

# A Classroom and Spoken Discourse Analysis Using the Sinclair and Coulthard 'IRF' Model

Carmen Hannah

## 1 . Introduction

The earliest record of the term 'discourse analysis' is found in an article entitled 'Discourse Analysis' written by the sentence linguist Zellig Harris (1952). During the intervening years the discipline of discourse analysis has come a long way and what we understand by the term nowadays is a far cry from that found in Harris' original work (Cook 1989). So what then is discourse analysis ?

### 1 . 1 . Definition of Discourse Analysis

It is important to be clear regarding the definition of discourse analysis. Chaudron (1988, p14) describes it as arising from a linguistic perspective as "an attempt to analyse fully the discourse of interaction in structural-functional linguistic terms" and has been defined by Richards et al. (1992, p111) as, "the study of how sentences in spoken and written language form larger meaningful units such as paragraphs, conversations, interviews, etc." Therefore, just as grammarians are concerned with the grammar of language, how the rules of language work and labels for grammar units, discourse analysts are concerned with a description of discourse, i.e., language that has been used to communicate something and is perceived to be coherent. Discourse analysts are in pursuit of what gives discourse coherence, with descriptions being couched in terms of discourse units (Brazil 1995). Discourse analysis is concerned with the internal structure of discourse with investigations focusing on questions such as: What devices are used to open a conversation, to introduce or change topics, impart information, influence behaviour or break off contact? (Stern 1992).

Discourse analysis can be split into two main categories of 'spoken discourse analysis', sometimes known as 'conversational analysis', and 'written discourse analysis', which some linguists refer to as 'text linguistics'. It is with spoken classroom discourse, a sub-category within spoken discourse analysis, that this paper is concerned.

### 1 . 2 . Origins of Modern Day Discourse Analysis

In recent times there has been much research focusing on discourse analysis that followed from the evolution in descriptive linguistics of analytical procedures for the description of suprasentential structures (Dressler 1978, Grimes 1975) in conjunction with sociolinguistic and ethnographic investigations into the structure of interactive language use (Chaudron 1988, Hymes 1972). However, it was in Birmingham University in England that a pioneering and influential study,

carried out by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), provided a model, which with modifications can be applied to many types of discourse. It is this particular model of discourse analysis on which the remainder of this paper will focus.

### 1.3. Aims of the Study

In the course of this study I wanted to investigate several concepts simultaneously. Firstly, to explore the Sinclair and Coulthard model of classroom discourse and find out how the model would fare when applied to a piece of classroom interaction for which it was not originally designed. Secondly, to locate specifically pieces of interaction that did or did not fit into the model and assign reasons and/or alternative forms of analysis.

### 1.4. Overview of the Paper

In the following section (Section 2) I will discuss the discourse analysis model developed by Sinclair and Coulthard with Section 3 focusing on a study undertaken to analyze a piece of discourse using the model. Section 4, is concerned with an analysis of the data while Section 5 highlights some specific characteristics revealed from the data. The final section (Section 6) contains a summary of the major issues, limitations of the study and points the way for future developments.

## 2. The Sinclair and Coulthard Model

### 2.1. Getting Started

In the 1960's works carried out by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) provided the strong notion that people do things with words and may have been an influential factor inspiring the research project undertaken by Sinclair and Coulthard. The British theoretical linguistic framework of that era was heavily based on the Hallidayan tradition of grammatical theory and it was in this environment that the Birmingham researchers began their work.

### 2.2. Rank Scale - Grammar

Halliday (1961) developed a description of the grammar of language on a rank scale. In a rank scale, the units at each rank consist of elements realised by units from the rank below. The ranks in the Hallidayan taxonomic hierarchy are: *sentence*; *clause*; *group*; *word* and *morpheme*, with sentence being the highest rank and morpheme being the lowest. A sentence consists of clauses; a clause consists of groups and so on down the scale. At the level of rank, each rank has a structure that is expressed in terms of permissible combinations of units from the rank below. At the top of the scale the structure is relatively loose with a sentence being made up of a main clause and any number of subordinate clauses. The unit at the lowest rank in the scale must be devoid of structure, in that it cannot be divided into smaller units of meaning (Brazil 1995).

#### 2.2.1. Rank Scale - Discourse

Drawing from precepts of grammatical rank scale, the researchers developed their model of a rank scale to analyse the structure of interaction. In order to test this new rank scale, Sinclair and Coulthard required to apply their model to some form of interactive discourse. Given that some forms of discourse are more easily recognisable, Sinclair and Coulthard chose to record a number of British primary school lessons where "the teacher was standing at the front of the class 'teaching' and therefore exerting the maximum amount of control over the structure of the discourse" (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, p6). On the basis of their data they proposed a rank scale consisting of 5 ranks to

cope with this particular form of interaction. The ranks are: *lesson*, *transaction*, *exchange*, *move* and *act*.

### 2.2.2. The Sinclair and Coulthard Rank Scale Structure

From the lowest rank of act, the researchers formulated rules on how acts combine to create moves, how moves combine to create various types of exchange, which combine to form transactions, which make up a lesson. Table 1. shows the basic structure of the Sinclair and Coulthard rank scale approach for classroom interaction, including both exchange and move type and classes of act as well as the internal structure of each unit as delineated by the Birmingham team.

**Table 1.** Levels, ranks and structures of the system of classroom interaction discourse analysis by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975)

<i>Rank: Lesson</i>	<i>Rank: Transaction</i>	<i>Rank: Exchange</i>	<i>Rank: Move</i>	<i>Rank: Act</i>
		Exchange Type	Move Type	Classes of Act
<b>Lesson</b> <Structure> <i>An unordered series of transactions</i>	<b>Transaction</b> <Structure> <i>Preliminary</i> <i>Medial</i> <i>Terminal</i>	<b>Boundary Exchange</b> <Structure> <i>Frame*</i> <i>Focus*</i>	<b>Framing Move</b> <Structure> <i>head*</i> <i>qualifier</i>	Marker* Silent Stress
			<b>Focusing Move</b> <Structure> <i>signal</i> <i>pre-head</i> <i>head*</i> <i>post-head</i>	Starter Marker Metastatement* Conclusion* Comment
		<b>Teaching Exchange</b> <Structure> <i>Initiation*</i> <i>Response</i> <i>Feedback</i>	<b>Opening Move</b> <Structure> <i>signal</i> <i>pre-head</i> <i>head*</i> <i>post-head</i> <i>select</i>	Marker Starter Elicit* Direct* Inform* Check* Prompt Clue Bid Nominate
			<b>Answering Move</b> <Structure> <i>pre-head</i> <i>head*</i> <i>post-head</i>	Acknowledge* Reply* React* Comment
			<b>Follow-up Move</b> <Structure> <i>pre-head</i> <i>head*</i> <i>post-head</i>	Accept Evaluate* Comment

\*denotes elements that may perform as the principle and obligatory element within each unit on the scale

It is this method of discourse analysis, which has contributed to a major growth in awareness of the internal formal structure and functional purpose of verbal interaction in the classroom (Chaudron 1988), which is the foundation upon which other researchers have based their work. Most second language researchers (Cathcart 1983, Chaudron 1977, Long and Sato 1983, Tsui 1995) have not employed such a comprehensive analytical scheme but have limited themselves to working within the general framework of the original Sinclair and Coulthard model and adapting it to suit the needs of their own particular investigations. In the forthcoming sections I will discuss my investigation into classroom discourse analysis and the ways in which the Sinclair and Coulthard model was applied to a transcribed recording of a language lesson.

### **3. The Study**

#### **3.1. Pre-research Concerns**

##### **3.1.1. Choice of Class for Observation**

My first concern was with which of my lessons I would use to gather information on classroom interaction. Attempting to get an 'average' lesson, and eliminate possible bias, I wanted the lesson selection to be made at random; therefore I numbered the lessons I teach in a one week frame then asked a colleague unfamiliar with my teaching schedule to select a number. The next step was to devise the recording method.

##### **3.1.2. Choice of Observation Procedure**

In order to obtain a preserveable, real time record of the lesson I considered making an audio visual recording which would give comprehensive coverage of most aspects of the lesson, but I realized that this method of recording would have a possible effect on how I taught the lesson and how the students performed in the lesson. Trying to minimize Labov's Observer Paradox as cited in Long (1981) and Allwright et al. (1991, p71), which argues that there is "an alteration in the normal behaviour of a subject under observation, due to the observation itself", I determined that an audio recording of the lesson would be the most practical and unobtrusive method with which to proceed.

##### **3.1.3. The Students and Class**

The lesson selected for observation was a 60-minute, English Conversation class in a 2-year women's junior college. The subjects were thirty 1<sup>st</sup> year Japanese students, in the 18-20-age range. At the time of the recording the subjects had been studying in the women's college for nine months. The students were post beginners, but within the group there is a wide range of ability levels. The assigned textbook for this class is '*Fifty-Fifty*' (Wilson and Barnard, 1992, pp. 25-29&113).

##### **3.1.4. Lesson Format**

The lesson was conducted in two stages. As this lesson was the final one before the winter vacation, the introductory section of the class involved the students working in small groups, discussing and making plans for the forthcoming holiday period. These plans were then shared with the class. In the second stage the students were engaged in work from the textbook and participated in activities involving prepositions of place, which concluded that particular textbook unit (Unit 4, pp. 25-29). Before recording the lesson I requested permission from the students; therefore, the students were aware the lesson was being recorded and understood the reasons for the recording.

### 3 . 2 . Post-test Concerns

#### 3 . 2 . 1 . Procedure for Analysis

Having obtained a recording of my lesson my first task was to transcribe it and make it suitable for analysis; this was done using standard orthography. This particular investigation followed a cross-sectional approach, with data being collected during only one session and leaning towards a quantitative research methodology as described by Reichard and Cook (1979, p10) and as cited in Freeman and Long (1991). The data exhibited many of the characteristics found in their paradigm of quantitative attributes. However, these attributes were not exclusive to this category and did exhibit some of the properties illustrated in the qualitative paradigm, in that it was subject to an insider perspective.

#### 3 . 2 . 2 . Resulting Data

The recorded data which was analyzed using Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' (exchange, move and act) model of classroom-spoken discourse can be found as Appendix 2. (A key to assist in the reading of the data can be viewed as Appendix 1.) The data has been divided into two stages corresponding to the two distinct stages in the lesson: Stage 1: The winter vacation; Stage 2: Textbook activities.

## 4 . Analysis of the Data

### 4 . 1 . Exchange - Move - Act

As was mentioned above, Sinclair and Coulthard proposed the 5 ranks of lesson, transaction, exchange, move and act in their classroom discourse analysis model, to establish a separate level of language description which was able to show relation between the individual utterances and the function those utterances deployed within the discourse (Sinclair 1992). From their data Sinclair and Coulthard were able to see strong patterns involving 3-part exchanges recurring frequently in the lessons. The 3-part exchange of *Initiation - Response - Feedback* was found to be one of the most basic units of classroom interaction and became the building blocks of this particular type of discourse. The sequence of *Act-Move-Exchange* soon became the principle focus with the exchange and its structure providing a linguistic context for the understanding of speech acts.

As Table 1. above illustrates, the rank of exchange is divided into two categories and is realised by 5 possible moves. *Boundary Exchanges* (typically used by teachers to begin and end transactions) are realised by Framing and or Focusing moves with *Teaching Exchanges* (used typically to inform, direct and elicit information) being realised by *Opening*, *Answering* and *Follow-up* moves. These moves are realised by a series of acts of which there are a finite number. (Appendix 3 gives a description of the acts identified by Sinclair and Coulthard.) It was therefore proposed that the 3-move eliciting structure of Initiation(I) - Response(R) - Follow-up(F) was the most normal form inside the classroom (see also Table 2.).

Table 2. provides a summary of the various initiation exchanges at work in the classroom and their structure realised by predicted move sequences stipulated by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

### 4 . 2 . Quantitative Data

From the data, the following quantitative data was obtained and is summarized in Table 3.

**Table 2.** The predicted move sequence for various exchange types.

Type of Initiation Exchange	Structure of predicted move sequence	Abbreviated Form
Teacher Inform	Initiation	I
Teacher Direct	Initiation - Response - (Follow-up)	IR(F)
Teacher Elicit	Initiation - Response - (Follow-up)	IR(F)
Student Elicit	Initiation - Response	IR
Student Inform	Initiation - Follow-up	IF
Teacher Check*	(Initiation - Response - (Follow-up))	(IR(F))
Student Check*	(Initiation - Response - (Follow-up))	(IR(F))

\* Check being a sub-category of elicit

( ) denote structural options

**Table 3.** Quantitative data obtained from data analyses using Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) classroom discourse analysis model.

Unit	Quantity of units found in the total data (Exchanges 1-177)	Quantity of units found in Stage 1 (Exchanges 1-91)	Quantity of units found in Stage 2 (Exchanges 92-177)
Transactions	12	8	4
Exchanges	17	90	86
Boundary Exchanges	31	12	19
Informing Exchanges	32	18	14
Eliciting Exchanges	88	57	31
Directing Exchanges	19	4	15

#### 4.2.1. Commentary on Findings

Sinclair and Coulthard's data from British primary school classroom lessons revealed that in content lessons more than anything else teachers ask questions (Brazil 1995) thus making eliciting exchanges most common. In accordance with the findings of Sinclair and Coulthard, this data too shows teacher eliciting exchanges account for the majority of exchanges in this classroom interaction. This is reflected in my own data with eliciting exchanges accounting for some 50% of all the exchange types in the lesson. Table 4. provides a summary of the quantities of Sinclair and Coulthard predicted move patterns found in my data.

#### 4.3. Fitting the Data to into the Sinclair and Coulthard Model

The following section deals with how the Sinclair and Coulthard model of classroom discourse analysis relates to my own data, and how easy or difficult it was to fit the data into the categories prescribed by the Birmingham researchers.

##### 4.3.1. Ill-fitting Data

Tables 5. and 6. indicate quantities and percentage values for exchanges and moves that did or did not appear to comply with the model.

**Table 4.** The quantities of predicted move patterns found in the data.

Type of exchange sequence	Abbreviation for exchange sequence	Quantity found in the total data (Exchanges 1-176)	Quantity found in Stage 1 (Exchanges 1-90)	Quantity found in Stage 2 (Exchanges 91-176)
Initiation	I	57	20	37
Initiation-Response	IR	64	25	39
Initiation-Response-Feedback	IRF	50	41	9
Initiation-Feedback	IF	4	4	0

**Table 5.** Quantitative values of units that did not fit easily into the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model of classroom discourse analysis.

Unit	Unit Type	Data that did not fit into the model (Total Data)		Data that did not fit into the model (Stage 1)		Data that did not fit into the model (Stage 2)	
		Quantity	% value	Quantity	% value	Quantity	% value
Exchange		45	25%	39	43%	6	7%
Move							
	Opening	146	0%	79	0%	67	0%
	Responding	115	3%	68	0%	47	6%
	Follow-up	53	79%	44	88%	9	33%

#### 4.3.2. Well-fitting Data

**Table 6.** Quantitative values of units that did fit easily into the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model of classroom discourse analysis.

Unit	Unit Type	Data that did fit into the model (Total Data)		Data that did fit into the model (Stage 1)		Data that did not fit into the model (Stage 2)	
		Quantity	% value	Quantity	% value	Quantity	% value
Exchange		177	75%	52	57%	80	93%
Move							
	Opening	146	100%	79	100%	67	100%
	Responding	115	97%	68	0%	47	9%
	Follow-up	53	15%	44	11%	9	7%

#### 4.3.3. Commentary on Results

From Table 5., we can see that one quarter (25%) of the overall data did not readily lend itself to the categories prescribed by Sinclair and Coulthard, yet Table 6. shows that the model was applicable to some 75% of the data, making it a relatively effective tool for analysing this particular lesson. One category in which the system proved particularly ineffective relates to follow-up moves which will be discussed in more detail in section 5.6.

## 5 . Data Characteristics

### 5 . 1 . Feedback

Sinclair and Coulthard's data revealed that in the content lessons the Initiation - Response - Feedback sequence was the norm in the classroom. In school (particularly in primary school classrooms) the teacher student relationship is asymmetrical with the teacher in a position of authority as organiser, principle initiator, controller and as the 'primary knower' (K1) (Willis, D. 1992). Therefore, the teacher's role as evaluator can be seen to be of vital importance. In any kind of didactic or supervisory discourse the teacher's use of the third move (Feedback) may give evaluation, feedback and/or comment on the lesson and student progress. This finding was not borne out in my own data with there being relatively similar numbers over the total data analysed for the three main sequence types, Initiation, Initiation - Response and Initiation - Response - Feedback, (see Table 4).

One factor responsible for these results (Table 4.) may be the type of lesson itself. In stage two of the lesson, the students were mainly engaged in pair-work activities with the teacher's main function being organiser and information provider, I and IR patterns are common. Interestingly, in Stage 1 when the teacher was interacting with individual students the IRF pattern is prominent, accounting for over 80% of exchange patterns. It seems likely that various types of activity will produce various types in interaction that in turn will produce a variety of exchange patterns, as different situations will require different formulae, depending on the roles and settings (McCarthy 1991).

### 5 . 2 . Student Initiations

In virtually all classrooms student initiations tend to be rare occurrences, with my data reiterating this notion in that the (IF) (see Table 4.) pattern occurred on only four occasions.

The pupils have a very restricted range of functions to perform. They rarely initiate, and never follow-up. Most of their verbal activity is response, and normally confined strictly to the terms of the initiation.

(Sinclair and Brazil 1982, p58)

Coulthard (1992) also points out that after a student initiation the teacher quickly resumes the role of principle initiator. In my data, in all four instances of student initiation (Exchanges 42, 51, 68 and 78) the teacher takes over the pupils' topic as a way of regaining control. "This particular feature of discourse is called prospection" (Sinclair 1992, p83).

### 5 . 3 . Inner and Outer Language

It is undeniable that the model of classroom discourse analysis developed by Sinclair and Coulthard is extremely valuable to anyone interested in the field of discourse analysis; however this model was based on lessons taught in British primary schools and so is most effective in that particular situation. "Most classroom researchers would agree that the talk of language lessons is more difficult to analyse and describe than the talk of 'content' lessons" (Willis, J. 1988, p163) with Cook (1989, p 116) going as far as to say "teaching conversation is notoriously difficult". This even more so in second language teaching and learning, as language is both the subject and the medium of instruction. This dual function of language is not adequately accounted for in the Sinclair and



Coulthard model. Second language teachers and learners often switch between inner and outer language during a lesson. As pointed out by J. Willis (1988, p163) "The 'Outer' structure is a mechanism for controlling and stimulating utterances in the 'Inner' structure which gives formal practice in the foreign language".

This can be seen in a number of exchanges in my data. Exchanges 94, 102, 105, 112, 114, and 157 illustrate classic examples of the teacher switching between the inner and outer forms of language during informing exchanges. Also, exchanges 124-136 and 144-155 (classed as eliciting exchanges according to the Sinclair and Coulthard model), are devoid of normal communicative value and bear little resemblance to normal discourse. Having classed these exchanges as elicits one would expect an informative, message oriented response and a follow-up to successfully complete the exchange. This does not occur and neither the classifications of teacher inform or teacher direct seem to be appropriate as they do not predict an obligatory verbal response. It may be that this type of classroom interaction could more usefully be thought of as being akin to what Willis (1988) refers to as Direct Verbals "where the teacher asks the students to say some words, repeat something, make a question, all involving language used as Inner" (Willis 1998, p166).

#### 5.4. When the Teacher Directs

Another occasion the Sinclair and Coulthard model appears inadequate to deal with language lessons is when a teacher direct initiation provokes a verbal response. This type of situation is highlighted in the following exchanges 11, 106, 162, 166, 170. The response to this particular type of teacher direct is the students to engage in pair work, which is a verbal response and not predicted in the Sinclair and Coulthard model. Similarly, in exchanges 97 and 103 the response to the teacher direct has the students engaging with the language non-verbally (in the sense that they do not vocalise the words) but they do engage with the language at a cognitive level by reading or thinking about what they are going to say.

#### 5.5. When the Teacher Informs

Exchanges 95, 115, 116, 121, 123 and 140 are troublesome in a different respect in that the Sinclair and Coulthard model predicts no response in this type of exchange. They are classed as teacher informs in so far as the teacher is passing on information to the students which does not require an answering move from the students, yet they may also be thought of as teacher directs in that they provoke the students to react in some way; look at specific areas of the textbook (exchanges 116 & 121) which is non-verbal but is a reaction, and to 'be careful' (exchange 140), to attend cognitively to the language they will use. Cathcart (1983) also found Sinclair and Coulthard's 'informative' to be inadequate to distinguish the possible functions of interaction in the language classroom. Coulthard (1985) himself alludes to this and realises that in all forms of teaching it can sometimes be difficult to distinguish between informs and directs.

#### 5.6. Following-up

##### 5.6.1. Assigning Acts

One area of analysis that was problematic lay in assigning classes of act to follow-up moves. In the Sinclair and Coulthard model the follow-up move has a three term structure, pre-head, head and post-head (See Table 1.) and these are realised by the acts *accept*, *evaluate* and *comment* respectively. As evaluate is the head act, it is a required element in a follow-up move. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992, p24) state,

The act evaluate is seen by all participants as a compulsory element. A teacher can produce a follow-up move which overtly consists of only accept or comment, but evaluation is then implicit (and usually unfavourable).

There are however numerous places in my analysis where on initial examination the follow-up is realised not by the act evaluate but rather by an accept (acc) which is inappropriate in the Sinclair and Coulthard model.

### 5.6.2. Modifications

Willis, D. (1992) supplies a useful modification to Sinclair and Coulthard's original model to cope with precisely such instances. Willis proposes that the scope of the act acknowledge (ack) be widened to allow it to function as the head in a follow-up move. An example of this could be exchange 82 where the repetition of the name 'Yasuyo' can be analysed as an acknowledge (ack) functioning as the head act and "She's the Uno champion of your group" being analysed as a comment (com). (There are numerous examples in the data, particularly in Stage 1 of the lesson, e.g. exchanges 25, 31, 41 and 60.)

How then can we justify awarding acknowledge (ack) the status of head act in a follow-up move? One reason might be that in real life, initiating exchanges outside the classroom (unlike those usually occurring within the classroom where evaluation is one of the many teacher roles) do not require one of the interlocutors to evaluate linguistically the utterances of the other person. Rather, the two interlocutors share equal investment and therefore enjoy equal rights in the interaction and are usually both in what Berry (1980) describes as the *secondary knower* (K2) position. Within Berry's paradigm, this is when a 'real' or 'true' question is asked, a genuine request for information by the speaker, in this case the teacher, making one of the speaker's/teacher's possible options for a follow-up acceptance or acknowledgement of the information provided by the student. In Stage 1 of the lesson the teacher may well be seen to be in the K2 position making accept/acknowledge follow-up options. This accept/acknowledge follow-up option is noticeably absent in Stage 2 of the lesson whereby the teacher may be seen to be in the position of *primary knower* (K1). It could also be argued that in Stage 1 of the lesson the activity may be perceived as a replication activity, as it attempts to replicate to some extent the kind of experience the student would have if engaged in everyday conversation.

### 5.6.3. Elicit or Inquire?

Subsequently the original Sinclair and Coulthard model may be insufficient to fully cover the myriad of activities that occur in a second language classroom. It may indeed be the case that each activity, or groups of activities, may require the model to be slightly modified to facilitate a more analytical framework. Again, in Stage 1 of the lesson many of the teacher elicit exchanges could be analysed using Francis and Hunston's (1992, p130) model. This model, which is an adaptation of the Sinclair and Coulthard model, is used for analysing everyday conversations. The Francis and Hunston model has elicitation initiations using inquire (inq) or neutral proposal (n.pr) as head acts in the opening move. These acts realise "questions which seek information" or "questions which seek a yes or no answer", respectively. Examples illustrating this point could be exchanges 16, 36, 59 and exchanges 20, 63 and 83 respectively.

Regardless of the need for modifying the Sinclair and Coulthard model to suit the type of classroom interaction being undertaken, it is an extremely effective device with which to analyse discourse functions that seem to be universal in many types of teaching/learning environment.

### 5.7. Boundary Exchanges

Due to the very nature of the classroom situation, of classroom interaction and the fact that lessons are made up of transactions, the Sinclair and Coulthard boundary exchange (realised by framing and focusing moves) is particularly valuable. Boundary exchanges are virtually exclusive to the teacher, as it is the teacher who chooses the topics and controls the lesson initiating and terminating transactions. J. Willis (1992, p.171) reminds us that,

No matter how free the interaction gets during the course of an activity, the teacher is always empowered to produce a boundary exchange, to terminate one activity, and to start another.

This can be seen clearly in many of the boundary exchanges from my own data, some examples being exchanges 26, 84, 92, 137 and 163.

Sinclair and Coulthard noted that at a formal level, transaction boundaries are typically marked by frames realised by the following closed set of words: “‘well’ ‘OK’, ‘right’, ‘now’ and ‘good’, uttered with strong stress, high falling intonation and followed by a short pause” (Coulthard 1977, p.123). This too was borne out in my data with 31 boundary exchanges of which 26 are realised by the utterances described by Sinclair, the exceptions being exchanges 4, 37, 111 and 137. This is in keeping with McCarthy (1991) as he draws attention to how some people habitually use the same word(s), and from analysing the data it is clear that I appear to give preferential treatment to the words ‘right’ and ‘OK’.

### 5.8. Bound Initiations

The Sinclair and Coulthard model is also useful in aiding understanding of bound initiations, of which there are five basic varieties: *re-initiation (i)*, *re-initiation (ii)*, *listing*, *reinforce* and *loop*. In a bound initiation, a secondary initiation is bound to the first in that it invokes the same question. (See appendix 4 for more information on the five varieties of bound initiations). Exchanges 24 & 25 and 48 & 49 are classic examples of the bound initiation classified as loop, which occurs when someone, usually the teacher, has not heard the response, or has not heard it as appropriate (Brazil 1995). Loop has an internal structure of Initiation-Response-Initiation b-Response-follow-up (IRIbRF) and this is clearly the case in the above examples.

### 5.9. Inform - Elicit - Inform

During an informing transaction (internal structure: boundary. teacher inform. (teacher elicit). (pupil elicit) boundary) there are two optional elements within the structure, indicated in parentheses. During a lengthy informing exchange or series of exchanges, the student role is restricted to one of acknowledging that the information has been heard. “However, embedded within an informing transaction may be brief teacher elicitation” (Coulthard 1992, pp31-32), deployed to check pupil understanding and also to check keep pupil attention. In Stage 1 of the lesson this feature is demonstrated in exchanges 2-9. (The elicitation at the end of the teacher inform (exchange 7) invoke no student response, as they lack low termination, which is one of the signals indicating the speaker has reached a point of semantic completeness (Coulthard 1985). (Although the work of Brazil (1997) on intonation has added valuable insight into the role and function of intonation in discourse, it is not within the scope of this paper to make detailed comment on the matter.) The elicitation in exchanges 8 and 9 do however highlight this teacher option to check student attention and understanding.

### 5.10. Teacher Asides

Exchange 122 is an interesting initiation that illustrates Coulthard's (1985, p20) point that "interaction proceeds according to the listeners interpretation of the force of an utterance". On the face of it, the exchange reads as a standard teacher elicit sequence of initiation-answer-follow-up. The question was in fact a teacher aside (z)\* which one of the students responded to, thus forcing me into a feedback move and is akin to Edmonson's (1981) 'hearer-knows-best' principle. In section 5, I have attempted to illustrate some specific areas of the data wherein the Sinclair and Coulthard model of analysis was both inappropriate and appropriate. The features highlighted above are in no way a finite list and many other positive and negative observations are possible.

## 6. Conclusion

### 6.1. Summary

In a study designed to investigate the Sinclair and Coulthard model of spoken classroom discourse I found it to be an extremely valuable and comprehensive tool in systematically allowing teachers to analyse the nature and functions of interactive exchanges happening in the classroom. This model, which is probably most easily applied to first language (L1) content lessons, is flexible in that it can, with modifications be appropriate to virtually any teaching situation as well as many types of discourse outside of the classroom. In this study I found that through close examination of discourse we have a mechanism that has the potential to reveal formally and functionally the cause and effect of both speaker utterances and listener reaction during interaction. However McCarthy (1992, p. 126) reminds us that "discourse analysis can highlight problem areas, it cannot give simple solutions".

### 6.2. Limitations of the Study

For teachers, small-scale research projects such as this one are an extremely valuable method of monitoring the teaching and learning experience occurring through interaction. With this particular study there are some weaknesses and limitations that I should mention. Analysing spoken classroom discourse using only an audio recording that has been orthographically transcribed fails to give a complete picture. A lack of information on such points as situation, tactic, intonation (although this can indeed also be extrapolated from an audio recording) and paralinguistic features, all of which influence the nature and function of the discourse, may be lost to the analyst. As the study was conducted for only one lesson the findings are not suitable for generalization. The subjects involved in the study were not representative of the general Japanese L1 population in terms of age sex and linguistic ability. The lesson recorded in the study contained only two basic types of language activities making it in no way comprehensive of general language teaching practices.

### 6.3. Future Developments

The Sinclair and Coulthard discourse analysis model is a large, complex, dynamic system and by applying it in situations for which it was not originally designed we test the envelope of its effectiveness.

Through greater awareness of the nature of classroom interaction we can come to a fuller under-

---

\*I was checking the number of objects (pictures) involved in the information gap activity. There were a total of twelve objects but two were given as examples leaving ten objects for the students to practice.

standing of the place discourse holds within the language system, how discourse is involved in the language acquisition process and the place it has in how that language is then used by students. Classroom discourse analysis remains a very worthwhile area of study and although much investigation has already been done in the field there is still room for improvement for both teachers and researchers alike.

## References

- Allwright, D. and Bailey, K.M. 1991. *Focus On the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, J.L. 1962 *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berry, M. 1980. *A Note On Sinclair And Coulthard's Classes Of Acts Including a Comment On "Comments"*. Nottingham Linguistic Circular. Vol. 8. 49-59.
- Brazil, D. 1995. *Classroom And Spoken Discourse*. Birmingham: The Center For English Language Studies; The University Of Birmingham.
- Brazil, D. 1997. *The Communicative Value Of Intonation In English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cathcart, R. 1983. 'Functional Analysis Of Language Data'. Paper Presented At The 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, Canada.
- Chaudron, C. 1977. *A Descriptive Model Of Discourse In The Corrective Treatment Of Learners; Errors*. Language Learning. Vol. 27. 29-46.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research On Teaching And Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. 1985. *An Introduction To Discourse Analysis*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dressler, W. 1978. *Current Trends In Textlinguistics*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
- Edmondson, W. 1981. *Spoken Discourse: A Model For Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Ellis, R. 1988. *Classroom Second Language Development*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study Of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Francis, G. and Hunston, S. 1992 'Analysing Everyday Conversation'. In Coulthard, M. (eds) *Advances In Spoken Discourse*. (pp123 161) London: Routledge.
- Grimes, J.E. 1975. *The Thread Of Discourse*. The Hauge: Mouton.
- Halliday, M. A.K. 1961. Categories Of The Theory Of Grammar. *Word* 17 241-92.
- Harris, Z. 1952. 'Discourse Analysis'. *Language*, Vol. 28, 1-30.
- Hymes, D. 1972. 'Models Of The Interaction Of Language And Social Life'. In Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. (eds) *Directions In Sociolinguistics*. Holt, Reinhart And Winston.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. 1991. *An Introduction To Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- Long, M. 1981. 'Input, Interaction And Second Language Acquisition'. In Wintz, H. (eds) *Native Language And Foreign Language Acquisition. Annals Of The New York Academy Of Sciences*. Vol.379. 259-278.
- Long, M. and Sato, C. 1983. 'Classroom Foreigner Talk Discourse: Forms And Functions Of Teachers' Questions'. In Seliger, H. and Long, M. (eds) *Classroom Oriented Research In Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.268-285). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- McCarthy, M. 1999. *Discourse Analysis For Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Nunan, D.** 1992. *Research Methods In Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J. and Platt, H.** 1992. *Dictionary Of Language And Teaching And Applied Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Searle, J.P.** 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J.P., Keifer, F. and Bierwish, M.** 1980. 'Speech Act Theory And Pragmatics'. *Synthese Language Library*, Vol.10. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Sinclair, J.** 1992. 'Priorities In Discourse Analysis'. In Coulthard, M. (eds) *Advances In Spoken Discourse*. (pp.79-88) London: Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. and Brazil, D.** 1982. *Teacher Talk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M.** 1975. *Towards An Analysis Of Discourse: The English Used By Teachers And Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H.H.** 1992. *Issues And Options In Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsui, A.** 1985. 'Analysing Input And Interaction In Second Language Classrooms'. *RELC Journal*, Vol. 16. 8-32.
- Willis, D.** 1992. 'Caught In The Act: Using The Rank Scale To Address Problems Of Delicacy'. In Coulthard, M. (eds) *Advances In Spoken Discourse*. (pp.111-122) London: Routledge.
- Willis, J.** 1992. 'Inner And Outer: Spoken Discourse In the Language Classroom'. In Coulthard, M. (eds) *Advances In Spoken Discourse*. (pp.162-182) London: Routledge.
- Wilson, W. and Barnard, R.** 1992. *Fifty-Fifty: A Basic Course In Communication*. London: Prentice Hall Regents.

## Appendix 1

Key to aid in the reading of the analyzed data.

- **Abbreviations** (See also Appendix 3.)

Framing M	Framing Move
Focusing M	Focusing Move
Opening M	Opening Move
Answering M	Answering Move
Follow-up M	Follow-up Move

- **Japanese Words and Translations**

<i>Exchange Number</i>	<i>Japanese word, phrase or sentence.</i>	<i>Translation/(Meaning)</i>
5	genki	lively
19	Daiwa	(The name of a department store.)
21/22	wagamama	Selfish
36	Gambatte kudasai	Do your best
63	yoroshiku	(Give my regards to)
67	Altsu Bandai	(The name of a ski resort.)
78/82	Uno	(A Japanese card game.)
98/119	Jan ken (pon)	Paper Scissors Stone (game)
112	Tskue no ue hon nii satsu ga arimasu.	There are two books on the desk.
112	doshi	verb

(j) denotes meaning

## Appendix 2.

Data from a lesson analysed using the Sinclair and Coulthard Classroom Discourse Analysis Model (1975).

Lesson : Stage 1 : Transaction 1

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
1	boundary	(Framing M) Right Let's see (Focusing M) The topic will be winter vacation	m/^ z ms				
2	informing	(Opening M) For me winter vacation is very soon From Thursday of next week I'm going to Scotland	i	(Answering M) Ohh, Ahh	ack		
3	eliciting	(Opening M) Would you like to come with me?	el	(Answering M) (laugh)	rea	(Follow-up M) It's ok	acc/ack/e
4	boundary	So ^	m/^				
5	informing	(Opening M) In Scotland I will spend three weeks with my family A long holiday. I'm very lucky. And I want to do many things when I'm in Scotland I want to visit my friends and family I want to go shopping I want to drive my father's new car And I want to play with my dog. My dog is very 'genki'	i				
6	boundary	Ok (Focusing M) So today's free talking topic is the winter vacation	m ms				
7	informing	(Opening M) About two weeks? Maybe So what will you do? Where will you go?	i z i el				
8	eliciting	(Opening M) Will you go to China?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		
9	eliciting	(Opening M) No? No-one?	el/l	(Answering M) NV	rea		
10	informing	(Opening M) Ok, maybe you will go somewhere Visit friends, visit relatives, go skiing, play, meet friends There are many things we can do in the winter vacation	m cl  i				
11	directing	(Opening M) With your partner, using only English, as normal, the topic is winter vacation. Ready go	dir ms dir	(Answering M) NV (Students engage in a pair work activity)	rea		



**Appendix 2 (cont'd)**

Lesson : Stage 1 : Transaction 2

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
12	boundary	(Framing M) Ok	m/^				
13	directing	(Opening M) Can you stop there	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
14	informing	(Opening M) Ok Let's talk to some people umm	m i z				
15	informing	(Opening M) The first person is going to be Misuzu	i n	(Answering M) Yes	ack		
16	eliciting	(Opening M) Misuzu Ok What's your plan for winter vacation?	m el	(Answering M) Winter vacation I have a part-time job	rep	(Follow-up M) Ahh	acc/ack/e
17	eliciting	(Opening M) You're not on holiday?	el	(Answering M) My holiday is December 28 and December 29	rep	(Follow-up M) So, on all other days you are working	acc/ack/e com
18	eliciting	(Opening M) What's your job?	el	(Answering M) Gift corner	rep	(Follow-up M) Gift corner	acc/ack/e
19	eliciting	(Opening M) Where?	el	(Answering M) Daiwa	rep		
20	eliciting	(Opening Move) Do you like this job?	el	(Answering M) No	rep	(Follow-up M) No, ha ha A very strong no	acc/ack/e com
21	eliciting	(Opening M) Why not?	el	(Answering M) My customer is 'wagamama'	rep	(Follow-up M) Ahh, 'wagamama'	acc/ack/e
22	eliciting	(Opening M) Does anyone know 'wagamama'?	el	(Answering M) Selfish	rep	(Follow-up M) Selfish That's right. Selfish selfish So customers are very selfish, ahh	acc e acc com
23	eliciting	(Opening M) Is your shop busy at New year time?	el	(Answering M) Yes, busy	rep		
24	eliciting	(Opening M) What gift is most popular?	el	(Answering M) Oil	rep		
25	eliciting	(Opening M) Foil?	el/l	(Answering M) No. Salad oil	rep	(Follow-up M) Ahh salad oil Ahh right, so New Year's gifts. Salad oil. Mmm	acc/ack/e com
26	boundary	Ok. Thank you very much	m com				

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 1 : **Transaction 3**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
27	boundary	(Framing M) Right	m/^				
28	informing	(Opening M) The next person is going to be... Who's next here. It is going to be Mami	i z n				
29	eliciting	(Opening M) Where's Mami?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		
30	eliciting	(Opening M) Ok Mami What's your plan for winter vacation?	m el	(Answering M) I will go to driving school	rep	(Follow-up M) Driving school	acc/ack/e
31	eliciting	(Opening M) Everyday?	el	(Answering M) Maybe	rep	(Follow-up M) That's a hard schedule	acc/ack.com/e
32	eliciting	(Opening M) Do you like driving school?	el	(Answering M) It's so so	rep	(Follow-up M) It's so so	acc/ack/e
33	eliciting	(Opening M) Who's your favourite teacher?	el	(Answering M) I don't have teacher	rep	(Follow-up M) Ahh	acc/ack/e
34	eliciting	(Opening M) So you have just started?	el	(Answering M) Yes	rep		
35	eliciting	(Opening M) So, do you like driving?	el	(Answering M) It is very difficult	rep	(Follow-up M) Ok	acc/ack/e
36	eliciting	(Opening M) When can you get your driving license?	el	(Answering M) Maybe next spring	rep	(Follow-up M) Next spring Well do your best 'gambatte kudasai'	acc/ack/e com

**Appendix 2 (cont'd)**Lesson : Stage 1 : **Transaction 4**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
37	boundary	(Framing M) Ehh	m/^				
38	informing	(Opening M) The next person is going to be Aki	i n	(Answering M) NV	rea		
39	eliciting	(Opening M) Aki, what's your plan for winter vacation?	el	(Answering M) I will go to the cinema. This year and next year I will watch a lot of movies	rep		
40	eliciting	(Opening M) What movies do you want to watch?	el	(Answering M) Many	rep	(Follow-up M) Many	acc/ack/e
41	eliciting	(Opening M) For example?	el	(Answering M) Pretty Bride and Six Sense	rep	(Follow-up M) Ahh Bruce Willis' movie	acc/ack/e com
42	(Student) informing	(Opening M) I will have a lot of part-time jobs	i			(Follow-up M) Ahh lots of work.	acc/ack/e com
43	eliciting	(Opening M) What's your job?	el	(Answering M) Home teaching	rep	(Follow-up M) Ahh You're a home teacher.	acc/ack/e
44	eliciting	(Opening M) Private teacher?	el	(Answering M) Yes	rep		
45	eliciting	(Opening M) How many students do you have?	el	(Answering M) Two	rep	(Follow-up M) Two	acc/ack/e
46	eliciting	(Opening M) Boys or girls?	el	(Answering M) Both	rep	(Follow-up M) Both	acc/ack/e
47	eliciting	(Opening M) One boy and one girl?	el	(Answering M) Yes	rep		
48	eliciting	(Opening M) How old are they?	el	(Answering M) Eleven and fifty	rep		
49	eliciting	(Opening M) Eleven and fifty?	el/l	(Answering M) Ahh ohh eh fifteen	rep	(Follow-up M) Yes fifteen Maybe fifty is a little old to be your student	e com
50	eliciting	(Opening M) What do you teach them?	el	(Answering M) Mmm I teach maths	rep	(Follow-up M) Maths	acc/ack/e
51	(student) informing	(Opening M) English, science and so on	i			(Follow-up M) Hmm	acc/ack/e
52	eliciting	(Opening M) What subjects do you like to teach?	el	(Answering M) Maybe English	rep	(Follow-up M) What a good answer. I think I'll give you a bonus point Well good luck working and I hope you enjoy the movies	e  com

**Appendix 2 (cont'd)**Lesson : Stage 1 : **Transaction 5**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
53	boundary	(Framing M) Ok right	m/^				
54	informing	(Opening M) The next person is going to be Namiko S	i n				
55	eliciting	(Opening M) Where's Namiko?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		
56	eliciting	(Opening M) Ok, what's your plan Namiko?	m el	(Answering M) In this winter vacation I will write New Year's cards. I will go to Nagaoka to visit my grandparents and my cousin	rep	(Follow-up M) I see	acc/ack/e
57	eliciting	(Opening M) About New Year's cards How many will you write?	s el	(Answering M) About forty or fifty cards	rep	(Follow-up M) Fifty! That's a lot of cards Wow	acc/ack/e com acc/ack/e
58	eliciting	(Opening M) Do you enjoy writing new year's cards?	el	(Answering M) Ok	rep		
59	eliciting	(Opening M) Do you write all of the cards by hand?	el	(Answering M) Stamp and hand	rep	(Follow-up M) Stamp and hand. Oh	acc/ack/e
60	eliciting	(Opening M) What kind of stamp?	el	(Answering M) Dragon	rep	(Follow-up M) A dragon, of course It's going to be the year of the dragon	acc/ack/e com
61	eliciting	(Opening M) And your grandparents Do they live in Nagaoka?	s el	(Answering M) Yes	rep		
62	eliciting	(Opening M) How old are they?	el	(Answering M) My grandfather is seventy-five years old.	rep		
63	eliciting	(Opening M) Is he a good grandfather?	el	(Answering M) Yes	rep	(Follow-up M) Ok Please say 'yoroshiku' for me when you go	acc/ack/e com
64	eliciting	(Opening M) Ok?	el	(Answering M) NV (nod)	rea	(Follow-up M) Thank you	acc/ack/e

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 1 : **Transaction 6**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
65	boundary	(Framing M) Right^	m/^				
66	informing	(Opening M) The next person is going to be, who's next Mayako	i z n	(Answering M) NV	rea		
67	eliciting	(Opening M) Mayako, what is your plan?	el	(Answering M) I will go.... I will go to Alstu Bandai to play snowboard.	rep	(Follow-up M) So you're going snowboarding	acc/ack/e
68	(student) informing	(Opening M) With my friend but I...I...	i			(Follow-up M) Ahh	acc/ack/e
69	eliciting	(Opening M) How many times have you tried snowboarding	el	(Answering M) Five times, maybe about five times	rep	(Follow-up M) Five times	acc/ack/e
70	eliciting	(Opening M) Is it difficult?	el	(Answering M) Too difficult	rep	(Follow-up M) Ha ha too difficult I see I see	acc/ack/e
71	eliciting	(Opening M) Do you fall many times?	el	(Answering M) Fall?	rep/l	(Follow-up M) Fall.	acc/ack/e
72	informing	(Opening M) Fall over, fall down you know (falling down gesture)	i	(Answering M) Many	rep	(Follow-up M) Many times, I see Well good luck snowboarding.	acc/ack/e com
73	informing	(Opening M) I hope you have a good time	i	(Answering M) Thank you	rep	(Follow-up M) Be careful	acc/ack/e

**Appendix 2 (cont'd)**

Lesson : Stage 1 : Transaction 7

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
74	boundary	(Framing M) Ok	m				
75	informing	(Opening M) And one more person It's going to be Yumi. Yumi W.	i n				
76	eliciting	(Opening M) Where's Yumi?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		
77	eliciting	(Opening M) Yumi. what's your plan?	el	(Answering M) I...I will have a 'nabe' party	rep	(Follow-up M) A 'nabe' party	acc/ack/e
78	(student) informing	(Opening M) With my friends. We will play Uno	i			(Follow-up M) Ok Uh huh	acc/ack/e
79	eliciting	(Opening M) When is the party going to be?	el	(Answering M) December twenty six	rep	(Follow-up M) December twenty six. ok	acc e
80	eliciting	(Opening M) In the evening? In the afternoon?	el	(Answering M) Evening	rep	(Follow-up M) Evening ok	acc e
81	eliciting	(Opening M) Who will cook the 'nabe'?	el	(Answering M) All members	rep	(Follow-up M) Everyone together right	acc/ack/e
82	eliciting	(Opening M) And who is the best Uno player in your group?	m el	(Answering M) Maybe Yasuyo	rep	(Follow-up M) Yasuyo. She's the Uno champion of your group. I see I see	acc/ack/e com
83	eliciting	(Opening M) Will you work? Do you have a part time job?	s el	(Answering M) No	rep	(Follow-up M) So you are free. You are lucky like me Free! Free!	acc/ack/e com
84	boundary	(Focusing M) Ok, thank you, thank you	m com				
85	eliciting	(Opening M) Anyone else?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		
86	directing	(Opening M) If you have some good plans Please raise your hand	s dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
87	eliciting	(Opening M) No? No?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 1 : **Transaction 8**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
88	boundary	^^	^^				
89	eliciting	(Opening M) Are you hot?	el	(Answering M) NV	rea		
90	directing	(Opening M) If you are hot please put your hand up	s dir	(Answering M) NV	rea	(Follow-up M) Two people	acc/ack/e
91	informing	(Opening M) Only two people. Ok let's leave the heaters like this	i	(Answering M) NV	rea		

**Appendix 2 (cont'd)**

## Lesson : Stage 2 : Transaction 9

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
92	boundary	(Framing M) Alright^ right right ok	m/^ m				
93	directing	(Opening M) Please take out your text books and let's continue	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
94	informing	(Opening M) Ok Last time we studied pages twenty five and twenty six. And page twenty five is about place. Words that tell us the place. Words like, 'in', 'on', 'under', 'between', 'next to', 'in the middle of'	m i				
95	directing	(Opening M) If you look at the bottom of the page	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
96	informing	(Opening M) There are sentences with those words	i				
97	directing	(Opening M) Now I would like you to spend a few minutes and read those sentences	m dir	(Answering M) NV (Students study the designated pages.)	rea		
98	directing	(Opening M) With your partner please 'jan ken'	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
99	boundary	(Framing M) Ok Let's see	m z				
100	eliciting	(Opening M) Meri You can choose, winner or loser?	n el	(Answering M) winner	rep	(Follow-up M) winner	acc/ack/e
101	directing	(Opening M) Ok The winner please cover the words and the loser try asking the questions	m dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
102	informing	(Opening M) For example 'Where is the phonebook?	i				
103	directing	(Opening M) And loser, using only the picture try to make the answer	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
104	Eliciting	(Opening M) Ok?	ch	(Answering M) NV	rea		
105	informing	(Opening M) So Number two, 'pens' Loser, when you ask the question be careful with the singular and plural. Ok pens So 'Where are the pens'	m i  s m i				
106	directing	(Opening M) So Please be careful Ok please begin	m dir	(Answering M) NV (Students engage in the pair work activity.)	rea		



**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 2 : **Transaction 10**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
107	boundary	(Framing M) Ok	m				
108	directing	(Opening M) Can you stop there.	dir	(Answering M) NV	rep		
109	eliciting	(Opening M) Ok Does any one have any questions?	m ch	(Answering M) NV	rep		
110	eliciting	(Opening M) No?	ch	(Answering M) NV	rea		
111	boundary	(Focusing M) A couple of things to tell you	ms				
112	informing	(Opening M) This word for the plural 'they're' Ok 'they're' 'there/they're' Ok 'there are' and 'there' is not the same Ok 'There are two books on the desk' 'Tskue no ue hon nii satsu ga arimasu' 'There' is 'BE doshi' So it's different ok 'There/they're'	s m i  m i  m i				
113	boundary	^^	^^				
114	informing	(Opening M) And also this word 'scissors' It is always plural. It is a plural noun, Maybe last time I told you too. So scissors, always 'Where are the scissors?' Ok ? 'Scissors', plural	m s i  com m i  ch i				

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 2 : **Transaction 11**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
115	boundary (directing)	(Framing M) Right ok^ (Focusing M)/(Opening M) Let's have a look at page twenty seven	m/^ ms/dir				
116	informing	(Opening M) Ok Page twenty seven is the speaking task	m i				
117	informing  (directing)	(Opening M) OK Exercise one and exercise two are the same but opposite Ok Exercise one, student A is on this page twenty seven and student B is on page one hundred and thirteen	m i  m i/dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
118	boundary	Ok	m				
119	directing	(Opening M) Now With your partner please 'jan ken'	m dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
120	boundary	Ok	m				
121	informing	(Opening M) The winner is student A, page twenty seven and the loser is student B, page one hundred and thirteen Ok You can see a drawing of a room. Your room and your partner's room are different. Two different rooms. On page twenty seven, student A is looking for ten things.	i  m i				
122	eliciting	(Opening M) Is it ten?	z/el	(Answering M) Twelve	rep	(Follow-up M) No twelve, twelve things	e acc
123	informing	(Opening M) Twelve things in the living room and student B, page one hundred and thirteen knows where those things are in the room. So Student A, you are going to ask your partner to tell you where the things are. The twelve things you are looking for are drawn near the top of the page.	i  m dir  i				
124	eliciting	(Opening M) Lets just try saying those words Please repeat after me 'coat'	ms el	(Answering M) 'coat'	rep	(Follow-up M) Oh not very 'genki'	e

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)

Lesson : Stage 2 : Transaction 11 (cont'd)

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
125	eliciting	(Opening M) Once more 'coat'	p el	(Answering M) 'coat'	rep		
126	eliciting	(Opening M) 'cushions'	el	(Answering M) 'cushions'	rep		
127	eliciting	(Opening M) 'book'	el	(Answering M) book'	rep		
128	eliciting	(Opening M) 'glasses'	el	(Answering M) 'glasses'	rep		
129	eliciting	(Opening M) 'magazines'	el	(Answering M) 'magazines'	rep		
130	eliciting	(Opening M) 'painting'	el	(Answering M) 'painting'	rep		
131	eliciting	(Opening M) 'slippers'	el	(Answering M) 'slippers'	rep		
132	eliciting	(Opening M) 'glass'	el	(Answering M) 'glass'	rep		
133	eliciting	(Opening M) 'newspaper'	el	(Answering M) 'newspaper'	rep		
134	eliciting	(Opening M) 'plant'	el	(Answering M) 'plant'	rep		
135	eliciting	(Opening M) 'cat'	el	(Answering M) 'cat'	rep		
136	eliciting	(Opening M) 'photo'	el	(Answering M) 'photo'	rep	(Follow-up M) Good. that's fine	e
137	boundary	So^	m/^				
138	informing	(Opening M) You are looking for those things in the living room. Ok Your partner knows where they are .Ok Your partner will tell you where they are and then you can draw the things in their right places in the living room	i  ms				
139	boundary	^^	^				
140	informing / directing	(Opening M) Now Something to be careful about. singular words and plural words ok For example 'coat' is singular. 'book' is singular but 'cushions' there are two cushions so that's plural so that question will be 'Where are the cushions?' Please be careful with those ones	m s  i/dir  m i/dir				
141	boundary	Right	m				

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 2 : **Transaction 11** (cont'd)

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
142	informing	(Opening M) And student B, page one hundred and thirteen the things you are looking for are	i				
143	boundary	Ok	m				
144	eliciting	(Opening M) Student B after me please 'dress'	s el	(Answering M) 'dress'	rep		
145	eliciting	(Opening M) 'book'	el	(Answering M) 'book'	rep		
146	eliciting	(Opening M) 'clock'	el	(Answering M) 'clock'	rep		
147	eliciting	(Opening M) 'suitcase'	el	(Answering M) 'suitcase'	rep		
148	eliciting	(Opening M) 'glass'	el	(Answering M) 'glass'	rep		
149	eliciting	(Opening M) 'plant'	el	(Answering M) 'plant'	rep		
150	eliciting	(Opening M) 'picture'	el	(Answering M) 'picture'	rep		
151	eliciting	(Opening M) 'jacket'	el	(Answering M) 'jacket'	rep		
152	eliciting	(Opening M) 'brush'	el	(Answering M) 'brush'	rep		
153	eliciting	(Opening M) 'photo'	el	(Answering M) 'photo'	rep		
154	eliciting	(Opening M) 'shirt'	el	(Answering M) 'shirt'	rep		
155	eliciting	(Opening M) 'make-up'	el	(Answering M) 'make-up'	rep	(Follow-up M) Ok fine	e
156	boundary	Ok	m				
157	informing	(Opening M) Your partner knows where these things are So With your partner you are going to ask questions like 'Where is the coat?' And you have to tell your partner where the things are in the room. For example 'The cushions are on the chair next to the table.' ok	i  m ms  s i				
158	boundary	Now	m				
159	informing	(Opening M) If you get stuck and you don't know how to say something please ask me and I will help you ok Any time just put your hand up ok	s  i				
160	boundary	^^	m				
161	eliciting	(Opening M) Are there any questions before we begin?	ch	(Answering M) NV	rea	(Follow-up M) Everybody looks ok	acc/a ck/e
162	directing	(Opening M) Ok Then you can start when you are ready	m dir	(Answering M) NV (Students engage in the pair work activity.)	rea		

**Appendix 2** (cont'd)Lesson : Stage 2 : **Transaction 12**

Exchange Number	Exchange Type	Initiation	Act	Response	Act	Feedback	Act
163	boundary	(Framing M) Excuse-me^	m/^				
164	directing	(Opening M) Can you stop for a moment	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea		
165	informing	(Opening M) There are some sentences on page twenty five that will help you if you can't remember what to say. They are near the bottom of the page under the picture of the classroom	i				
166	directing	(Opening M) Ok Please continue	m dir	(Answering M) NV (Students re-engage in the pair work activity.)			
167	boundary	(Framing m) Ok	m				
168	informing	(Opening M) It looks like most of you are just about finished	ch				
169	directing	(Opening M) Can you put up your hand if you are not finished	dir	(Answering M) NV	rea	(Follow-up M) Yup, nearly all of you	acc/ack/e
170	directing	(Opening M) If you haven't finished please keep going and the people that have finished look at your partner's picture.	dir	(Answering M) NV (Students resume pair work activity.)	rea		
171	informing	(Opening M) The two pictures should be the same.	i				
172	boundary	Ok	m				
173	directing	(Opening M) Can you all just stop there	dir	(Answering M) NV			
174	directing	(Opening M) Ok We are just about to finish for today, but before we do can you look at the pictures again. If there are any, furniture, if there is any furniture you don't know how to say in English please circle it and check it for homework.	m ms  dir				
175	eliciting	(Opening M) Are there any questions?	ch	(Answering M) NV	rea	(Follow-up M) No questions I think you just want to stop working	acc/ack/e com
176	boundary	Alright	m				
177	informing	(Opening M) We can finish there for today Have a good weekend everyone	i com		rep	(Follow-up M) Bye	acc/ack/e

### Appendix 3

Table 7. Classes of Acts (based on Sinclair and Coulthard 1992, p19-21)

<i>Act</i>	<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Realisation (example)</i>
Accept	acc	Shows the teacher has heard correct information	'Yes', 'No', 'Good', 'Fine'
Acknowledge	ack	Shows the student has heard and understood the initiation and intends to react.	'Yes', 'Cor', 'OK', 'Wow', 'mm', 'mmhm'
Aside	z	Shows the teacher is talking to himself/herself.	Statement/Question/Command
Bid	b	Signals a desire to contribute to the discourse.	'Sir', 'Miss', teacher's name, raised hand/ heavy breathing/ finger clicking
Check	ch	Enables the teacher to check progress	'Finished?', 'Ready?', /Question
Cue	c	Evokes an appropriate bid.	'Hands up!', 'Don't call out!', 'Is (student's name) the only one?'
Clue	cl	Provides additional information to facilitate a correct response.	Statement/Question /Command
Comment	com	Exemplifies/justifies/expands and provides additional information	Statement/Tag question
Conclusion	con	Summaries	Anaphoric statement
Directive	dir	Requests a non-linguistic response.	Command
Elicitation	el	Requests a linguistic response.	Question
Evaluation	e	Evaluates a response.	'Good', 'Interesting', 'Yes', 'Team point'/Statement/ Question tag
Informative	i	Provides information	Statement
Loop	l	Returns the discourse to the stage it was at before the student responded.	'Pardon', 'You what', 'Eh', 'Again', 'Pardon'
Marker	m	Marks boundaries in the discourse.	'Well', 'Right', 'OK', 'Now', 'Good', 'Alright'
Metastatement	ms	Refers explicitly to the development of the lesson.	Cataphoric statement
Nomination	n	Calls of gives permission to a student to contribute to the discourse.	'You', 'Yes', 'Anybody', 'John'
Prompt	p	Reinforces an elicitation or directive.	'Go on', 'Come on', 'Hurry up'
React	rea	Provides a non-linguistic response to a directive.	Non-linguistic action
Reply	rep	Provides a linguistic response to an elicitation.	Statement/Question/Nod
Silent Stress	^	Highlights a marker	Pause
Starter	s	Provides information to facilitate a response	Statement/Question/Command

## Appendix 4

Information summary on bound initiations.

Table 8. Summary of characteristics of bound initiations based on Brazil (1995).

<b>Bound Initiation Type</b>	<b>Internal Structure</b>	<b>Internal Structure &lt;Abbreviation&gt;</b>	<b>Use</b>
Re-initiation(i)	Initiation-Initiation b(n)-Response-Follow-up	I IbRF	When the teacher gets no response to an elicitation and so can start again by repeating or rephrasing the question or use one or more of the acts prompt, nomination, clue.
Re-initiation(ii)	Initiation-Response-Follow-up-(Initiation b)-Response-Follow-up	IRF (Ib)RF	When the teacher gets the wrong answer, the question may be allowed to stand while the teacher moves on to another student.
Listing	Initiation-Response-(Initiation b)-Response-Follow-up-(Initiation b)-Response-Follow-up	IRF(Ib)RF(Ib)RF	When an evaluation is withheld in order that the teacher may obtain a list of possible answers,
Reinforce	Initiation-Response-Initiation b-Response	IRIbR	When a teacher direct has been misunderstood a clue or prompt may be given to correct this.
Loop	Initiation-Response-Initiation b-Response-Follow-up	IRIbRF	When the teacher has not heard the response, or has not deemed it appropriate.

\* Ib is a bound initiation