

**Analyzing a One-on-one Advanced Conversation Lesson  
using Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Model**

July 31, 2004

Mary Umemoto

For  
University of Birmingham  
MA TEFL/TESL

Module 4  
Classroom and Spoken Discourse  
&  
Phonology

SD/04/04

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

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

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

# **Analyzing a One-on-one Advanced Conversation Lesson using Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Model**

## **1.0 Introduction**

Some have criticized the very idea of a discourse model based on data gathered from traditional, teacher-fronted classrooms, contrasting the nature of classroom interaction with that which occurs in 'the real world'. Anderson et al. (1999:372) refers to teacher-fronted discourse as "antithetical to classroom discussion", while McDonough and Shaw (1999:243) expounds the need to "break the traditional lock-step of the classroom." (in Nunn 2001:2) A traditional classroom is, after all, "a peculiar place, a place where teachers ask questions to which they already know the answers, where pupils...have very limited rights as speakers, and where evaluation by the teacher of what the pupils say is a vital mechanism in the discourse structure." (McCarthy 1991:19)

Notwithstanding these criticisms, having a model whose structural criteria is strictly defined does have an advantage; namely, it provides a sound linguistic basis for direct comparison of data from different discourse samples. For language classrooms in particular, it allows us to evaluate both teacher and student output, from which we can draw evidence of the type and quality of communication that actually goes on in the classroom. With this purpose in mind, I have transcribed the opening segments of one of my own classes and will analyze the data using Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model for discourse analysis.

First the model, then the context of the lesson and the data gathering process will be described, followed by predictions made before analysis. Next, the actual data analysis will be presented and specific examples from the transcription will specify some of the difficulties which occurred when applying the model. Finally, conclusions which can be drawn from the data will point towards the usefulness of the DA model for understanding classroom communication.

## 1.1 What is discourse analysis?

Discourse analysis is “the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used.” (McCarthy 1991:5) It is this at level, the one above grammatical form, where one ultimately determines the discourse value, or function, of an utterance. To illustrate this, consider the following examples from Sinclair and Brazil (1982:20):

1. Who’s next (as a command)
2. Go and jump in the lake (as an insult)
3. I’m hungry (as a request)
4. And the earth is flat (as a denial)

The first sentence is an interrogative at the grammatical level, but it functions as a command at the discourse level. The remaining sentences also show a similar mismatch between form and function. A grammatical analysis alone, without taking into account the situation, the relationship of the speakers involved, and the immediately preceding utterances and would not adequately explain the meaning of the above sentences. What is needed is a level above grammatical analysis, hence discourse analysis comes into play.

## 2.0 Sinclair and Coulthard’s IRF model

In response to a challenge by Halliday that language should be seen “both as a system and a process”, (Halliday 1984:3 in Malouf 1995:2) Sinclair and Coulthard developed a model for discourse analysis based on observations of classroom interaction. They adapted Halliday’s rank-scale classification of grammatical structure and used it to develop a rank-scale classification of discourse “units”. These units provide the structural basis for their model, which combined with a consideration of the moment-by-moment process of discourse allows for each utterance to be classified in terms of its effect on the immediately following utterance. (Francis and Hunston, 1992:151). This model is also known as the Discourse Analysis (DA) Model.

### 2.1 Discourse structure

The units of structure which are identified in the DA model are, in ascending order of rank, *act*, *move*, *exchange*, *transaction*, and *lesson*. There are rules which define the structure of each unit above the smallest unit, *act*, which by definition has no structure. The largest unit, *transaction*, would likewise by

definition not form part of a yet larger unit. Before applying the model, it is important to understand the characteristics of the smallest unit, “act”, and the rules which define the structure of the larger units.

### **2.1.1 Acts and moves**

For the smallest unit, Sinclair et al. originally proposed twenty-two acts. These can be categorized as meta-interactive, interactive, and turn-taking. Acts are basically defined according to their interactive function. For instance, the function of the act “*elicitation*” would be to request a linguistic response, while that of an “*informative*” would be to provide information. A detailed description of each act is too lengthy to include here, but it may be referred to in Appendix 1.

One or more acts combine to form a move. A move is the minimum contribution a speaker may make to an exchange. Something which can stand as the sole item in a move is a free act, one which cannot be a bound act. Free acts include ‘*elicitation*’, ‘*informative*’, ‘*directive*’, ‘*check*’, ‘*reply*’, ‘*acknowledge*’, ‘*react*’ and ‘*evaluate*’. These are the acts which serve as “head” of a move. Just as in grammar where a phrase must have at a minimum a head, moves at a minimum must contain one head act.

### **2.1.2 Exchanges**

Moves combine to form exchanges. The DA model encompasses a three-part structure for exchanges made up of Initiation, Response, and Follow-up moves. For classroom interaction in particular, the three-part structure is the norm. There are two reasons for this. The first is that the teacher often repeats the contribution of a single student for the benefit of the others to hear. Secondly, and more importantly, in most cases the teacher already knows the answer to the questions he or she is asking, and the students expect feedback as to whether their contributions are “correct” or not. In practice, teachers often withhold the feedback move from answers which are incorrect. (Coulthard 1985:125)

Exchanges, which combine to form transactions, can be classified as one of two types: boundary exchanges and teaching exchanges. Boundary exchanges, as the name suggests, occur at the beginning and ends of transactions, and they are used by

the teacher to organize the lesson. Students normally do not contribute, therefore boundary exchanges typically consist of one move. The structure of a boundary exchange is a framing move followed by a focus. Framing moves consist of a marker followed by a silent stress. Markers are generally realized by words such as “*well*”, “*OK*”, “*now*”, “*good*”, “*right*”, and “*alright*”. Teachers often have personal preferences in that they tend to consistently use the same one or two markers for this function.

Boundary exchanges are followed by any number of teaching exchanges, of which there are three types: informing, directing, and eliciting. These moves are named in accordance with the head act in the initiating move of the exchange. Hence, the head act of the initiating move of a directing exchange is “*directive*”, that of an eliciting exchange is the act “*elicitation*”. These correspond to the three things that teachers ‘do’ during the course of the lesson. In addition, there are bound exchanges. These occur when an exchange reactivates an element in another exchange instead of repeating or rephrasing it. A description of the structure for each type of exchange is included in Appendix 2.

### **2.1.3 Transactions and lessons**

Exchanges combine to form transactions. A transaction, which consists of a boundary exchange followed by any number of teaching exchanges, is the largest unit whose structure can be specified.

The original DA model included “*lesson*” as the largest unit, but with the understanding that its status was similar to that of “*paragraph*”. This is because although sentences do combine into paragraphs, there are no rules to describe its structure, hence its inclusion is postulated only “as an act of faith”. (Coulthard 1985:123)

## **2.2 Modifications to the original exchange structure**

Within the original DA model the structure of an exchange was I (R) (F). This allowed for a maximum of three moves within an exchange. A problem with this structure is that it does not adequately explain exchanges such as:

T: Can anyone tell me what this means  
P: Does it mean danger men at work  
T: Yes

Here we have an example of a polar eliciting move, wherein the pupil's utterance functions both as a reply to the preceding item and an initiation to the following item. (Coulthard 1985:135) This type of exchange often occurs when the pupil is unsure of his or her reply. In order to take into account that two eliciting moves, as well as two informing moves, may occur within the same exchange, the original exchange structure was revised to include up to five moves, I (R/I) R (F) (F).

Another modification proposed by Willis was that “*acknowledge* should be acceptable as head of a follow-up move in an eliciting exchange.” (Willis 1992:118). The original exchange structure only allowed for one act, “*evaluation*”, to serve as head of a follow-up move. The significance of this amendment is that it allows us to distinguish between eliciting exchanges which are initiated by display questions and those which are initiated by referential questions. Display questions would have the structure I (*elicit*) R (*reply*) (F) (*evaluate*); while referential questions would have the structure I (*elicit*) R (*reply*) (F) (*acknowledge*).

Before analyzing the data, let's examine the background and setting of the language lesson from which the data was gathered.

### **3.0 The language lesson.**

The data chosen for analysis was gathered from a private one-on-one advanced conversation class.. The weekly lessons take place in my home, hence the atmosphere is rather relaxed. There is a one-year old baby present, so there are occasional interruptions in the lesson.

The student is native Japanese-speaking female who teaches English to children at a well-known language “juku”, or cram school. She has studied abroad at an American university, subsequently her English is fairly fluent. As a result, lessons can proceed totally in English without the typical communication breakdowns that occur at lower levels.

A typical lesson proceeds as follows: After the student has settled and some social interaction has taken place, I usually introduce a handout which provides a topic for that day's lesson. We first do the activity, and thereafter the topic provides a basis for further conversation.

### **3.1 Data Gathering**

The topic for this particular lesson is "family conflict"; the handout used for this is presented in Appendix 3. Data was gathered via a small cassette recorder placed near the area where the lesson took place. Afterwards, the data was transcribed, then analyzed using the DA model.

We will now proceed to the data analysis to see whether there were any problems in applying the DA model to the data sample from this lesson.

### **4.0 Data presentation and analysis**

The data chosen for analysis comprises the first four transactions of the lesson. The data transcription and analysis are presented in table format in Appendix 4. The first column lists the exchange number, and the remaining three columns indicate the opening, answering, and follow-up moves.. A solid line indicates exchange boundaries, and dotted lines indicate incomplete or bound exchanges. Each move is labeled according to type, and next to it in parenthesis is the name of the head act. Exchanges which occur as interruptions or asides are marked in red, and student contributions are marked in blue. Color coding to differentiate between teacher and student speech makes for easy comparison of student and teacher talk.

Despite sections where the lesson appears to drift into social conversation, it remains clear that this remains a lesson. For one, boundary exchanges clearly mark where the lesson begins and where social conversation ends. The topic is chosen ahead of time by the teacher, and the student, though free to initiate, rarely strays from the chosen topic. Boundary exchanges containing framing and focusing moves are conspicuous and make it clear that the teacher remains in control of the lesson's progress. The analysis shows this data to clearly be 'classroom data' rather than 'an outside conversation between friends'.

#### 4.1 General ease and/or difficulty of the analysis

Overall, I was successfully able to fit the data into the DA model. Actual classification did prove time consuming, mainly because of my own unfamiliarity with the model and initial confusion when deciding between acts with seemingly similar functions such as “*accept*”, and “*acknowledge*”. Specific difficulties which arose during the analysis will be discussed in section 5.0.

#### 4.2 Predictions and results

Sinclair and Coulthard based the DA model on observations made during teacher-fronted classes of multiple students, which took place in an institutional setting. Taking into account the informal setting and class size of one, I predicted there would be some differences in the data gathered for this particular class. We shall next examine these predictions in light of the results to see if they held true.

##### 4.2.1 Turn-taking acts

The first prediction was that, having only one student, the turn-taking acts “*cue*”, “*bid*” and “*nominate*” would not occur. Actual results, however, proved to the contrary. Turn-taking acts occurred twice in transaction number two:

2.15		S:	I	My turn? (bid)
	T:			Um hmm. (nom)
2.18		S:	I	Me? (bid)
	T:			Um hmm. (nom)
				The father says [reading] “ <i>It’s _____</i> ” (el)

These bids can be explained by the type of activity that was being done. The handout being used for this lesson (see Appendix 3) was a fill-in-the-blanks activity involving a conversation between father and son. Since there was only one student present, the teacher and student were alternating roles when reading aloud. In the exchanges above, it was not clear to the student whose turn it was. Of course, once the worksheet activity was completed there were, as would be expected, no further instances of bids and nominations.

#### 4.2.2 Opportunities for student to make opening and follow-up moves

In traditional classrooms, student contributions are largely limited to answering moves. (McCarthy 1991:122) Given the relaxed nature of this teacher-student relationship, the casual ‘at home’ setting, the student’s level of proficiency combined with an outgoing personality, a second prediction was that student contributions would not be largely limited to answering moves. Instead, there would be evidence of student contributions in the opening and follow-up moves as well.

The actual results differed depending on the type of activity involved. The beginning of the lesson, as represented by the first two transactions, involves introducing and doing the activity described in the handout. The teacher here is playing the traditional teacher role of “primary knower” by asking display questions and evaluating the correctness of the student’s responses. (Willis 1992:113) Here the student’s contributions are limited to answering moves, with the opening and follow-up moves dominated by the teacher’s talk.

Transactions 3 and 4, however, show a much different pattern. Twelve of the twenty-seven opening moves and four of the thirteen follow-up moves are made by the student. The follow-ups were the result of initiating student elicits. This shows that the activity contained in the second two transactions provided the student with more freedom to contribute to the discourse.

### 5.0 Specific problems encountered during analysis

A detailed analysis of every exchange is beyond the constraints of this paper. Instead, a few of the exchanges which proved the most difficult to fit into the model will be discussed.

#### 5.1 Exchange 1.3: Pupil inform

Exchange 1.3, though short and routine, proved the most difficult to label. The first attempt produced the following analysis. The head act of the transaction is noted with an asterisk:

1.3 S:	I	Here you go. (*dir) [Hands envelope with payment to T] (NV)
T:	R	Oh, thank you. (ack) [Accepts envelope] (*rea)

Since the function of a directive is to “request a non-linguistic response” (Coulthard 1985:26), it seemed that the “Here you go” could be interpreted as a student directive indicating that the teacher should take the payment envelope. The problem with this interpretation, however, is that the DA model only allows for two types of pupil-initiated exchanges; namely “*Pupil Inform*” and “*Pupil Elicit*”. That there is no mention of “*Pupil Direct*” is understandable when teacher-student roles are taken into consideration. In traditional classrooms it is rare for a student to direct the teacher to do something unless given permission beforehand as in, for example, a TPR activity where the teacher reverses roles with the students and becomes the TPR doer. In fact, in many situations where students give outright directives to the teacher, it can be interpreted as belligerence.

A second attempt was made at labeling the exchange, this time as a pupil inform, with the following result:

1.3 S:	I	Here you go. (*inf) [Hands envelope with payment to T] (NV)
	T:	F Oh, thank you. (*e) [Accepts envelope] (NV)

Here the student’s “Here you go” is labeled an inform, indicating that she is informing the teacher that she intends to pay for the lesson now. This analysis follows the I F structure for pupil informs as defined by the DA model, which does not allow for an I R structure when the pupil initiates with an informative move.

Labeling the opening move as a pupil inform presents an additional problem. According to the model, the head act of a follow-up move for a pupil inform can only be an evaluating act by the teacher. But the expression “Oh, thank you” as an evaluation seemed odd in this instance.

I finally realized that what made this exchange problematic was my inability to see past the teacher/student roles with which the participants had been labeled. Here is an instance in which those roles are transcended. The speaker who opens with “*Here you go*” identifies him or herself as the ‘giver’, it no longer matters whether the giver is a teacher or a student. Likewise, the person who reciprocates with “*Thank-*

*you*” becomes the ‘receiver’. Since “*Here you go*” spoken by a ‘giver’ predicts a non-verbal response from the receiver (namely ‘receiving’) it can be labeled the same as a directive without the need to differentiate it as a “pupil directive”. The model did not provide for a separate “pupil directive” not because it did not exist, but because it would have produced no structural change. The exchange was finally labeled as follows:

1.3 S:	I	Here you go. (*dir)
		[Hands envelope with payment to T] (NV)
T:	R	Oh, thank you. (acc)
		[Accepts envelope] (*rea)

## 5.2 Handling interruptions and asides

Exchange 1.3 has an interesting effect on the immediately preceding exchange:

1.1 T:	Frame	OK (m)	^
1.2 T:	Focus	so, (m)	
			today’s lesson. (s)
			Last week we sort of did, umm, divorce(s)

The statement “Last week we sort of did, umm, divorce” was most likely intended to be a *metastatement*, however the following pupil inform exchange (1.3) serves as an interruption. Consequently, the act is relegated as a *starter*. A *starter* is a bound act which “does not normally occur as the sole item in a move”. (Coulthard 1985:126). However, this is not to say that it can *never* occur as a sole item in a move, taking into consideration that speakers can be interrupted in the midst of a move.

However, labeling this act a *starter* leaves this exchange (1.2) both incomplete and without a head. By definition, an exchange without a head is a bound exchange, and bound exchanges occur only during teaching exchanges (see Sinclair and Coulthard 1992:28-31). This, I believe, shows that there are limits to any model of discourse in that it cannot exhaustively account for all the possibilities inherent in an interaction.

In this particular case, the pupil has broken out of the expected ‘routine’, that is, she makes an initiation which in and of itself is a rare occurrence in the typical

teacher-fronted classroom upon the DA model is based, and furthermore which occurs at an unexpected time in the discourse -- during a boundary rather than a teaching exchange. Considering the circumstances, I decided to leave it as an incomplete focusing exchange which the teacher again takes up immediately following the interrupting exchange (1.3) as follows:

1.4	T:	Focus	Last week's topic was divorce(s) So, (m) this week the topic is sort of related. (s) It's families, (*ms) but not necessarily divorce. (com)
-----	----	-------	--

To show this in the analysis, the analysis in Appendix 4 shows the 'interrupting' exchange in red, with the boundaries of the preceding and following exchanges being a broken rather than a solid line.

The second transaction coincidentally also contains an interruption during a boundary exchange which relegates the first attempt at "*metastatement*" to "*starter*" (exchanges 2.1 and 2.2). Just after the interrupting exchanges (2.3 - 2.4), a framing and a focusing move occur as a second attempt to begin the transaction (2.5 and 2.6).

In exchange 2.7, this time the teacher again interrupts herself in the middle of a focusing statement with an aside, again relegating an intended "*metastatement*" to a "*starter*". Although the aside takes the form of a question, the teacher is merely talking to herself while writing and does not intend it to be an actual elicit. The student, however, takes it for an actual elicit and provides a response.

2.7	T:	I	Is Ryuta a boy or a girl?	It's a Japanese name, I think, of course. (z)
	S:	R	I think a boy? A boy's name? (rep)	
	T:	F	Maybe a boy? (ack)	Okay, Ryuta is a boy. (acc)

### 5.3 Exchange 1.13

The first pupil inform which occurs at transaction 1.13 is interesting. In this case, the exchange begins as a teacher inform, however the student, anticipating the completion of the inform, takes it over and turns it into her own inform, thus completing the move herself. This relegates the teacher's inform to a starter. The teacher then follows up with an evaluation and further comments on it.



. During the first two transactions, opening moves were restricted mainly to the teacher, whereas during the second two transactions almost half of the opening moves were made by the student. This shows that I held a large degree of teacher control over the beginning of a lesson, but that as the lesson progressed the degree of teacher control also relaxed, allowing the student to contribute opening moves more freely. Consequently, the DA model helped provide feedback as to the degree of teacher and student control over various portions of the lesson.

## **6.0 Conclusion**

Thus far we have described the DA model along with later modifications to the theory, and we have applied model to the data transcribed from a one-on-one classroom lesson. Despite the contrasts that can be made between a private one-on-one lesson and a traditional classroom of multiple students, the data clearly fit into the DA model without the need to make any personal modifications to the theory. Specific difficulties which arose during the process of analysis and their resolutions were specified. Finally some advantages of using the DA model for understanding classroom communication were considered.

This research involved a small data sample from a single lesson. Further research involving a larger sample of data obtained during one-on-one classrooms may be helpful in determining whether there are unique patterns of interaction applicable to this teaching situation.

For instance, Sinclair and Coulthard observed that after a teacher inform “pupils may, but usually do not, make a verbal response to the teacher’s initiation”. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992:26). However, the data sample taken from my lesson showed that in fact, every teacher inform was followed by a verbal acknowledgement from the student, and every pupil inform was followed by either an evaluation or a acknowledging follow-up by the teacher.

It is possible that during one-on-one lessons the “*acknowledgement*” act in response to an informing move may have the same status as the “*evaluation*” act for a teacher eliciting move (specifically an initiating display question) meaning that its absence would be noticeably conspicuous, leaving the speaker wondering if he or she

was being heard. This would be an area where further analysis based on larger data samples of one-on-one lessons could provide some interesting insights.

## References

- Anderson J., Nussbaum, J. and Grant, J. (1999) "Interaction skills in instructional settings." in A. Vangelisti, J. Daly, and G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication theory and research methods* (pp. 359-374). LEA.
- Coulthard, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.* Longman.
- Francis, G. and Hunston, S. (1992) "Exchange Structure" in Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 50-78. Routledge.
- Halliday, M. (1984) "Language as code and language as behavior: a systemic-functional interpretation of the nature and ontogenesis of dialogue." in Fawcett, R., Halliday, M. Lamb, S. and Makkai, A. (Eds.), *The Semiotics of Culture and Language* 1:3-36. Frances Pinter.
- Malouf, R. (1995). "Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse"  
(<http://odur.let.rug.nl/~malouf/papers/talk.pdf> )
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. (1993) *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford.
- Nunn, R. (2001) "Language learning across boundaries - Negotiating classroom rituals." in *TESL-EJ* 5(2)  
(<http://www-writing-berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej18/a1.html>)
- McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge.
- Sinclair, J. and Brazil, D. (1982) "No sooner said than done" in *Teacher Talk*. Oxford.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1992) "Toward an analysis of discourse". in Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 1-34. Routledge.
- Willis, J. (1992) "Inner and outer:spoken discourse in the language classroom." in Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1992. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 162-182. Routledge.

## Appendix I - Acts and Their Definitions

*Definitions and symbols as per Coulthard (1992: 19-21)*

*Types I - III as per Coulthard (1985: 126)*

*Type IV as per Brazil (1985)*

<b>I. Meta-interactive Acts</b>		
Act	Code	Definition
conclusion	con	Realized by an anaphoric statement, sometimes marked by slowing of speech rate and usually the lexical items 'so', or 'then'. In a way it is the converse of metastatement. It's function is again to help the pupils understand the structure of the lesson but this time by summarizing what the preceding chunk of discourse was about.
loop	l	Realized by a closed class of items -- 'pardon', 'you what', 'eh', 'again', with rising intonation and a few questions like 'did you say', 'do you mean'. Its function is to return the discourse to the state it was at before the pupil spoke, from where it can proceed normally.
marker	m	Realized by a closed class of items: 'well', 'OK', 'now', 'good', 'right' 'alright'. When acting as head of a framing move it has a falling intonation, [1] or [+1], as well as a silent stress. Its function is to mark boundaries in the discourse.
metastatement	ms	Realized by a statement which refers to some future time when what is described will occur. Its function is to help the pupils to see the structure of the lesson, to help them understand the purpose of the subsequent exchange, and see where they are going.
silent stress	^	Realized by a pause, of the duration of one or more beats, following a marker. It functions to highlight the marker when it is serving as the head of a boundary exchange indicating a transaction boundary.

<b>II. -Interactive Acts</b>		
Act	Code	Definition
accept	acc	Realized by a closed class of items -- 'yes', 'no', 'good', 'fine' and repetition of pupil's reply, all with neutral low fall intonation. Its function is to indicate that the teacher has heard or seen and that the informative, reply, or react was appropriate.
acknowledge	ack	Realized by 'yes', 'OK', 'cor', 'mm', 'wow', and certain non-verbal gestures and expressions. Its function is simply to show that the initiation has been understood, and, if the head was a directive, that the pupil intends to react.
check	ch	Realized by a closed class of polar questions concerned with being 'finished' or 'ready', having 'problems' or 'difficulties', being able to 'see' or 'hear'. They are 'real' questions, in that for once the teacher doesn't know the answer. If he does know the answer to, for example, 'have you finished', it is a directive, not a check. The function of checks is to enable the teacher to ascertain whether there are any problems preventing the successful progress of the lesson.
clue	cl	Realized by a statement, question, command, or moodless item. It is subordinate to the head of the initiation and functions by providing additional information which helps the pupil to answer the elicitation or comply with the directive.
comment	com	Realized by a statement or tag question. It is subordinate to the head of the move and its function is to exemplify, expand, justify, provide additional information. On the written page it is difficult to distinguish from an informative because the outsider's ideas of relevance are not always the same. However, teachers signal paralinguistically, by a pause, when they are beginning a new initiation with an informative as a head; otherwise they see themselves as commenting.
directive	d	Realized by a command. Its function is to request a non-linguistic response.
elicitation	el	Realized by a question. Its function is to request a linguistic response.
evaluate	e	Realized by statements and tag questions, including words and phrases such as 'good', 'interesting', 'team point', commenting on the quality of the reply, react or initiation, also by 'yea', 'no', 'good', 'fine', with a high-fall intonation, and the repetition of the pupil's reply with either high-fall (positive) or a rise of any kind (negative evaluation)

<b>II. -Interactive Acts</b>		
<b>Act</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Definition</b>
informative	i	Realized by a statement. It differs from other uses of statement in that its sole function is to provide information. The only response is an acknowledgement of attention and understanding.
prompt	p	Realized by a closed class of items -- 'go on', 'come on', 'hurry up', 'quickly', 'have a guess'. Its function is to reinforce a directive or elicitation by suggesting that the teacher is no longer requesting a response but expecting or even demanding one.
react	rea	Realized by a non-linguistic action. It's function is to provide the appropriate non-linguistic response which is appropriate to the elicitation.
reply	rep	Realized by a statement, question, or moodless item and non-verbal surrogates such as nods. Its function is to provide a linguistic response which is appropriate to the elicitation.
starter	s	Realized by a statement, question, or command. Its function is to provide information about or direct attention to or thought towards an area <i>in order to make a correct response to the initiation more likely</i> .

<b>III. Turn-taking Acts</b>		
<b>Act</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Definition</b>
cue	cu	Realized by a closed class of items of which we so far have only three exponents, 'hands up', 'don't call out', 'is John the only one'. It's sole function is to evoke an appropriate bid.
bid	b	Realized by a closed class of verbal and non-verbal items -- 'Sir', 'Miss', teacher's name, raised hand, heavy breathing, finger clicking. It's function is to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse.
nominate	n	Realized by a closed class consisting of the names of all the pupils, 'you', with contrastive stress, 'anybody', 'yea' and one or two idiosyncratic items such as 'who hasn't said anything yet'. The function of nomination is to call on or give permission to a pupil to contribute to the discourse.

#### **IV. Others**

<b>IV. Other</b>		
<b>Act</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Definition</b>
aside	z	Realized by a statement, question, command, moodless, usually marked by lowering the tone of the voice, and not really addressed to the class. As we noted above, this category covers items we have difficulty in dealing with. It is really instances of the teacher talking to himself: 'It's freezing in here'. 'Where did I put my chalk?'.

## Appendix 2 - Exchange Structure

The structure below is from Coulthard (1992:69,70)  
Amendments, indicated in red, are from Willis (1992:18)

### I. Boundary Exchanges

#### a. Beginning a transaction:

(fr) frame ^ = *marker* (high falling intonation) followed by a short pause ^  
(fo) focus = *metastatement*

#### b. Ending a transaction:

(fo) focus = *conclusion* (outlines what the class has just done or is about to do)  
(fr) frame ^ = *marker* followed by a short pause ^

### II. Teaching Exchanges

I (R) (F)

#### 1. Teacher eliciting exchanges: (brackets indicate head act)

I (*elicit*) I (*elicit*)  
R (*reply*) R (*reply*)  
F (*evaluation*) (F) (*acknowledge/evaluate*)

Willis's amendment:

Display questions have structure I R F with *evaluate* as head of F.

Referential questions have structure I R (F) with *acknowledge* as head of F.

#### 2. Teacher directing exchange

I (*directive*)  
R (*react*)  
(F) (*evaluation*)

#### 3. Teacher informing exchange

I (*inform*)  
(R) (*acknowledge*)

#### 4. Pupil eliciting exchange

I (*elicit*)  
R (*reply*)

#### 5. Pupil Inform (teachers usually respond with feedback of some type)

I (*inform*)  
F (*evaluation*)

### III. Bound Exchanges= when an exchange reactivates an element in another exchange instead of repeating it or rephrasing it.

#### 1. Re-initiation (i) = when the teacher does not get a response to an elicitation

I Opening (*elicit*)  
-- Lack of Response  
Ib Bound Initiation (acts such as *prompt, nomination, or cue*)  
R Response (answering - *rep*)  
F Feedback

2. Re-initiation (ii) = when a teacher gets a wrong answer, i.e. moving to another pupil and letting the question stand.

- I Opening (*elicit*)
- R Response (answering - *rep*)
- (F) Feedback (evaluation - note may be withheld)
- (Ib)
- R Response (answering - *rep*)
- F Feedback (*accept* and *evaluate*)

3. Reinforce = follows a misunderstood teacher direct, who then gives *clue* or *prompt* to correct.

- I Opening (*direct*)
- (R) Response (missing or incorrect)
- Ib bound exchange - (reinforce) realized by *clue* or *prompt*.
- (R) Response (NV *react*, but correct)

4. Listing

- I Opening (*elicit*)
- R Response (reply)
- F Feedback (*accept*., but no *evaluate*)
- (Ib)
- R Response (reply)
- F Feedback (*accept*, but no *evaluate*)
- (Ib)
- R Response (reply)
- F Feedback (*accept*, but no *evaluate*)
- (Ib)
- R Response (reply)
- F Feedback (*accept* and *evaluate*)

## EXTENDED FAMILIES

Fill in the blanks in the conversation with words from the box. After that, read the conversation between Ryuta and his father with a partner. Finally, practice it again, but this time try to speak with emotion.

stressful    terrible    follow    graduate    nursing home  
get along    expected    selfish    independent

Ryuta: After I \_\_\_\_\_, I want to get married, travel around the world, and then maybe come back and be a teacher in Kyoto.

Father: Kyoto! That's too far away!  
You're my only son and you're \_\_\_\_\_ to live in the family home.

Ryuta: Live at home?! No way—I want to be \_\_\_\_\_.  
I want to \_\_\_\_\_ MY dreams.

Father: It's \_\_\_\_\_ to think only about yourself.  
Your mother and I will need you to take care of us when we get older.

Ryuta: You could go to a \_\_\_\_\_ when you can't take care of yourselves, couldn't you?

Father: That's a \_\_\_\_\_ thing to say! Families have to take care of each other.  
And children should be near their grandparents.

Ryuta: But what if you or Mom don't \_\_\_\_\_ with my wife?  
That would be so \_\_\_\_\_.

Father: I'm sure we'll like your wife.  
I'm your father and you should do what I say.

### Ask your partner:

1. Whose opinion do you agree with the most? Why?
2. Did you live with your grandparents when you were growing up? If so, did you like it?
3. Who will take care of your parents when they are old?
4. When you are old, would you rather go to a nursing home or be taken care of by your family? Why?



### Appendix 4 - Data Transcription and Analysis

Transaction #1			
#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
1.1	<b>FRAME</b> T: OK (m) ^		
1.2	<b>FOCUS</b> T so, (m) today's lesson. (s) Last week we sort of did, umm, divorce (s)		
1.3	<b>Initiation (direct)</b> S: Here you go. (dir) [Hands envelope with payment to T] (NV)	<b>Response (react)</b> T: Oh, thank you. (acc) [accepts envelope]. (rea)	
1.4	<b>FOCUS</b> T: Last week's topic was divorce. (s) So, (m) this week the topic is sort of related. (s) It's families (ms) but not necessarily divorce. (com)		
1.5	<b>Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: But not divorce? (el) [laughs] (NV)	<b>Response (reply)</b> T: No, (rep) [laughs] (NV) but maybe a, sort of a little bit of conflict, ahh, , between, ahh, maybe son and father. (com)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> S: Oh, I see. (ack)
1.6	<b>Initiation (aside)</b> T: Today the 19 <sup>th</sup> ? No, today's the 21 <sup>st</sup> , April 21 <sup>st</sup> . (z) [writing date on payment envelope].	<b>Response / initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: Oh no, 14 <sup>th</sup> I think. (i)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Oh, 14 <sup>th</sup> ! Okay, (ack) Oh wow, I lost a whole week! (z)
1.7	<b>Initiation (direct)</b> T: Thank - you. (dir) [Hands envelope back] (NV)	<b>Response (react)</b> S: You're welcome. (acc). [Takes back envelope, puts it away] (rea)	

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
1.8	<b>Initiation (direct)</b> T: Here's today's handout. (dir) [Gives handout to student] (NV)	<b>Response (react)</b> S: [Receives handout and looks it over] (rea)	
1.9	<b>Initiation (elicit)</b> T: Do you know, sort of, what the meaning is behind "extended families"? (s) What is an extended family? (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: Exten...extending mean to make wid...wider. (rep)	<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Yeah, extended means 'wider'. (e)
1.10	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: The opposite of an extended family is a nuclear family. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Oh, oh, nuclear family. (ack) Mom, dad, kids, that's all. (com)	<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Yeah, mother, father. (e)
1.11	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: Extended family usually includes the grandparents.(i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Mmm. (ack)	
1.12	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: It could include aunts and uncles, depending on the culture, but I think in Japan it's mostly the grandparent who live together. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Mmm. (ack)	
1.13	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> T: In the US, of course, it's not common for..... (s)  S: .....Usually, ah, in America, ah, nu..nuclear family is more common. (i)		<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Yes, more common. (e). The extended family is, or, usually only  common maybe among newly arrived immigrants, uh ..... [S: .....Ah, mmm....(z)] because that's their culture, .... [S: .....mmm....(z)] .and maybe also they have less money so it's, it's, ah, cheaper to live together. (com) [S: Mmm,mmm,mmm. (z) ]

Transaction #2			
#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
2.1	<b>FRAME</b> T: OK (m) ^		
2.2	<b>FOCUS</b> T: [Referring to the handout] So, (m) here we have an extended family.....(s)		
2.3	<b>Initiation (aside)</b> [Baby begins making loud noises] T: Uh-oh! (z)	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: She's trying to do poo poo! (rep)	
2.4	<b>Initiation (aside)</b> T: Okay Emi-chan! Push! (z) [ Baby makes more noises]	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: Go for it! (rep) [Straining noises continue]	
2.5	<b>FRAME</b> T: Okay (m) ^		
2.6	<b>FOCUS</b> T: Extended families. (s) So, (m) we have a conversation between Ryuta.....(s)		
2.7	<b>Initiation (aside)</b> T: Is Ryuta a boy or a girl? It's a Japanese name, I think, of course. (z)	<b>Response/Initiation (reply)</b> S: I think a boy? A boy's name? (rep)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Maybe a boy? (ack) Okay, Ryuta is a boy. (acc)
2.8	<b>FOCUS</b> T: So (m) the son Ryuta and his father. (s) So, (m) [reading from handout] " <i>Fill in the blanks in the conversation with words from the box. After that, read the conversation between Ryuta and his father</i> ". (ms)		

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
2.9	<p><b>Initiation (elicit)</b>  T: So here we have [reading vocabulary words enclosed in box] “<i>stressful, terrible, follow, graduate, nursing home, get along, expected, selfish, independent</i>”. (s)  [S: <i>Hmmm.</i> (z)]  T:: So Ryuta says [reading] “<i>After I _____</i>” (el)</p>	<p><b>Response (reply)</b>  S: Graduate? (rep)</p>	<p><b>Feedback (evaluate)</b>  T: Graduate, okay. (e)</p>
2.10	<p><b>Initiation (Pupil aside)</b>  S: [said while writing] Let me write that. (z)</p>		<p><b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b>  T: OK, we’ll write that down. (ack)</p>
2.11	<p><b>Initiation (direct)</b>  (a) T: [Reads from the handout]  “<i>After I graduate...</i>” (dir)</p>	<p><b>Response (react)</b>  S: Graduate, yes. (ack)  [<i>begins reading aloud</i>] “<i>I want to get married</i>”...  [...<i>Married, hmm...</i>(z)]  [<i>continues reading</i>] “<i>Tra....vel, travel</i>” (rea)</p>	<p><b>Feedback (evaluate)</b>  T: Yes, travel. Um hmm. (e)</p>
2.12	<p><b>BOUND EXCHANGE (direct)</b></p>	<p><b>Response (react)</b>  S: [<i>continues reading</i>] “<i>travel around the world, and then maybe come back and be a teacher in Kyoto.</i>” (rea)</p>	
2.13	<p><b>Initiation (elicit)</b>  T: Father says [reading] “<i>Kyoto! That’s too far away! You’re my only son</i>” (s)  Oh, I didn’t notice that part, so Ryuta is a boy. (z)  [<i>continues reading</i>] “<i>You’re my only son and you’re _____.</i>” (el)</p>	<p><b>Response (respond)</b>  S: Mmmmmm (z)  You’re, oh, you’re, you’re, you’re, hmmmm, <i>expected?</i> (res)</p>	<p><b>Feedback (evaluate)</b>  T: Expected. Yeah. (e)  [<i>reading</i>] “<i>You’re <u>expected</u> to live in the family home</i>”.</p>
2.14	<p><b>Initiation (aside)</b>  [Baby: Oh, pee pee! ]  T: What happened, Emi-chan? (z)</p>		

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
2.15	<b>BOUND EXCHANGE (elicit)</b> <b>Initiation (nominate)</b> S: My turn? (bid) T: Um hmm. (nom)	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: [reading Ryuta's line] "Live at home?! No way -- I want to be <u>independent</u> . (rep)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T:: Um hmm. (ack)
2.16	<b>BOUND EXCHANGE (elicit)</b>	<b>Response / Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: Independent? (rep)  <b>Response (reply)</b> T: Independent. (r)	<b>Feedback (Pupil aside)</b> S: Hmm. Independent. [said while writing] (z)
2.17	<b>BOUND EXCHANGE (elicit)</b>	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: [reading] "I want to ____"....."I want to ____", "I want to ____".....follow. (rep)	<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Yes, follow. (e) [reading] "I want to <u>follow MY dreams</u> ".  S: Follow my...okay, follow. (z) [said while writing]  S: [said after writing] Um, all right. (z)
2.18	<b>Initiation (elicit)</b> S: Me? (bid) T: Um hmm. (nom) The father says [reading] "It's ____" (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: [reading] "It's [ <u>pause</u> ] to think only about.." "it's..." oh.... "it's <u>selfish</u> ?" (rep)	<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Selfish, yes. (e) [reading] "It's <u>selfish</u> to think only about yourself Your mother and I will need you to take care of us when we get older." (s)  [S: Umm. (z)]
2.19	<b>Initiaton (elicit)</b> T: [reading] So next Ryuta says? (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: [reading] "You could go to a ..... [laughs (z) "a <u>nursing home</u> " (rep)	<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Aaa, a nursing home! (e) Ooow! He's mean! (com)  S: Absolutely, yeah! (com)

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
2.20	<p><b>Initiation (elicit)</b>  T: [reading] “You could go to a <u>nursing home</u> when you can’t take care of yourselves, couldn’t you? (el)</p>	<p><b>Response (reply)</b>  S: Ohhh (z)  [reading] “That’s”,  “That’s a <u>terrible</u> thing to say”. (rep)</p>	<p><b>Feedback (evaluate)</b>  T: “That’s a terrible thing to say” (acc)  Yes, ‘<u>terrible</u>’. (e)    S: That’s terrible. [said while writing] (z)  [reading] “That’s a terrible thing to say!  Families have to take care of each other.  And children should be near their grandparents.”</p>
2.21	<p><b>Initiation (elicit)</b>  T: [reading] “But what if you or mom don’t ___” (el)</p>	<p><b>Response (reply)</b>  S: Don’t <u>get along</u>? (rep)</p>	<p><b>Feedback (evaluation)</b>  T: Um hmm. Yes. (e)</p>
2.22	<p><b>Initiation (elicit)</b>  T: [reading] “<u>don’t get along</u> with my wife? That would be so ___”. (el)</p>	<p><b>Response (reply)</b>  S: So <u>stressful</u>? (rep)</p>	<p><b>Feedback (evaluation)</b>  T: Stressful. (e)  T: [reading] Father, “I’m sure we’ll like your  wife. I’m your father and you should  do  what I say.  T Mmmmm. [laughs] (z)  S: Ahhh [laughs] (z)</p>

Transaction #3			
#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
3.1	<b>FRAME</b> T: Okay ^		
3.2	<b>Initiation (elicit)</b> T: So, (m) what do you think about Ryuta's plans? (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> S: Actually,ah, umm,I'm,I sort of agree with Ryuta, this part, " <i>But what if you or Mom don't get along with my wife? That would be so stressful. (rep)</i>	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Um hmm, yes. (ack)
3.3	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: Yeah, I agree with him, but, ah, I'm not gonna say, if me, if me, I'm not gonna say " <i>You could go to a nursing home</i> " It's so sad! (i)		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: No! (ack)
3.4	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: No, no, he goes a little too far! (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Too far, yeah! (ack)	
3.5	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: But yeah, I understand that sometimes, uh, it can cause problems between in-laws. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Umm. (ack)	
3.6	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: Expecially like, in the US, there's always the stereotype where, uh, the husband doesn't get along with the mother-in-law. (i)	<b>Response/ Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: Oh really? (el)  <b>Response (reply)</b> T: Yes. (rep) There seems to be, like, uh, especially on television situation comedies, there's always tension between the husband and the mother-in-law. They're always arguing or they don't like each other, or sometimes it's the father and the son-in-law. (com)	
3.7	<b>Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: How about, ah, ah, wife, and, uh, mother-in-law? (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> T: Ahh, sometimes too, yes.(rep)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> S: Oh. (ack)
3.8	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: In Japan in, uh, wife and, wife and mother-in-law, they not sometimes they, they do not		<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Yes, uh huh. (e)

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
	get along. (i)		
3.9	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> Not sometimes, you know, like, it's a big issue in Japan. (i)		<b>Feedback (evaluate)</b> T: Yeah. (e) Especially if they have to live together..... [S: um-hmm (z)] and they don't get along. (com)
3.10	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: Yeah, actually one of my friend, she, she, she's, she was my classmate during Junior high, and she used to live with mother-in-law, ah, parents-in- law, but, ah, event...eventually, uh, eventually she and her husband and two boys, they moved out and they build their own house. (i)		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Uh huh. (ack)
3.11	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: But she said, umm, those days, that um, they living together with um parent-in-law...were very stressful. (i)		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Uh huh, stressful, yes. Uh-huh. (ack)
3.12	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: I know, when ah I was talking to Atsumi... [S: Uh huh (z)]...and I mentioned you know before I married Masashi, and so, she was asking me uh, how, how about Masashi's parents.... [S: Uh huh, uh huh. (z)]....Do you, you know, and I was "Oh, they passed away about a year	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Yeah! (ack) I understand what's her feeling! (com)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Ahh, uh huh. (ack)

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
	before” and she goes “Oh, that’s too bad, but, no mother-in-law! (i) [laughs] (z)		
3.13	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: So you know, I, uh, in this case I never knew his mother, so I don’t know whether I would have gotten along with her. I think there would have been a language problem. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Oh, I see.	
3.14	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: But at the same time, Masashi had already bought a separate house. (i)	<b>Reply/Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: Oh really? (el)  <b>Response (reply)</b> T: Yeah.	
3.15	<b>Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: But a, near their, their house, right? (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> T: They lived in Yashima. (com) Yeah. (rep)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> S: Mmmm. (ack)
3.16	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: But his mother was also, um, ahh, she had, uh, kidney disease, so she spent a lot of time at the hospital anyway. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Oh, I see. (ack)	
3.17	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> [Baby makes crying noises] T: She needs, she needs to change. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Go ahead. (ack)	
3.18	<b>Response (inform)</b> T: She did a, a messy diaper, so excuse us for a minute (i) [Gets up and moves] (NV)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: No, no, no, go ahead. (ack)	
3.19	<b>Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: Um, may I use the bathroom? (el)	<b>Response (reply)</b> T: Sure, sure. Go ahead. (rep)	<b>Feedback (acknowledget)</b> S: Okay. (ack) [Gets up and moves] (NV)

Transaction #4			
#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
4.1	<b>FRAME</b> [Returns to table] T: Sorry for that. [z] Okay (m) ^		
4.2	<b>FOCUS</b> T: So, (m) we were talking, we were talking about, uh, stress, and not getting along with your in- laws. (ms)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Mmmm. (ack)	
4.3	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: Uh, so that can be a problem, especially, ah, I guess, sometimes when there are grandchildren involved. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: I see. (ack)	
4.4	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: I know sometimes mothers-in-law want to give too much advice. (i)	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Oh yeah. (ack)	
4.5	<b>Initiation (inform)</b> T: Or if they don't agree with their, the way their daughter-in-law raises her children, it can cause problems.	<b>Response (acknowledge)</b> S: Yeah, (ack) too much advice, ad...vice. Yes, too much advice. (com)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Yeah. (ack)
4.6	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: Yeah, actually, my fiance's mother, she's just like, just like, like mother, yeah. (i)		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Yes, yes. (ack)
4.7	<b>Initiation (Pupil elicit)</b> S: Actually, uh, my fiance's old...younger brother, she, ah he was married and he already has two, two little girls, but ah, ah, mother, mother- in-law and um (s) ah, what can I say...(el)	<b>Response (rep)</b> T: Daughter-in-law? (rep)	<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> S: Daughter-in-law. (ack)
4.8	<b>Initiation (loop)</b> T: Uh huh? (loop)		
4.9	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b>		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b>

#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
	S: They are not get along together. (i)		T: Oh. (ack)
4.10	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: Because of, I don't know, but, um, I think mother, his mother, he, she say, she says lots of things, I mean. (i)		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Uh huh. (ack)
4.11	<b>Initiation (Pupil inform)</b> S: She does a lot of advice. (i)		<b>Feedback (acknowledge)</b> T: Yeah. (ack) Maybe too much advice, it comes off as sounding critical or judgemental. (com)

Transaction #5			
#	Opening	Answering	Follow-up
5.1	<b>FRAME</b> T: Okay (m) ^		
5.2	<b>FOCUS</b> T: Now let's go on back to the article. (ms)		