THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
MORAY HOUSE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

USE OF FILM DIALOGUES AS A
MODEL OF NATURAL CONVERSATION FOR
DEVELOPING CONVERSATIONAL
PROFICIENCY

HYONG-JU JEON

This extended study is presented in part fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Masters of Education in
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

2003

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This study is informed by the theories of spoken discourse analysis, and aims to locate authentic materials that will facilitate the development of conversational proficiency and are easily available in EFL contexts. The study first reviews the nature of conversation and describes several dimensions of natural conversation, which are concerned with purposes of conversation, norms of conversation, conversational rules and structures (i.e., openings and closings, topic management, turn-taking mechanisms), repairs, and formal features of conversation as spoken language. In order to see if textbook materials for teaching conversation play the basic role of providing authentic samples of conversation, the study critically evaluates two conversation textbooks that are currently published in Korea. The analysis of the textbook dialogues shows that they fail to present learners with the way people actually speak. Four possible reasons are discussed, then the study suggests the use of feature films as instructional materials and investigate film dialogues. In order to see whether they are authentic enough to substitute genuine conversation, eleven samples from two currently released feature films (*Notting Hill* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*) are analysed. The results show that even though there are some difficulties and limitations, film dialogues more closely approximate natural conversation than the textbook dialogues and thus they can be presented as a model of natural conversation. To illustrate how they can be exploited in a classroom, the study first looks at two major approaches to the teaching of conversation and argues that the direct approach is more appropriate than the indirect approach in Korea. It then suggests ways of making the most of the features identified through the analysis and offers a sample lesson with a rationale for the plan including a commentary on the activities and tasks. The process of analysing samples highlights the importance of teachers' having a good understanding of the theories of spoken discourse and skill of implementing the analysis, so the study suggests that study of discourse analysis be one of the main components of teacher training and in-service education programmes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all tutors, Gillies, Rosemary and Ruby for their prompting, insightful suggestions and critical comments, which became the best guide in this study. I am particularly grateful to Gillies, who gave me the inspiration for this study at the very early stage and has offered me a great deal of support and encouragement until the completion of this dissertation. I also thank my family, dear friends and colleagues in Korea for every help and support they have provided during my study here in Edinburgh.

Chapter 1   Introduction

1.1 Background to the study

The role of English in this century is incredibly powerful in all spheres of life. It is the best instrument to get access to new information and a practical medium for global communication. The development of new technology has rapidly expanded the worldwide use of English and it seems that the future of English as an international language is undoubtedly evident and this is an irresistible trend. Moreover, as a result of rapid globalisation and increasing international trade, much more demand has been made for people who can communicate orally in English. The South Korean government has recognised the leading role of English and placed English learning and teaching high on its agenda to ensure that South Korea will play an active and important role in world political and economic activities. The Ministry of Education has also reflected this awareness in the *Primary and Secondary Schools Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997). Naturally, its main emphasis is on the development of communicative competence based on equal improvement of four language skills.

Teaching speaking skills or conversation skills is situated in such an awareness of the importance of acquiring a 'good command of oral English'. The subject of conversation in Korea is taught for students aged from 17 to 18 in high schools on the basis of linguistic knowledge which is supposed to be acquired from 'common required courses based on national standards' (Ministry of Education, 2000). While putting great value on its practical usefulness, it aims to develop students' ability of listening comprehension and expression. Enhancing cultural understanding of the target language in terms of the way of behaviour and communication of native speakers constitutes another important goal. In accordance with the guidelines of the national curriculum, a number of school textbooks have been developed. One of them is adopted by the whole school and teachers use it in their practice.

1.2 Language learning and teaching context

Whatever we discuss in relation to educational practice, we need to take into account individual and social contexts of teaching and learning since they play a crucial role in shaping the processes and outcomes of learning by offering either practical assistance or constraints

fed in the whole process of teaching and learning. Above all, it should be noted that English is taught as a foreign language in Korea. Richards (2001: 213) specifies several issues concerned derived from the significant differences between teaching EFL and teaching ESL, and the consequential difficulties of teaching EFL in South Korea is well illustrated by Li (2001: 160). The point is that English is not used for daily communication, so there is no urgent need for working on spoken English.

Main purposes of learning English of Korean people come from *extrinsic* and *instrumental* motivation (see Williams and Burden, 1997: 111-8) and English serves primarily transactional functions. As for high school students, the most important motivation is passing exams. The most important of all is the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT). It is a national examination for university entrance whose main focus is on reading and listening (KICE, undated). As a result of its huge washback effect, curricula and classroom teaching practices in academic high schools tend to be organised or adjusted to improve those two skills and subsequently teaching speaking or conversation skills has been considered secondary or relatively neglected although it figures prominently in the national curriculum.

When it comes to language input, both teachers and students in a non-English-speaking environment have no opportunity of being exposed to real language in natural settings. This lack of exposure to authentic language results in, first of all, difficulties in getting authentic materials, by which I mean ones not specifically produced for language teaching purposes. It also prevents teachers and students from developing their oral language proficiency. To most of them, the classroom is the only place where they can hear and speak English. Considering the fact that learning is facilitated by exposure to authentic language and through using language for genuine communication (Richards, 2001: 214), these contextual limits immediately call for the use of effective teaching materials for teaching conversation in compensation for the lack of rich natural language input. This becomes even more crucial in that natural language input is often regarded as an essential and fundamental prerequisite for achieving oral competence.

In most school classrooms in Korea, however, rich authentic input is less prevalent than desired and in most cases it is missing altogether. As indicated earlier, all textbooks used in

they consist of artificially constructed and simplified language. As Meinhof (1987) points out, a strict interpretation of *authenticity* would include only original pieces of written or spoken language which occurred naturally between native speakers and could therefore be accepted as 'genuine communicative acts'. In this sense, school textbooks are not authentic. However, using textbook materials has a good justification in pedagogic terms. That is, "the teacher simplifies by selecting and ordering the linguistic phenomena he is to deal with so as to ease the task of learning" (Widdowson, 1979). So, the matter is not simplification itself but how successfully it can be executed (Guariento and Morley, 2001: 348). The problem is that simplification certainly carries risks. Hence, what should concern us primarily is not the originality of the language itself but the "qualities of natural speech" (Richards *et al.*, 1985: 22) by which the degree of *authenticity of conversation* should be measured. So the question to be asked is: "To what extent textbook conversations have the qualities of people's day-to-day language use", so "Whether they are good models for teaching conversation".

1.3 The purpose of the study

This study seeks to answer a key question: "In what way teachers can provide Korean students with an opportunity to be exposed to authentic conversation to develop their *conversational proficiency* (for my definition, see 2.1.2) where sufficient amount of natural language input is not available from the context". The primary purpose of this study is therefore to find more appropriate, authentic materials which are available to Korean teachers. Given the widespread use of textbooks, my study starts from the critical evaluation of textbook materials by looking at the degree to which they reflect the authenticity of conversation. In order to do this, I will first describe several dimensions of natural conversation which explain the 'qualities' of natural conversation. These will further function as criteria for evaluating the authenticity of textbook dialogues or other potential teaching materials. In so doing, analysis of language samples becomes an indispensable process. I will make use of the insights gained from the theories of spoken discourse analysis: speech act theory, exchange structure theory and ethnomethodological approach (see 2.1.3).

Critical evaluation of textbook materials will enable us to identify what is satisfactory or deficient in terms of the qualities of a naturally occurring conversation, thereby providing a

starting point of my attempt to locate supplementary or alternative materials. Another aim of this study is thus to suggest that teachers use more authentic materials, here in my study, feature films. I will claim that despite some limitations, film dialogues more closely approximate to natural conversation than textbook dialogues, i.e. they are more authentic, hence they can be usefully exploited in classrooms as teaching materials. Approaches to teaching conversation will then be discussed and I will propose that conversation be taught in more direct way in EFL teaching contexts. Finally, some practical suggestions for exploiting film dialogues in a conversation class will be made by providing a sample lesson plan.

1.4 Limitations of the study

There are several important issues closely associated with developing second language learners' conversational proficiency, which will not be fully discussed in my study. For example, the patterned structure of everyday linguistic events such as making requests or complaints is worth in-depth investigation in its own right. The main focus here is on developing an ability to use language appropriately according to situational parameters such as power, social distance, and degree of imposition (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Here, the issue of appropriacy is closely interwoven with intracultural and cross-cultural variation in the use and realisation of language. If teachers are working with a functional type of syllabus based on speech acts and speech functions especially with advanced level learners, this issue becomes of vital importance in that errors in the appropriate use of language, which are sensitive to cultural values, are typically interpreted as "breaches of etiquette" (Boxer and Pickering, 1995: 56).

Since speech acts differ cross-culturally in their distribution, function and frequency of occurrence (Schmidt and Richards, 1980), learners who want to be communicatively competent also need to acquire an understanding of the subtle rules and conditions which govern the performance of speech acts in the two languages concerned, in addition to the surface features of language such as syntax, phonology and vocabulary (White, 1993: 201). Obviously, this makes language acquisition a quite complicated task. Dealing with these issues, which are the main concerns of sociolinguistics and pragmatics, is beyond the scope of this study and I will only utilise the results of those studies for the evaluation of language

samples. Instead, teachers are likely to gain useful insights into teaching speech acts from McCarthy and Carter (1994) for making requests; Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) and Aston (1995) for expressing thanks; Psathas and Kozloff (1976) and Scotton and Bernsten (1988) for direction-giving; Boxer and Pickering (1995) for complaining; Taborn (1983) for the transactional dialogues, and White (1993) and Meier (1997) for teaching politeness.

Chapter 2   Nature of conversation

2.1 Understanding key concepts

2.1.1 What is 'conversation'?

Talking is something most of us are rather good at and enjoy. We can almost all speak, so we take the skill too much for granted. That is why, as Bygate (1987: vii) says, teaching speaking skills is in many ways undervalued. He argues that speaking is "a skill which deserves attention every bit as much as literary skills, in both first and second languages" (ibid.). However, we have noted that second language learners of English who are equipped with a good knowledge of syntax, phonology, a large vocabulary often fail as 'conversationalists' though they 'speak' reasonably correct and even fluent English. Why is that so? What is involved in producing fluent, appropriate and intelligible conversation? It seems that conversation involves something beyond the manipulation of the language itself. In this vein, some people make a distinction between speaking skills and conversation skills (e.g., Nolasco and Arthur, 1987). What then is 'conversation'?

In the literature the term 'conversation' is widely used but somewhat ambiguously and in a non-technical sense. Sometimes it refers to any spoken encounter or oral interaction and sometimes it is understood in a more restricted way[1]. One common observation is that a conversation has "no specified setting, no time or place (except for the absence of other speech activity, in which case it is heard as an interruption), no required roles other than 'persons' (though some external roles such as professor/student may not be shed), no pre-specified agenda, and a quorum of simply two or more" (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 133). Here in my study I will use the term *conversation* to refer to the talk which is less formal, not

---

[1] For example, Goffman (1976: 264, quoted in Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 118) defines *conversation* as "talk occurring when a small number of participants come together and settle into what they perceive to be a few moments cut off from (or carried on to the side of) instrumental tasks; a period of idling felt to be an end in itself, during which everyone is accorded the right to talk as well as to listen and without reference to a fixed schedule; everyone is accorded the status of someone whose overall evaluation of the subject matter at hand…is to be encouraged and treated with respect; and no final agreement or synthesis is demanded, differences of opinion to be treated as unprejudicial to the continuing relationship of the parties." Cook (1989: 51) takes a similar line and excludes the possibility of eavesdropping by

primarily necessitated by a practical task and involves relatively small number of participants who have the equal right to talk or listen without having to follow a fixed schedule.

2.1.2 Conversational proficiency

Given the definition of conversation, *conversational proficiency*[2] should be defined with reference to the ability of engaging in a dynamic process of on-going, interactive and mentally satisfying communication, rather than to the ability of native control of a language in terms of phonology, syntax and vocabulary, i.e., linguistic competence. It has been argued that linguistic competence is a necessary but not sufficient condition for communicative ability and now it is generally accepted that the achievement of communicative competence involves not only grammatical but sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence as well (Canale and Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983). It seems that the notion of communicative competence has been honed to its perfection in Bachman's (1990) framework of *communicative language ability*, which encompasses all components in communicative language use. According to Bachman's model, conversational proficiency is pertinent to *strategic competence*, i.e., a set of general abilities that utilise all of the elements of language competence in the process of negotiating meaning. In short, it is clear that developing students' conversational proficiency involves several dimensions which make up the construct of communicative competence. Hence, in teaching conversation, a healthier balance between the development of competence in the language system and competence in its use is called for.

2.1.3 Models for the analysis of conversation

What, then, are the dimensions which make up a conversation? How does conversation work in the real world? In order to answer these questions, we need to know, first of all, what native speakers do when they 'make conversation'. This leads us to lean on the studies of spoken discourse, which provide insights into what conversation is and what successful conversation involves. There are three important theories of discourse analysis especially relevant to

---

[2]   I will use the term 'conversational proficiency' to distinguish it from 'conversational competence', which refers to "the speaker's knowledge of how speech acts are used in social situations" (Richards and Sukwiwat, 1983: 113). Conversational competence involves appropriate use of speech styles "according to whom the speaker is addressing and the circumstances under which the act of communication is taking place" (ibid.: 117). It is clear that conversational competence corresponds to 'pragmatic competence' in Bachman's (1990)

conversation: speech act theory, exchange structure theory and ethnomethodological approach called conversational analysis[3]. Let us briefly look at these theories.

A. Speech act theory

Speech act theory derives from the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), whose approach is concerned with the analysis of language functions. Their central perception is that language *performs* communicative acts between speakers and listeners. This theory enables us to identify and label different communicative functions within utterances into separate segmented units which can be linked in sequence. According to this theory, individual speech acts can be illocutionary (the issuing of an utterance with conventional communicative force achieved "in saying") as well as perlocutionary (the actual effect achieved "by saying"), and can be direct as well as indirect. This makes it possible to start to map the optional and unpredictable nature of conversation (Cockcroft, 1999: 25). One of the important contributions of speech act theory to language teaching is that it has led to the design of the notional-functional syllabus, which many EFL textbooks adopt. However, a number of problems remain in applying the theory to the analysis of conversation. The difficulties come from the essential difference that "[speech acts] are usually defined in terms of speaker intentions and beliefs, whereas the nature of conversation depends crucially on interaction between speaker and hearer" (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 126). In the first place, since the function does not reside in the utterance itself but comes from the speaker who utters the form, linguistic forms need to be interpreted with reference to the participants, roles and settings (McCarthy, 1991: 18). Accordingly, there is no 'one utterance-one function' relationship and in fact, many speech acts are multifunctional (Hatch, 1992: 135). Another limitation is that since the analysis is at the utterance level, it does not allow us to see how speech act units combine to form a system, so it cannot help us to understand the structure of discourse (Hatch, ibid.).

B. Exchange structure theory

The exchange structure model was proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) as a result of their investigations in school classrooms and developed as an analytic framework for the description of the interaction in classrooms. The model works with *exchange* as the basic unit

---

[3] Speech act theory and conversation analysis are small areas of pragmatics, which particularly studies the relationship between sentences and the contexts and situations in which they are used (Richards *et al.*, 1985: 225). Main researchers include Grice (1975), Levinson (1983), and

of conversation. An exchange consists of an *initiating/opening move* (from whoever speaks first), a *responding move* (from whoever responds in some way, either by word or action like nodding of a head) and, in many cases, a *feedback/follow-up* move (in which the initiator comments on the response in some way). Each move can also be called a *turn*. We can give a function to each move, e.g., request or acknowledge. In order to do so we need to take account of factors such as who the speakers are, where and when the conversation occurs, as well as the position of the move in the stream of speech. By using descriptive categories such as the exchange and its sub-components, this model "enables us to describe actual performances, to delimit targets more accurately in language teaching and to evaluate input and output in the teaching/learning process" (McCarthy, 1991: 21). In addition, "it captures patterns that reflect the basic functions of interaction and offers a hierarchical model where smaller units can be seen to combine to form larger ones and where the large units can be seen to consist of these smaller ones" (McCarthy, 1991: 22). However, exchange structure model is not without its problems. As McCarthy (ibid.) and Cook (1989: 51) point out, all sorts of complications arise when we try to apply the model to talk in more informal, casual and spontaneous contexts, i.e., conversation. Indeed, some conversations are difficult to mould to any overall structure like that proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard.

C. Ethnomethodological approach: conversational analysis

Conversational analysis is an approach to discourse analysis often associated with a group of scholars known as *ethnomethodologists*. The emphasis is always on real data. Working with large amount of naturally occurring spoken language, ethnomethodologists or conversational analysts attempt to describe everyday linguistic events (e.g., requesting, thanking, inviting, telling anecdotes, etc.) to observe regular patterns of behaviour that might indicate adherence to underlying norms or 'rules' of conversation (McCarthy, 1991: 24; McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 117). Conversational analysts view discourse as a developing process, rather than a finished product, so rather than try to impose large structures on what is happening from the outset, they begin at the most local level, trying to see how participants in interaction manage conversation. This, after all, is how the participants must be handling it and making sense of it, without the benefit of transcription and *post hoc* theorising (Cook, 1989: 52). Conversation analysts find that conversation follows certain rules which can be described. For example, in

normal conversation usually only one person speaks at a time; the speakers change; the length of any contribution varies; there are techniques for allowing the other party or parties to speak; neither the content nor the amount of what they say is specified in advance (Nolasco and Arthur, 1987: 7). Conversational analysts seek to explain how this occurs. Therefore, they investigate "how pairs of utterances relate to one another (the study of *adjacency pairs*), how turn-taking is managed, how conversational openings and closings are effected, how topics enter and disappear from conversation, and how speakers engage in strategic acts of politeness, face-preservation, and so on" (McCarthy, 1991: 24). Since ethnomethodologists observe how people orient to the demands of the speech event, they enable us "to combine the best features of the old 'situational' approach with communicative approaches stressing the functions that particular linguistic realizations can perform" (McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 123).

The studies of discourse analysts have greatly expanded our understanding of the nature of conversation. As a result, many dimensions of conversation have been identified. The followings are the most basic and essential findings.

2.2 Purposes of conversation

A useful distinction has been made between *transactional* and *interactional* regarding the major purposes or functions of language. The transactional function is primarily concerned with the exchange of information for getting business done. On the other hand, the primary purpose of the interactional function is the creation and maintenance of social relationships (Brown and Yule, 1983b: 11-6; McCarthy, 1991: 136). Some interactions can be both: "It would be unlikely that, on any occasion, a natural language utterance would be used to fulfil only one function, to the total exclusion of the other" (Brown and Yule, 1983a: 1). For example, in service encounters transactional language is combined with interactional language to soften and make less forbidding the business of getting certain tasks done (Carter and McCarthy, 1997).

2.3 Norms of conversation

2.3.1 The cooperative principle: conversational maxims

Richards and Schmidt (1983) contend that conversation is more than a series of exchanges. They explain that "it consists of exchanges which are initiated and interpreted according to intuitively understood and socially acquired rules and norms of conversational cooperation, which can in turn be manipulated to create a wide range of meanings beyond the level expressed directly by the utterances in the conversation themselves" (ibid.: 122). This is clearly described by 'general principles of cooperative behaviour' proposed by Grice (1975) as criteria for successful communication. These norms are called maxims. They are: (1) The maxim of quantity: be brief; (2) The maxim of quality: be truthful; (3) The maxim of relevance: be relevant, and (4) The maxim of manner: be clear. Conversational implicatures are inferences based on the normal assumption that the conversational maxims are being followed.

2.3.2 The politeness principle

Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that most speech acts are in some way threatening to either the speaker or the hearer. Central to their model is a notion of 'face', which consists of two specific kinds of desires ('face wants'): the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (negative face) and the desire to be approved of (positive face) (ibid.: 13). Their thesis is that speakers estimate the 'cost' of a particular speech act in terms of its relative threat to speaker, hearer, or both. In determining the level of politeness, speakers make use of their perceptions of relative power of hearer over speaker, the social distance between them, and the ranking of the imposition involved in doing the face-threatening act within a particular culture (ibid.: 15). Then, they choose the appropriate strategy or conversational style for doing the act. Brown and Levinson describe a great number of strategies of *positive* and *negative politeness* in detail (see ibid.: 101-211). Positive politeness strategies involve speaker's claiming common ground with others, conveying that all participants wish to be co-operative and fulfilling hearer's want. These include: paying attention to the other speaker(s) by showing interest, sympathy or approval; seeking agreement by choosing safe topics; avoiding disagreement by pretending to agree; using white lies or hedging one's own opinions; presupposing or asserting common ground; making jokes and so on. Negative politeness strategies perform the function of

minimising the degree of imposition that the face-threatening act unavoidably effects by being indirect[4], questioning and hedging, being pessimistic, apologising, etc.

2.4 Conversational rules and structures

Conversation reflects the rules and procedures that govern face-to-face encounters. This is seen in openings and closings, topic management, turn-taking mechanisms and repairs (or 'conversational strategies').

---

[4] Brown and Levinson's (1987) claim for a linear relationship between indirectness and politeness is criticised by some researchers such as Meier (1997), who argues that politeness

2.4.1 Openings and closings

Conversations do not simply begin and end. There are many ways of starting a conversation, and most of them are fairly ritualised (see 2.6.4) typically by using *adjacency pairs* [5] (e.g., greetings and introductions). Other openers include questions for finding some common ground, comments on the actual circumstances of the meeting itself, comments on the weather, general complaints, 'pseudo-apologies' (e.g., *Excuse me*) and so on (Wardhaugh, 1985). So, part of the structure of conversational openings has to do with the positioning of topics within the conversation, as Schegloff and Sacks (1973) point out. Openings allow further talk once the other person's attention has been obtained. What is crucial in opening a conversation is "being able to assess accurately the context in which it is to take place and some of the more salient features of the other person, and to have command of the devices that will be necessary to keep the conversation going once you overcome the initial difficulties" (Wardhaugh, 1985: 119).

Like openings, closing a conversation is also a cooperative activity. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) view closing procedures as sensitive to the sequential context and its local organisation of speaker turns in an ongoing discourse. They relate them to the need to shut down the current topic, to allow for the (re)introduction of further topics, to suspend the operation of the turn-taking machinery. According to Bardovi-Harlig *et al*. (1991: 6), closing is a matter of politeness and thus we need to use some essential components of 'felicitous closings', i.e., the terminal exchange, the pre-closing and the shut-down while considering the situational variables such as the setting and the relationship of the participants as well as cultural differences. Pre-closing signals include *OK then…, All right…, So…, Well, I suppose… Erm, I'm afraid… I've got to go now, I'll let you get back to your writing, It's been nice talking to you…* and so on.

---

[5] Adjacency pairs are the basic structural units in conversation (Coulthard, 1985: 70). They refer to utterances produced by two successive speakers in which the second utterance can be identified as related to the first as an expected follow-up. For some first pair parts the second pair part is reciprocal (Greeting-Greeting), for some there is only one appropriate second (Question-Answer), for some there are a variety of options (Complaint-Apology/Justification), which can be explained by the *preferred* and *dispreferred* responses (Levinson, 1983: 307). Adjacency pairs operate the turn-taking system, and also prescribe the type of talking that the

2.4.2 Topic management

The way topics are selected for discussion within conversation and the strategies speakers make use of to nominate, develop or change topics constitute another important dimension of conversational organisation (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 136). For example, coherent conversation respects norms concerning the choice of topics, which requires speakers to handle topics delicately. Coulthard (1985: 79) comments that "We experience, see, hear about events all the time: some are 'tellable', some aren't, and of those that are tellable some are tellable to everyone, some have a restricted audience, some must be told immediately, some can wait and still retain their interest." In addition, the participants select a topic as first topic through a process of negotiation (Richards, 1990: 70). Winskowski (1977, quoted in Richards, 1990: 70) focuses on topic as process and uses the term 'topicalizing behaviour', by which is meant bringing up topics, responding to other people's topics, mentioning something, avoiding the mention of something, carrying the discussion one step further, and so on – the creating of topic in the activity.

Hatch (1978: 434, quoted in Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 140) emphasises that fluent conversationalists in a second or foreign language need a wide range of topics at their disposal. Initially, learners may depend on 'canned topics'. However, to move beyond the stage where discourse is predictable with familiar and practised topics, learners need practice in introducing new topics into conversation as well as making appropriate contributions to the nominated topic. They also need to know how native speakers build on what others have said (e.g., by linking new topics to previous ones with such phrases as *that reminds me of…, now that you mention it, That's like what happened to me…*), how they attempt to return to a previously nominated topic (e.g., *to get back to what I was saying*), how they signal the intention of changing the direction of conversation by using discourse markers (e.g., *anyway, well, Oh, by the way*) and how they end a topic (e.g., use of clichés like *That's life*, *Win some, lose some*) (Wardhaugh, 1985: 139-47). Learning the way to follow the flow of a topic through conversation is also an important skill to be learned. It is said that knowledge of the real world (i.e. schema knowledge) is one source of information the learner can make use of, predicting and anticipating questions and the direction of conversation for certain topics (Richards, 1990: 71)

2.4.3 Turn-taking mechanisms

The turn-taking system is basic to the management of the collaborative process of a conversation. This is closely related to topic management in that such conventions as attention getting, topic nomination, topic development and conversation maintenance appear to be ways in which interlocutors organise and perform the turns in conversational discourse. There are a variety of strategies or devices used in turn-taking (Wardhaugh, 1985: 148-50). For instance, strategies for taking up a turn include using interjections to signal a request for a turn (e.g., *Mm-hmm, Yeah*) and rising intonation, accepting a turn offered by another speaker by responding to a question or by providing the second pair part of an adjacency pair, completing or adding to something said by the previous speaker, and so on. In order to hold a turn, speakers use devices indicating they are making a series of remarks: *First of all* or *To begin with* followed by *Then, After that, Next,* etc. Expressions such as *Another thing* and connectors like *So, Because* and *However* promote continuity. Use of fillers and hesitation devices is also very useful (see 2.5). For relinquishing the turn, thereby bringing others into the conversation, adjacency pairs and phonological signals (e.g., slowing down the final syllables of an utterance and increasing the pitch change signalling completion of the turn) are used. Pausing and using a facial expression or bodily gesture are also useful to indicate that a turn is finished.

In holding the floor, speakers need to be assured that the activity is worthwhile and thus can be continued. So, the listener uses back-channel signals and feedback signals ('monitoring behaviour' in Wardhaugh's term) to encourage the speaker to keep talking: for example, eye contact, head nods, smiles, noises like *umhmm, oh, uhhuh, Mmmm,* words such as *yerright, Well?, So?, Really?, And then?,* expressions like *I see, I agree, Is it?, Does he?*, evaluative feedback such as *Great!, Beautiful!, Crazy!*, *Exactly, Correct, How interesting!, That's nice* and the various intonations (Wardhaugh, 1985: 130-7; Hatch, 1992: 14). The turn can be interrupted for some reasons: to seek clarification, correct, challenge and/or as a secondary conversation ('side sequence') (Wardhaugh, 1985: 150-5). In addition to the use of turn-taking strategies, Brown and Yule (1983b: 19-20) argue that speakers need to be able to use long transactional turns as well as short interactional turns in which they are only required to make one or two utterances at a time.

2.5 Repairs: conversational strategies

Conversation is reciprocal. The speaker can monitor reception and adjust to it – or, to put it another way, the listener can influence the development of what is being said (Cook, 1989: 60). The term 'repairs' refers to efforts by both parties in conversation to correct communication trouble spots such as not knowing a particular word, or misunderstanding the other speaker (Schegloff *et al.*, 1977, quoted in Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 147). Other terms like 'conversational strategies' (Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994) and 'conversational adjustments' (Bygate, 1987, 2001) are used synonymously. Repairs can be seen as a kind of feedback within turn-taking mechanisms and may be initiated by either the speaker ('Self-repairs') or the hearer ('Other Repairs') (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 147; Richards, 1990: 72). Checkers (e.g., *OK, so far?*, *Are you with me?*, *Got it?*) may be used to find out whether the audience is still attentive or whether there is any problem in following the talk, and expressions like *huh?, what?* and *I'm sorry?* can be used to signal the need for repair. Facial expressions, gestures and eye movements have the same function. 'Echoing' is one technique which is sometimes used: the speaker repeats a word or phrase which is not understood, thereby asking for clarification, and the conversational partner explains it or replaces it with an easier item (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 148). Any actual restating can be prefaced by expressions such as *What I mean* [*meant, want*] *to say, Let me put it another way*, or just simply *I mean* (Wardhaugh, 1985: 133-4).

The concepts of repair in second language communication can be extended to include *communication strategies* (see Oxford, 2001). That is, self-initiated repairs and requests for assistance occur when the speaker is trying to express concepts for which target language vocabulary is lacking. They include approximation, using synonyms, word coinage, circumlocution, borrowing, mime, topic shift and topic avoidance. Use of fillers and hesitation devices (e.g., *well, erm, I think, you know, you see, Now let me see, The thing is…*) to fill the pauses, to stall and to gain planning time is also useful (Brown and Yule, 1983a: 17, 1983b: 30; Wardhaugh, 1985: 131-4). This becomes even more important especially to foreigners considering that they sometimes lose their turn because they hesitate to find the right word, and that fillers are notoriously difficult to translate into foreign languages (Stubbs, 1983: 69). By making use of time-creating devices, speakers keep the conversation going. In addition, it is

said that appropriate use of fillers is a vehicle for fluency, rhythm and emphasis (Wray, 2000: 471) and adds to the efficiency of communication (Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994: 44).

2.6 Formal features of conversation

Conversational discourse is also recognized by formal features, which distinguish it from written discourse. They reflect the constraints that derive from the use of spoken language. Speaking is a behaviour that takes place 'here-and-now, under pressure of time' (Brown and Yule, 1983b: 21) and these on-line processing conditions impose pressures on speakers (Bygate, 1987[6], 2001). Accordingly, they need to produce language in a flexible and inventive manner, rather than with linguistic complexity (Brown and Yule, 1983b: 9).

2.6.1 Grammar and syntax

Brown and Yule (1983a) point out that the syntax of spoken language is typically much less structured than that of written language in that spoken language contains rather little subordination and short sentences. That is, in spoken language there is a tendency to string together coordinate clauses, often linked by *and*, *but, then* rather than to use subordinate clauses, so spoken language is syntactically very much simplified (Bygate, 1987: 15). Spoken language also contains fragmentary utterances and incomplete sentences. There is often a great deal of repetition of not only words and phrases (and related forms) which speakers themselves have introduced, but syntactic forms which have been introduced by previous speakers. These features are sometimes considered non-fluency features[7] (e.g., Byrne, 1986). In addition, Bygate (1987: 16) notes that in conversation, speakers tend to avoid complex noun groups containing a series of adjectives and instead spread adjectives out over several clauses. Unusual clause constructions such as ellipsis (especially situational), heads (or 'topic-comment structure'), tails including tags, and frequent use of modality are usually considered

---

[6] Bygate (1987: 14-15) argues that time pressure tends to affect the language used in at least two main ways. Firstly, speakers use devices in order to *facilitate* production, and secondly they often have to *compensate* for the difficulties. In this vein, he explains that syntactic features in spoken language such as simplification, ellipsis and parataxis, use of formulaic expressions, and use of fillers and hesitation devices are skills to facilitate production of speech.

[7] Other non-fluency features include hesitations, high proportion of fillers and hedging devices, frequent false starts (starts then stops or repeats or reformulates), excessive use of overlaps and interruptions, failure to identify and repair miscommunication, failure to use such strategies as clarification, code-switching, conversational maxims, politeness strategies in order to improve

interpersonal elements in spoken grammar (see Carter and McCarthy, 1995, 1997; McCarthy and Carter, 1995).

2.6.2 Vocabulary and lexis

There are certain broad features which tend to characterise the vocabulary of spoken language. Crystal and Davy (1975: 111) analyse natural conversations and state that "lack of precision is one of the most important features of the vocabulary of informal conversation." That is, speech in a casual conversation is peppered with very generalised, non-specific or vague words and phrases such as *a lot of, got, do, nice, stuff, chap, guy, place, something, somewhere, things like that, the thing is…, sort/kind of…* and *a bit like…* (see also Channell, 1994[8]). Interactive expressions including discourse markers, especially, utterance-initial *well, now, then, right, OK, anyway, you know* and *I see* are also prevalent (Stubbs, 1983: 68; Carter and McCarthy, 1997). Brown and Yule (1983b: 6) argue that the loosely organised syntax, the use of non-specific language and the use of interactive markers and fillers make spoken language less conceptually dense than other types of language such as expository prose. In addition, frequent use of phatic language functioning for 'social lubrication' and the use of deixis (i.e., reference to the interlocutors as well as the physical time and place of the communication) and idioms are very common in spoken language (Carter and McCarthy, 1997; Cockcroft, 1999). Cockcroft (1999: 32-3) talks about *discourse features* and includes back-channel signals in this category. In particular, the use of comment clauses expressing speaker's tentativeness (*I think, I suppose, they say*), certainty (*I'm sure, I must say, there's no doubt*) and emotional attitude (*I'm delighted to say, I'm afraid, to be honest, frankly speaking*) is pertinent to 'modality' and 'hedges' (see McCarthy, 1990: 60-1; Carter and McCarthy, 1997) as well as the politeness strategies (see 2.3.2).

2.6.3 Phonological and paralinguistic features

The speaker uses the resources of stress and intonation, pausing and rhythm, a wide voice range and voice quality. Also, body language such as facial expressions, gaze direction,

---

[8] Channell (1994: 21) maintains that the English of advanced students, while grammatically, phonologically, and lexically correct, may sound rather bookish and pedantic to a native speaker, and "This results in part from an inability to include appropriate vague expressions." She also argues that "there is an interaction between vague language and politeness" (ibid.: 205). This view is supported by Brown and Levinson (1987), who make the point that one way for speakers to be polite when expressing a point which might be construed as threatening or rude to

postures and gestures is exploited to deliver the message (Brown and Yule, 1983a, 1983b; Byrne, 1986).

2.6.4 Conversational routines

In everyday conversation, similar speech situations like greetings and leave-takings recur and speakers make use of similar and sometimes identical expressions, which have proved to be functionally appropriate. Most of them are fixed and highly conventionalised, and are accessed and used as wholes. Such expressions can be referred to as *conversational routines* (Coulmas, 1981: 2; see also Aijmer, 1996; Ellis, 1996). Similarly, Stubbs (1983: 154) points out that "a significant percentage of conversational language is highly routinized into pre-fabricated utterances." Pawley and Syder (1983) maintain that native speakers have a repertoire of thousands of memorised routines and their use in appropriate situations contributes to the sense of naturalness and native-ness about a person's speech. In addition, the use of routines leads to an impression of oral fluency and this is why many language teachers have particular interests in teaching them (Richards and Sukwiwat, 1983: 114; Bygate, 1987: 17).

It seems that the most useful and comprehensive account of routines is provided by Wray (2000). She adopts the term *formulaic sequences* which encompasses the wide range of idiomatic forms of expression including routines, and identifies turn-holders, turn-claimers, discourse makers, hedges, fillers and other conventionalised conversational exchanges, i.e., almost all relevant aspects of conversational discourse, as types of formulaic sequences. According to her, formulaic sequences perform socio-interactional functions in everyday spoken interaction and, at the same time, reduce speakers' and listeners' processing effort. In a similar vein, Widdowson (1985: 135) also claims that a great part of communicative competence is merely a matter of knowing how to use such conventionalised expressions. Following their arguments, it is suggested that acquiring conversational routines or formularised expressions can be a shortcut to the development of conversational proficiency. Therefore, it is most likely to be beneficial to learners.

2.7 Summary and implications for teaching

I have begun my discussion with defining key concepts of conversation and conversational proficiency and argued that the understanding of how natural conversation works, how

speakers orient towards reciprocity and convergence and how such features as topic management are realised are all central in developing conversational proficiency. The various features of conversation which reflect its nature have been examined by drawing the concepts from speech act theory, exchange structure theory and ethnomethodological approach. It seems that good conversationalists make use of openings and closings, skills for topic management, turn-taking strategies, repair strategies and conversational routines to initiate and develop conversation on a wide range of topics within the constraints of spoken language production, while observing conversational maxims and the politeness principle to express and interpret each other's utterances.

Given the above, the teaching of conversation is a much more basic and comprehensive activity than is sometimes assumed, and implies far more than the parroting of dialogues (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 150). First implication is that students' attention needs to be drawn to the mechanisms by which speakers engage in the conversational process. It has been suggested that recognition and understanding of the features of naturally occurring conversation should be an essential starting point in developing an effective conversation course, thereby the legitimate goals of the classes (Nolasco and Arthur, 1987; Richards, 1990; Bardovi-Harlig *et al.*, 1991; Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994). Furthermore, the various dimensions of conversational discourse should provide a basis for the design and selection of materials and classroom activities because "Only through materials that reflect how we really speak… will language learners receive an accurate account of the rules of speaking in a second or foreign language" (Boxer and Pickering, 1995: 56; see also Richards, 1990: 81).

Now the first and indispensable steps towards deciding what shall be taught in conversation classes are taken by knowing how language works and how people use it when they have conversations. Students need to be encouraged to notice the principles as much as possible and provided as many opportunities as there can be for practising necessary strategies from teaching and learning environment and/or teaching materials. In that case, do the textbooks used in conversation classrooms in Korea play such a role? Let us turn our attention to look at Korean textbooks.

Chapter 3   Evaluation of textbook materials

3.1 Criteria for the evaluation of instructional materials

Our analysis will be informed by the theories of spoken discourse analysis, which provide well-established, legitimate criteria for evaluating the naturalness or authenticity of conversation. If instructional materials and activities are to be truly useful, they should manifest the nature of casual conversation in their samples and focus on several relevant dimensions. It is suggested that they contain (more or less) authentic dialogues which will enable both teachers and students to work out: what principles should be observed to produce a conversation as cooperative behaviour, what strategies are involved in turn-taking, topicalising behaviour and repairs, how conversational syntax is distinct from that of written language, what styles are appropriate in speaking, and what conversational routines are used to facilitate a smooth conversation. The final decision about the usefulness of samples of conversation presented or studied in class lies, therefore, with looking at whether they play such a fundamental role, whereby they act as a catalyst for promoting conversational proficiency.

3.2 Analysis and evaluation of the Korean textbook dialogues

Two typical conversation textbooks among twelve published for school use in Korea have been chosen for evaluation: *High School English Conversation* (An *et al*., 2002) and *High School English Conversation* (Bak *et al*., 2002) – I will refer the former as A and the latter B in my analysis. 61 dialogues were closely examined as major objects of analysis. This is because they come from the main section of each textbook subtitled 'Core Conversation' and 'Let's Talk' respectively, which seems to present learners with the main sample of conversation. All 36 dialogues in 'Core Conversation' from A have been selected, and exceptionally one additional dialogue is from the section of 'More Listening'. The rest 24 are from B. Other sections, which include very short exchanges and conversational activities, have also been looked at to consider some relevant issues.

In the first place, it has been found that both textbooks are slightly imbalanced between the two types of talk: they introduce more examples of transactional talk (65% in A and 75% in

B) than interactional talk. Many talks in service encounters make good use of standard formulaic expressions or conversational routines without unnecessary redundancy or descriptive language use (see Scotton and Bernsten, 1988). Taborn (1983) reviews the transactional dialogues in textbook materials on the evidence of a corpus of actual dialogues and finds eight areas of abnormality including length, grammar and vocabulary, plot, style, etc. He argues that schoolbook dialogues are very often highly deviant from real, living instances of communication and thus they have "very little transfer value to genuine real-life situations" (ibid.: 207). Compared with his findings, most transactional exchanges contained in the two Korean textbooks are generally good and quite close to genuine talk: exchanges are relatively short, grammatically and semantically simple, and largely predictable in structure. It is a pity, however, that there is no example which shows the incorporation of the elements of interactional talk into transactional talk. Considering that there is a constant tendency in real conversations for customers and assistants to engage in some sort of friendly chat either before or after the mainly transactional phase, learners, who have only worked out what to say before engaging in a transactional encounter in L2, will certainly be thrown into confusion by unexpected friendly chat from the other party (McCarthy, 1991: 137).

One obstinate problem in textbook presentation of transactional talk is concerned with the way of teaching how to achieve politeness in English (see Meier, 1997). Whereas An *et al*. view politeness as a situation-dependent matter by asking students "Is it impolite for Yura to directly say "No, that's Semin" and "No, that's me"? Why or why not?" (2002: 45), Bak *et al*. (2002: 102, 111) treat it in terms of formal markers of politeness (i.e., lexical items and syntactic structures, in addition to tone). The assumption is that directness sounds rude and impolite, and syntactic constructions identified as direct (e.g., use of bold imperatives) should thus be avoided. It further implies that the degree of politeness is measured by directness and the intention of politeness can be demonstrated by the use of certain vocabulary such as *please* or expressions like *Would you…?*, *Could I have…, please?*, *I wonder if I could have…, please*, or *I don't mean to bother you, but do you think I could…?*. Teaching only the more elaborate directives such as the embedded imperative like those exemplified above as a blanket form will result in the speaker's looking 'overly polite at best, or odd at worst' in many situations as well as in service encounters (Scotton and Bernsten, 1988: 382). Although it is

interpreted as a good attempt to capitalise on the importance of using appropriate softening devices according to situations, it is unfortunate that it is explained in isolation with no discourse context and thus fails to reflect many variables across the situation.

It has also been noticed that potentially 'face-threatening' speech acts such as requests are performed in a very blunt way without using any prefacing or softening devices, though they follow certain routines. For example, a speaker uses a typical first pair part of an adjacency pair to ask a favour by saying *Hi, Jinho. Could you do me a favor?* and this is immediately accepted by *Sure. What can I do for you?* (B: 29). Or, the suggestion of *How about going to a movie this evening?* is instantly refused by *Sorry, I can't. I have to write…* (B: 108). In natural conversations, however, it has been observed that when people engage in such kinds of speech acts, they carefully structure their utterances following predictable steps (for example, see McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 117-21). Strategic devices such as hedges including vague language and modality are frequently used to avoid coming straight to the point, to avoid speaking directly or to mitigate the force of what is said (Carter and McCarthy, 1997: 16-7; see also Levinson, 1983: 334-5). However, little or no mention is made in Korean textbook dialogues of these features. This is mainly because most speech acts are limited only to minor occasions which occur between people who are assumed to be friends sharing some common ground already and thus may not necessarily require delicate process of opening, elicitation and negotiation. Although providing excuses is mentioned as a strategy for 'refusing favors politely' (B: 111, 113), it is only explained as factual statements in the section of "Cultural focus" and practised without contexts. It seems that they will not properly prepare learners for coping with rather formal situations which require them to be much more sensitive to the underlying social strategies of speech acts.

As an example of a particular transactional event, it seems useful to look at direction-giving dialogues as they are always regarded as indispensable speech behaviour in almost all textbook materials. According to Psathas and Kozloff (1976), three sequential phases are common in actual direction-giving: the situation-defining phase (where the receiver of the directions is starting from, how well he/she knows the environment and what means of transport is to be used), the information and instruction phase concerning the route (where the actual directions are given) and the ending phase (where checks are made and mutual reassurances given such as

You can't miss it). Similarly, Scotton and Bernsten's (1988) study of natural conversations find overwhelming uniformity in the structure of the direction-giving turn: an opening sequence, the directions themselves, a pre-closing and possibly a closing. Their study shows that orientation checkers, parenthetical comments (e.g., *It's quite aways*) and confirmation checkers are frequently used throughout the exchange and natural non-fluencies also characterise the exchange. In contrast, direction-giving dialogues in Korean textbooks clearly lack those distinctive features and have only reduced set of components. They contain only three parts: a request for directions, a set of directions as the response, and a statement of thanks from the direction-seeker (see Scotton and Bernsten, 1998: 373), as the following example indicates:

> [Example 1] Unit 12: Let's Talk - *How to Get There*
> Practice the dialogue. Then exchange roles and practice again.
> 1   Tony: Excuse me, can you give me directions to KOTRA?
> 2   Hanna: Stay on this highway until you see the sign for Yangjae IC. Then exit the highway and go straight up the road. Go on until you reach the first intersection. Then, you will see the twelve-story glass building on your right. That's KOTRA.
> 3   Tony: Thanks.
>
> (Bak *et al.*, 2002: 181)

Obviously, this kind of dialogue cannot train learners to deal with cognitive and interactional demands direction-giving sequences make on them.

Now let us turn our attention to interactional exchanges. In both Korean textbooks, number of participants in a conversation is fairly limited: 95% of the dialogues in A and 83% in B are between two persons. Dialogues in A are organised according to situations and topics. Before the presentation, a brief explanation of the setting and the content of talk are provided, which clearly helps learners predict the kind of verbal exchange that will take place. However, there is no clear indication about the relationship between speakers. We have to suppose that they are strangers, intimates or family from the other conversations presented in previous units, the situation itself, or from the style of speaking. In B, any information on situational factors in a conversation such as setting, context and relationship between participants is not offered at all. Authors do not appear to take these factors into account in their presentation of dialogues.

Hence, such dialogues fall short of offering examples that reflect the way people actually speak which is strongly conditioned by contextual and interlocutor variables.

Most conversations open with adjacency pairs (73% in A and 75% in B). They include questions (a total of 34%), greetings, offers, requests, introductions, summons followed by suggestions or asking favours, etc. Special pseudo-formulaic openings in particular circumstances such as *Can I help you?* or *Are you ready to order, sir?*, and pseudo-apologetic expressions like *Excuse me* have also been classified into this category. Speakers also make use of a range of attention-getting devices at the beginning of a conversation (27% in A and 17% in B). For example, utterances like *This is really good. It has a very nice flavor* (A: 78), *You wouldn't believe how hard the farmers work…*(A: 125), and *I heard on the news that…*(A: 190) efficiently work as conversational openers since they almost certainly act as a signal for someone in speaker's immediate environment to reciprocate or respond in some way, for example by showing agreement (*I agree*) or interests (*Really?*), or by asking for further information or clarification (*…you mean?*).

Surprisingly, in a total of 61 dialogues no example was found which has the whole set of closing routines: the shut-down of topic, pre-closing and terminal exchange. 19% in A and 37% in B have only shut-down of topic: e.g., Semin: *Well, I'll teach you if you want.* Gary: *That would be great* (A: 29). 78% in A and 63% in B do not have even a bare minimum of a terminal pair like *Goodbye-Bye*, and the exchange suddenly ends without any closing signal. Korean textbook dialogues seem to be completely deficient in presenting closing formulae. It has been suggested that closings which are overly brief or overly extended may make speakers appear rude, by seeming either abrupt or hard to 'get rid of' (Bardovi-Harlig *et al.*, 1991: 6). Students, who have not been given any opportunity of recognising the value of closing exchanges as a politeness strategy and their function in relation to turn-taking strategies, will not be able to close, or end, conversations appropriately and consequently fail as conversationalists.

When we see the whole structure of a conversation, it is very easy to find all sorts of features that would be odd in a conversation in the real world. Let us see the example below.

[Example 2] Unit 5: Let's Talk - *Likes and Dislikes*

Practice the dialogue. Then exchange roles and practice again.

1 Mary: Tell me some more about your trip to the east coast of the United
2 Jinho: States.
3 Mary: OK. What would you like to know?
4 Jinho: What was the best part of your trip?
5 Mary: Well, the scenery along the coast was fantastic!
6 Jinho: What was the worst part?
   I hated tipping. And also, I didn't like paying tax whenever I bought
7 Mary: something.
8 Jinho: What were the people like?
   They were very honest and friendly. I liked them.

(Bak *et al.*, 2002: 75)

From the conversations held previously, we infer that Mary and Jinho are friends and they are talking primarily for interactional purposes. However, we can easily notice that this dialogue has problems as a model of conversation. In the first place, there is no proper opening. The talk begins with Mary's bold request for more stories about Jinho's trip. Jinho complies (turn 2) and answers her questions (turn 4, 6 and 8), but Mary does not use any commenting follow-up moves (turn 5 and 7). She simply goes on to her next questions, which are purely transactional in nature. The exchanges suddenly stop without any closing formulae (turn 8). There is no signal on Mary's part to show her attentiveness to Jinho such as *Did you?*, *I see* or *Yeah*. Because of the lack of follow-ups, the questioner sounds rather impersonal and the subtopics jump around somewhat. Consequently, the whole dialogue has the characteristics of an interview rather than a conversation that is mutually built up. It is not surprising that we cannot see the process of topic development in this kind of exchanges.

Some conversations do have follow-up moves as in the following example:

[Example 3] Core Conversation II
Listen to the conversation and fill in the blanks. Then practice it with a partner.

While their parents are talking about food in the kitchen, Gary and Semin's sister, Yura, are looking at a family photo album.

1 Yura: Can you tell me who that chubby <u>baby</u> is?
2 Gary: Is that you?
3 Yura: No, that's Semin when he was only a year old!
4 Gary: Really, that's Semin? I <u>can't</u> <u>believe</u> <u>it</u>. He's so tall and slim now!

5	Yura:	And can you <u>tell</u> who this cute little girl in the blue dress is?
6	Gary:	Is that your <u>older</u> sister?
7	Yura:	No, that's me. When I was little, I had my <u>hair</u> permed once.

<div align="right">(An et al., 2002: 45)</div>

The conversation is initiated by a question which naturally comes up from the context of the talk (turn 1). Instead of giving a direct answer, Gary asks in return to Yura (turn 2). His question is interpreted as an answer on the assumption that he conforms to the maxim of relevance. In response to Yura's answer, Gary makes follow-up moves in turn 4. He first expresses surprise by saying *Really* and repeating part of Yura's utterance (*that's Semin?*). He then provides further evaluation (*I can't believe it.*) and comments (*He's so tall and slim now!*). These expressions show that Gary is monitoring Yura's talk – 'Yes, I hear you' – and, at the same time, he is evaluating it – 'I find that surprising' (see Wardhaugh, 1985: 137). Such utterances also have a very important function of encouraging the speaker to talk more. Hence, if only Yura responds to Gary's comments or makes a further contribution to his remarks, the topic can be expanded at this point. Unfortunately, however, she does not and the subtopic is shifted by her next question (turn 5). The same pattern of exchange is repeated and the conversation ends abruptly (turn 7). Though this conversation has the potential to demonstrate that a conversation can be developed from a very small starting point based on some common ground, and that the evaluative responses provided by a conversational partner have the strategic function of making conversations keep going, it fails to exemplify such useful points.

In many conversations in A, topic is nominated quite naturally from the actual circumstances of the conversation itself (e.g., talking about hobbies or telling anecdotes while watching photos). There are some elaborating moves, which contribute to topic development. Yet, it is never realised – in B no example of topicalising behaviour was found. Although some exchanges contain certain possibilities for the conversation to go in a variety of directions, they are not fully exploited to the maximum. It is unfortunate that their presentation, initially very promising, falls short of actually assisting learners in noticing and developing strategic devices for topic nomination, ratification, elaboration, expansion, shift, monitoring and

termination. Not only is this a missed opportunity, it is a deficiency that may be detrimental to language learners as they attempt to develop their interactive conversation skills.

In all conversations in Korean textbooks, turn-taking is typically operated by adjacency pairs and the use of conversational routines. Every turn is smoothly exchanged without overlaps or interruptions. Conversational maxims are in general well observed and thus most dialogues are free of ambiguity. Noticeably, the dialogues consist only of short-turns. This seems to explain why interactive features such as the following are generally hard to find or missing altogether: (1) stalling mechanisms to hold the turn such as fillers, hesitation and pauses[9]; (2) back-channelling or attention signals required by the speaker who wants to keep the floor; (3) monitoring behaviour which indicates the listener's continual alertness to speaker's continuous talk; (4) repairs[10] and other relevant devices including checkers, confirming devices from the speaker[11], checkers either from the speaker or the hearer, etc.

There is one excellent example of a conversation in A (see Appendix 1). It contains an attention-getting signal (*Oh*), a conversational opener with a tag to involve a listener (*I remember this story! Don't you?*), a marker or time-buyer before telling a story (*Well*), a marker to indicate speaker's making of long remarks (*first*), monitoring behaviour on the part of the listener (*OK. Then what?*, *Oh, yes*, *Yeah*), connectors (*and, Then*) used to continue the story talked by the previous speaker, and the process of collaborative story-telling. This dialogue effectively demonstrates one important characteristic of natural conversation: both parties initiate and respond to a turn, and they share the responsibility of building up a conversation. However, this dialogue is exploited only for listening comprehension exercises, so it does not get full attention as an adequate model of conversation.

Overall, it must surely be clear that students who have not been given sufficient opportunities to practise such interactive skills will be considered overly passive in conversation with native

---

[9] Bak *et al*. (2002: 151) show a very good attempt to teach hesitation strategies by saying that "Pretend you haven't heard. Repeat the question. Use delaying sounds." They also provide some examples of each technique. Sadly, however, it ends up with an isolated presentation out of speaking contexts.

[10] To ask for repetition, speakers in B use expressions like *Excuse me?* and *Could you say… again, please?*. An interpretive question (*Pardon? You mean…?*) is used to ask for clarification. We have a similar example in A and, in addition, we have *Don't do what?*. In A, one example shows the use of prefacing (*I mean*) before paraphrasing.

speakers. Moreover, students who are only capable of producing short turns will experience a lot of frustration when they are thrown into the complex business of conversation, where they often need to manage long-turns in order to 'express themselves' (Brown and Yule, 1983b: 20).

Focusing on formal features of conversation, we can easily notice how the language in Korean textbooks is different from the one in real-life contexts. Comparing textbook dialogues with naturally occurring data, Crystal and Davy (1975: 3) argue that the specimens of English presented to the learner under the heading of 'conversation' are highly stylised. They assert that they are "stiff imitations of the dynamic spontaneity of real life" and in a word, "they are not *real*" (ibid.). Similarly, native speakers of English find a very wide range of linguistic features in ELT listening texts which make them distinguished from 'real' language (Porter and Roberts, 1981: 37-8): for example, structural repetition, complete sentences, distinct turn-taking, too much information, etc.

Unfortunately, their arguments seem to apply in many aspects to the Korean textbook conversations. Syntax and lexis are rather formal. Simplification of syntax by ellipsis is well utilised by speakers in most dialogues. A few subordinated clauses are found but they seem to be acceptable in given speech contexts (e.g., in a quiz show or an interview). However, since there are not enough examples of long-turns, it is hard to see the tendency to connect sentences by everyday conjunctions such as *and*, *but* or *then*. Fragmented sentences are not found. Most utterances tend to be carefully structured and complete, and the sentences are neat, simple, rather short and well-formed. The level of redundancy is low. Repetition of words and phrases occurs only to ask for clarification or as an evaluative response to the previous talk. In some cases, particular structures are repeated with obtrusive frequency in order to present a particular language form for a specific function. For instance, *You should not…* is repeated four times in one utterance in order to show the use of the phrase for 'stating rules' (B: 167).

Language is standardised, and vocabulary is generally 'tidied up' and restricted in a variety of ways. Swearing never occurs, and slang, colloquial forms[12] and idioms are rare. We have

examples of generalised, non-specific vocabulary (e.g., *some, nice, got, something, a lot of*) and vague expressions typically used for number approximations with times, dates and figures (e.g., *a couple of, or so, around, about*). However, since messages are generally explicit, examples of vague expressions are not many. Deixis including addressing words (*Mom, Honey, sir, Mr., kids*, etc.) and references to the physical time and place of the communication is often used. There are some dialogues where meanings are the subject of negotiation and re-negotiation. Most of them are, however, free of non-fluency features, which are expected to be prevalent in normal conversations. Hedges (or comment clauses) and modality are sometimes used to express speaker's attitudes, though limited in a variety. Among 37 dialogues in A, for instance, *I think* and *I'm afraid* are used five times each and *I'm sure* three times. Other hedges include *I suppose*, *I guess*, *I have to admit* and *I doubt it*. In addition to modal verbs (e.g., *should*, *seems like*, *must have been*), modal adverbs such as *really*, *just*, *pretty*, *probably*, *strongly* and *truly* are used. The only filler used in high proportion is *well* (18 times) and the only other filler is *The thing is*. Clause-final *though* (3 times) adds the colour of spoken language but we cannot see any example of heads and tails, which are often mentioned as typical interactive elements in spoken grammar. A limited number of discourse markers are found: *Now*, *All right* (3 times each) and *Well* (2 times). Besides, *OK, Anyway* and *By the way* are used once each. Comparatively speaking, most of these 'spoken-language-specific' features are very rare or missing completely in B.

As for the language in tape-recorded dialogues in both textbooks, it contains all sorts of characteristics which make it inauthentic (see Crystal and Davy, 1975: 3; Porter and Roberts, 1981: 37-8; Byrne, 1986: 9). It is marked by unusually wide and frequent pitch-movement, standard pronunciation, enunciation with excessive precision, slow pace and absence of extraneous noise. This is largely because it was clearly articulated by actors and specially recorded for teaching purposes. Moreover, recorded tapes seem to be designed to improve either pronunciation or listening comprehension. They are not specifically aimed at developing the learner's productive speaking skills (Cane, 1998: 34). On the whole, the samples of spoken language in the Korean textbooks are skilfully contrived as models for oral production and, as a result, lack the features of genuine speech.

3.3 Results of the evaluation and possible reasons

3.3.1 Overall results

In the previous section, two conversation textbooks currently published in Korea have been examined in terms of the presence or absence of the qualities of genuine conversation, i.e. the degree of authenticity. The analysis of textbook dialogues has revealed a lot of deficiencies and limitations. Many conversations have been decontextualised and the language has been generally idealised, lacking features of naturally occurring spoken discourse. They give both teachers and learners very little information about the dynamic, interactive nature of conversation. They do not provide sufficient number of dialogues which effectively demonstrate, for instance, how to attract people's attention to open a conversation, how to initiate suitable topics according to the circumstances, how to express cooperation and politeness during the exchange, how to close the conversation appropriately, how to compensate for their linguistic deficiency while producing speech 'here-and-now' and so forth. Although a few dialogues showed the potential as a good guide which leads learners to the awareness of strategies required to manage conversation in a collaborative way, they eventually failed to capitalise on such points. By and large, constructed textbook dialogues appear to bear little resemblance to authentic native-speaker conversation because they exclude some of the most vital grammatical, pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of everyday conversation. In a word, they lack authenticity. Hence they do not adequately prepare learners for managing the conversation effectively as well as coping with the language they hear in the real world. This can be detrimental to ESL/EFL students as they attempt to talk naturally outside the classroom. To sum up, the Korean textbook dialogues fail to achieve their role as teaching materials and, subsequently, they fail to develop learners' conversational proficiency effectively.

3.3.2 Possible reasons

What are the possible reasons for these deficiencies? First of all, it seems to be concerned with the purpose of the presentation of textbook dialogues. Obviously, the focus is not on how conversational partners, as equal participants of talk, interact with each other for socialising purposes. It is rather on how speakers express a specific language function by using certain

language forms. The aim of [Example 2] (see 3.2) is, as clearly stated before the presentation, to teach the way to say 'likes and dislikes'. [Example 3] (see 3.2) has the goal of teaching 'how to describe'. As such, a simple conversation containing only a few exchanges composed of short-turns might be enough to expose students to particular phrases or structures with which the dialogue aims to present learners. There is no further need to extend the exchanges by offering follow-up moves, introducing new topics and developing a nominated topic. This is why topicalising behaviour cannot be found at all and the conversation abruptly stops without necessarily using proper closing routines. This observation seems to be confirmed by the fact that in order to get students more familiarised with the target forms, the dialogues are often followed by the presentation of a number of standard formulaic expressions used for the same speech functions and of a variety of second pair parts of an adjacency pair typically used for the purpose. In short, the main emphasis of teaching conversation is put on developing linguistic competence rather than conversational proficiency.

The second reason why the natural features of authentic conversation are largely excluded in the Korean textbook dialogues can be found in the *Commentary on High School Curriculum: Foreign Languages (English)* (Ministry of Education, 2000). It states that authentic texts in real contexts cause problems confusing learners because they contain too much realism, and accordingly authentic texts need to be reconstructed by simplifying syntactic structures and controlling vocabulary (ibid.: 36-7). The essential point is that teaching materials used in language classrooms should provide comprehensible input to enhance students' understanding, although there is a risk of creating distorted texts in terms of the qualities of natural discourse. At the expense of the invaluable benefits of exposing learners to the real language, the priority is given to pedagogical consideration.

Thirdly, there seems to be a mismatch between the kind of conversation that they need to be able to perform for practical purposes and that of conversation that learners might need to perform ultimately. That is, the objectives of the curriculum tend to focus more on the practical role of conversation as a tool for exchanging information, while learners should also be able to truly 'express themselves' to maintain social relationship during the communication. The point is that transactional function of a conversation often overrides interactional function in the textbooks.

Lastly, it appears that there is an underlying belief that speech is somehow naturally acquired once the learner has mastered a number of speech functions, listened enough times to the accompanying cassettes, or has completed sufficient exercises of written responses to the listening comprehension questions provided in the textbooks (see Cane, 1998: 32). Through participation in interactive situations such as role plays with little or no specific language input or explicit language strategies provided, learners are expected to attain the linguistic and communicative competence they need in order to converse like native speakers. It has been pointed out that most communicative-style textbooks, which adopt an indirect approach to teaching conversation, are based on this assumption, and that this approach has not always been successful (Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994) (for further discussion, see Ch. 5).

3.4 Implications for future directions

The direct implication of the evaluation of textbook dialogues is that we need more authentic models of conversation which reflect more accurately the kinds of exchanges that naturally occur among native speakers of English. Considering that many, or probably the majority, of teachers work within constrained syllabuses and with pre-selected material, using the textbook dialogues in a productive way can be suggested. The starting point is that "teachers and learners become critically aware of what the materials are offering them", and "they should perceive opportunities to adapt them where they are felt to be lacking in the features of natural discourse" (McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 194). Many researchers have proposed a variety of methods and techniques to make the most of limited dialogues profitably based on the modification: for instance, Bardovi-Harlig *et al*. (1991: 5), McCarthy and Carter (1994: 196-7) and Carter and McCarthy (1995: 155) suggest that inappropriate and incomplete dialogues be used as a cue for a language-awareness activity and problem-solving work. In particular, McCarthy and Carter (ibid.) show some useful ways to adapt textbook dialogues. They effectively illustrate that how simple addition of follow-up moves with a comment, connector and a checking tag gives the limited sequence of textbook dialogues a discoursally natural set of features without increasing the lexico-grammatical load. Lee (1998) makes eight suggestions about how textbook dialogues can be reconstructed, thereby enhancing the qualities of input. It is also useful to see Madsen and Bowen (1978: ix) who propose three

levels of adaptation and a variety of techniques to be employed in the process of adaptation which include supplementing, editing, expanding or modifying situational content, etc.

Another means to supply natural conversation to classrooms would be the use of other authentic sources, which do not aim to teach language. Given the constraints in EFL teaching context, where actual, unscripted conversations can hardly be obtained directly, we can think of other second-hand sources which are readily accessible and easily available. Radio and TV soap operas, drama texts and films could be some possibilities. Here, I suggest the use of feature films. In the following chapter, we will first consider the pedagogic value of introducing films into language teaching contexts. This will be followed by the analysis of film dialogues to see if they contain the qualities of natural conversation, whereby they can function as authentic input of conversation.

Chapter 4   Film dialogues as a model of natural conversation

4.1 Rationale for using feature films as instructional materials

Where is the place of feature films in language teaching? We need to consider several points: what an educational rationale for showing films to students is; how the learners will benefit from learning through films in the language classroom; in what way films can help learners, in particular, developing conversation skills and how they support the curriculum. The national curriculum of Korea clearly recommends the use of audiovisual materials and multimedia in conversation classrooms to enhance the effect of learning, help learners understand the target culture and to take into account their affective factors (Ministry of Education, 2000: 187-91). On what basis, then, do we say audiovisual materials can enhance learning? In fact, issues of using video as a teaching tool are often questioned and some limitations have been pointed out (see Canning-Wilson, 2000). Nevertheless, many studies and empirical data support the proposition that video can facilitate the learning of foreign languages.

The first and most fundamental value of using films as an educational medium of instruction relates to the inherent strength of multimedia applications, i.e., films enable learners to gain broad access to oral communication both visually and auditory (Tschirner, 2001: 306). Audio-visual environments of films permit students to listen to spoken language and to see how language is used naturally in realistic settings rather than artificial situations, and they expose students to a wide range of native speakers, each with their own slang, reduced speech, stress, accents and dialects (King, 2002: 510). This realism of films offers a wealth of contextualised linguistic information which ideally combines phonetic, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and sociocultural features (Tschirner, 2001: 314-5). In relation to classroom activities, films thus provide a context and a reason for communication as well as realistic models and examples to practise with or imitate for role-play. Moreover, the foreign language produced in a dramatic context on a film gives an enormously important extra dimension of information: for example, the look of the participants, the physical relationships between the participants, the level of closeness between them, together with all the details of the physical context of communication (Brown and Yule, 1983b: 85-6; Voller and Widdows, 1993: 342). In particular, students can directly observe the paralinguistic features such as facial expressions, gestures, eye contacts

and hesitations used to convey a message, whose information is difficult to gain from books or audio tapes (Flynn, 1998; Canning-Wilson, 2000; King, 2002: 510). It naturally follows that all of these features will increase the probability of comprehensible input (Flynn, 1998). In short, films can provide rich and authentic language input, which is essential to promote language acquisition (Richards, 2001: 214).

In addition, since the settings, linguistic and paralinguistic information found in films are closely associated with the target language culture, films are a very good source of instruction on culture. Films provide excellent contexts for observing appropriateness and suitability of language or behaviour in a given culture. The acquisition of everyday cultural knowledge is therefore greatly aided by the use of films (Tschirner, 2001: 312). Films can increase students' cultural awareness, i.e., "sensitivity to the impact of culturally-induced behaviour on language use and communication" (Tomalin and Stempleski, 1993: 5). Furthermore, feature films are enjoyable and thus more intrinsically motivating than other materials produced for teaching purposes (King, 2002: 510)[13]. Considering that we also need to take care of students' affective needs, it is suggested that one of the important goals of classroom teaching is to stimulate students' interest and to sustain and deepen positive attitudes towards learning, while lowering anxiety inevitably evoked by the stressful process of language learning (see Ellis, 1995: 479-83). Films may support these emotional goals (Tschirner, 2001: 316). Besides, films may help students with different learning styles by widening the classroom repertoire and range of activities (Arthur, 1999, quoted in Canning-Wilson, 2000). Undoubtedly, films appeal to younger students who are part of the video generation (Flynn, 1998). Overall, films 'bring language to life in the classroom' and can make learning a richer experience, so they are invaluable resources for teaching language[14].

---

[13] Peacock's (1997) study shows that learners may be more motivated by authentic materials rather than inauthentic ones, though it is not directly because they are more interesting.

[14] There is one thing to be noted. The legal situation regarding the copying and sale of feature films for educational purposes like language teaching needs to be considered, and this is usually concerns copyright (Lonergan, 1984: 80). Yet, a wide range of videotapes is easily available for rental or hire.

4.2 Criteria for choosing films

Finding an appropriate feature film should be purposeful and tailored to students' learning needs and proficiency level (King, 2002: 520). In selecting films for the purpose of language instruction, the first major criterion is comprehensibility (Brown and Yule, 1983b: 84-5; Arcario, 1992, quoted in King, 2002: 514). For this, films with a strong story line and clearly drawn main characters are recommended (Voller and Widdows, 1993: 343). Teachers need to avoid films that assume too much detailed background knowledge of a subject or culture which their students do not have (Voller and Widdows, ibid.). It is also important "to choose scenes that balance dialogue with a high degree of visual support, and provide appropriate speech delivery, a clear picture and sound, and a standard accent" (King, 2002: 514). Sometimes even though the storyline might be appealing to students, actors' enunciation, speed, accent and use of dialect may prevent understanding.

Secondly, the appropriateness of content and the comfort level of students need to be taken into account (King, 2002: 514). In order not to risk giving offence, films with explicit sex, gratuitous violence and excessive profanity will logically be ruled out. Minor scenes of sex, violence and profanity could be skipped and fast-forwarded past whatever may be deemed offensive in some cultures. Other 'taboo subjects' usually include drugs, alcohol, religion, politics, history and stereotypes like sexism and racism (Tomlinson, 2001: 68). Besides, long slow-moving films or ones full of monologues, distracters or too many visuals which are not really necessary or relevant to the story need to be avoided (Voller and Widdows, 1993: 343; Canning-Wilson, 2000).

Thirdly, as far as student motivation and interest are concerned, entertaining films are sometimes enjoyable and relevant to learners' appreciation of popular culture (King, 2000: 515). In this sense, recently released films are more appealing to students than classic ones even though old films are by and large inoffensive.

Fourthly, choosing films that are age and culture appropriate and suitable for both genders is also important (King, ibid.). In this respect, suitable genres are likely to include romances, romantic comedies and less-violent action movies with relatively simple plots and subplots.

Lastly, in relation to choosing film dialogues for the purpose of teaching conversation, we need to consider the interest and naturalness of the communicative content, the interest and naturalness of its language, and the length of the dialogue and of utterances (Rivers and Temperley, 1978: 16-7).

Here, we have a criterion of the 'naturalness of its language', which is our major concern. The question arises: is the language in film dialogues truly natural? More precisely, can we say with confidence that film dialogues can substitute natural conversation?

4.3 Nature of film dialogues

In the discussion above, it has been argued that films can provide 'authentic language'. Native speakers in feature films do engage in conversation without any intention of displaying or teaching language to the audience. Yet, given our criteria for evaluating the authenticity of conversation (see 3.1), we have to question if the qualities of language in film dialogues are the same as those in genuine conversation. The most essential problem is that film dialogue is, in its essence, composed of written language read aloud. Brown and Yule (1983b: 82) point out that such language will tend to consist of complete sentences, pausing at the end of sentences, well-worked-out language and relatively well-packed with information, and thus it may bear rather little resemblance, except for the fact that it is spoken, to spontaneous speech. McCarthy (1991: 128) also makes a similar point by saying that "how idealised are the representations of speech not only in teaching materials, but in novels, so-called 'verbatim' reports, radio and television soap operas and drama in general." Obviously, it follows that film dialogue cannot offer an ideal substitute for training with real spontaneous speech.

However, we need to go back to our starting point again: what we are looking for is the 'qualities of natural speech', not the originality of the language itself. Brown and Yule (1983b: 82) say that "any fragment of conversation…becomes fascinating from the point of view of the interaction, how who says what, how who is friendly to whom, how who ever-so-discreetly disagrees, how who plays for time, and so [on]." Giving an example analysis of TV soap opera, McCarthy and Carter (1994: 118) also maintain that dramatised data are often an excellent source of language considered by consumers to be 'natural'. In this vein, there would be no reason for not using written dialogues read aloud sometimes, if only we could see they

do contain the qualities of natural conversation and are exploitable in a classroom. Now let us move on to look at to what degree film dialogues resemble genuine conversation in terms of the interaction between participants and of formal features of spoken language.

4.4 Analysis of film dialogues

4.4.1 Selection of the films and notes on transcription

In accordance with the criteria for choosing films (see 4.1.2), and considering the age of target learners this study is aimed at (17-18), two feature films have been selected for the analysis: *Notting Hill* (1999) and *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001). Both films have some common characteristics. They are currently released British films, they are romantic comedies, they are hilarious and engaging, and they gained a lot of popularity in Korea. It is expected that both films have an immediate appeal to Korean teenage learners.

Film scripts can be easily gained from the Internet, which greatly relieves the heavy burden of teachers' transcribing all of the dialogues from scratch. Moreover, some videos or DVDs (digital versatile discs) provide subtitles[15]. In some scripts, a detailed description of settings, atmosphere of the scenes, actors' thoughts and actions like a slight change of facial expressions is also included. The problem, however, is that they are not always accurate. Some words or phrases tend to be improvised and some lines might be added to or cut out from the original script. More importantly, they tend to be tidied up in that some interactional features such as hesitations, fillers and back-channelling noises are often reduced, if not missing altogether. Accordingly, teachers who wish to focus on such particular features in their class need to add anything necessary to the main dialogues and transcribe even very unclear sounds in detail.

Length of the scenes selected for analysis is between 1 and 4 minutes. In my transcription, the convention of Carter and McCarthy (1997), which seems fairly broad and simple, has been followed with some exceptions such as the use of punctuations (e.g., comma (,) to indicate the short pauses less than one second and three full stops (…) to indicate a pause longer than one

---

[15] Comparing with videotapes, Tschirner (2001) and King (2002) contend that DVDs are vastly superior to them because of their compactness, audio-visual quality, availability and other interactive features. For this reason, Tschirner (2001: 305) further argues that foreign language classrooms need to be equipped with multimedia computers and projectors so that digital video may be used for presentation and practice as well as the acquisition of listening and speaking

second, etc.), latching (=) and overlaps ([ ). It is easy to write on the part of teachers and easy to read on the part of students. Each turn is numbered and speakers are indicated with names, titles or roles. Other sounds (e.g., laughing or chuckling) or paralinguistic features (e.g., smiling or hugging) are also included. Uppercase type indicates prominent syllables[16].

The question raised is: whether film dialogues can substitute natural conversation. In order to answer this question, let us look at the examples of film dialogues drawing our attention to the features of genuine conversation. We have eleven samples: the first five are drawn from *Notting Hill* and the next five from *Bridget Jones's Diary*. They cover transactional and interactional talk. Six of them are analysed in detail but as for the rest four, only the main features are identified without in-depth analysis. Finally, one sample, which presents useful features of conversation but at the same time raises important issues of suitability, is analysed. Complete transcriptions of all the samples discussed are provided in the Appendices.

4.4.2 Sample 1: Transactional talk in a bookshop

In this dialogue (see Appendix 2) main participants of the talk are William and Anna, and they are basically engaged in transactional talk. The conversation opens by a formulaic expression at shops and service encounters (turn 1: *can I help you at all?*). This initiation is followed by one of the typical second pair parts of the adjacency pair with a comment (turn 2: *No, thanks. I'll just, look around.*), then the typical follow-up move (turn 3: *Fine.*).

In turn 4, William holds a fairly long turn, using fillers (*ah*, *erm*) and a level pitch in order to signal his intention of continuing talk. In this long turn, he makes a contrast between *THAT book* and *THIS one* by making use of a number of hedges (*really*, *you know*[17], *very*, *I think*, *actually*) to either strengthen or soften his argument. He uses high key to draw Anna's attention, while mid key is employed for providing additional information about the author

---

[16] *Prominent* syllables refer to syllables which stand out in the flow of talk because the speaker has uttered them with relatively greater intensity, or duration, or pitch variation compared with surrounding syllables (McCarthy, 1991: 94). It seems that the speaker deliberately selects certain words and make them salient for a variety of purposes in the interaction (see ibid.: 96-9).

[17] *You know* is a discourse marker. This is frequently used on the assumption that the listener does share the speaker's view of the world. This serves to personalise the talk and involve the listener. This contrasts with *you see* which is used to signal explanations and things that the

and low key for reiterating amusing incidents in the book. Here he violates the maxim of quantity: he talks more than he needs. This would look overly kind in normal situations, but this indicates his personal interests and emotional attitudes towards Anna, a world-famous film star. We can see from this that the 'flouting' of the cooperative principle has a social meaning – in our example, it reflects the relationship between the sender and the receiver of the message (Cook, 1989: 32).

Exchanges from turn 7 to 19 are characterised by William's attempt to negotiate with a thief before a direct accusation of stealing a book. We can see how indirect speech act serves to retreat from danger or any possible conflict. It begins with a summons (turn 7: *Excuse me!*), a starter (turn 9: *Bad news.*), an elicitation (turn 11: *we've got a security camera…*) and a direct accusation (turn 13: *So, I saw you put that book down your trousers.*) Confronted with the thief's continuous denial, William gives up the negotiation. This is clearly signalled by a discourse marker *RIght* (turn 17) with falling intonation and a short pause afterwards. Still, his speech is indirect: he uses fillers (*I tell you what um…and um what can I say*) and modality (*really*) to weaken the force of his remarks on the police. After the thief's indirect admission of his attempt (turn 18), William's speech becomes fairly directive. Although he uses the second conditional clause, the utterances sound like imperatives because he gives prominence to every verb (turn 19: *reMOve*, *WIpe*, *PUT*, *BUY*, *SEE*).

The next exchange is particularly interesting in that Anna and William are engaged in interactional talk in a business situation. Anna says *I was gonna steal one but now I've changed my mind* (turn 20), which can be interpreted as an attempt to establish a cooperative relationship with William in an embarrassing situation, and William laughs as a feedback. She then changes the topic by saying *OH, signed by the author I see* (here she jumps to high key, which typically marks the initiation of a topical segment) and in response to this, William makes a joke in a humorous tone (turn 21: *Erm, yeah, couldn't stop him. If you can find an UNsigned one it's worth an absolute fortune.*) and Anna smiles.

We can see another long turn in turn 31. William's speech is directly concerned with face-saving strategies. To plan his talk or search for the right expression, the time-buying devices (*OH RIGHT right so uh well*) and fillers (*erm*, *uh*) are effectively used. He then accommodates

which he previously recommended (*CHILdish kebab stories*). Use of hedges (*on second thoughts*, *maybe*, *actually*, *really*) and vague expressions (*sort of*, *that sort of thing*) are also noticeable in relation to politeness strategies. The conversation ends with another formulaic adjacency pair (turn 32 and 33): *Thanks - Pleasure*.

To sum up, in this film dialogue, we can see a number of useful features which clearly show several aspects of natural conversation. We have typical conversational routines and adjacency pairs used for opening and closing the talk at service encounters. We have two long-turn moves, which demonstrate: (1) how to persuade a person to buy a particular book (e.g., by making a contrast with an additional help of phonological and lexical choices); (2) how to hold the turn (e.g., by using fillers, pitch and key movement); (3) how to show personal interests or attitudes (e.g., by talking more or less than required); (4) how to show politeness in expressing opinions or in a face-threatening situation (e.g., by using hedges and vague language, and by avoiding disagreement and approving other's opinion). We can also see how the speaker structures the utterances step by step in order to elicit the main message, while observing the norm of politeness under the circumstances. In particular, we have an example of interactional language in the process of conducting business, which transactional dialogues in the Korean textbooks typically lack. We can now conclude that this dialogue can function as a legitimate model of natural conversation.

4.4.3 Sample 2: Greeting and introducing people

This sample of dialogue (see Appendix 3) shows the talk between six people, five of whom (i.e., all except Anna) are close intimates or family members. The close relationship between the participants results in very informal style of conversation. Max and Bella are preparing a birthday dinner for Honey, William's little sister. William and Anna arrive there first, then Honey and Bernie one after another. They greet each other and William introduces Anna to the others. We have conversational routines and adjacency pairs used for greeting and introducing people (turns 6-7, 10-13, 15-17, 22-23, 27-29, 34-35, 37-39, 40-43). Sometimes the most preferred second pair part of an adjacency pair is not followed (e.g., turn 8 and 30) but this is understood from the situation ('Vague food crisis' and 'one of those key moments in life').

Other adjacency pairs include offer-thanking (turns 17-18) and congratulation-thanking (turns 24-25). In turn 35, we have an apology sequence: Bernie apologises for his coming late (*I'm sorry I'm so late*) and provides a reason (*Bollocksed up at work again I fear*) and further information (*Millions down the drain*), but this is simply responded to by *Well done*, which is understood as an ironical joke acceptable between close friends. Besides, we have informal language, especially in exclamations showing surprise (*Oh CHRIST*, *OH GOD*, *GOOD Lord*, *OH HOly FUck*) and other useful routines (e.g., *I'll get it*, *Red or white?*).

In turn 30, Honey holds a fairly long turn, expressing her genuine excitement about meeting Anna in person. Here we find interpersonal elements of spoken grammar, natural non-fluency features in spoken language use, and a tendency of connecting coordinate clauses by 'and'. In addition to the repetition of some words, Honey uses numerous modal adverbs and hedges to express her emotions unequivocally (e.g., *really genuinely cool and I, I'm…*, *just a HUNdred perCENt. I, I ABSOLUTEly TOTALly and UTTERly aDORE you and I JUst think…the most beautiful…*, *AND MOre importantly I, I GENUINEly believe and I've believed…*).

This dialogue provides a very good example of conversation which clearly shows: (1) how the informal setting and the close relationship between the participants affect the style of speech and the use of language; (2) how people greet each other and introduce people; (3) how people express their feelings straightforwardly and without ambiguity; (4) how speakers strengthen the force of what they say, etc. This information is presented by amusing characters in a clear context and thus this dialogue can function as a model of an authentic conversation.

Nevertheless, we might have a slight reservation about presenting exclamations which show profanity like *Oh CHRIST*, *OH GOD*, *GOOD Lord* and *OH HOly FUck*. These are typical reactions in conversation to startling or shocking things, but they are taboo words. It is said that they are offensive to many people, not only to people with strong Christian beliefs, so they are best avoided (Carter and McCarthy, 1997: 40). Although they are perfectly acceptable in the given context, they raise an important issue of suitability of teaching materials. This issue will be dealt with in 4.4.

4.4.4 Sample 3: Getting to know people

In this dialogue (see Appendix 4), Bernie and Anna are engaged in purely interactional talk. Bernie seeks to interact with Anna, who is still a stranger to him – at the previous encounter, he is the only person who did not recognise her. The conversation is opened by Bernie's question about Anna's job: *SO uh TELL me um Anna. What do you do?* [18] (turn 1). It is said that the speaker can attach some kind of label to the interlocutors by knowing their names, acquaintances, addresses and occupations, which will not only enable the speaker to establish who is taking to whom fairly quickly but provide him/her with some clues to the possible topics he/she can talk about (Wardhaugh, 1985: 119-20). By getting occupational information at the very beginning of the talk (turn 2: *I'm an ACTress*), Bernie begins to orientate himself to Anna (see Wardhaugh, 1985: 120[19]).

Bernie then falls back on stereotypes of 'acting', thereby finding other sub-topics (i.e., wages in turns 6-8 and turns 12-14, and kinds of acting in turns 9-11) and proceeding to handle the following exchanges in a comfortable way. In turn 5, immediately after telling about his job, he talks about his personal experience in similar fields: *THOUGH UM Um I have done the odd bit of amateur stuff um uh P.G. Wodehouse uh farce, all that, you know*[20]. By finding some common ground on which he can talk with Anna with mutual concern, Bernie achieves politeness. Moreover, he establishes some conversational rapport with Anna, which enables him to express more individualistic opinions: e.g., *ALways imagined it's a pretty tough job though, acting*[21], *I mean the WAges are a SCANdal, aren't they?*[22] (turn 6), …*It's no life* (turn 8).

---

[18] Note the use of 'So' at the utterance-initial position. This is a characteristic discourse marker that has a rather general introductory function (see Stubbs, 1983: 68). This also indicates a break with what has talked immediately before, and the initial boundary of a new section of discourse. Fillers (*uh*, *um*) are used to create more time to formulate what he intends to say next.

[19] Wardhaugh (1985: 120) says that in Western culture "it is quite acceptable to ask very early of a stranger *What do you do?*…You have an obligation to answer a question about occupation with reasonable honesty."

[20] Here Bernie jumps to the high key to get attention from Anna and also to introduce a new topic. Use of a colloquial word (*bit of*), a general word (*stuff*), vague language (*all that*) and a discourse marker (*you know*) is also noticeable.

[21] Clause-final 'though' typically appears in spoken language. The word *acting* is a 'tail', which is an interpersonal element of spoken grammar and is here used to reinforce or clarify what Bernie is saying.

[22] In this utterance, we have a discourse marker *I mean* and a tag *aren't they?*. 'I mean', which is

One of the excellent features of this dialogue has to do with exchange structure. In all exchanges except turns 4-5, where Anna asks back about Bernie's job, Bernie initiates the talk by asking questions (turn 1, 6, 9 and 12) and Anna simply responds by giving answers (turn 2, 7, 10 and 13). Interestingly, Bernie always provides follow-up moves to Anna's answers. They usually consist of acknowledgements and evaluation of the content (turn 3: *OH SPLENdid*, turn 11: *OH SPLENdid. OH WELL DONE*, turn 14: *Right… So, that's…mm fairly GOOD*), or comments and elaboration which amplifies the topic (turn 8: *I see friends from university, CLEVER chaps* [23]. *…It's no life.*). Accordingly, the exchange structure of this conversation is I→R→F/I→R→F/I …, which shows a marked contrast to that of the Korean textbook dialogues, i.e., I(Question)→R(Answer)→I(Question)→R(Answer)… as in [Example 2] (see 3.2). We can see that Bernie is not a 'journalistic' interviewer but a cooperative conversational partner who wants to learn about the other party. The conversation is closed by Max's interruption (turn 15: *Right! I think we're ready*), which informs the beginning of the birthday dinner for Honey.

To sum up, we have a very good example of a dialogue which manifests some essential aspects of natural conversation for socialising purposes. The point is that when we make a conversation with a stranger about whom we want to know more, we need a set of skills. For example, we need to know: (1) how to open a conversation and keep it going (e.g., by asking a question whose answer is expected to reveal more possible topics, thereby finding some common ground on which to manoeuvre); (2) how to show our attention to the speaker (e.g., by providing follow-up moves); (3) how to show the intention of interacting with, not interviewing or at worst interrogating, the interlocutor (e.g., by giving evaluative comments or elaboration); (4) how to show our intimacy to the conversational partner and add informality in our use of language (e.g., by using tags or tails), and so on. This film dialogue is a valuable source of this kind of information and thus it can be used as a natural sample of conversation.

---

tag also has the strong interactional effect in the conversation, reinforcing intimacy and informality between speakers. Another example of self-repair is in turn 12: *How's the PAY in movies? I mean, LAST film you did, what did you get paid?* (Here, Bernie's reformulation of his question is prefaced with *I mean*.)

[23] The phrase *CLEVER chaps* is a tail used to comment on Bernie's *friends from university*. The

4.4.5 Sample 4: Talking about self

After dinner, all participants are engaged in a conversation, which is basically interactional (see Appendix 5). Interestingly enough, however, five participants among six – except Max who is acknowledged as a leader of the talk – conduct the conversation with the aim of getting 'the last brownie as a prize to the saddest act' (turn 3), and this goal motivates the whole exchanges as a sort of 'agenda' (see Wardhaugh, 1985: 147). Consequently, the talk is in part message-oriented, focusing on exchange of information: i.e., this conversation is transactional within the overall framework of interactional conversation in a very informal context.

Max opens the conversation with a starter (turn 1), then sets the agenda (turn 3), which governs the following exchanges as a full 'conversational topic' (see Brown and Yule, 1983a: 87-94), i.e., 'talking about self as the saddest person to get the brownie'. This is basically a competition against each other, so there is no need for the participants to try to observe the politeness principle or preserve face for themselves as well as others. Also, they do not necessarily have to tell the truth – they need to 'act'! All of these situational elements make the conversation very amusing.

Once the topic is successfully launched with approving noises and the next speaker is nominated (turn 4: *Uh huh. Bern!*), the conversation moves from Bernie to Honey, to Bella, to William, to Anna with a very short space of time. All speakers claim their right to talk and actively participate in conversation by making their own contributions with their own sub-topic (or 'speaker's topic' in Brown and Yule's (ibid.) term). Typical strategy of introducing a sub-topic is to bring some elements in previous speaker's talk. That is, Max talks about job and money about which Bernie talked (turn 9), Honey talks about her appearance and unsuccessful relationships with the opposite sex about which Bernie mentioned (turn 10), Bella talks about friendship which is a kind of relationship (turn 12), then her physical disability which is closely associated with appearance (turn 14).

In turn 16, Bella closes her topic by using a cliché, *C'est la vie…*('That's life' in French) and changes the direction of the conversation[24], which is signalled by *STILL* and a short pause

---

[24] When speakers try to end a topic clearly so that others can either add to it or change the direction of the conversation, they make use of several clichéd way of providing suitable endings: *So it goes, That's life, I suppose, Win some, lose some, We'll wait and see, Something*

filled with *um*. She then brings the exchanges back to the starting point of the whole conversation, i.e., 'who deserves the brownie?' by saying *that's worth a brownie*. Max resumes the talk by reintroducing the sub-topics of profession, appearance and relationship (turn 17) and these sub-topics still remain in Anna's talk, which comes after 'side sequences' for a brief period (turns 23-25). In turn 26, she talks about the difficulties in her job including 'a diet for a decade' and privacy dealt with 'entertainment', broken-hearted experiences with 'not-nice boyfriends', 'painful operations for beautiful looks' and the vanity of appearance.

Noticeably, the listeners are attentive and active. They monitor the speaker's talk and show a variety of responses to the content of what they hear. They sometimes express sympathy (turn 2: *Shame!*), sharply disagree and challenge (turn 6: *NONsense*), ask reconfirmation (turn 7: *Really?*), add their opinion (turn 9: *You see*[25] *and unless I'm much mistaken,…*), strongly agree (turn 10: *YES!*, turn 17: Bella's *That's true* as back-channelling), summarise with an evaluative comment (turn 11: *You see, inCREDIBLy sad*), partly agree (turn 12: *=Yeah, but on the other hand…*), approve with comments (turn 13: *=Oh well that's true. I can't deny it. I mean she NEEDS me, what can I say?*), express uncertainty (turn 17: *WELL, I don't KNOW*), request a clarification (i.e., 'other-repair') (turn 23: *I'm sorry? You think YOU deserve the brownie.*), show surprise or ask for more information (turn 27: *Really?*), make a general evaluation with a comment (turn 29: *No! NICE try, gorgeous but you don't fool anyone*), and report on observation on what was said (turn 30: *PaTHEtic effort to hog the brownie.*). Some of these words and phrases function as lexical cues to signal the speaker's intention of ending and, at the same time, shifting a sub-topic (for the same purpose, speakers typically use phonological cues such as falling intonation and indicate that their topic has been sufficiently explored). Through this dialogue, "we see how important it is to recognize that cooperation is behind much of what happens when two or more people converse. We monitor ourselves and others to keep the cooperative enterprise going" (Wardhaugh, 1985: 138).

We can find some other characteristics of casual conversations which relate to turn-taking mechanisms. For one thing, it is said that "speakers predict one another's utterances and often complete them for them, or overlap with them as they complete" (McCarthy, 1991: 127). We

---

[25] Here in our context, a discourse marker *You see* is a clear indicator of listener's

have such an example in turn 18, where Bernie jointly completes Max's turn by saying *FLOppy*. Another feature is to do with the way speakers hold the turn. In order to continue speaking, the speakers in our sample chain their statements together typically by using 'and'. Sometimes, it is used together with fillers (e.g., 'Uh', 'I mean', 'um', 'well', 'what can I say'), which is followed by short pauses with rising intonation or level pitch. Other connectors or expressions used to signal the intention of keep on talking include: *Or*, *because*, *whilst*, *but on the other hand*, *whereas*, *and to add insult to SERIous injury*, and *the truth is…*. They also contribute to the expansion and development of the topic. Lastly, we have an example which shows a strategy that speakers who have been nonparticipants can make use of in order to join a conversation which is already under way. In turn 22, Anna interrupts an ongoing talk and asks for the turn by saying *OH WAIT! What about ME?*.

As for formal features of spoken language, we have sufficient examples of ellipsis (e.g., *(What a) Shame!*, *(It is) NONsense*, *(He is) VERY unsuccessful professionally. (He is) DIvorced. (He) USED to be handsome*, etc.), repetition or non-fluency features (turn 5: *all right all right*, *since well since*, turn 10: *I haven't got hair. I've got feathers and I've got…*, turn 26: *it it's taken…*), tags[26] (turn 5: *isn't it?*, turn 20: *right?*, turn 24:*…uh?*), a tail (turn 14: *smoking, my FAVOURITE thing*), informal, colloquial language including a vague expression (*fancy*, *flog*, *boobies*, *kind of squidgy*, *a shot at it*, *a bit*), slang (*Nah*), an idiom (*to add insult to SERIous injury*) and a fixed expression (*day and night*). We also have a number of discourse markers and fillers as mentioned above.

To be sure, we can conclude with confidence that this film dialogue does represent a genuine conversation (especially, interactional talk) because it demonstrates a number of useful features of real data which is, in particular, concerned with topicalising behaviour, monitoring behaviour of both speakers' and listeners', and turn management. Close analysis of this dialogue underlines the importance of all participants' collaborative efforts in making a successful conversation.

---

[26] The tags create informality and intimacy among the speakers, which are not necessarily demand a reply; they just suggest a shared view of the situation (Carter and McCarthy, 1997:

4.4.6 Sample 5: Leave-taking and closing

This conversation (see Appendix 6) is held before William and Anna leave after the birthday dinner. So, we have the example of speech acts for leave-taking, adjacency pairs and conversational routines typically used in closing rituals. Closing rituals begin with Anna's appreciation for *SUCH a terrific time* (turn 1), which is a kind of pre-closing, and Max responds by *I'm delighted* (turn 2). Max's utterance acts as a comment on the whole conversations that have been previously made and, at the same time, as a marker of a completed unit of an exchange. *It was lovely to meet you* (turn 6) and *It was just so nice to meet you* (turn 10) have the same function (see Wardhaugh, 1985: 156-7).

Closing rituals are broken three times: in turn 3, where Anna offers compliment to Max (*That's a great tie.*); in turn 7, where Bella makes a joke; in turn 10, where Honey expresses her apology for 'the loo thing' (she had walked into the toilet with Anna), then suggests shopping[27], and comments on the whole occasion itself. After these interruptions, there seems to be nothing new to introduce, and thus all participants agree to the ending of pre-closing rituals. From turn 14, they exchange the final Goodbye and some equivalent including *Cheers*, *See you*, *Take care*, *Good night* and *Bye-bye*, and the closing rituals are brought to a mutually satisfying end. Arrangement of the next meeting (turn 16), which is often made in pre-closing rituals, is made after the beginning of terminal exchange.

The main usefulness of this sample lies in its clear demonstration of the fact that closing a conversation is a cooperative activity. In normal conversation, both parties are required to manoeuvre jointly towards a closing (Wardhaugh, 1985: 157), and this film dialogue successfully exemplifies such a process.

4.4.7 Sample 6: Greeting, and talking with a stranger

This dialogue (see Appendix 7) is essentially interactional and shows the exchanges between six participants in informal context. All of them are connected with each other as family members or neighbours. This rather long exchanges can be divided into three parts: (a) from turn 1 to 7, where Bridget arrives at her mother's; (b) from turn 8 to 25, where she joins a

---

[27] In turn 10, Honey does not complete her utterance (*I meant to leave but I just,*) but suddenly changes a topic, which is marked by *LOOK* and the characteristic jump to high key in saying

buffet, exchanges greetings and talks with people there and is introduced to Mark; (c) from turn 26 to 34, where she talks 'to', rather than 'with', Mark. In part (a) and (b), we have a variety of routines for greeting (turn 2, turns 8-9, 12-14 and 16-19), some of which are not always responded by preferred second pair part (e.g., turn 19: *Torture.*).

The exchanges between Bridget and Mark in part (c) are particularly interesting in terms of speech acts and turn-taking. They used to play together when young but now they are complete strangers, and both of them are already disappointed with each other. This personal attitude towards each other makes a strong influence on their speech acts. Bridget makes a desultory attempt at conversation: she opens the talk with *So* and Mark responds by the same *So* brusquely (turns 26-27). To break the ice, however, Bridget brings a topic from the actual circumstances of the meeting (New Year's Day) and asks, *You staying at your parents' for New Year?* (turn 28). Mark shortly replies in a very indifferent way and asks back (turn 29: *Yes. You?*).

In turn 30, Bridget answers and adds more information: *Oh no no no. I was in London at a party last night so, I'm afraid I'm a bit hung OVer, wish I could be lying with my HEad in a TOILet like all normal people [chuckles]*. Since Mark does not show any attempt to take the turn, Bridget continues speaking. For this, she brings a new sub-topic of her New Year's resolutions (*DRINK less*, *QUIT smoking*, *keep New Year's resolutions*, *stop talking terrible nonsense to strangers*). She talks in an idiosyncratic style, using many interjections, fillers, pauses and a coordinate conjunction (*oh and…mm Oh and…, oh and uh*), without considering Mark's reactions.

As a conversational partner, Mark is truly uncooperative. This is clear from the desultory language (the only response to her talk is 'mm' as a back-channel signal), his postures, facial expressions and eyes wandering around. He then abruptly closes the conversation (turn 31: *Yes, well, perhaps it's time to eat.*) and walks away, which is very rude. The failure of conversation is partly due to Bridget's choice of sub-topics in talking with a stranger, i.e., alcohol and smoking, which are usually considered not 'safe' or 'taboo' subjects.

In addition to many routines, this dialogue includes a wide range of interactive features of spoken language. Ellipsis is common (e.g., *(Where are) Doilies, Pam?*, *(They are in the) Third*

drawer…, *(I) Laid out…*, *(do you) remember?*, *(Did* or *How about) You?*). We have tails, which show speakers' personal attitudes towards or evaluative stance on the things previously mentioned (turn 3: *He's a BARRISter, VERy well off*, turn 5: *His wife was Japanese, very cruel race*, turn 19: *Human-rights barrister, pretty NASTY beast*). The talk is also peppered with informal and colloquial language (e.g., *There you are, dumpling*, *mum*, *Here we go*, *fellow*, *Mr. Right*, *a bit*, *pretty*, *DRINKS like a FIsh*, *Yummy*). Besides, we have addressing words (e.g., *dumpling*, *Pam*, *Bridget*, *Uncle G/Geoffrey*, *Dad*, *DARling*, *Una*, *Mother*) and an onomatopoeic word (turn 15: *Tick-tock, tick-tock*). We also have a number of discourse markers used for a variety of purposes (e.g., *By the way*, *Now*, *well*, *then*, *All right*, *you know*, etc.).

In short, this dialogue contains a number of useful features of real conversation particularly concerned with turn-taking mechanisms. More precisely, this sample is a very useful counter-example which presents a very 'unsuccessful' conversation. It suggests what kind of topics should be avoided in talking with strangers and in what way we can avoid taking turns (e.g., by using paralinguistic means). It also shows what the use of language is like between people who have already established close relationships and have mutual knowledge. It can therefore be a good model of natural conversation.

4.4.8 Other useful samples

Six film dialogues have so far been closely analysed and we have seen that a number of dimensions of genuine conversation can be found in more than one film and in more than one scene. The dialogue in sample 7 (see Appendix 8) shows how native speakers preface and elaborate their language in making requests. It also shows how they perform indirect speech acts and how they make use of conversational implicature to interpret them. We can see that listeners make predictions about the speakers' next utterances while listening and attempt to complete them by interrupting the current stretch of talk.

Sample 8 (see Appendix 9) shows the way of openings and greetings, and introductions in both formal and informal ways. The dialogues in sample 9 and 10 (see Appendix 10 and 11) are particularly useful in relation to openings and closings, turn-taking mechanisms and structuring a long-turn coherently. We find some useful devices which are used: (1) to catch or

demand attention, interrupting the closing routine (e.g., by saying *LOOK* or *LIsten* with high key); (2) to introduce and shift topics (e.g., by bringing elements from the previous talk or occasions relevant to the present state); (3) to elicit the key information (e.g., by prefacing the talk carefully to prepare the ground and softening the message by means of hedges and fillers); (4) to make a change, modify or clarify what he/she is saying (e.g., by using markers like *I mean* or rephrasing expressions such as *what I'm trying to say…is…*); (5) to show personal attitudes (e.g., by using modal adverbs and comment clauses), and so on.

4.5 Difficulties and limitations in film dialogues

It has become clear that film dialogues do provide features of natural conversation. However, they are not without problems. We need to be aware that we are selecting 'texts for classroom teaching'. Some of the film dialogues are definitely inappropriate even though they contain a number of useful features. Some topics are taboo subjects, or some of the language can be offensive (see the second criterion for choosing films in 4.2). To illustrate this point, let us consider the dialogue in sample 11 (see Appendix 12). This again comes from *Bridget Jones's Diary* and involves a couple talking about a third person.

This dialogue is useful in many aspects. It contains a number of discourse markers used for a variety of purposes: e.g., for getting attention (*look*), for marking boundaries or different phases in the discourse (*So*, *Now*, *ANYway*) and for shifting topics (*listen*). We have an example of monitoring behaviour (*Then what?*), which serves to encourage speakers to continue talking and is also considered signs of good manners. A strategy of topic avoidance (*And then uh… NOThing*) as well as spoken language features such as fillers (*Well*, *Hmm*, *um*, *Yeah*, *uh*), informal language (*I bet*, *God*) and routines (e.g., *What about you?*, *in all honesty*, *Why don't you…*, *Don't care*) is found. Yet, the crucial problem of this dialogue is that it contains offensive expressions, many of which have sexual associations (e.g., *give a fuck*, *Arsey*, *you dirty bitch*, *a nasty BAStard, a DULL BAStard*, *fuck him*, *French-kissing*).

Concerning this, it has been argued earlier that films with these kinds of elements should be ruled out. However, we also need to look at this from a different point of view. The question is: "Should materials be censored?" (Tomlinson, 2001: 68). It has long been pointed out that published teaching materials tend to describe only the 'safe, clean, harmonious, benevolent,

undisturbed' world and thus they are in general too bland and often fail to achieve the engagement needed for learning (see Tomlinson, ibid.). Accordingly, it is arguable that "provocative texts which stimulate an affective response are more likely to facilitate than neutral texts which do not" (Tomlinson, ibid.).

From this viewpoint, the above dialogue may, though problematic, be a good text which will certainly involve learners. What we need are careful consideration and a compromise between (arguably) positive impact on students' motivation and educational suitability in general of the content. In this sense, dialogues which contain some utterances that has a slight degree of sexual implications (e.g., *how's your love life?*, *You career girls can't put it off forever you know* in sample 6) or taboo subjects including profanity and stereotypes (e.g., *Oh CHRIST*, *OH GOD*, *GOOD Lord*, *OH HOly FUck* in sample 2; *Japanese, very cruel race*, *You'll never get a boyfriend if you look like you've WANDERed out of Auschwitz* in sample 6) can be acceptable – anyway, the content of the utterances itself is not the focus of teaching conversation skills, and in case students' attention is drawn to it, teachers can utilise it as a good chance of enhancing cultural awareness through discussion.

It needs to be mentioned here that I, as a non-native speaker of English, have experienced difficulties in understanding some use of slang which is directly associated with sex. Teachers' lack of knowledge of slang and subtle expressions which have sexual connotations can result in bewilderment or even acute embarrassment in a classroom and thus it seems necessary for teachers to have a good knowledge of informal language and slang as well as formal language. Besides, a strong British English accent can also be another source of difficulty for some students to listen and understand if they are only accustomed to that of American English, as most Korean learners are.

One clear limitation of film dialogues has to do with the nature of a film genre itself. In many films with a *strong* storyline, each scene is along the line of a coherent meaning-making structure. It is more likely that scenes are packed with carefully and, more importantly, economically written dialogues and free of 'meaningless', 'unnecessary' or 'irrelevant' talk that does not contribute to the next discourse. In most casual conversations, however, "we find topics being raised for a variety of reasons, often just to keep the talk going, simply

how topics start, grow, shift, merge into one another and come to a close" (McCarthy, 1991: 133). There can be such 'time-consuming but important' scenes which constitute the theme of a film (e.g., in dramas or psycho-thrillers?), but generally it seems not easy for us to find this kind of dialogue in which talk drifts aimlessly from one topic to another and speakers restructure a topic at any point.

4.6 Results of the analysis and implications

4.6.1 Results of analysis of film dialogues

Our analyses of film dialogues have clearly shown that they approximate to genuine conversation in terms of the interaction and natural qualities of language in conversation and thus are more authentic than the Korean textbook dialogues. They can be excellent input into conversation classes. Film dialogues exemplify the essential aspects or dimensions of natural conversation that learners need to know and understand as a basis of developing conversational proficiency. They also demonstrate a set of strategies or devices which learners should acquire and make use of effectively in order to be a good conversationalist. In short, film dialogues can be usefully exploited as a model of natural conversation. On the other hand, some difficulties and limitation are also found in the process of analysis. It is suggested that teachers be informed by the knowledge of both formal and informal language use in their selection of extracts as teaching materials and scrutinise everything in the text with caution.

4.6.2 Implications

Initially, analysing conversation can be an appallingly difficult and time-consuming job. However, it is worthwhile. It reveals what particular aspects of conversation skills can be practised with a given sample of a dialogue, what other aspects should be supplemented and what can be problematic for classroom use. In other words, the process of conversation analysis provides teachers with huge insights into planning conversation lessons by yielding some possible areas which will constitute lesson objectives, thereby enabling teachers to make sound judgement about the suitability and exploitability of samples of dialogues. Moreover, it also enables teachers to determine where the difficulty lies when students fail to converse successfully and to help them with it.

Obviously, the key to using films effectively in conversation classes lies primarily with the teacher's expertise in finding their potential or limitation through careful analysis of dialogues. Accordingly, it is a fundamental prerequisite for the teacher to have an understanding of the theories of spoken discourse and skill of implementing the analysis. By possessing such analytic tools, teachers can be more confident in finding potentially useful authentic materials such as film dialogues and locating the specific points to be trained. In a word, teachers ought to become conversational analysts themselves (see Brown and Yule, 1983b: 50; McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 196).

Now we have more authentic materials, which will enhance the process of learning. The next step to be taken is to consider how we exploit these materials in a conversation classroom. Prior to this, we need to think about, first, how we approach the teaching of conversation. Considering that effective teaching facilitates learning, it is necessary for teachers to use appropriate teaching methodology which will greatly benefit learners in developing conversational proficiency.

Chapter 5   Teaching conversation using film dialogues

5.1 Approaches to the teaching of conversation

5.1.1 Indirect approaches

In the current literature, two major approaches to the teaching of conversation have often been discussed (Richards, 1990; Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994; Celce-Murcia *et al.*, 1997; Cane, 1998). One is an indirect approach, "in which conversational competence is seen as the product of engaging learners in conversational interaction" (Richards, 1990: 76-7). SLA researchers argue that linguistic competence gradually emerges as a direct result of the process of learners' engagement in extensive communicative tasks with little specific language input and experiment with the internal mechanism of the language (see Richards, 1990: 77). This approach was typical of communicative language teaching (CLT) in the 1980s, which involves setting up and managing lifelike communicative situations in the language classroom such as situational role plays, problem-solving tasks, information-gap activities and discussion which are expected to lead learners to acquire communicative skills incidentally by seeking situational meaning (Schmidt, 1991, quoted in Celce-Murcia *et al.*, 1997: 141). It is this approach, Richards believes, that communicative-based ELT textbooks have generally taken, which is confirmed by the two Korean textbooks for teaching conversation that have been previously reviewed. However, it has been pointed out that "while communicative language teaching methodology has offered detailed guidelines for how to create genuine communicative situations in the language classroom, it has failed to specify which conversational skills and what kind of language input we should focus on" (Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994: 40). Moreover, Widdowson (1978: ix) maintains that a purely functional approach to language and language use did not do justice to the "whole complex business of communication" and calls for the "consideration of the nature of discourse and of the abilities that are engaged in creating it." Later, he also argues that incidental, 'natural' language acquisition is a "long and rather inefficient business" and that "the whole point of language pedagogy is that it is a way of short-circuiting the slow process of natural discovery and can make arrangements for learning to happen more easily and more efficiently than it does in 'natural surroundings'"

(Widdowson, 1990: 162). His argument is in line with that of McCarthy and Carter (1994: 162), who say that "under certain conditions explicit knowledge can facilitate acquisition".

5.1.2 Direct approaches

The other approach to teaching conversation is more direct. The direct approach "involves planning a conversation program around the specific microskills, strategies, and processes that are involved in fluent conversation" (Richards, 1990: 77). Language classes following this approach attempt to deal with conversation more systematically. For example, they aim at fostering the students' awareness of the main conversational rules, various elements of conversational structure (e.g., openings, closings, the turn-taking system), strategies to use, pitfalls to avoid, and discourse-level grammar, as well as increasing their sensitivity to the underlying processes (see Nolasco and Arthur, 1987; Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994). The direct approach adopts various features of direct grammar instruction in teaching conversation skills (Celce-Murcia *et al.*, 1997: 141). It focuses explicitly on the processes and strategies involved in casual conversation and makes use of structured and controlled activities like drills and dialogues, which may not be entirely communicative. Yet, this approach is often described as a 'principled communicative approach', which extends and further develops CLT methodology by adding more and more conscious elements to CLT techniques[28] (see Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1994: 47; Celce-Murcia *et al.*, 1997: 147). In this sense, it can be said that the direct approach integrates some seemingly opposed theories of language learning such as explicit/implicit learning, form-focused/meaning-focused, conscious/unconscious, knowing that/knowing how, product/process, accuracy/fluency, and so on (McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 161), whereby it bridges the gap between knowledge of rules and true communication through 'pseudo-communicative' (Rivers and Temperley, 1978: 5) or 'pre-communicative' activities (Littlewood, 1981: 85). As Richards (1990: 84) says, therefore, the indirect and the direct

---

[28] This idea is well supported by other researchers such as Bialystok (1982), Rutherford and Sharwood Smith (1985) and Widdowson (1990). They provide good justifications from different perspectives which are respectively concerned with the form and the meaning,

approach play a complementary role and thus a balance of both approaches seems to be the most appropriate methodological option[29].

5.2 Appropriate methodology in EFL teaching contexts

Considering the constraints in teaching EFL in Korea (see 1.2), it appears that the direct approach is more effective and appropriate than the indirect approach. It provides practical guidance to both teachers and students about what skills need to be taught and learned in order to conduct conversations in a native-like way in the real world. In addition, after so many years of schooling in rather traditional settings, most Korean students tend to rely on the teacher who gives information directly and prefer explicit teaching approach such as the Grammar-Translation Method to CLT (see Li, 2001: 157). This context is most likely to support the direct approach to the teaching of conversation. Moreover, the common observation that some features of natural conversation of English are often not directly translatable language to language or absent from the learner's natural conversational discourse (see Stubbs, 1983: 68-9; McCarthy, 1991: 123; Hatch, 1992: 6-81)[30] underlines the importance of specific awareness training where necessary through the observation of native speakers' behaviour and guided discussion based on authentic data. This also encourages the direct approach.

One remaining question is that whether some features like incomplete sentences, which are commonly produced under time pressure, need to be 'taught'. To take the extreme case, it can be argued that there is no point whatsoever in teaching students to be non-fluent, hesitate or make false starts and mistakes in an English way. It seems necessary for teachers to work out some satisfactory compromise by considering the fundamental proposition that learners need to be exposed to real language and should be allowed to come into contact with as much

---

[29] In this vein, Carter and McCarthy (1995) and McCarthy and Carter (1995) propose a 'three Is' (Illustration-Interaction-Induction) methodology for teaching spoken language. It is based on observation, awareness and induction. As they argue, if the methodology is developed in tandem with a syllabus, it seems to have "considerable potential for a more rapid acquisition by learners of fluent, accurate, and naturalistic conversational and communicative skills" (McCarthy and Carter, 1995: 217). Similarly, Bardovi-Harlig *et al.* (1991: 5) suggest four steps as a way of integrating pragmatically appropriate language into the English classroom: (1) identification of the speech act; (2) data collection and description; (3) text and materials evaluation; (4) development of new materials. This seems more suitable for teaching ESL.

authentic English as possible. As Crystal and Davy (1975: 118) argue, "it is essential that they be taught how to interpret the speech of native speakers which *will* contain such 'errors'". The point is that learners ought to know the communicative value of such features as filling noises or repetition and be able to exploit such strategies appropriately when necessary.

Given our preference for the direct approach, we then need to consider, in more practical terms, how we apply its principles to planning a conversation lesson. We have film dialogues as teaching materials whose useful features have been identified through analysis, so they need to be exploited in a classroom for developing students' conversational proficiency.

5.3 Suggestions for exploiting film dialogues

Some of the film dialogues we have discussed are particularly useful for practising specific speech acts such as greeting, introducing people or leave-taking, whereas some are more suitable for strategy training like topic management or turn-taking. Teachers might use one or more dialogues according to the level of target learners, the objectives of the lesson and the suitability of the materials for the purposes.

5.3.1 Using contrastive samples for a lesson

Observing more than one data and making comparisons and contrasts, rather than focusing on only one sample, can be more effective in making the point clearer. For instance, two conversations between strangers (sample 3 and 6) could be presented to students, who are asked to think about why the conversation between Bernie and Anna is quite successful while the other between Bridget and Mark is not. Strategies of opening a conversation, managing topics and being friendly are likely to be discussed guided by teacher's prompting questions. This will make students aware of the importance of choosing suitable topics in talking with a stranger and providing follow-up moves as a means of showing politeness as a cooperative conversational partner. Students are then asked to generate their own examples of New Year's resolutions which would possibly make more sub-topics surface, so that they can develop the exchange as well as involve the interlocutor.

---

[30] For instance, we can think of follow-up moves which evaluate the content of other people's talk such as *oh dear*, *how awful*, *lucky you*, *oh no*, *I see*, *did you* and discourse markers like *well*,

At the same time, participants can be directed to adopt different attitudes towards the conversational partner. Role-play exercises can be developed. For example, three different role cards would be distributed to the students playing Mark: (a) "You are very interested in Bridget. Show your desire to communicate with her. Be friendly and polite."; (b) "You are moderately interested in Bridget. Be polite. Keep the conversation going."; (c) "You are not interested in Bridget. But, at least, be polite." The conversation is opened by the same utterance as the one in the original dialogue. This time, however, the pattern of exchanges will become different and the conversation can be more extended than the original, as Mark will handle the conversation in different ways. After the role-play, the students who played Bridget are asked to find which role their partners adopted. As a follow-up, students discuss the various strategies used by their partner to show politeness and express personal interests.

5.3.2 Sample lesson: exploiting one film dialogue

Instead, several aspects of conversational management presented in one film dialogue can constitute the discourse goals of a lesson. A number of tasks and activities which aim to develop different aspects of conversation skills can be designed[31]. To see how this works in practice, a sample lesson has been devised. The plan is provided in Appendix 13. The following is a rationale for the plan including a commentary on the activities and tasks.

The lesson is for intermediate and above level students and based on the dialogue in a bookshop in *Notting Hill* (see sample 1). The scene in which the conversation is situated is in the beginning of the film where the main participants of the talk – William (an ordinary Englishman) and Anna (an American film star) – are introduced and their relationship is identified and established. The main aim of the lesson is to develop students' awareness of the communicative value of hedges, discourse markers and fillers and their role in achieving politeness, and of the importance of the variables in interlocutors and settings in speech acts.

Preliminary activities are intended to orientate students implicitly towards the understanding of the principle that speech act is determined by role and setting. Speech event of the main dialogue will be contextualised by showing students the introductory part of the film, which

---

[31] In relation to task design, McCarthy and Carter (1994: 180-2) suggest a list of strategies, which consists of genre-related strategies, coherence-related strategies, politeness strategies, planning

provides essential information about the setting and the participants. It will also activate students' content schemata based on their general knowledge about a romantic film, thereby enabling them to predict what will happen between William and Anna. Formal schemata are activated by a brainstorming activity, through which some adjacency pairs and conversational routines used in transactional talk are likely to be produced.

This is followed by more analytical activities and tasks, which aim to raise language awareness. Firstly, students watch the clip of the film containing the main dialogue between three participants and observe their speech acts in terms of 'talk in service encounters'. Brief discussion about some interesting features of the scene such as a server's kindness to a customer, his way of coping with the thief on the spot, exchanging jokes between the server and the customer while engaging a transaction, etc. will serve to prepare the ground for the following activities.

Next, groups of students work with the film script, from which hedges including modal expressions, discourse markers and fillers used in William's utterances are all removed. They are required to study the script and discuss topics, the length of turns and the functions of the utterances. After filling in the gaps while listening to the conversation again, they discuss the roles of the gapped words in connection with his attitudes towards Anna and the thief. This activity will enable students to recognise that the length of turns and the use of linguistic means like discourse markers are affected by the speaker's attitudes towards the interlocutors. It is also intended to make students aware of the communicative value of such linguistic devices which contribute to softening or strengthening William's arguments and to expressing politeness.

Students are then asked to generate politeness strategies from their observation of the conversation. Teacher should prompt discussion of how William engages in strategic acts of directness/indirectness and politeness for face-saving. She may ask questions such as 'why he speaks relatively longer than his conversational partner', 'how he hedges his talk', 'how he starts, elicits and expands the exchanges instead of getting directly to the main message', and 'how these features are relevant to the relative status of the interlocutors'. By observing the behaviours of native speakers within the context, students will get to recognise the underlying

norms of conversation, which vary according to whom one is talking to and in what circumstances.

While performing preceding activities, students have furthered their understanding of the rules of conversation. At this stage, students need to use such awareness to produce more authentic speaking. As a follow-up activity, role play is devised, which aims to make students utilise the rules of conversation and relevant skills learned through the preceding activities. Different role is assigned to Anna: she is not a film star but an everyday customer and she needs to be more responsive and cooperative in conversing with William, i.e., be more polite. Students playing Anna are asked to expand the conversation by sharing the responsibility of driving the conversation forward with William. They are given a card which informs the way to be used for this purpose (e.g., "Generate more than one response" followed by "by evaluating William's talk." / "by commenting on William's talk" / "by adding your own opinions" / "by asking for more information on some elements of William's talk", etc.). Use of hedges, markers and fillers is also encouraged in performing the role-play. After role-playing, students are asked to briefly discuss the strategies used to develop the conversational exchange. Students are expected to learn how the variables in roles have a strong effect on the exchange patterns of conversation and thus how close the relationship between those variables and exchange structure is.

This lesson plan is only one of many possibilities of exploiting the film dialogue. Other lessons based on the same material can also be designed in order to develop different aspects of conversation skills: for example, some teachers might want to focus more on phonological features like stress and pitch movement in order to show students how it highlights or alters the meaning.

Film dialogues are rich, authentic source of natural conversation and provide a wide range of possibilities that can be exploited in a classroom. In order for teachers to get the best results of their teaching, they need to take into account contextual factors that may influence on the effectiveness of their teaching practice and make use of appropriate teaching methodology. By doing so, the chances of developing their students' conversational proficiency are likely to be greatly enhanced.

Chapter 6   Conclusion

In this study, it has been argued that conversation has its own distinctive features different from written language in terms of linguistic and discoursal features and thus they need to be catered for by reflecting them in conversation textbooks. However, it has turned out that Korean textbook dialogues fall short of offering the learner examples that reflect the way people actually speak, so they need to be supplemented or replaced with more authentic samples which capture the nature of genuine conversation. It has been suggested that feature films are one of those authentic materials that are relatively easily available to many teachers in EFL teaching contexts. Their educational value has been briefly discussed, and samples of film dialogues have been analysed in detail in an attempt to answer the question if they are 'authentic' enough to substitute natural conversation. The analyses have identified a number of characteristic features of natural conversation and this assured us that although there are some difficulties and limitations, film dialogues approximate the flow of speech in real-life situations, hence they can be usefully exploited as a model of conversation in a language classroom. Lastly, two main approaches to the teaching of conversation have been discussed, and the direct approach, which advocates a more explicit conceptualisation and practice of skills and sub-skills involved in fluent conversation, has been supported. A sample lesson plan has been offered as an example of a way of exploiting film dialogues.

This study directly concerns language teachers who want to develop conversational proficiency of the learners by using effective teaching materials and approaches. The more teachers are interested in teaching language in a communicative way, the more need of exposing learners to the language in the real context and having them interact with each other in real life situations are likely to arise. Given the difficulty for many EFL teachers to obtain rich natural data from the immediate environment, how to gain samples of authentic conversation would be one of the common concerns of all language teachers. In this study, I have attempted to provide merely one of the examples of how to evaluate the authenticity of a conversation and how to locate more authentic materials. This study, although it particularly addresses teaching EFL in South Korea, thus extends to other countries in EFL/ESL situations.

"Knowing how language works and how people use it is a first and indispensable step towards deciding what shall be taught" (McCarthy and Carter, 1994: 3). The problems of how and what to select for language teaching seem to be considerably lessened the more we know about people's day-to-day uses of language. As indicated earlier, discourse analysis is the very means which enables us as language teachers to get to grips with the underpinning principles of everyday language use in the real world. It makes us approach language teaching in a more descriptive way. It also provides insights into the ways to deal with the language for real purposes beyond the sentences/utterances and paragraphs/exchanges, thereby bridging the gap between the language itself and the language in its actual use.

In this vein, I have argued for the necessity of teachers to become conversational analysts (see 4.6.2). Teachers ought to be well aware of the nature of conversation to determine what is naturalistic input into their conversation class. They also need to make conscious and persistent efforts to introduce the relevant features of a conversation. Provided the teachers are competent conversational analysts, they can be much more flexible in employing other materials such as TV soap operas or sitcoms which are probably more authentic than textbook dialogues. It will further allow teachers to help students become observers of conversation in its natural contexts and promote their discourse awareness. Accordingly, it is suggested that study of discourse analysis be one of the main components of teacher training and in-service education programmes. For this reason, this study would also be of interest to administrators and teacher educators.

My hope is that I have suggested a useful addition to the armoury of teaching tools which every teacher needs to maintain. I hope this study will help teachers not only to utilise the techniques of spoken discourse analysis exemplified here in their evaluation and selection of conversational data but also to develop others of their own that will be suitable for the diverse abilities and needs of the students they serve. By tailoring their instructions to meet the specific needs in teaching and learning conversation, teachers are most likely to assist their students with better preparation for the experience of authentic conversation.

References

Aijmer, K. *Conversational Routines in English: Convention and Creativity*. Harlow: Longman. 1996.

An, B. G., Y. J. O and A. Dahland. *High School English Conversation*. Seoul: S. Korea: Jihaksa. 2002.

Arcario, P. 'Criteria for selecting video materials.' In: Stempleski, S. and P. Arcario (eds.) *Video in Second Language Teaching: Using, selecting and producing video for the classroom*: 109-121. Alexandria, VA: TESOL. 1992.

Arthur, P. 'Why use video? A teacher's perspective.' *VSELT* 2/4: 4. 1999.

Aston, G. 'Say 'Thank you': some pragmatic constraints in conversational closings.' *Applied Linguistics* 16/1: 57-86. 1995.

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1962.

Bachman, L. F. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1990.

Bak, C. Y., J. H. Seo, O. Y. Bak and D. B. Kim. *High School English Conversation*. Seoul, S. Korea: Minjungseorim. 2002.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., B. A. S. Hartford, R. Mahan-Taylor, M. J. Morgan and D. W. Reynolds. 'Developing pragmatic awareness: closing the conversation.' *ELT Journal* 45/1: 4-15. 1991.

Bialystok, E. 'On the relationship between knowing and using linguistic forms.' *Applied Linguistics* 3/3: 181-206. 1982.

Boxer, D. and L. Pickering. 'Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: the case of complaints.' *ELT Journal* 49/1: 44-58. 1995.

Brown, G. and G. Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983a.

Brown, G. and G. Yule. *Teaching the Spoken Language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983b.

Brown, P. and S. C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987.

Bygate, M. *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1987.

Bygate, M. 'Speaking.' In: Carter, R. and D. Nunan (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*: 14-20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.

Byrne, D. *Teaching Oral English*. 2nd edition. Harlow: Longman. 1986.

Canale, M. 'From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy.' In: Richards, J. C. and R. W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*: 2-27. Harlow: Longman. 1983.

Canale, M. and M. Swain. 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.' *Applied Linguistics* 1/1: 1-47. 1980.

Cane, G. 'Teaching conversation skills more effectively.' *The Korea TESOL Journal* 1/1: 31-37. 1998.

Canning-Wilson, C. 'Practical aspects of using video in the foreign language classroom.' *The Internet TESL Journal* VI/11. November 2000. Available from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Canning-Video.html Accessed 20 May 2003.

Carter, R. and M. McCarthy. 'Grammar and the spoken language.' *Applied Linguistics* 16/2: 141-158. 1995.

Carter, R. and M. McCarthy. *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997.

Celce-Murcia, M., Z. Dörnyei and S. Thurrell. 'Direct approaches in L2 instruction: a turning point in communicative language teaching?' *TESOL Quarterly* 31/1: 141-152. 1997.

Channell, J. *Vague Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1994.

Cockcroft, S. *Investigating Talk*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1999.

Cook, G. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1989.

Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*. The Hague: Mouton. 1981.

Coulthard, R. M. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. New edition. Harlow: Longman. 1985.

Crystal, D. and D. Davy. *Advanced conversational English*. Harlow: Longman. 1975.

Dörnyei, Z. and S. Thurrell. 'Teaching conversational skills intensively: course content and rationale.' *ELT Journal* 48/1: 40-49. 1994.

Eisenstein, M. and J. W. Bodman. ''I very appreciate': expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English.' *Applied Linguistics* 7/2: 167-185. 1986.

Ellis, N. 'Sequencing in SLA: Phonological memory, chunking, and points of order.' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 91-126. 1996.

Ellis, R. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1995.

Flynn, K. F. 'Bring language to life: using video in your ESL/EFL program.' *ESL Magazine* March/April. 1998. Available from: http://www.eslmag.com/marapr98art.html Accessed 20 May 2003.

Goffman, E. 'Replies and responses.' *Language in Society* 5/3: 257-313. 1976.

Grice, H. P. 'Logic and conversation.' In: Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and semantics* 3: 41-58. New York: Academic Press. 1975.

Guariento, W. and J. Morley. 'Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom.' *ELT Journal* 55/4: 347-353. 2001.

Hatch, E. M. *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 1978.

Hatch, E. M. *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1992.

KICE (Korea Institute of Curriculum and Education). 'College Scholastic Ability Test.' Seoul, S. Korea: Author. Undated. Available from: http://www.kice.re.kr/english00/ Accessed 18 July 2003.

King, J. 'Using DVD feature films in the EFL classroom.' *CALL* 15/5: 509-523. 2002.

Lee, Y.O. 'Analysis of input and development of input enhancement model based on the properties of spoken discourse.' Unpublished MEd dissertation. Chongwon: Korea National University of Education. 1998.

Levinson, S. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983.

Li, D. 'Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea.' In: Hall, D. R. and A. Hewings (eds.) *Innovation in English Language Teaching. A reader*: 149-166. London: Routledge in association with Macquarie University and The Open University. 2001.

Littlewood, W. *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1981.

Lonergan, J. *Video in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1984.

Madsen, H. S. and J. D. Bowen. *Adaptation in Language Teaching*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 1978.

McCarthy, M. *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1990.

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

McCarthy, M. and R. Carter. *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. London: Longman. 1994.

McCarthy, M. and R. Carter. 'Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it?' *ELT Journal* 49/3: 207-218. 1995.

Meier, A. J. 'Teaching the universals of politeness.' *ELT Journal* 51/1: 21-28. 1997.

Meinhof, U. 'Predicting aspects of a strategic model of text comprehension.' In: Bloor, T. and J. Norrish (eds.) *Written Language*: 39-54. London: CILT. 1987.

Ministry of Education. *Primary and Secondary Schools Curriculum*. Seoul, S. Korea: Author. 1997.

Ministry of Education. *Commentary on High School Curriculum: Foreign Languages (English)*. Seoul, S. Korea: Author. 2000.

Nolasco, R. and L. Arthur. *Conversation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1987.

Oxford, R. L. 'Language learning strategies.' In: Carter, R. and D. Nunan. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*: 166-172. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.

Pawley, A. and F. H. Syder. 'Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency.' In: Richards, J. C. and R. W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*: 191-226. Harlow: Longman. 1983.

Peacock, M. 'The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners.' *ELT Journal* 51/2: 144-153. 1997.

Porter, D. and J. Roberts. 'Authentic listening activities.' *ELT Journal* 36/1: 37-47. 1981.

Psathas, G. and M. Kozloff. 'The structure of directions.' *Semiotica* 17/2: 111-130. 1976.

Richards, J. C. 'Conversationally speaking: approaches to the teaching of conversation.' In: Richards, J. C. *The Language Teaching Matrix*: 67-86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1990.

Richards, J. C. 'Postscript: The ideology of TESOL.' In: Carter, R. and D. Nunan (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages:* 213-217. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.

Richards, J. C., J. T. Platt and H. Weber. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman. 1985.

Richards, J. C. and M. Sukwiwat. 'Language transfer and conversational competence.' *Applied Linguistics* 4/2: 113-125. 1983.

Richards, J. C. and R. W. Schmidt. 'Conversational analysis.' In: Richards, J. C. and R. W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*: 117-154. Harlow: Longman. 1983.

Rivers, W. and R. S. Temperley. *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1978.

Rutherford, W. E. and M. Sharwood Smith. 'Consciousness-raising and Universal Grammar.' *Applied Linguistics* 6/3: 274-282. 1985.

Schegloff, E. A., G. Jefferson and H. Sacks. 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation.' *Language* 53: 361-382. 1977.

Schegloff, E. A. and H. Sacks. 'Opening up closings.' *Semiotica* 8: 289-327. 1973.

Schmidt, R. W. *Input, Interaction, Attention and Awareness: The Case for Consciousness Raising in Second Language Teaching* (Anais do X encontro Nacional de Professores Universitáros de Língua Inglesa 1). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Pontifícia Universidade Católica. 1991.

Schmidt, R. W. and J. C. Richards. 'Speech acts and second language learning.' *Applied Linguistics* 1/2: 129-157. 1980.

Scotton, C. M. and J. Bernsten. 'Natural conversations as a model for textbook dialogue.' *Applied Linguistics* 9/4: 372-384. 1988.

Searle, J. R. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press. 1969.

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

Stubbs, M. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.* Oxford: Blackwell. 1983.

Taborn, S. 'The transactional dialogue: misjudged, misused, misunderstood.' *ELT Journal* 37/3: 207-212. 1983.

Tomalin, B. and S. Stempleski. *Cultural Awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1993.

Tomlinson, B. 'Materials Development.' In: Carter, R. and D. Nunan (eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages*: 66-71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.

Tschirner, E. 'Language acquisition in the classroom: the role of digital video.' *CALL* 14/3-4: 305-319. 2001.

Voller, P. and S. Widdows. 'Feature films as text: a framework for classroom use.' *ELT Journal* 47/4: 342-353. 1993.

Wardhaugh, R. *How Conversation Works*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1985.

White, R. 'Saying please: pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction.' *ELT Journal* 47/3: 193-202. 1993.

Widdowson, H. G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1978.

Widdowson, H. G. *Explorations in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1979.

Widdowson, H. G. 'Knowledge of language and ability for use.' *Applied Linguistics* 10/2: 128-137. 1985.

Widdowson, H. G. *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1990.

Williams, M. and R. Burden. *Psychology for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1997.

Winskowski, C. 'Topicalization work in telephone conversations.' *International Journal of Psycholinguistics* 4/1: 77-93. 1977.

Wray, A. 'Formulaic sequences in second language teaching: principle and practice.' *Applied Linguistics* 21/4: 463-489. 2000.

Appendix 1   'More Listening'

A. Listen and choose the one that describes Peter best.

    (a) strong and hardworking

    (b) friendly and easygoing

    (c) patient and helpful

B. Listen again and put the pictures in the correct order.

[5 pictures]

(An *et al.*, 2002: 187)

<Listening Script>

1 A: Oh, I remember this story! Don't you?

2 B: It looks familiar but I'm not sure.

3 A: Well, first, Peter was walking along the wall at sunset.

4 B: OK. Then what?

5 A: He saw a hole in the wall and put his finger in it.

6 B: Oh, yes. I remember now. He had to sit there all night without sleeping so the water wouldn't come in.

7 A: Yeah, and a man found him in the morning

8 B: Then the wall was fixed and Peter became a hero.

Appendix 2   <Sample 1>
Transactional talk in a bookshop (from *Notting Hill*)

_ Setting: At a bookshop (Length: 3mins 30secs)

_ Participants: William (a bookshop owner), Anna (an actress), a thief

_ Context: Anna, a world-famous American film star, comes into William's bookshop in London.

1 William: Uhum can I help you at all?

2 Anna: No, thanks. I'll just, look around.

3 William: Fine.

(Anna wanders over to a shelf as he watches her and picks out a quite smart coffee table book.)

4 William: Uh THAT book's really not great. Just in case you know browsing turned to buying [laughs] ah you'd be wasting your money. But if it's TURkey you're interested in erm THIS one on the other hand is VERY good erm I think the man who wrote it has actually BEEN to Turkey which helps erm there is also a very amusing incident with a kebab erm which is one of many amusing incidents.

5 Anna: Thanks. I'll think about it.

6 William: Or in the bigger hardback variety there is uh…*(William suddenly spies something odd on the small TV monitor behind him. He sees a person trying to steal a book.)* Erm sorry can you just give me a second. *(Goes to the thief.)*

7 William: Excuse me!

8 Thief: Yes?

9 William: BAD news.

10 Thief: What?

11 William: Ah we've got a security camera in this bit of the shop.

12 Thief: So?

13 William: So, I saw you put that book down your trousers.

14 Thief: What book?

15 William: The one down your trousers.

16 Thief: I don't have a book down my trousers.

17 William: RIght. I tell you what um I'll CALL the police and um what can I say if I'm wrong about the whole book down the trousers scenario I I really apologise.

18 Thief: Okay. WHAT if, I did have a book down my trousers?

19 William: Well uh iDEALly when I went back to the desk you'd reMOve the Cadogan guide to Bali from your trousers and uh either WIpe it and PUT it back or BUY it. I'll SEE you in a sec. *(Goes back to Anna.)* Sorry about that.

20 Anna: That's fine. I was gonna steal one but now I've changed my mind. [<William> [laughs]] OH, signed by the author I see.

21 William: Erm, yeah, couldn't stop him. If you can find an UNsigned one it's worth an absolute fortune. [<Anna> [smiles]] *(Suddenly the thief is there.)*

22 Thief: Excuse me.

23 Anna: Yes.

24 Thief: Can I have your autograph?

25 Anna: Ah, sure, ah *(borrowing William's pen)* [<William> Yes] what's your name?

26 Thief: Rufus.

(Anna signs his scruffy piece of paper. He tries to read it.)

27 Thief: What does it say?

28 Anna: That's my signature and above it it says 'Dear Rufus you belong in jail.'

29 Thief: Good one… Do you want my phone number?

30 Anna: Tempting, but, NO, thank you. *(Thief leaves.)* *(To William)* I will take this one. *(She hands William a note and the book he said was not great.)*

31 William: Oh RIGHT right so uh well on second thoughts erm maybe it's not that bad after all. Actually it's a sort of CLAssic really. None of those CHILdish kebab stories you find in so many books these days. And erm I tell you I'll throw in one of these for free. *(drops one of the signed books in the bag)* Useful for uh fighting fires, wrapping fish that sort of thing. [<Anna> [smiles]]

32 Anna: Thanks.

33 William: Pleasure. *(Anna leaves.)*

Appendix 3   <Sample 2>
Greeting and introducing people: in informal context (from *Notting Hill*)

_ Setting: Max and Bella's house (Length: 2mins 47secs)

_ Participants: William, Anna (a film star), Max (William's friend), Bella (William's friend and Max's wife), Honey (William's little sister), Bernie (William's friend)

_ Context: While Max and Bella are preparing for a birthday dinner for Honey, guests arrive one after another. William brings Anna to the dinner as a date. As they meet, they greet each other and William introduces Anna to his friends and sister.

1	Max:	He's bringing a girl?
2	Bella:	Miracles do happen.
3	Max:	Does the girl have a name?
4	Bella:	Don't know. He wouldn't say.
5	Max:	*(Smoke in the oven)* Oh CHRIST! What is going on in there?
		(The bell rings.) OH GOD.
		(Max heads for the door, opens it and turns back to the kitchen.)
6	Max:	*(without looking at William and Anna)* Hi, come on in, vague food crisis.
7	Bella:	Hiya! Sorry, the guinea fowl is proving more complicated than expected.
8	William:	He's cooking guinea fowl?
9	Bella:	Don't even ask.
10	Anna:	Hi.
11	Bella:	HI! GOOD Lord you're the spitting image of =
12	William:	=BELla! This is Anna.
13	Bella:	…Right.
14	Max:	Okay. Crisis over.
15	William:	MAX! This is Anna.
16	Anna:	Hi.
17	Max:	Hello, Anna *(recognising her)* Scott. HAVE SOME wine.
18	Anna:	Thank you.
19	Max:	*(Doorbell goes.)* I'll get it.
20	William:	*(To Anna)* Red or white?
21	Honey:	*(Max opens the door)* Oh.
22	Max:	Hi.

23 Honey: Hi. *(Honey does a little pose, wearing a nice dress.)*

24 Max: OH Yes. Happy birthday.

25 Honey: Thank you.

26 Max: Look, your brother has brought this girl.

27 Honey: *(Walking into the room)* Hi guys. *(On seeing Anna, surprised)* OH HOly FUck.

28 William: Hon, this is Anna. Anna, this is Honey. She's my baby sister.

29 Anna: Oh hi.

30 Honey   Oh god, this is one of those key moments in life. When it's possible you can be really genuinely cool and I, I'm going to fail just a HUNdred perCENt. I, I ABSOLUTEly TOTALly and UTTERly aDORE you and I JUst think you are the most beautiful woman in the world, AND MOre importantly I, I GENUINEly believe and I've believed for some time now that that uh WE could be best friends. So, what do you think?

31 Anna: Ah haha [smiles] ah LUCKY me. [<Honey> [laughs]]

             Uh well *(handing Honey a present)* Happy birthday.

32 Honey: Oh you gave me a present. We're best friends already then. MARRY WILL! He's a really nice guy then we can be sisters.

33 Anna: [smiles] I'll think about it.

             (The front door bell goes.)

34 Max: That'll be Bernie. *(opening the door)*   Hi.

35 Bernie: Hi. I'm sorry I'm so late. Bollocksed up at work again I fear. Millions down the drain.

36 Max: Well done. *(They enter the room.)*

37 Max: BERNIE, this is ANna.

38 Bernie: Hello, Anna. Delighted to meet you.

39 Anna: And you.

40 Bernie: *(He doesn't recognize her and turns to Honey.)* Honey Bunny!

             (singing) Happy birthday to you. *(To Bella)* Hi, Bella

41 Bella: Hi.

             (Bernie kisses Honey on her cheek and hands her a present.)

42 Bernie: *(To Honey)* Um it it it's a hat. You don't have to wear it or anything.

             (To William) Hi, Will!

43 William: Hi!… *(Bernie picks up nuts and eating them still without noticing anything.)*

             (To Bernie) Hi… hi.

44 Bernie: What?

45 Max: WINE, Bernie?

46 Bernie: Mm.

Appendix 4   <Sample 3>
Getting to know people: opening and developing a conversation (from *Notting Hill*)

_ Setting: Max and Bella's house (Length: 1min 7secs)

_ Participants: Bernie (William's friend), Anna (a film star)

_ Context: Not recognising the famous film star, Bernie begins talking with Anna.

1 Bernie: SO uh TELL me um Anna. What do you do?

2 Anna: I'm an ACTress.

3 Bernie: OH SPLENdid.

4 Anna: What do you do?

5 Bernie: I'm actually in the stockmarket myself so uh not really similar fields. [smiles] THOUGH UM Um I have done the odd bit of amateur stuff um uh P.G. Wodehouse uh farce, all that, you know, *(with acting voice)* "Careful there, vicar!" [<Bernie and Anna> [laugh]]

6 Bernie: ALways imagined it's a pretty tough job though, acting, I mean the WAges are a SCANdal, aren't they?

7 Anna: They can be.

8 Bernie: I see friends from university, CLEVER chaps. Been in the business longer than you, they're SCRAPing by on seven, eight thousand a YEar. [frowns] It's no life. [<Anna> [looks down]]

9 Bernie: WHAT sort of ACTing do you do?

10 Anna: Films, mainly.

11 Bernie: OH SPLENdid. OH WELL DONE. [<Anna> [smiles, nodding]]

12 Bernie: How's the PAY in movies? I mean, LAST film you did, what did you get paid?

13 Anna   Fifteen million dollars.

14 Bernie: *(Surprised)* Right… So, that's… mm fairly GOOD.

15 Max: Right! I think we're ready.

Appendix 5   <Sample 4>
Talking about self: interactional talk (from *Notting Hill*)

_ Setting: Max and Bella's house (Length: 3mins 46secs)

_ Participants: Max, Bella, Bernie, Honey, William, Anna

_ Context: After a birthday dinner for Honey, each of them talks about how each deserves to get the last brownie.

1 Max: Having you here, Anna, firmly establishes what I've long suspected that we really are the most DESperate lot of underachievers.

2 Bernie: Shame!

3 Max: I'm not saying it's a bad thing, in fact, I think it's something we should take pride in. I'm going to give the LAST brownie as a PRIze to the saddest act here.

4 William: Uh huh. Bern! [<All> [laugh]]

5 Bernie: Yeah all right all right well obviously it's me, isn' it? I mean, I work in the City in a job I don't understand and everyone keeps getting promoted above me. And I haven't had a girlfriend since well since PUberty. And, NObody fancies me, and if these cheeks get any chubbier, they never will.

6 Honey: NONsense. I fancy you.

7 Bernie: Really?

8 Honey: YEAH! Or I did before you got so fat. [<All> [laugh]]

9 Max: You see and unless I'm much mistaken, your job still pays you rather a lot of money whilst HONEY here earns 20 pence a week flogging her guts out in London's worst record store.

10 Honey: YES! And I haven't got hair. I've got feathers and I've got funny goggly eyes and I'm attracted to cruel men and actually NO one will marry me because um my boobies have actually started shrinking.

11 Max: You see, inCREDIBLy sad. =

12 Bella: =Yeah, but on the other hand, her best friend is Anna Scott.=

13 Honey: =Oh well that's true. I can't deny it. I mean she NEEDS me, what can I say? [<All> [laugh]]

14 Bella: And most of her limbs work whereas I'm stuck in this thing day and night in a house full of ramps and to add insult to SERIous injury… I've totally given up

smoking, my FAVOURITE thing, and um well the truth is... we can't have a baby.

(Dead silence.)

15 William: Bella!

16 Bella: C'est la vie... *(Bella and Max watch each other with sad eyes.)* STILL um we're LUCKy in LOTS of ways, but surely that's worth a brownie. [laughs]

17 Max: WELL, I don't KNOW. Look at William. VERY unsuccessful professionally. [<Bella> That's true.] DIvorced. USED to be handsome, now kind of squidgy around the edges. [<All> [laugh]] And ABSOLutely certain never to hear from Anna again once she's heard that his nickname at school [<William> No don't.] was   FLOppy.

18 Bernie: FLOppy. [<All> [laugh]]

19 William: You DID, I can't believe it, you did. [<All> [laugh]]

20 William: Thanks VERY much. Thank you. Well at least I get the last brownie, right?

21 Max: Come on, yeah, I think you get it.

22 Anna: OH WAIT! What about ME? *(Everybody is surprised. Silence.)*

23 Max: I'm sorry? You think YOU deserve the brownie.

24 Anna: [laughs] Well, a SHOT at it at least uh?

25 William: Well you'll have to PROVE it. I mean this is a very very good brownie. I'm gonna FIGHT for it.

26 Anna: I've been on a diet every day since I was nineteen, which basically means I've been hungry for a decade. [<All> [laugh]] I've had a series of not-nice boyfriends, one of whom hit me. Uh and EVERY TIME I get my heart broken the newspapers SPLASH it about as though it's ENTERTAINment. [laughs] And, it it's taken TWO, RAther PAINful, operations to get me LOOKing like this.

27 Honey: Really?

28 Anna: Mm really. *(points her chin)* [<William> [laughs]] *(points her nose)* And one day not long from now, my LOOKS WILL go, they will discover I CAN'T act, and I will, become some sad middle-aged woman who, LOOKS a bit like someone who was FAmous for a while.

(Silence. All look at her.)

29 Max: No! NICE try, gorgeous but you don't fool anyone. [<All> [laugh]]

30 Bernie: Nah.

31 William: PaTHEtic effort to hog the brownie. [<All> [laugh]]

Appendix 6   <Sample 5>
Leave-taking and closing rituals (from *Notting Hill*)

_ Setting: Max and Bella's house (Length: 1min)

_ Participants: Max, Bella, Honey, Bernie, William, Anna

_ Context: Anna and William leave after Honey's birthday dinner.

1 Anna: Thank you for SUCH a terrific time.

2 Max: I'm delighted. *(Anna pecks on Max's cheek. Max loves this.)*

3 Anna: That's a great tie.

4 Max: Now you're lying.

5 Anna: Okay. It's true. I TOLD you I was bad at acting.

6 Anna: *(To Bella)* It was lovely to meet you. *(pecks on Bella's cheek)*

7 Bella: Yeah, and you and you. I'll WAIT until you've gone before I tell him you're a
               vegetarian.

8 Max: No!

9 Anna: Ah… Oh… [chuckles] *(To Honey)* Good night.=

10 Honey: =Good night. I'm SO sorry about the LOO thing. I meant to leave but I just,
               LOOK, RING me if you need someone to go shopping with. I know lots of
               nice cheap places, I mean not that money necessarily. It was just so nice to

11 Anna: meet you.

12 Honey   Happy birthday. [<Honey> Thank you.] You are my style guru.=

13 William: =Oh. Sorry can I just…*(hugs Anna)* Oh thanks.
               Leave her.

14 Anna: *(Anna and William head out.)*
               Good night everyone.

15 All: *(All head out together with Anna and William)*

16 William: *(Greetings are overlapped.)* <?> Bye. <?> Cheers. <William> Bye.

17 All: *(To Max and Bella)* See you in a couple of days. [<Honey> Bye guys.] See

you. <William> I CALL ya.= [<Bella>= Yeah.] <Honey> Bye, Anna. <Anna> Bye. <?> Take care. <Bernie> *(To Anna)* Love your work. <William> Bye. Bye, Hon. <?> Take care. <William> Good night. <?> Good night. <William> Bye- bye.

Appendix 7 <Sample 6>
At a buffet: greeting, and talking with a stranger
(from *Bridget Jones's Diary*)

_ Setting: At a turkey curry buffet at Pam's house (Length: 4mins 50secs)

_ Participants: Bridget, Pam (Bridget's mother), Bridget's father, Una (Pam's neighbour), Geoffrey (Pam's neighbour, Una's husband), Mark (a barrister), Mrs. Darcy (Mark's mother)

_ Context: On New Year's Day, Bridget visits her mother's.

[<Bridget> (Voice-over) It all began on New Year's Day in my THIRTY-SECond year of being SINgle. Once again, I found myself ON MY OWn and going to my mother's annual turkey curry buffet. EVERY year she tries to fix me up with some bushy-haired, middle-aged bore, and I feared this year would be NO exception.]

1 Pam: There you are, dumpling. *(Pecks)*

[<Bridget> (Voice-over) My mum, a strange creature from the time when a GHERkin was still the height of sophistication.]

2 Una: Doilies, Pam? Hello, Bridget.

3 Pam: Third drawer from the top, Una. Under the mini gherkins.

(To Bridget with excited look) By the way, the DARcys are here. They brought MARK with them. [<Bridget> (Voice-over) Ah, here we go.] You remember Mark? YOU used to play in his paddling pool. He's a BARRISter, VERy well off.

4 Bridget: No, I don't remember.

5 Pam: He's diVORced, apparently. His wife was Japanese, very cruel race. NOW, what are you going to put on?

6 Bridget: This.

7 Pam: Oh, don't be silly, Bridget. You'll never get a boyfriend if you look like you've WANDERed out of Auschwitz. Now, run upstairs. Laid out something LOVELY on your bed. Tsk. [sighs]

<At turkey curry buffet>

[<Bridget> (Voice-over) Great. I was wearing a carpet.]

8 Geoffrey: Here she is. *(Singing and staggering)* My little Bridget.

9 Bridget: Hi, Uncle Geoffrey. HHHHH*(Pecking)* Hmm [<Geoffrey> Hmhm.]

10 Geoffrey: Had a drink?

11 Bridget: No.

12 Geoffrey: No? Come on, then. [<Bridget> (V.O.) Actually, not my uncle. Someone who insists I CALL him uncle while he gropes my ass and asks me the question DREaded by all singletons.] So, how's your love life?

13 Bridget: SUper. THANKs, Uncle G.

14 Geoffrey: Still no fellow then eh? All right, then.

15 Una: You career girls can't put it off forever you know. [<Bridget> Hmm] Tick-tock, tick-tock.

(Bridget goes towards her father.)

16 Bridget: Hello, Dad.

17 Dad: Hello, DARling. *(Pecks)*

18 Bridget: How's it going?

19 Dad: Torture. *(Watching Pam)* Your mother's trying to fix you up with some diVORcé. [<Bridget> Uhh.] Human-rights barrister, pretty NASTY beast, apparently. [<Bridget> *(Watching Mark's back)* (Voice-over) HOO! DING-DONG! Maybe this time Mum had got it RIGHT.]

20 Pam: Come on. Why don't we see if Mark fancies a gherkin?

21 Dad: *(In a whisper)* Good luck.

22 Pam: *(Approaching Mark)* Mark? [<Bridget> (Voice-over) Maybe this was the mysterious Mr. Right I'd been waiting my whole life to meet.] You remember Bridget? [<Bridget> *(On seeing Mark's reindeer jumper, Bridget gets disappointed.)* (Voice-over) Maybe NOT.] She used to run around your lawn with no clothes on, remember?

23 Mark: Uh no, not as SUch. *(Awkward silence)*

24 Una:	COME and look at your gravy, Pam. I think it's going to need sieving.
25 Pam:	Of course it doesn't need SIEving. Just STIR it, Una. *(Una sends her some signal.)* YES, of COURSE. I'll be RIGHt there. *(To Bridget and Mark)* Sorry. Lumpy gravy calls.
	(Pam leaves them.)
26 Bridget:	[sighs] So [chuckles]
27 Mark:	*(brusquely)* SO.
28 Bridget:	You staying at your parents' for New Year?
29 Mark:	Yes. [<Bridget> Mmm.] *(stiffly)* You?
30 Bridget:	Oh no no no. I was in London at a party last night so, I'm afraid I'm a bit hung OVer, wish I could be lying with my HEad in a TOILet like all normal people. [chuckles] Ah *(Mark clearly doesn't like this.)* New Year's resolution, DRINK less, *(watching her cigarette)* oh and QUIT smoking mm [chuckles] [<Mark> mm] Oh [chuckles] and keep New Year's resolutions, [chuckles] oh and uh [chuckles] *(Poking Mark in his chest)* stop talking terrible nonsense to strangers. In fact, STOP talking full stop. [chuckles]
31 Mark:	*(insolently)* Yes, well, perhaps it's time to eat. *(walks away)*
	[<Bridget> Mmm.]
	<Mark talks with his mother.>
32 Mrs.Darcy :	ApPARently she lives just 'round the CORner from you. Mother, I do NOT NEED a blind date. ParTICULarly not with some
33 Mark:	VERbally inCONtinent SPINster who SMOKES like a CHIMney, DRINKS like a FIsh and DRESSes like her MOther.
	(Mrs. Darcy notices Bridget. Bridget overheard his talk and got embarrassed.)
	(With awkward smile) Yummy, turkey CUrry, my FAVourite. *(walks away)*
34 Bridget:	

Appendix 8   <Sample 7>
Making a request (from *Bridget Jones's Diary*)

_ Setting: At a restaurant (Length: 25secs)

_ Participants: Tom and Jude (Bridget's friends), An elderly man (other customer in a restaurant)

_ Context: Bridget and her friends are chatting while having dinner at a restaurant.

1 Tom: Exactly. [<Jude> [chuckles]]

2 Man: Excuse me. I'm TERRibly sorry to INTERRUPT you when you're having dinner. It's just   that…

3 Tom: YES. Yes, it was me. Yes. Nine years ago. No current plans to record anything else. Thank you so much.=

4 Man: =Oh, it's just that ahem your your chair is on my wife's coat. [<All> [chuckle]] Your your chair on the coat…

5 Tom: *(embarrassed)* Of course it is, of course it is. I'm so terribly sorry.

6 Man: Thank you so much. Thank you.

Appendix 9   <Sample 8>
Openings, greetings and introductions
(from *Bridget Jones's Diary*)

_ Setting: At the launch party for a book (Length: 1min 22secs)

_ Participants: Bridget, Mark, Perpetua (Bridget's working colleague), Natasha (Mark's friend, an attorney)

_ Context: Bridget comes across Mark at the party again. Both of them do not have a good feeling about each other since the first meeting at the buffet.

1 Bridget: What are YOU doing here?

2 Mark: I've been asking myself the same question. [<Bridget> Hm] I came with a colleague. So how are you?

3 Bridget: Well, apart from being VEry disappointed not to see my favourite reindeer JUMPer again, I'm well.

4 Perpetua: ANYone going to introduce me?

5 Bridget: (Voice-over) Ah! introduce people with thoughtful details. "Perpetua. Hm. This is Mark Darcy. Mark's a prematurely middle-aged PRICK with a cruel-raced ex-wife. Perpetua's a fat-ass old bag who spends her time bossing me around." Maybe not.

6 Perpetua: Anyone going to introduce me?

7 Bridget: Ah, Perpetua. Hmm. Ah, this is Mark Darcy. Mark's a TOP BARRIster. He comes from Grafton Underwood. Perpetua is one of my work colleagues.

8 Perpetua: Why, Mark, I know you by reputation of course.

9 Mark: Ah, Natasha. This is Bridget Jones. Bridget, this is Natasha. Natasha is a top attorney and specialises in family law. Bridget works in publishing and used to play NAked in my paddling pool.

10 Natasha: How odd. [<Bridget> *(little bit embarrassed)* Hmm]

11 Natasha: Perpetua, how's the house hunt going?

12 Perpetua: Disaster. Can't even go into it with you. By the by, that man is GORgeous.

13 Natasha: Ah yes Mark. Just give me time, give me time. [<Perpetua> [chuckles]]

Appendix 10   <Sample 9>
             Repairing relationship: expressing attitude 1
             (from *Bridget Jones's Diary*)

_ Setting: At a friend's house (Length: 2mins 30secs)

_ Participants: Bridget, Mark

_ Context: Bridget had made a funny mistake while reporting news. After the dinner with
           couples, she is going to leave earlier than others. Mark comes out to talk to her.

1 Mark: *(Walking down the steps)* I VERY much enjoyed your Lewisham fire report by
                the way.

2 Bridget: Thank you.

3 Mark: *(almost whispering or talking to himself)* I just yeah well... so… it didn't work
                out with Daniel Cleaver?

4 Bridget: No, it didn't.

5 Mark: I'm deLIGHTed to hear it.

6 Bridget: Look, are you and Cosmo in this together? I mean YOU seem to go out of your
                way to try to make me feel like a comPLETE idiot every time I see you, and
                you REALly NEEDn't bother. I already feel like an idiot most of the time
                anyway, with or without a fireman's pole. *(Doorbell buzzes.)* That'll be my
                taxi. Good night.

7 Mark: LOOK! Um umm I'm SOrry if I've been...

8 Bridget: What?

9 Mark: I don't think you're an idiot at all. I mean there ARE elements of the ridiculous
                about you. Your Mother's pretty interesting. And you really are an
                aPPALLingly bad public speaker. And um you tend to let whatever's in your
                HEAD come out of your MOUTH without MUch consideration of the
                consequences. I REALised that when I met you at the TURkey CURry BUffet
                that I was unforGIVAbly rude and WEARing a reindeer JUMPer that my
                mother had given me the day before. But the thing is um what I'm trying to say
                VERy inarticulately is... that um, in fact, perhaps, despite appearances... I
                LIKE you, VERY much.

10 Bridget: Ah, apart from the smoking, and the drinking, and the vulgar mother, and the
                verbal diarrhoea.=

11 Mark: =No. I like you very much, just as you are. [<Bridget> [surprised look]]

12 Natasha: Mark, we REALly are making progress on the case in here. Jeremy's had a

MOST brilliant idea.

13 Mark: Right. Right… I must go uh because… well… bye.

Appendix 11   <Sample 10>
Repairing relationship: expressing attitude 2
(from *Bridget Jones's Diary*)

_ Setting: At the Darcys' ruby wedding party (Length: 2mims 37secs)

_ Participants: Bridget, Mark, Natasha

_ Context: Bridget gets to know the truth about the relationship between Darcy, his ex-wife and Daniel. Bridget comes to see Mark at his parents' ruby wedding party.

1   Mark: *(To others)* Sorry. One moment.

2   Bridget: Thank you for inviting me.

3   Mark: I DIDN't. Must've been my parents.

4   Bridget: So...

5   Mark: So.

6   Natasha: Hello, Bridget. Didn't know you were coming. Mark, your father wants to begin A.S.A.P.

7   Mark: Oh, does he? Right. Well uh...

8   Natasha: Come on, Mark. Be helpful, please. The caterers have totally screwed up. Does nothing work outside of London? Hmm? Apparently not huh.

9   Mark: *(To Bridget)* Well I'd better... *(Turns around)*

10 Bridget: LIsten uh I owe you an apology, about Daniel. He said you ran off with his fiancée and left him broken hearted, he said.

11 Mark: AH… No it was the other way around. It was uh, MY, WIfe, my heart.

12 Bridget: Sorry… That's why you always acted so strangely around him uh and beat him to a pulp quite rightly… well done.

13 Mark: WELL UM…

14 Bridget: Can can we just um pop out there, for a moment?

                [<Man> Quite delightful, isn't it, my dear? <Woman> Yes.]

15 Bridget: OK. I just have something that, I want to say. Um YOU once said that you liked me just as I am and I just wanted to say, likewise. I mean there are STUpid things your mum buys you. *(Watching Mark's necktie with snowmen)* Tonight's another CLAssic hmm. You're haughty and you ALways say the wrong thing in EVEry situation and I SERIously believe that YOU should REthink the length of your side burns. But, you're a nice man and... I like you… So if you wanted to pop by sometime that might be nice… more than

16 Mark: nice.

             Right… Crikey. *(Bell rings.)* [<Voice-over> Ladies and gentleman. Could I have

17 Bridget: your attention for a moment, please?] Excuse me.

             …Of course.

Appendix 12   <Sample 11>
Talking about others (from *Bridget Jones's Diary*)

_ Setting: At a restaurant (Length: 1min 20secs)

_ Participants: Bridget, Daniel (Bridget's boss)

_ Context: Bridget and Daniel are having dinner together. Both of them know Mark, and Bridget asks Daniel how he knows Mark.

1 Bridget: So how do you feel about this whole situation in Chechnya? Isn't it a nightmare?

2 Daniel: I couldn't give a fuck, Jones. Now, look. How do you know uhm Arsey Darcy?

3 Bridget: Hmm Apparently I used to um run 'round naked in his paddling pool.

4 Daniel: Hmm I BET you did, you dirty bitch.

5 Bridget: What about you?

6 Daniel: Same. Yeah. [<Bridget> [chuckls]] No, no, I was um best man at his wedding. Um knew him from Cambridge. He was a mate.

7 Bridget: Then what?

8 Daniel: And then uh… NOThing.

9 Bridget: You don't need to protect him. He's no friend of mine.

10 Daniel: Well um then many years later, I made the somewhat catastROPHic mistake of introducing him to my FIANcée… and um... I couldn't say in all honesty I've ever quite forGIVen him.

11 Bridget: GOD! So, he's a nasty BAStard, and a DULL BAStard.

12 Daniel: YES yes I think that's fair. ANYway, fuck him, listen, don't let him ruin our evening. Why don't you have some more wine and tell me more about practicing French-kissing with the other girls at school because that's a very good story.

13 Bridget: It wasn't French-kissing.

14 Daniel: Don't care. Make it up. That's an order, Jones. [<Bridget> [laughs]]

Appendix 13   Lesson plan

_ Materials: *Notting Hill* sample 1 (see Appendix 2)

_ Level: Intermediate and above

_ Time: 50 minutes

_ Aim: To make students aware that the variables in interlocutors and settings affect speech acts, and that hedges, discourse markers and fillers have communicative value and play an important role in achieving politeness.

_ Preparation: From the completed film script, remove hedges including modal expressions, discourse markers and fillers used in William's utterances and leave the gaps. Make a set of role cards which tell students who are playing Anna, as a cooperative conversational partner, how they generate more than one response.

_ Procedure

1. Preliminary activities (5mins): Show students the introductory part of the film and tell them to generate words and phrases related to the situation by free association.

2. Awareness-raising activities (35mins)

    (a) Show the clip of the film which is the focus of the lesson, then ask students what is interesting in this conversation compared with normal conversation at a bookshop.

    (b) Give out the film script with gaps to students and tell them to divide the conversation into five small units by distinguishing different interlocutors and identifying topics.

    (c) Tell the groups of students to study the script together concentrating on the length of the turn and what participants are doing with the language, i.e., functions of the utterances.

    (d) Ask the students to fill in the gaps while listening to the conversation again. After that, encourage students to interpret the roles of the gapped expressions. Explain that they need to think about his different attitudes towards Anna and the thief.

    (e) Ask the groups to generate strategies for showing politeness.

3. Follow-up activities (10mins): Divide students into pairs. Tell them that Anna is now an everyday customer and she needs to cooperate with William in developing the conversation. Give out the role cards to students playing Anna and ask them to follow the instructions

written on it. Encourage them to use hedges, markers and fillers. After role-playing, ask students to briefly discuss the strategies used.