure?
90	T	Mmmm.
91	T	Okay. Let's have a look at some more grammar. (writing on whiteboard)
92	P1/2	NV
93	T	Already? You know? (laughing)
94	T	You felt ... mmm ... to see the new house.
95	T	Maybe I think it was I think you felt ... to see the new house. Okay?
96	T	(writing on whiteboard) Okay?
97	T	Ummm. What's er can you see anything wrong with this?
98	P2	Y- you you was [inaudible Japanese] you were fun.
100	T	Mmmm. We don't really use fun so much for people.
101	P1	Happy.
102	T	Happy? Mmmm.
103	T	We can say you ... felt happy.
104	T	(writing on whiteboard) Let's ... let's put that there but let's have a look at fun later.
105	P2	Mmmm
106	T	You felt happy. Hum. You were happy. (writing on whiteboard) Happy ... to see the new house... It was ... fun.
107	P1	Ahhh.

108	T	And if you want to say ... it was fun for you ... Mmmm. It was fun for you to see the new house.
109	P2	Mmmm.
110	T	If you just have this, it sounds like it was just fun for me. Okay? Mmmm. So I think it was fun ... for you ... to see the new house.
111	T	Wh- What is it?
112	P1	To see the new house.
113	T	Yeah. So we use it for ... so- something being fun ... for like activities. Okay? Mmmm.
114	T	Studying English is fun.
115	P1/2	(laughter)
116	T	Yes, yes. Good, good. You understand the question.
117	T	Okay. Good. Er ... One more thing.
118	T	(writing on whiteboard) In ... our house ... there is a small garden ...
119	P1	Ah.
120	T	Okay?
121	P2	Yeah, it's okay.
122	T	Mmmm. That's fine ... but it's a bit strange.
123	P1	They are a small.
124	T	There is?
125	T	One garden, yeah?
126	T	There is a small garden.
127	P1	Sm- eh? Little.
128	T	Little. Small. Little. They're kind of the same.
129	P1	Little house. Ah. Out of our house.
130	T	Ye- Yeah.
131	P1/2	(laughter)
132	T	Not in. Mmmm.
133	P2	In the house?
134	T	Maybe not in the house, yeah? It could be a really big house.
135	P1	Ahhh.
136	T	It sounds gorgeous. Mmmm.
137	P2	At.
138	T	Maybe, though ... it still sounds a bit ... unnatural. Erm ... I think we could start with our house.

139	P2	Has.
140	T	Has. (writing on whiteboard) Our house has a small garden. It's much more ... natural. There is a small garden.
141	P1	In my house.
142	T	Yeah. If it's inside. Erm.
143	T	By our house? Mmmm. In front of.
144	P1	In front of.
145	T	At the back of? (writing on whiteboard)
146	P2	Mmmm.
147	P1	At- er front.
148	T	In front of our house? (writing on whiteboard)
149	P1/2	Ahhh.
150	T	Okay. Good. Good.
151	T	I'm going to give you a few minutes to talk about these topics. (pointing to handouts) And you can have ... five minutes but I'm gonna use the timer.
152	T	(distributing handouts) Good. Let's use these to warm up. I don't think P3's coming.
153	P2	Have you ever been Tokyo Tower?
154	P1	No.
155	P2	No?
156	P1	No.
157	P2	Eh. Have you ever visit ... Tokyo?
158	P1	Yes.
159	P2	Ohhh.
160	P1	Several times.
161	P2	Ohhh.
162	P1	No. Don't ask me why. (laughter)
163	P2	Eh.
164	P1	Have you been (laughter) have you ever visited Tokyo Tower?
165	P2	Yeah ... two times.
166	P1	Nice. Wi- with who?
167	P2	Ah. First time ... I ... with ... first time with my father or parents. It was [inaudible]
168	P1	Oh. When you were small

169	P2	Small. Right.
170	P2	Second time mmm I forgot.
171	P1	Your friend?
172	P2	(laughter) I forgot.
173	P1	[inaudible]
174	P1	In Tokyo Tower ... what will ... what can ... we see? Yeah. Wh- Why are we go to Tokyo Tower?
175	P2	(laughter) Mmmm. Tokyo Tower is a symbol of Tokyo.
176	P1	Yeah ... and er you can s- ... you can see Tokyo bi- big there?
177	P2	Hmmm? Ah. Okay. By the way mmm have you ever visit Nagoya TV Tower?
178	P1	No.
179	P2	No. Mmmm. Are you interested ... in (laughter) tower?
180	P1	No (laughter)
181	P2	Ehhh (laughter)
182	P1/2	(laughter)
183	P1/2	Mmmm.
184	P1	No.
185	T	Are there any famous ones in China?
186	P2	Ah. In in Shanghai.
187	P1	Ahhh. There are maybe ... I remember ... maybe there are two tower. You can go mi- middle of the tower and the top of the tower. I only go to the (laughter) middle of tower.
188	P2	Are you ... (laughter) interested in towers?
189	P1	No. (laughter) [inaudible] I ... go to there with my Japanese friend.
190	P2	(laughter)
191	P1	She ... want to ... wanted to go there so I.
192	P2	Ah. Okay. (laughter) I understand.
193	T	How about you, James?
194	P2	How about?
195	T	How about you? Have you ever visited Tokyo Tower?
196	P2	Ah yes. Two times.
197	T	Oh, yes. You said, didn't you? (laughter)
198	P2	Mmmm. Mmmm. The designer of Tokyo Tower ... designed Nagoya TV Tower. Did you know?

199	P1	Designed ... the designer of Tokyo Tower?
200	P2	Yes.
201	P1	I don't know.
202	P2	Mmmm. Tokyo Tower. Mmmm. Okay.
203	P1	Different from Tokyo Tower?
204	P2	Nagoya Tower Nagoya TV Tower ... is older than Tokyo Tower.
205	P1	Ol-?
206	P2	Older. ... Older than Tokyo Tower.
207	P1	Ol-?
208	T	Older.
209	P1	Older. Ahhh. Yeah.
210	P2	Mm.
220	P1	Mm.
221	P2	So, de- designer same designer eh ... but ... the designer ... ah ... when the designer was younger ... designed Nagoya TV Tower.
222	P1	Ehhh.
223	P2	And ... next ... he ... designed Tokyo Tower.
224	P1	Ehhh.
225	P1	Mmmm. So what about the difference from ah what is the difference?
226	P2	Nagoya TV Tower ... is ... er ...
227	P1	Simple.
228	P2	Eh? Simple tha- er ... pi- pillars old pillars are ... straight, not bent. Be- be- be-
229	T	Bent?
230	P2	O- o- old pillars are straight. Tokyo Tower ... is ...
231	P1	Mmmm. Mmmm.
232	P2	The pillars of Tokyo Tower are bent.
(Timer alarm sounds)		
233	P1	Ah. I'm tired today.
234	T	(laughter)
235	P1	And ... er ... yesterday ... I drink ... late.
236	T	Oh, really?
237	P2	(laughter)
238	T	Mmmm. So you're tired?
239	P1	And today ... very hard work.

240	P1/2	(laughter) [inaudible]
241	T	Okay. Actually, there's some very simple grammar I'd like to check first. Just for grammar practice, okay?
242	T	Erm. In Tokyo Tower, what can you see?
243	P1	What can you do?
245	P2	What can you see?
246	T	Well, see is okay.
247	P2	From Tokyo Tower.
248	T	Could it be from? Mmmm. (drawing on whiteboard) If you're in the area of Tokyo Tower
249	P2	At.
250	T	Mm. So the area ... at.
251	T	(drawing on whiteboard) It's got to be ... curved ... bent ... okay ... erm ... that's quite good ... erm ...
252	T	The area ... at Tokyo Tower. (drawing on whiteboard) From Tokyo Tower looking from here. So ... from ... good.
253	T	For Towers, we can't really say in, can we?
254	T	Mmmm. Have you visit ... oh, it should be a question ... that's my mistake (writing on whiteboard) ... Have you ever visit Tokyo Tower?
255	P1	Visited.
256	T	Yeah. I said it's very simple, yeah? Mmmm.
257	P2	Ah, ah.
258	T	Mmmm. Actually, if we go back to the first one ... it's fine ... at Tokyo Tower what can you see ... but maybe a native speaker would probably start with ... What can you see ... from Tokyo Tower.
259	T	Okay. Let's go on to the next one ... Are you interested in tower?
256	P2	Towers.
257	T	Yeah. (laughter) So simple. Sorry. I couldn't find any more useful mistakes.
258	T	Ah ... Let's have a look at this one. (writing on whiteboard) This wasn't a mistake but I want to practice some grammar. We already studied this grammar today ... Tower was designed by Uh-hmm (pointing to ellipsis in the sentence written on the whiteboard) archi- architect
259	P2	Very famous.
260	T	Really? Must be famous. Yeah. Mmm ... was designed by ... this is

		something we've studied today
261	P1	[inaudible]
262	T	Ah ... Let me read it for you. (Pointing to the example sentence on the whiteboard) Tokyo Tower was designed by uh-hmm (pointing to ellipsis in the sentence written on the whiteboard) architect uh-hmm (pointing to ellipsis in the sentence written on the whiteboard) TV Tower.
263	P1/2	(laughter)
264	P1	As.
265	P2	As the TV Tower.
266	T	Yep.
267	P2	Uh-huh.
268	P1	The same as ... the same.
269	T	Good. Yes.
		School staff member is seen through the window approaching with a camera.
270	P1/2	[inaudible]
271	T	Maybe he's going to come in and take our ... photo. We'll have to try and
272	P1	Only two people?
273	T	(laughter) Only two people ... mmm ... mmm
274	T	That's probably good timing for him because ... it means ... (exchanging signals with staff through classroom window)
275	P2/T	[inaudible]
276	P2	Sa- Sa- Sapporo TV Tower er ... Tokyo Tower ... Nagoya TV Tower ... Osaka [inaudible]
277	T	All towers ... What's the one in France called?
278	P2	France called?
279	T	What's the one in France ... called?
280	P2	Eh ... Eiffel Tower {Japanese pronunciation}
281	T	Ah ... in English, we say ... (writing phonemic symbols on the whiteboard)
282	P2	<i>nani, sore?</i> In English?
283	T	Mmm ... the
284	P1	French Tower.
285	T	(laughter) No ... but that's a good guess.
286	P2	(reading phonemic symbols on whiteboard) Ei- Ei- Eiffel.

287	T	Yeah ... that's right. So maybe in France, they would say er ... er... Eiffel {French, Japanese hybrid pronunciation} ... but in English we say Eiffel (English pronunciation) like in ... <i>dou suru</i>
288	P2	(laughter) <i>aifuru</i>
289	T	(laughter)
290	P2	(singing) <i>Dou suru ...aifuru</i>
291	P1	<i>Sugoi ... muzukashii jooku desu ne</i>
292	P1/2/T	(laughter)
293	P1	Eiffel. Eiffel. Eiffel. {English pronunciation}
294	P2	The spelling is same ... Eiffel {French pronunciation} Eiffel {English pronunciation}?
295	T	Yeah.
296	P2	Oh, really?
297	T	Mmmm.
298	T	[inaudible] Maybe let's move on to the next part. Okay?
299	P2	Mmmm.
300	T	We've got lots to do today, so we'd best ... maybe need to speed up a little.
301	T	Mmmm. Please repeat ... for the vocabulary ... commemorative.
302	P1/2	Commemorative.
303	T	Author.
304	P1/2	Author.
305	T	Transmit.
306	P1/2	Transmit.
307	T	Exceed.
308	P1/2	Exceed.
309	T	Okay ... I'm gonna give you ... I'm not gonna use the timer. I'm gonna clean the board. It's a race to see who's finished first and when I'm finished, we'll check. Okay?
(Teacher cleans whiteboard and students match vocabulary to definitions on the handout)		
310	T	Oh. Before I'd started, you'd finished?
311	P2	Yes.
312	T	Wow. Let me check. NV
313	T	Okay. Katie, can you choose one and tell us the answer.
314	P1	One. Author.

315	T	One?
316	P1	Two.
317	P2	(laughter)
318	P1	Number one.
319	T	Commemorative?
320	P1	Maybe c.
321	T	Yes. In memory of a special event. Good.
322	T	James, your choice.
323	P2	Author is writer.
324	T	Yes. Katie.
325	P1	Mmmm. Transmit. To be greater than ... more than.
326	T	Mmmm. Second chance.
327	P2	(laughter)
328	P1	[inaudible] To send.
329	T	Yeah ... okay? And Katie again.
330	P1	Exceed. To be greater than ... more than.
331	T	Yeah ... good, good.