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Abstract

This thesis aims to clarify what everyday communication and classroom communication have in common rather than note and compare their differences. First the author identifies conversation resources such as speech, topic, body motion, manner of place and time that seem to be involved both in everyday communication and classroom communication. Then the author describes what additional resources characterize teacher-student conversation in English classes.

Conventional studies of classroom conversation have been primarily devoted to the elucidation of the special nature of classroom talk typical of the I-R-E structure. These studies have been carried out by dividing the participants into two categories, namely teachers and students and analyzing the contents and methods of turn-taking found in their conversations. Such studies, the premise of which is the analysis of the teacher-student power relationship, are well suited to portraying the special characteristics of this teacher-student relationship in the classroom, but they fail to provide a comprehensive model of communication that includes everyday communication. Therefore, this thesis is intended to analyze communication in the classroom and other places of activity from a single point of view by examining elements relating to the formation of communication such as the rhythm of conversation, the style of speech, and the rules specific to places, both inside and outside the classroom.

In the first chapter, we will verify that conversational rhythm is "the organization of verbal and non-verbal communication" (Erickson 1982). Taking
the dinner table talk of an American family as a case study, we will consider how
the rhythm of our daily conversation, which involves not only speech but also
non-verbal activities such as laughter, nodding and gesture, is created in the course
of interaction. In addition, this family's dinner table talk indicates that
time-based coordination has a significant place in generating and maintaining
conversation.

In the second chapter, we will state that the emphasis on the verbal and
non-verbal rhythm in our everyday life, as seen in the American dinner table
example and telephone conversation discussed in the first chapter, also occurs
during English classes in Japan. In other words, we will observe, between
teachers and students and among students themselves, the acts of adjusting to the
speech rhythm of the other party when turn-taking and of changing the length of
one's speech and rhythm according to circumstances (ex. solo utterance or the
utterance in the sequence of other speakers etc).

In chapter three, we will argue that the teacher's style of speech and the rules
of the classroom are the prominent resources that characterize the communication
in the classroom. First, we will focus on teacher's entrusting behavior which
does not have instructive intention such as evaluating or questioning students into
their classes. In spite of the ambiguity of teacher's utterances, indeed because of
the ambiguity, the students seem to be encouraged to respond to the teachers
without being directed. From these observations, we can conclude that teacher's
entrusting speech style is one of the significant resources that contributes to the
maintenance and development of conversations in the classroom. We will also
examine whether or not the classroom rules hamper teacher-to-student entrusting
utterances and how the conversation rhythm helps to maintain and develop
communication between teachers and students in English classes. Some cases were observed where the timing of speech by students was delayed due to the classroom rules that require them to stand up before speaking. The rhythm of everyday conversation, in which a response is made immediately after a speaker's utterance or on the next beat as reported by Erickson & Schulz (1982), does not always reflect this style of communication in the classroom. A typical example of this is when a teacher calls on a particular student, s/he repeats the same question to all students, the students wait raising their hand until they are called on, and they stand up to answer when asked. It has become clear that this causes a delay in the timing of speech by students and that a pause occurs after the students have taken their turn. The sense of "commitment" in a typical classroom supports class work as a tacit rules and generate smooth classroom communication. At the same time, however, it is also one of the factors that prevent the students' use of free-flowing conversational English.

If communication like that found in everyday conversation is what English education aims to achieve, a necessary subject of research in English class language education should be how to identify and fill the gap between that goal and the status quo. In brief, this study attempts to offer some suggestions on how to conduct classes in such a way as to allow the rhythm of communication as generated by the traditional classroom practices to coexist well with the rhythm of everyday conversation.
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INTRODUCTION

When we say that “the students were communicating effectively” after observing an English language classroom, on what basis do we judge whether or not effective communication was established? Hans Christian Andersen’s fairy tale “Stupid Hans” is full of valuable insights into this question.

The story begins with a princess in a certain country issuing an official proclamation that she will take as her husband a person who can communicate well. As many as three sons of a certain lord come forward to compete to be the bridegroom. The two oldest are a master of Latin and a legal expert respectively. On the contrary, Hans, the youngest one, has no specialized knowledge or skills. Called “Stupid Hans,” he is laughed at by everyone. Hans and his brothers are summoned to an interview held at the castle to select the bridegroom. On their way to the castle Hans’s older brothers are absorbed in preparation for the interview, working out ideas in their heads for their speeches, never opening their mouths. Meanwhile, Hans picks up what he finds on the way and talks to his brothers many times, but they ignore him. However, despite the two older brothers’ serious and thoughtful preparation, it is Hans who is the choice of the princess. The reason: Hans can give answers and continue conversation. The other bridegroom candidates say to the princess in the interview, “It is too warm here in this room.” But they become unable to continue speaking the moment the princess responds saying, “It is because we are grilling young chickens on the stove.” Indeed, this is
quite an unexpected answer. Who would have thought that the royal family would do such a thing! Not surprised at her response, however, Hans takes the carcass of a crow that he picked up on his way to the castle, out of his pocket, and says, “Well, please grill this bird, too.” When asked “What shall we put the bird in?” Hans takes out a wooden shoe he also picked up on the way. When asked “What shall we baste it with?” he shows the mud that he had squeezed into his pocket. Hans wins the heart of the princess by carrying on a series of quick, well-timed verbal exchanges.

What makes Hans different from his brothers is that he cares about speaking with the princess, while Hans’ brothers are only interested in speaking at her unilaterally. For Hans’s brothers, “communicating well” is nothing more than preparing a speech based on their knowledge and reproduction of what they have practiced. While, for Hans, the act of communication involves exchanging responses with his conversational partner within the context, at a given time, in a given situation. He does not divide the act of speaking into a rehearsal and a public performance.

Development of practical communication ability is given as one of the learning goals of foreign language teaching. Considering communication skills in light of Andersen’s story, it may be said that practical communication is likened to the dialogue between Hans and the princess, and that practical communication skill is the ability to establish a relationship in which one can, like Hans, exchange situationally appropriate responses with another person.

It is necessary to reexamine the process of communication, in light of the view that communication is a highly time-and-situation-dependent behavior. So far, traditional studies of spoken discourse have not made reference to
matters involving time, such as rhythm and tempo of conversation. Rather, research has generally been concerned with the meanings of speech and turn taking in utterance based on written transcripts of the conversation, not unlike the study of written discourse. In other words, the research failed to deal with issues like the speaker's tone, where he or she talked fast or faltered, and how soon other interlocutors responded. With regard to this, Auer, Couper-Kuhlen and Mucller (1999) said that the conventional research is somewhat "frozen" and "time-neutral" (p.201). They further criticized that, from this "frozen" perspective, it is impossible to accurately portray the processes by which speakers interact to create discourse. Their research recognizes the dynamic characteristics of spoken discourse, such as the timing of interjections in conversation, when the speakers nod and how that timing is perceived by conversational participants. The researchers also argue that the conversational rhythm, in particular, often plays the vital role of a contextualization cue. For example, the speakers have the highest degree of rhythm synchronization in a telephone conversation immediately before finishing their conversation. The rapid-fire rhythm serves as a contextualization cue signaling that it is time to hang up the receiver.

Upon observing classroom discourse, Erickson (1996) points out that there is a certain rhythm pattern in verbal communication and non-verbal communication, such as nodding, gestures, and changes in posture, during class and that the teachers and students act in time with this rhythm. He also suggests that when the conversational rhythm changes or breaks down, the degree of students' concentration on the class and their subsequent understanding of what is being taught also changes. Furthermore, he says
that conversational rhythm is a phenomenon affected by knowledge of the topic, relationships among the participants and other invisible elements.

This thesis is aimed at clarifying how teachers and students share the same perception of time and thus how they engage in making conversation in a rhythmic framework. By analyzing discourse through the conversational rhythm, the degree of cooperation among participants in a class becomes clear. At the same time, it also leads us to examine how teachers and students make use of diverse conversational resources to maintain and develop conversation in English classrooms.
CHAPTER 1

The Rhythm of the Everyday Communication

1. 1 The Significance of the Rhythm in Communication

In Japanese, lively conversation is described with the phrases “ikiga au” and “hanashiga hazumu”. “Ikiga au”, literally translated, means that interlocutors are synchronizing their breathing. “Hanashiga hazumu” literally means that the conversation bounces. The word synchronize refers to the perfection of timing of action and its maintenance. The word bounce refers to the rhythmic movement and its repetition. Both expressions are related to the rhythm of human action. In other words, there is a sense of rhythm in lively conversation.

As for school classes, observers evaluate the rhythm of classroom conversation informally using such expressions as good rhythm or good flow and poor rhythm or poor flow. The classroom rhythm is generated by the series of rhythms of individual communicative acts between teacher and student and among students themselves. This research looks at English classroom communication not from the perspective of information exchange but from the standpoint of whether participants are trying to share the same rhythm. Rhythm does not simply occur as the by-product of the communication of meanings. The author’s view is that a certain rhythm and its repetition constitute a basis for communication. In this sense, dialogue is the act of trying to maintain the rhythm through the cooperation of those participating in
the discourse. Being able to speak in good rhythm and being able to interject in a timely manner while the other person is talking are not simply a matter of communication technique. Rather, such collaborative behaviors are communication itself.

1.2 Definition of the Rhythm of Communication

According to Erickson and Shultz (1982), the rhythm of communication is the “organization of verbal and non-verbal communication.” It refers to a rhythm being created through interactions, including non-verbal acts such as laughter, nodding and gesture. To put it another way, the rhythm of communication does not develop simply from the linguistic feature of time-stress in English. Rather, it is also created by the vocal and bodily rhythmic senses of interlocutors. A speaker adjusts the rhythm of her/his own speech and body movements to harmonize with those of her/his conversation partner.

Erickson and Shultz say that the rhythm of communication in English creates “mechanically measurable” repetition and that it continues with considerable metronomic time accuracy. They report the regular interval for English speakers is four beats in 10 seconds, plus or minus two beats. The appropriateness of this assertion is endorsed by many studies that observed the interaction between caretakers and their children (Beebe 1985; Gratler 1999, 2000; Malloch 1999, 2000). For example, Malloch reports that turn taking and the accompanying turn unit time (1.53 +/- 1 sec.) repeat regularly after observing the exchange of voices between a mother and her six-month old baby. Based on the observation of interaction between newborn infants and their
caretakers, Gratler also states that there were four continuous beats in 10 seconds in their interaction. These instances coincide with the regularity of communication in English as Erickson argues. As part of the communication issue dealt with in this thesis, a voice analysis was made and the existence of “rhythmic repetition” as described by Erickson et al. was confirmed.³

However, the rhythm mentioned in this paper refers not only to mechanically measurable time called “Chronos”, but also appropriate time called “Kairos”.⁴ “Kairos mean the right time—the now whose time has come.” (Erickson 1982, P.72) The Ecclesiastes poem begins with “To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven: a time to be born and a time to die...a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; [Ecclesiastes 3:1, 2 and 7].” In this poem, the Hebrew word translated as “time” in English corresponds to the Greek word Kairos, appropriate time. In a broad sense, Kairos provides organization, be it for life changing events or successive units of discourse. In the case of conversation, Kairos means the moment when interlocutors feel that something should happen next, for example, tactically important things such as appropriate timing of response.

From the perspective of music, Yako (2001) also defined rhythm as a combination of both Chronos and Kairos. He understood rhythm to be not only a phenomenon of sound but also a product of attention, that is how a person focuses her/his mind on the phenomenon. The rhythm patterns tell the hearer where to focus attention. Speech rhythms provide a foundation for speech and action.
1.3 The Rhythm of Everyday Conversation

1.3.1 Change of Rhythm in the Discourse

Let us imagine the following scenes: (1) You are trying on a bikini in a fitting room. Looking mournfully at your sagging belly in the dressing room mirror, you ask a store clerk, “How do I look?” After a long pause, the sales person says, “Oh, you look great!” (2) You find your colleagues whispering shoulder to shoulder in your office. You approach them and ask, “What happened?” Your colleagues respond quickly, repeating “Nothing,” “Nothing.” In the case of (1), do you believe the words of the store clerk? You will probably feel the salesperson stammered because the swimsuit did not really suit you. In the case of (2), you might suspect from the way your colleagues responded hastily that perhaps they were gossiping about you.

Silence and changes in the speed of utterance in communication sometimes prove to be more eloquent than the contents of the utterance. After all, when and how we talk is just as important as what we talk about in our daily conversations with others. The issues of when and how we speak are concerned with the elements of rhythm such as timing, pitch and speed of utterance, as well as the quality of voices and expressions. Erickson and Shultz (1982) emphasized the importance of when and how.

Conversationalists have two related practical problems in the conduct of talk together. One problem is when, specifically, to say what to whom. Another problem is how, specifically, to say what to whom. Most analysis of conversation by students of face-to-face interaction, regardless of disciplinary perspective, has been concerned with understanding the latter of these two problems of practice. But since conversation takes place in real time, the when of the action may be as fundamental a practical matter as the what of it. To “say” or to “listen” the right thing in the wrong time, verbally or nonverbally, can be as inappropriate—as inadequately social—as to say (or listen) the wrong thing in the right time. (p.76)
Observing a conversation between teachers and students, Erickson and Shultz stated that when the rhythm of conversation goes off track, those involved in the communication tend to get an unfavorable impression and may misunderstand each other. They argue that derailment of conversational rhythm, which is constituted by both verbal and non-verbal behaviors, is caused by such things as the absence of well-timed responses and a change in the tempo of utterance. In Figure 1, for instance, a student was asked, “How did you do in your 010 biology test?” The student answered “A” after an interval of two beats instead of answering immediately. In everyday conversation, a listener is normally expected to respond on the beat immediately after the last word of a speaker, that is “LRRM”, Listener Response Relevance Moment defined by Erickson and Schultz, or on the next beat at the latest. But, in this example, the student’s responses came later than normally anticipated. This “failure” to respond in the right time might have been interpreted by the counselor merely as an indication of unfamiliarity with the conversation. However, Erickson and Shultz reported that the students’ hesitation gave the counselor an unfavorable

C: Counselor (Teacher)  S: Students  . :  Pause

1  C:  .  .  .  Bi

2  C:  ology  one-on-one  .

3  S:  “A”  .

4  C:  Reading  one  Hundred?  

5  S:  “B”  .  .

Figure 1. Communication between American university tutors and students
impression of the student and that some students who had hesitated to answer in the interview failed the interactional mini-test, which was conducted experimentally after observation of counseling.

1.3.2 Co-established Rhythm in the Discourse

Auer et al. focused on the rhythm of dialogue in everyday communication in an analysis of telephone talks in their 1992 study. They observed telephone talks of English, German and Italian speakers from beginning to end. They found that all of the speakers had the best coordination in the rhythm (meaning they exchanged conversational turns smoothly) just before they put down the telephone. Auer et al. determined that the rapid-fire rhythm generated by the exchange of short words at the end of a conversation acts as a signal to end the conversation over the telephone. Therefore, it may be said that the rhythm of the telephone conversation plays the role of a contextualization cue that dictates the behavior of a speaker in a certain situation. When the two speakers bring the conversational rhythm to a high point, the rhythm serves as a sign to hang up the receiver.

A similar study conducted by Erickson (1992) indicates that conversation is maintained using various contextualization cues and through the coordination of verbal and non-verbal behaviors. Erickson analyzed an American family’s dinner table talk. Using a rhythm score, his research shows how the utterances and even the movements of the seven family members and their guests proceed in a certain rhythm throughout the meal (see Figure 2). From this rhythm score it can be seen that the utterances and physical movements of this family are continuing in two-four time without a break. Erickson gives three reasons
for the repetition of the conversation at a precise interval (0.85 seconds). (1) "The transition relevance point" lies on the beat next to a stressed syllable of earlier speaker’s utterance or on two beats behind and all speakers alternate in

※ Fa: Father, M: Mother, G: Guest, B: Brother, S: Sister

- B-1 represents the eldest brother. In this conversation there are four brothers who talk.
- The utterances are presented in measures of two beats each, with a time signature of 2/4. The numbers, 10~13 represent the measures.
- FP represents eater’s fork touched the plate. FM represents the food-laden fork touched the eater’s mouth.

**Figure 2.** Excerpt from family dinner table conversation

F. Erickson (1992), They know all the lines: Rhythmic organization and contextualization in a conversational listing routine. In P. Auer and A.D. Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language*, pp. 265-397.
giving utterance according to this rule. (2) The stress position of the speakers’ syllables often overlap. However, even when two or more speakers are taking turns speaking simultaneously, the conversation proceeds without this being perceived as interference when they are talking about the same topic. (3) Portioning out food, as well as talking and listening, are performed to the beat of the conversation. This family’s dinner table talk indicates that time-based coordination has a significant place in generating and maintaining conversation.
CHAPTER 2
The Rhythm of Classroom Conversation

2.1 Examination of a Japanese Junior High School English Class (1)

This chapter describes in what way a cadential organization in communication in the Japanese junior high school classroom is similar to that of the dinner table talk of the American family and the everyday telephone conversation discussed in Chapter 1.

The studies by Erickson (1995, 1996) observed the conversational rhythm in kindergarten and primary school classrooms. During story time, a 6 year-old kindergarten pupil, who was asked by a teacher how to read the letter “S” fell silent. When the child did not answer, three other children took turns and answered “S”, each in turn following the same beats. In a Spanish lesson in a primary school, where a child was called on to find a card with the number that a teacher pronounced in Spanish, the child pointed to the card with the timing of LRRM (Erickson 1982). Based on these findings Erickson states that rhythm acts as an indicator of the extent of a child’s comprehension.

The above instances show that each of the students sensed the timing of speech and action in the classroom so that one student could “rob” another student of her/his turn to speak or perform non-verbally in accordance with the established rhythm. In other words, in the above classes, the teachers and students shared the same time axis for the conversation. Erickson discussed various aspects of learning by examining the rhythm within classroom discourse.
As we have seen in Chapter 1, how we talk is just as important as what we talk about in daily conversation. If achieving practical communication is considered the primary aim of English teaching in Japanese classrooms, the way by which something is said is just as important as what is actually said. It can therefore be said that it is beneficial to observe the rhythm of classroom discourse.

2.2 Method

2.2.1 Subjects

The subject is an hour-long English class for third graders in junior high school in Shimane prefecture. An interview during the homeroom hour following the English class was also observed. The same Japanese teacher conducted both the English class and the interview in English.

2.2.2 Procedure and Data Analysis

A protocol was made from the VTR and all utterances made during the class were written down. Based on the protocol, the author then selected the parts of the protocol in which the teacher and students were making conversation. Their speech stream was examined and illustrated in a way that makes interval of stressed syllables clear. To find vocally stressed syllables and beats, the author received the guidance and checks of music specialists. The findings are summarized into a conversation score. From the score, two meaningful data were obtained. One was the beat or the regular interval of stressed syllables. (In Japanese, *haku.*) This then becomes the standard for the rhythm. The other was the perceptual beat. (In Japanese, *hyoushi.*) This was determined
by calculating how many times the pattern generated by the repetition of strong and weak beats appeared in the conversation. The perceptual beat is counted in measures.

To examine the more subtle speech rhythms in individual measures, one male student and one female student who spoke the longest were chosen. For one male student, the scene where he was speaking with the same teacher in a class one year ago was written down on the rhythm score and compared with his present speech rhythm. It seemed that his previous skill of utterance was not high, compared with his present level. An analysis was carried out to find out whether or not the student was sharing the conversational rhythm with the teacher one year ago. In the case of the female student, her utterance at the home room interview was written down on the rhythm score and compared with her utterance in the class to examine how her utterance rhythm had changed according to the situations: the differences of listener, time constraints and topic.

In the process of transposing the conversation into a protocol with beat, rhythm changes were found to have occurred sporadically throughout the score, but most of the conversation could be described by a two-four rhythm. The conversational score was numbered starting from the first measure. With regard to the speech where pitch changes were observed, the author noted down pitches up to three degrees above and below the standard musical scale set at the note D. Furthermore, accent marks were also noted down.

After this work, portions of the audio track from the videotape were played into a voice analyzer, which digitalizes waveforms in speech stream. The duration of the interval between stressed syllables in the teacher’s and student’s
utterances as well as the changes of the duration of the interval when the utterance alternates between the teacher and the student were measured by the machine.

2.3 Results

2.3.1 Voice Analysis

The results of the voice analysis showed that stressed syllables occurred at a regular time interval in the students' utterances. For example, in the case of the female student, excerpt 1, the duration of the interval between stressed syllables that occurred most frequently was 975 milliseconds (hereafter ms.) (see, Appendix 1). Therefore, 975 ms was taken as the standard length of interval for this student. Couper-Kuhlen et al. (1993, 1999) report that the variations of stressed positions with a 20% variation in time are hardly perceptible to humans. Therefore, if the variation remains within the 780 ms to 1070 ms range, the length between stressed syllables for this student will be perceived as being virtually the same. Except for in one case in which the student put emphasis on the word “so”, the standard interval was maintained repeatedly throughout her utterance.

As for the male student shown in Appendix 2, Excerpt 2, the most repeated interval was 794 ms and was thus taken as the standard length of interval for this student. Almost all stressed syllables fell within the 635 ms to 953 ms range, except for the moment where he paused to say “Ah.”

At the turn change, the student beginning to speak conformed to the rhythm of the teachers' utterance. It may be assumed that the students are adjusting to the teacher’s rhythm at the start of their speaking turn, as they realize that
teacher's rhythm is different from theirs. For instance, in Excerpt 2, when the teacher calls on the student and the student responds the interval between stressed syllables is 998ms, which is almost the same time interval as that of the teacher up to that time. This means that there was neither delay in the utterance of the student at the alternation of the turn nor did the student's utterance clash with the teacher's as may have happened if the student responded too hastily. When the teacher took his turn after the student's utterance, there was an interval of 726ms, slightly shorter than the teacher's standard measure of 998ms. This may be because the teacher adjusted to the shorter rhythm of the student’s utterance.

2.3.2 Timing of Utterances

Conversation scores of three students illustrated with beats (Appendix 3) shows that the beats in the dialogue are being created in a cooperative way. This dialogue is extracted from a scene where the teacher asks three students for their opinion after holding a one-on-one discussion about the question: “If a girl with a donation box is standing beside a juice vending machine, what would you do? Would you buy juice or give a donation?” Here the basis for the teacher-student dialogue is a 4-beat rhythm consisting of the repetition of a strong beat, a weak beat, a medium-strong beat, and a weak beat. It was also found that the timing of the utterance closely resembles that of the dinner table conversation in the American home.

In the classes mentioned above, there were several examples of timing similar to that of everyday conversation. For example, in Excerpt 3, Appendix 3, 3-1 at the turn 4P, Yukiko was momentarily at a loss for words and paused for
a beat when asked by the teacher: “Which would you put your coins in?” She missed the best timing of response, LRRM. However, she immediately uttered “A:h” and succeeded in getting into rhythm and connecting her turns. The teacher said to Tomo-chan, “Would you be a reporter?” and Tomo-chan managed to reply “A:h,” and took his turn quickly (Appendix 3, Excerpt 4, 3-2) at the turn 3P. Then he made a pause as if he was taking a breath and finally started speaking. At the turn 2P (Appendix 3, Excerpt 5, 3-3) Hayato answered “Ten-yen” immediately on the next beat when he heard only “How”, the first word of the teacher’s question “How much would you donate?” All these show that the three students spoke with the same timing as the American family’s dinner table talk not with that of the typical question and answer format between teacher and student (see Chapter 1). The teacher also never missed that timing throughout the entire dialogue.

The reason that the students could continue the dialogue without making a pause or disrupting the conversational rhythm is that the teacher inserted an appropriate injunction during the break in the students’ speech, thereby encouraging the students to maintain rhythm of conversation. He spoke on the beat immediately after the utterances of the students and filled up the pause by laughing, repeating students’ words, or correcting their grammatical errors. At the same time, success in maintaining the rhythm of the dialogue is also due to the behavior of the students who coordinated the rhythm of their utterances with that of the teacher. The image that comes to mind when describing this kind of conversational rhythm is that of a relay race where one person passes the baton to the other and that person accepts the baton and runs with it.
2.3.3 Summary of Results

From this classroom observation, the following two points became clear. (1) There is a rhythm of conversation that is created and shared by participants in English class. Some kind of conversational rhythm, even among those with a different speech rhythm, is maintained through their cooperative efforts to get in rhythm with others at the change of the speaking turn. (2) In this class, the listener’s response occurs immediately after the speaker’s utterance as in the dinner table talk in the American home. These findings contradict a report that the timing of the listener’s speech is delayed in the teacher-student conversation (Erickson & Shultz 1982; Erickson 1992).

2.3.4 Unsolved Questions

From the results of these analyses, however, new questions have also arisen. Concerning summary (1), there is the question of whether or not a learner who is not yet skilled at speaking English fluently will be able to create a conversational rhythm. If the conversational rhythm is only created by the explicit verbal act of speaking, the learner who cannot speak well will be unable to generate a conversational rhythm, being left out of classroom communication all the time. In the junior high school class surveyed, however, the learners who did not necessarily seem to have high proficiency were carrying on conversations using their English. This indicates that there are other significant factors, in addition to speech, that contribute to conversational rhythm. Body motion is one of such factors. Mead (1934) suggests that the human response to other’s body motion is the root of person-to-person communication. Moerman (1990) argues that one’s movements take
precedence over the speech. Further he criticizes the inappropriateness of describing human communication only in terms of verbal communication. He insists that “Verbal communication is a term for a nonexistent entity: communication by means of pure language: without context, without body, without time.” (p.9)

Taking these arguments into consideration, it may be assumed that the non-verbal aspects of conversation also contribute to the creation of a communication rhythm. Therefore, it seems necessary to take a closer look at non-verbal behavior. With regard to summary (2), another question has arisen as to what will happen in other classroom scenes. Although the timing of speech in the class mentioned in 2.2 and 2.3 was close to that of everyday conversation, this may be very rare in English class. In addition, the situations where conversation occurs in class vary. It is likely that the conversational rhythm varies according to the conditions such as the number of conversation participants, their relationship, time constraints and topics (Erickson 1992). As already mentioned, Couper-Kuhlen (1999) reports that a constant rhythm does not continue in telephone conversation. She notes that the sharing of the rhythm peaks at the end of the conversation, signaling that the speaker is going to hang up the receiver. Following the earlier studies, the present research further examines two issues: (1) the role of body motion in conversational rhythm and (2) the influence of situations over the conversational rhythm.

2.4 Continued Examination of the aforementioned class (2)

2.4.1 Body Motion and Rhythm

Firstly, let us look at how the male student’s non-verbal expression affects
conversational rhythm. Rhythm scores were made from two conversations between the male and his teacher in two different situations. The first (Appendix 4, Excerpt 6) conversation was recorded when the student was in the second grade. The second conversation (Appendix 5, Excerpt 7) was recorded one year after the first. Comparing two scores revealed a difference between the two conversations in the frequency of gestures (see Appendixes 4 and 5). When the student was less proficient, he used three kinds of gestures. One was a gesture that slightly preceded the word: for example, shaping money with his fingers (measure, hereafter M., M.11 and M.17), forming a paper money with his hands (M.26) and pointing at the tape-recorder (M.29). These gestures appeared before the student says the words “money” “paper” and “this”

1) Rapid-fire rhythm (frequent use of continued notes)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
| \text{Canadian coin is all} | \text{all coins OK. Twenty five cents and one dollars.} \\
|\text{They have a lot of, ah, tears and and smile, There'er good ??} | \\
\end{array} \]

2) Repetition of the same words

\[ \begin{array}{c}
| \text{is um paper paper} | \\
| \text{not activity, activity was} | \\
\end{array} \]

3) Frequent use of fillers

\[ \begin{array}{c}
| \text{not er twe-} | \text{er twe-} | \\
| \text{Ah ~, that ah ~} | \\
\end{array} \]

※Upper column: interview one year ago. Lower column: recent interview

Figure 3. Rhythm score of utterance in the interview of a male student
respectively. Another type of gesture occurred simultaneously with speech, turning his finger around three times (M.19~M.20) with the word "all". The student used the last type of gesture when he faltered, for example, scratching his nose (M.24). This type of gesture fills up the pause in the utterance. The student also sways from right to left in time with the already established rhythm when he could not speak fluently (see Appendix 4). The first and third type of gestures were not observed in the utterance of the male student in the later conversation (see Appendix 5).

In regards to the rhythm of the student’s utterance, there was no significant difference between the two conversations (Figure 3). When he is confident about what he is saying and able to speak fluently he speaks almost exclusively in triplets (Figure 3-①). When he is at a loss for words, he repeats the same words (Figure 3-②) or slows down his speech and often uses a filler (Figure 3-③). It is possible to say the reason that this student could maintain the discourse rhythm in the first conversation despite his lower proficiency was that his body motions filled the pauses, promoted his utterances and helped him maintain the rhythm.

2.4.2 Situation and Speech Rhythm

Let us now consider the case of a certain female student in regard to the question of whether conversational rhythm varies according to situations (research question 2). The first speech of this female student, Excerpt 8, was made in a class where charity was discussed as a topic. All the students in this class first read about Japanese aid response to the earthquake calamity in India, and then they talked about their thoughts and raised their hands to make
Excerpt 8. The utterance in class

I was surprised to hear the fact because Japan is much richer than India.

so I think we should make contributions more.

Excerpt 9. The utterance in the interview

So, I will, if I'm a member of student I can make contributions.

But I can't make so many. So I would like many people to know the fact contributions that people need many things and there are many troubles in other countries. So ah, I would like to spread the news to other people like for example, making newspaper and from the school.

ah umm, make videos about them like you.

Figure 4. Rhythm score of the utterances of female student in class and in the interview

comments in front of the class. The second speech, Excerpt 9, was recorded when the teacher went round to the students and asked for their comments, while recording with a video camera.

A comparison between these two instances of speaking clearly demonstrates that there is an outstanding difference between the amount of speech during class and the amount of speech in the interview, with the former
having nine measures and the latter 17 measures. It is obvious that there is also a difference in rhythm. In the speech in the classroom presentation (Figure 4-①, (1)-(9)), for example, continued notes did not appear at all except where rhythmical dotted notes, mostly a quarter note and eighth note, appeared twice between measure M.2 and M.3. This may be called a marching rhythm. In the interview (Figure 4-②), however, a triplet appeared as many as 12 times in 17 measures. A five-continued note and a six-continued note also appeared. All this indicates that there was a rhythm like that of machine gun. It may be said that the rhythm of the speech of the female student is close to that of teacher’s English, considering that many of three-continued notes and six-continued notes were used in the teacher's speech during the interview (Appendix 6, (5), (6), (8), (12), (13), (14)). The speech of the female student changed significantly in terms of both amount and rhythm. How should we interpret this?

2.4.3 Sharing of the Sense of Timing

It may be said that the change of the female student’s conversational rhythm occurred because of psychological factors such as stress. One possible interpretation is that when the whole class full of students was listening, the female student became so nervous that she spoke less, becoming unable to keep her own conversational rhythm. However, even though the only listener in the interview was the teacher, there were other causes for tension specific to the interview. For example, the video camera was running before her eyes and she did not know what question would be asked. In both cases, the topics were similar; “What do you think about the charity that the Japanese people did for
India?” and “What do you think you can do about it?” Therefore, it does not seem that the contents of the topics influenced the change in conversation rhythm. Rather, what makes the speech in the class different from that in the interview is that the latter is a single, highly independent utterance, but the former occurs amid a series of utterances by other students. This seems to influence the amount of speech produced and its rhythm.

The female student spoke at the climax of the class when it was nearing the end. She was the fourth among the six students who responded to the call of the teacher saying, “Is there anyone who wants to say something?” The speech of the six students was written down on the conversation score with beats (see Appendix 7).

The score revealed two important facts about the timing of this conversation. First of all, at the turn taking from the teacher to the students, no one paused or overlapped another person's utterances. This seems to indicate that the teacher and the students coordinated the timing of their utterances.

Secondly this effort to cooperate with others was made not only in regards to the timing of speech but also the amount of speech and its rhythm as well. For example, the three students' utterances delivered earlier the female student (Excerpt 10), were rather short, between two to four measures long. The rhythm of their speech consisted of one eighth-note and four quarter-notes as shown in Figure 5. They did not speak in triplets. During her turn, the female student uttered nine measures in a rhythm also without triplets. However in the interview after the class, she spoke in a quick rhythm with triplets, spending 17 measures for one question from the teacher. Taking these facts into account, it appears that the female student coordinated the length and rhythm of her speech.
The first student

I think we can make contribution

The second student

I was shocked because zero point eight seven yen don't full one yen.

The third student

I felt it's very little because we didn't send one yen.

The fourth student (The utterance of the female student)

I was surprised to hear the fact because Japan is much richer than India so I think we should make contributions more.

Figure 5. Rhythm score of the utterances of female student and other students in class with that of her classmates' utterances rather than to have simply been too unable to say more.

Sugawara (1998), an anthropologist, who has been researching communication among African tribes and whose work has been influenced by his experience communicating with his autistic child, describes the features of communication as follows. Communication is "an act of response and repetition using the same phrases as the other party" and "the joy of associating with others and an inclination toward coordination". According to his claim, communication cannot be explained by semiotic acts such as the transmission and reception of meanings. Communication is repetition itself at some level and thus requires that participants share the same time axis.

One example of a communication activity that requires participants share
the same time axis is playing in an orchestra. Kimura (1998) notes that “music is a temporal artistic activity and it exists only where participants share a common consciousness of the future time.” If you read Kimura’s statement in the context of classroom activity, it means that conversation develops only when the teacher and the students feel the flow of time in their conversational activity and anticipate what will come next. In the case of the female student, rather than simply trying to avoid a long solo talk, it may also be said that her behavior represents a subconscious coordination of rhythm and subconscious desire to speak with the same sense of time and rhythm as the other students.

2.4.4 Sharing of the Sense of Body and the Coordination with Listening and Speaking Activity

Coordination with others can also be observed in non-verbal acts. The non-verbal acts of the female student in the interview after her class (Excerpt 9), such as the movement of her head, the orientation of her body, her nodding, laughter and where she looked were written down on the score (see Appendix 6). A preliminary question, “Did you help her? [Did you help the student sitting next to you with her composition?]” was asked before the teacher gave the student the main question. The teacher proposed the main question “What did you think...” in M.6. At one point in the conversation (from M.4 to M.6), the female student glanced away from the teacher and turned her body toward her friend sitting next to her, but she redirected her glance as soon as the teacher started asking her questions. She then continued looking at the teacher until he finished questioning her. What was most characteristic was the way the student nodded throughout the conversation. Student clearly nodded at least
six times. She nodded once in response to the teacher's question in M.9, and three times when the teacher stressed the copula in M.8, M.12 and M.13. In M.14, she also nodded as if to keep time on the first and second beats. How should we view these acts of the student?

Hall (1964, 1969, and 1974) argued that the act of listening is not a receptive but a productive activity in its own right. Focusing on turn taking in the analysis of speech, Erickson (1985) also made the criticism that the roles of the listener and the speaker had been treated as fixed. He stated that a listener is "a sender as well as a receiver" who does much more than simply listen (p.315). The participants both listen, both speak. That is to say, in the conversation between the teacher and the student, there are no fixed relationships, one being passive listening and the other being active speaking. Both teacher and students actively participate in the conversation. The student being questioned supported the teacher in many ways; most obviously by answering the teacher's questions. However less obvious, yet just as, if not more important, is the fact that the student's nods in response to the teacher, thus encouraging the teacher to continue speaking and signaling "Yes, yes, I see" and "Please go ahead. I am listening."

2.5 Summary and Further Research Issue

So far two issues have been examined: (1) the role of the body motion in conversational rhythm and (2) the influence of situations over the conversational rhythm. As for (1), a male student's speech a year ago and his present conversational rhythm, including his gestures and body movements were transcribed into musical notation and compared. It was found that though the
feature of the speech rhythm was similar. The earlier transcription indicates the student used more types of gestures and used them more often. It seems that the reason this student could maintain the discourse rhythm despite his lower proficiency was that his body motions helped him keep the rhythm. With regard to (2), the speech of a female student in the class and in the solo interview has been compared. It was observed that the female student adjusted her speech to the length and rhythm of her classmates' speech.

In summary, the following three features of this English class communication was found: (1) the students are keeping the rhythm of speech using the body motion, despite their limited vocabulary and grammatical knowledge; (2) they are adjusting the rhythm of their speech to match that of others according to the situation (ex. solo utterance or the utterance in the sequence of other speakers etc); and (3) there is verbal and non-verbal coordination between the speakers and the listeners. These acts may be something we do in our everyday lives, but they seem to be quite unusual phenomena in the context of foreign language study in the classroom.

In the next chapter, we will consider what enables natural communication activities in English classrooms to happen. We will focus on how teachers and students make use of diverse resources such as speech style of teachers and the rules of the classroom to maintain and develop conversation in English classrooms.
CHAPTER 3
The Resources of Classroom Communication

3.1 Discourse Production Resources in Dinner Table Talk

In Chapter 1, we saw from the earlier studies by Erickson et al. (1992) that everyday communication is made up of verbal and non-verbal exchanges of rhythm. In Chapter 2, we discussed how the coordination of rhythm among interlocutors in English classes is similar to that of day-to-day communication. We also observed that the rhythm of conversation is not achieved solely by speech. Rhythm is created through the integration of speech, body motion, laughter, and other elements into a rhythmical framework shared by the participants in the conversation. Chapter 3 will investigate what elements affect the generation and development of teacher-student conversation in English (foreign language) classes. We will further examine how such elements affect the rhythm of conversation. Based on the results of these analyses, we will attempt to explain what causes differences in teacher-student communication in various classes.

Before considering classroom conversation, we will first examine the resources that form the basis for interaction in everyday conversation. The word, resource as used by Erickson and other conversation analysts indicates elements that generate and develop conversation. This use of the word resource arises from the view that every conversational participant is an agent who establishes conversation actively. With regard to the discourse at the
American dinner table discussed in Chapter 1, Erickson (1992) states that those gathered around the table use the following six resources: (1) knowledge of topic, (2) knowledge of grammar, (3) knowledge of table manners, (4) spatial positioning, (5) family relationships, and (6) temporal organization of speech and body motion. Erickson described these resources as follows:

1. General cultural knowledge of what things cost nowadays (by which members could participate in the overall topic of conversation of the moment).
2. Knowledge of phonology, lexicon, and grammar (by which list generation could be done as a speech routine).
3. Knowledge of skill in using utensils, dishes, and food in serving and ingestion, and knowledge of how to do this in relation to the talk that is going on simultaneously with eating.
4. Spatial positioning of participants—in relation to the food and to one another at the table.
5. Patterns of family relationships, especially as regards speaker-audience collaboration, including the presence of the guest as a special auditor during the production of the speech routine, and including teamwork in cooperating and/or competing for audience attention.
6. Temporal organization of speech and body motion in interaction.

(Erickson 1992 p.369)

Erickson takes the view that these production resources enabled the conversation to be carried out smoothly. According to Erickson's analysis, the resources are under the influence of the family-shared, culturally learned schemata of expectations of how one should talk and eat at the dinner table. The resources of conversation are not universal but peculiar to each individual situation. Although Erickson has not given his explanation in more detail, it seems that these resources are not in a parallel relationship, but mutually are related on different levels, and finally are concentrated on the sixth resource, namely that of temporal organization of speech and body motion (see Figure 6).
Knowledge of Grammar

Knowledge of Topic

Knowledge of Table Manners

Temporal organization of Speech and Body Motion

Spatial Positioning

Family Relationships

Figure 6. Discourse production resources and their relations at dinner table talk in an American family (Based on Erickson, 1992)

To take an example reported by Erickson, when family members discuss the high cost of living, those participating in the conversation need to have a common knowledge of that specific topic as well as knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. These two resources thus form an inseparable relationship. However, Erickson does not seem to use the term knowledge to simply represent a set of grammatical rules possessed by individual speakers. He also seems to be referring to tactics employed by conversation’s participants in order to give the conversation continuity and cohesiveness. For example, the members of this family were seen to continue conversation by echoing the sentence structure and vocabulary of the previous speaker as follows.
(15a) B-1: I don’t have to pay taxes on a house
(15b) B-1: I don’t have to pay mortgage
(15c) B-1: I don’t have to pay uh all kinds
(15d) B-1: I don’t have to pay all kinds of stuff like that
(18) S: a water bill
(19) B-2: You don’t have to pay for a car ‘n the insurance
(19) B-4: electric bill
 I don’t have to keep
two cars on the road
(20) M: electric bill
gas
insurance
(21) B-3: You don’t support five kids
(24) B-1: I don’t support five kids either
(25) B-4: You don’t have to pay for gas
(27) B-3: shoes
‘n clothes

※ B: Brother, S: Sister, M: Mother

- The numbers in the parentheses represent the turn in the conversation.
- B-1 represents the eldest brother. B-2, B-3 and B-4 represent the second, third and fourth brothers.

In this conversation each family member borrows the previous speakers’ expression and they collectively build a long list of household expenses. Here each speaker’s utterance directly becomes a resource for the other speakers. Erickson remarks that this “list routine conversation” (Erickson 1992 p.395) unfolded as if the participants knew what the others would say from the beginning.

A knowledge of table manners is directly concerned with how each person uses space at the table (spatial positioning). Family relationships also widely influence the amount of space used by the various family members at the table and the order in which they join the conversation. In this family a local rule of turn taking was seen in several conversation sequences where it was reported that the eldest son took the first turn and the father took the last turn, giving the final word on the topic.
The conversational resources in Figure 6 are particular to the situation in which the family has dinner at home. More general conversational resources are conceptualized and illustrated by the author in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Discourse production resources and their relationships

The three white ellipses, *speech, body motion* and *time*, are the constituents of discourse, and at the same time, each of them is also a resource for the discourse that follows. The two dark ellipses of *topic* and *manner of place* are both derivatives of *speech* and *body motion*. It can thus be said that the *speech-topic* and *body motion-manner of place* pairs of resources have a similar relationship to that of light and shadow.

With regards to this light-and-shadow relationship between speech and topic, as we have already seen, the family members at the dinner table utilize a part of the previous speakers’ speech for making their own utterances. This behavior of borrowing the other family members’ words as a resource of one’s own utterances illustrate that each participant tacitly utilizes the shared family knowledge of the topic in order to create conversational cohesiveness. As Erickson (1992) mentioned, each situation in which a conversation occurs has
unique rules that the participants follow subconsciously. The rules seem to be constituted by the habits and histories of the participants and the relationships of power and authority among the participants. The relationship between manner of place and body motions is the same. The family members and the guest, eight persons in total, can sit around the table and establish the dinner table conversation by conforming to the manner of place tacitly: how to use the space of the table, how to talk and take a meal simultaneously, how to take a speaking turn. These local rules are regulated by the habits and relationships of power in this family.

*Time* is the concept which unifies *speech* and *body motion* when participants are engaged in a conversation. The reason we can maintain conversation, even when there are a large number of participants taking part or when participants cannot see each other such as telephone talk, is that the participants utilize *time* as an effective guidepost for marking the appropriate moment when the participants should listen or should take their turn to talk. *Time* functions as a framework giving cohesiveness individual utterances. *Time* is more than just a resource of discourse. *Time* is the linchpin that holds discourse together.

### 3.2 Discourse Production Resources in Foreign Language Classes

In the English class discussed in Chapter 2, the students and the teacher shared the rhythm of conversation. If we explain this phenomenon by using Figure 7, we can say that *speech* and *body motion* are harmonized by *time*. This kind of conversation can be described as *ikiga au* and *hanashiga hazumu* conversation. These expressions are described as follows. *Ikiga au* implies
that each interlocutor adjusts her/his breathing so as to exchange conversational turns without any interruption. *Hanashiga hazumu* means that a conversation becomes more and more lively as it continues. Both expressions, *ikiga au* and *hanashiga hazumu* have a *time* resource. However *hanashiga hazumu* also refers to the content of the conversation, that is *topic* in Figure 7. It is possible to say that the degree to which the teacher and the students share the knowledge of the *topic* affects the development of the conversation in English classes. But considering that English lessons are conducted in accordance with a textbook, knowledge of the *topic* alone cannot completely explain why differences of discourse arise among the classes that use the same textbook. Another possible explanation for the difference in conversational development among classes is teacher's speech style. The teacher's speech style seems to heavily influence the development of conversation. This is due to the fact that in English (foreign language) classes, the difference in level of proficiency between the teacher and the student is so overwhelming that the student seldom takes the initiative during the conversation. Thus, the student has no choice but to try to adjust her/his way of speaking to that of the teacher.

By observing the teacher's style of speech as well as the rhythm of conversation, we will examine how the teacher’s speech style affects the development of communication in the classroom. In addition, we will propose the tentative general conversation resources model through the observation of the teacher-student conversation in previous chapter and this chapter.

### 3.3 Method

Classroom observation was conducted in two types of classes. One was an
English class and the other was an elective Spanish class in a junior high school in Kagawa prefecture. Four hours of Spanish lessons and five hours of English lessons were videotaped during September and November 2002. Spanish lessons for the third grade were instructed in English by a joint teaching team of an Assistant Language Teacher (ALT) and a Japanese English Teacher (JTE). It was the students' first experience of learning Spanish. English lessons for the second and the third grade were taught by the same Japanese teacher who was team-teaching Spanish. In addition, one hour of an English lesson by another JTE who taught at a different junior high school was observed.1

In order to analyze the rhythm of the classroom communication, portions of the conversations between teachers and students which lasted 30 seconds or more were extracted from the videotapes and transcribed into the protocol. The rhythms of the conversations, including physical reactions and pauses, were taken down in musical notation under the guidance of a specialist in music.

3.4 Resource (1)

3.4.1 The Rhythm of Lively Conversation

An analysis of the following conversations, Excerpts 11 and 12 (Figures 8 and 9 respectively) seem to reveal that both conversations meet the ikiga au criterion for a lively conversation. Figure 8 shows the score of the rhythm of the conversations between the JTE and students in an English class. Figure 9 shows the score of the rhythm of the conversations between the ALT and a student in a Spanish class. It is important to note that in both of these excerpts the students made no pause in responding to the teacher's questions. For example, in Figure 8 (Excerpt 11), the teacher asked the question "How many
(T: teacher, S: student)

Figure 8. (Excerpt 11.) Conversation between JTE and six students

Figure 9. (Excerpt 12.) Conversation between ALT and male student
piles [of udon] do you [normally] order?” This was asked to third-year students made no pause in responding to the teacher’s questions. For example, in Figure 8 (Excerpt 11), the teacher asked the question “How many piles [of udon] do you [normally] order?” This was asked to third-year students sitting in rows. Six students in class answered the question, one after another. The figure shows that the responses of each student, including the student who just leaned his head to one side, were made without leaving a beat after the questions.

In Figure 9 (Excerpt 12), the ALT and a male student were having conversation about their family photographs in front of the other students. Focusing on the new expressions to be learned in class, “Cuantos (Cuantas) tienes?” (“How many...do you have?”), the ALT asked the student about the numbers of people in his family, and their names. The student answered these questions. That is to say, their conversation followed the Q & A format. Although the conversation lasted 48 measures, two-and half minutes in total, no pause was noted throughout its duration. Physical reactions such as nodding and turning over the pages of the photograph album were performed to the beat of the conversation.

3.4.2 Difference of Speech Style between JTE and ALT

There is a similarity between the rhythm of the two excerpts discussed above, in that no pause was made between questions and answers in either conversation. However, during the classroom observation the conversations between the JTE and student and the ALT and student seemed different in regards to the characteristic of hanashiga hazumu conversation. What causes
this difference? To answer this question, the speech styles of the teachers were examined.

Excerpt 11 is an example of *ikiga au* but not *hashiga hazumu* conversation. From M.13 to M.18 in Figure 8, even after the sixth student tilted his head to the JTE's question, "How many?" the JTE still tried to encourage the student to respond by proposing the model answers, "one, two, three, four, five?" Then, after the student tilted his head for the third time, the JTE produced the anticipated answers, "Three or four piles" before the student actually answered. Finally, the JTE closed the conversation with the word, "OK".

In contrast, Excerpt 12 (Figure 9) is both an *ikiga au* and *hanashiga hazumu* conversation. In M.31 and M.32, the student's statement, "Un hermanos, hermano. (I have a brothers, brother.)", is received by the teacher simply with the utterance, "Ha. Un hermano. (You have a brother)." Then she showed her photo album and said; "Yo tengo...dos hermanas. (I have...two sisters.) Ah, Su nombre es Adoriana. (Ah, her name is Adoriana.)" The ALT's utterances are not intended to evaluate students' responses nor to give them instructions.

There is a fundamental difference in the speech style of ALT and JTE. The JTE's utterances in Excerpt 11 simply require a precise answer from the students about the number of helpings of *udon*. On the other hand, the ALT's utterance does not require a specific answer. The ALT's utterance might be considered less "teacher-like". Nonetheless, it is rather interesting that the ALT succeeded in continuing the conversation with the students for two and half minutes without any pause, in spite of the obscurity of her utterances in regards to instructional intention.
3.4.3 Entrusting Behavior and Grounding Behavior in Conversation

In order to make a closer examination of the difference between two teachers' style of speech, it might be useful to look at Okada's study (2000). It suggests that the uncertainty of the meanings of a person's action is a key philosophy and explains a variety of social interactions, such as our daily conversation, in terms of the relationship between an agent of behavior and a reactor. An agent herself/himself cannot completely decide the meanings of her/his actions. In other words, the meanings of action become apparent only in the interaction between agent and reactor.

Okada explains this phenomenon in light of two types of behavior: entrusting behavior and grounding behavior. When one party speaks to the other, she/he does not take full responsibility for showing the meanings of her/his utterance, so she/he leaves the interpretation of the meanings of her/his utterance up to the other party. Okada calls such an action 'entrusting behavior'. The corresponding behavior, interpreting the preceding action, is known as 'grounding behavior'. Okada also explains that everyday conversation consists of sequences of 'entrusting behavior' and 'grounding behavior.' Borrowing Okada's terms, I shall use the term 'entrusting behavior' (hereafter E.B.) to refer to one's behavior which talks to her/his interlocutor to expect she/he will take responsibility for determining the meanings of one's utterance. The term 'grounding behavior' (hereafter G.B.) refers to interpreting other's utterance.

Further investigation was made, focusing on whether or not an E.B.-G.B. relationship was observed in both conversations between the ALT and student and the JTE and students.
3.4.4 Conversation between ALT and a Student

The conversation between the ALT and the students in Excerpt 12 was examined to see whether the ALT left the students to interpret her utterances and whether the students actively interpreted the ALT's utterances.

Excerpt 12
21. ALT: Kouki, ah, nice. Mira, mira. Yo tengo un hermano, dos hermanos, una hermana, dos hermanas. (Look, look. I have one brother, two brothers, one sister, two sisters.) Ah. Su nombre es Adriana. (Her name is Adriana.)
23. ALT: Adriana. Su nombre es Seisa. (Her name is Seisa.)
25. ALT: Seisa.
26. S: Cuantas abuelos tienes? (How many grandparents do you have?)
27. ALT: Dos. Maria y Vicente. (Two. Maria and Vicente.)
28. S: ((nodding))
29. ALT: Um.

In the utterance numbered 21, the ALT did not ask a question about the student's family nor did she direct the student to state his opinion. Rather the ALT's utterances seem to have a different nature than those at the very beginning of this conversation (see Appendix 8 for unwritten part of Excerpt 12, from M.1 to M.27) which had been following Q & A format. The ALT's utterance does not show any intention to instruct the student, but this utterance is definitely addressed to the student. The ALT expected the student to react empathetically, judging by her pleased look when the student respond to her statement. The conversation continued as follows;

Student: Adriana.

ALT: Adriana. And, this is Seisa.
Student: Seisa.
ALT: Seisa.
Although the student was not urged to say anything, he expressed that he was listening carefully to the ALT by voluntarily repeating the name of the ALT's sister. Of course, it is also possible that it was one of the few possible ways for him to respond to the ALT due to his limited knowledge of Spanish. However, this student's utterance is the student's G.B. The ALT continued her E.B. again by introducing the name of her other sister. A similar kind of E.B. on the part of the ALT can be observed in a conversation with female student in the same class.

Excerpt 13

21. ALT: Ah, Jyuria. Tu abuela? (Your grandmother?)
22. S: (nodding) Yes.
23. ALT: Um, beautiful. Mi abuela. (My grandmother.)
24. S: She is very beautiful.
25. ALT: Thank you. Mira, mira [...] (Look, look...)

In line 24, the student immediately replied to the ALT's E.B., "Mi abuela. (My grandmother)" with her G.B., "She is very beautiful". This led to the ALT's utterance "Thank you".

The ALT's speech in Excerpt 12 and 13 does not intend to instruct or evaluate the student thus may be seen as a departure from typical classroom discourse. However, from the view of E.B.-G.B., it is a very straightforward daily utterance. Thus, the attempt to explain the conversation through E.B.-G.B. seems to put another interpretation on the classroom communication. Furthermore, in line 43 in Excerpt 12, the student asked a question to the ALT voluntarily. It demonstrates that the ALT's E.B. sustains their relationship on equal ground throughout the discourse.
3.4.5 Conversation between JTE and a Student

JTE's utterance in Excerpt 11 can be mainly characterized by two points: (1) he closed the conversation with the word "OK"; (2) he brought up anticipated answers before the students answered his question. As regards the first point, his utterance "OK" functions as a terminator, ending the dialogue. By saying "OK", the JTE did not allow the student to continue the conversation by "entrusting" the JTE with an utterance of their own. As regards the second point, there was a clear tendency for the JTE to ask a question that required a definitive answer. The question in Excerpt 11 was provided along with the four other questions during the first twenty minutes of the class. Possible answers for all of those five questions seem to be rather limited. Followings are the JTE's questions/expected answers;

Q1.) Do you like udon? /Yes.
Q2.) What type of udon do you like? /"Kake." or "Zaru."
Q3.) How many piles (of udon) do you order? /One~five.
Q4.) To eat four piles (of udon) is easy? (Is it easy for you to eat up four piles of udon?) / Yes or No.
Q5.) Is it easy or difficult for you to get up at six? /It's easy, or It's difficult.

What is immediately apparent in these examples is that answers of those five questions had been predicted by the JTE beforehand. Sawyer (2001) attributes the reason why we are able to carry on a conversation to our ability to predict how the conversation is going to develop. As we continue a conversation we expect the other's E.B. and anticipate the possible developments of the conversation. We create a sort of mental "script" of what our conversational partner will say before they say it. Therefore, it is natural that the JTE should try to predict the students' answers in these circumstances.
It must be, however, noted that the JTE limits the students' answers; not only by the type of questions he asks, but also through his narrow expectations as to what possible answers students might give to his questions. Consequently the students are reluctant to answer.

Taking for example, the male student in Excerpt 11, who only inclined his head and did not reply to the JTE. It should not have been difficult for him to answer the question, "how many piles of udon do you order?", since he need only say a number. Moreover he had already heard how five other students had answered the question before his turn came around. However we could well assume that the student wanted to answer that he could not be sure of how many piles he normally ordered since it really depended on the circumstances. If this be the case, the student may have simply inclined his head, instead of answering the question because he did not know how to express his unique and personal answer in English. Furthermore, the JTE could not assist the student in framing his reply because the JTE had already mentally precluded any responses other than the numbers one, two, three, four, and five.

This kind of speech style can have a negative effect on conversation. If a teacher excessively persists in demanding a particular expected answer from students as the JTE in Excerpt 11 did, it might result in forcing his opinion on students and stunting growth of conversation. Then, instead of "grounding" the JTE's question in her/his own way, the student may simply respond by saying whatever she/he believes the JTE is anticipating. Students' responses to the JTE's questions constituted a sort of subordinate G.B. wherein the students cannot really "ground" the JTE's utterances because the teacher has not "entrusted" them to do so in the first place. That is to say, an utterance, which
carries with it narrow expectations concerning appropriate response, cannot be
counted as E.B.. Hence, it seems reasonable to conclude that neither E.B. nor
G.B. exists between the JTE and the students in Excerpt 11.

3.4.6 Relation between Entrusting-Grounding Behaviors and the Rhythm of
Conversation

In Excerpt 12 and 13, while the ALT's utterances did not clearly suggest
her intention, the conversation lasted over two and half minutes without
breaking the constant rhythm. This might be because the ALT's utterance did
not display instructional intentions but instead encouraged the students' G.B..
On the other hand, in Excerpt 11, although the JTE and the students appeared to
be having a conversation keeping on the rhythm, from the standpoint of G.B. and
E.B., this "conversation" is really more of a monologue on account of the lack
of E.B. in the JTE's speech. Indeed, in other classes taught by this JTE a long
silence occurred between the JTE and a student, when the student struggled to
answer but the JTE did not provide possible responses. Consequently the
rhythm of the conversation was not maintained (see Appendix 10).

In Excerpt 11, the reason that the rhythm of discourse was maintained in
spite of the absence of the teacher's E.B. was that required answer was so easy
that the students could respond immediately without any struggle. Therefore
the students could cooperate to maintain the rhythm of teacher's "monologue"
conversation. To put it another way, unless a teacher's use an entrusting
speech style with students, there is no other way for the teacher to control the
rhythm of conversation than by anticipating student's answer. Contrastively, it
was also observed that the rhythm of conversation was spontaneously produced
and consistently maintained among a teacher and students in any excerpt where E.B. was recognized in conversation.

3.4.7 Conversation between Another JTE and a Student

There is a specific kind of E.B. in which the ambiguous nature of an utterance is used not only to continue a conversation but also to create humor. The following example illustrates an English class by another JTE for second-year students at junior high school, which provides a different case from the one we have seen. The students were working on an English composition about their school excursion in pairs with each other's support. While the teacher was walking around in a class, he was asking the students about contents of their compositions as well as answering questions raised by them.

Excerpt I4

1. JTE: So, what did you do on the third day?
2. S: ((shaking her head))
3. JTE: What did you do on the third day?
4. S: ((shaking her head)) I'm (?)?
5. JTE: (?) What did you enjoy? You can..., S: ((shaking her head)) ((thinking)) I enjoyed ((turning her eye's on upward)) talk, talk with my friends.
6. JTE: Talking with
7. S: Talking with my friends.
8. JTE: One more sentence. Two sentences, three sentences.
9. S: ((tilting her head))
10. JTE: What did you do on the forth day?
11. S: ((muttering)) Forth day. We went to "Expo-land". ((nodding four times))
    It was bad..., 12. JTE: Bad?
13. S: Bad weather.
14. JTE: Oh, bad weather.
16. S: ((nodding two times))
17. JTE: What ride did you enjoy the most?
18. S: ((shaking her head))
19. JTE: What ride did you like best?
20. S: Ah....
21. JTE: Did you like?
22. S: No.
23. JTE: No? Nothing?
25. JTE: Oh, because you didn't have money.
26. S: ((laughing, twisting her body and turning away))
27. JTE: I'm sorry.
28. S: MUKATSUKU.
29. JTE: Don't say mukatsuku in Japanese, OK?
30. JTE, S: ((laughing together))

This student could hardly remember any pleasant memories about the school excursion. At the beginning of the dialogue, this female student was asked what things she had enjoyed during the trip and answered "I chatted with my friend on the third day," and "The weather was not good when we went to the Expo-land on the fourth day". No impressive memory seemed to come into her mind indeed. Supposing that the student should have enjoyed some rides at the theme park, the teacher asked the student the question "What ride did you enjoy the most?", with the intention of specifying a question for the student. In spite of the teacher's attempt, the student shook her head in objection and stuck to saying "No". In addition, she insisted on her saying "Nothing" in the end. Although the teacher reluctantly abandoned his questions, he still tried to conclude the conversation with drawing laughter from the student by saying "Oh, because you didn't have money". The student returned her smile to the teacher and said "Mukatsuku-!" ("Whatever!" "Don't make me get
3.4.8 What Teacher’s Entrusting Behavior Could Bring to Communication in Class?

The teacher’s utterance “Oh, because you didn’t have money”, which implies his E.B. to the student, could be regarded in this context as similar to ‘manukeochi’ in rakugo (Japanese classical comic storytelling). ‘Manukeochi’ is in the art of closing conversational exchange with a ridiculous utterance. It brings unexpectedness to a listener and makes her/him feel “Sonna Bakanna!” The joke punch lines in rakugo are generally thought to be divided into twelve categories. Besides ‘manukeochi’, there are other famous types of punch lines such as ‘buttsukeochi’ which closes a dialogue with mutual misunderstanding between speakers. Nomura (1996) observes that those joke punch lines in rakugo are considered to be “rhetorical manipulation and rhetorical conflict or contradiction which draws attention of an audience by means of causing the sense of improperness.” The E.B. delivered by the teacher deviates from the mental “script” written in the minds of the student and thus creates a Rakugo like sense of humorous incongruity. For the student who is at a loss for utterance, as a result of surprise, all she would be able to do is smiling in order to save the situation.

If the JTE had simply said “I see” or “That's too bad” instead of “Oh, because you didn’t have money”, that would have indicated only his agreement, confirmation of the facts or empathy with the student, neither a sense of improperness or that of conflict would have occurred in their conversation. However, it would not have caused laughter or the student’s reaction instead. By pretending not to know that the student had money to spend on rides at the
theme park, the JTE succeeded in producing the sense of playfulness in their conversation, which had been discouraged by the student's negative utterances such as "Bad weather," and "Nothing". The JTE's word "Oh, because you didn't have money" was accepted as humor when it was followed by a series of the student's responses: laughing, twisting her body, smiling to say "Mukatsuku-!") The JTE attempted to draw laughter from the student, then, the student responded to the language game proposed by the JTE. It could be said that the sense of security, which was brought by the student's feeling of understanding the JTE's intension, and the JTE's feeling of being understood by the student, satisfy the communication between them. While such a conversation is taking place, a speaker's physical response, such as laughing or twisting one's body, functions as rhythmical punctuation to smooth

(Figure 10. (Excerpt 14.) Conversation between JTE and female student)
the conversation. Consequently, the liveliness of the conversation can be sustained. Such a rhythm of conversation between a teacher and a student in class might be rarely produced by constant repetitions of question and answer, but is easily produced by physical sympathy followed by utterance, such as laughing and nodding (see Figure 10).

Teacher’s E.B. has the possibility of changing the relationships between teacher and student from a state in which the teacher is always a teaching donor while the student is always a receptor, to a state where teacher and student have horizontal relationship in the dialogue. In such a relationship a student would be able to express herself/himself in class in the same way she/he expresses herself/himself in daily conversation outside a class: repeating the teacher’s utterances, asking the teacher questions, and even sometimes enjoying the rakugo like sense of improperness in a conversation with a teacher.

So far we have explored how teacher’s speech style affects classroom communication, considering the difference between the following two types of classes. In one classroom we find ikiga _au_ but not hanashiga _hazumu_ conversation. In the other we find both _ikiga _au_ and _hanashiga _hazumu_ conversation. The difference between the two classrooms appears to be that teachers in the _hanashiga _hazumu_ class bring their daily conversation style including E.B., which does not have instructive intention of evaluating or questioning students, into their classes. In spite of the ambiguity of their utterances, indeed because of the ambiguity, the students seem to be encouraged to respond to the teachers without being directed. From these two observations, we can conclude that teacher’s entrusting speech style is one of the significant resources that contributes to the maintenance and development of conversations.
in the classroom.

3.5 Resource (2)

We will now finally have a brief discussion how *manner of place* affects conversation in the English classroom. Analysis of the next incident, Excerpt 15 suggests that *manner of place*, in particular *classroom rules* can influence the rhythm of conversation. Subsequently, we will consider the rhythmic problems that occur in classroom conversation when students try to follow the rules of the classrooms.

3.5.1 A Class Where Students Stand up When They Make Comments

Excerpt 15, Appendix 11 was extracted from the conversation in a second grade English class. The students were studying how the global environment will change as a result of deforestation. Having had an opportunity to exchange their thoughts, the teacher then called out the name of a student, and asked the student to present his views.

As can be seen in the case of Saito-kun, after the teacher called his name and asked "How about Saito-kun? Saito-kun?" it took him as many as seven and a half beats from 2P to 3 to stand up, shake his body and start answering, "I don't think we cut trees." In the case of Nishizaki-kun, it similarly took him seven beats to stand up after the teacher called his name and the student said "Ee!!" ("Well."). Then, after a delay of a half beat, Nishizaki-kun began to speak, but he was apparently unable to continue after saying "I think" and remained speechless for an interval of another three beats.

Occasional disruption of conversational rhythm does not mean that there is
no rhythm in this class. The students set about actions such as voicing
utterances and standing up on the beat immediately following the teacher's
questions. It can be surmised that one reason for the delay is the "rule" of the
classroom which requires students to stand up before answering. There is a
difference between the rhythm of the classroom communication and the rhythm
of everyday conversation in English, insofar as verbal communication is not in
tune with physical actions in the classroom.

3.5.2 Classroom Rules and Conversational Rhythm in English

Apparently, there exist certain rules of engagement in varied forms in any
class. For instance, let us consider what happens in a typical classroom when a
teacher asks a student a question. The teacher asks a question to which the
answer is obvious. The teacher first puts the question to all the students.
Then the teacher calls on a specific student. Students raise their hands and
wait until they are called on. When a student's name is called, the student
stands up and answers. The student gives an answer just as expected by the
teacher (Ishiguro 2003).

Iwakawa (2003) claims that school education did not originally make
enriching communication as one of its primary goals. He also states that
school was intended to be a place of discipline where knowledge was poured
into students in the absence of communication with other learners, in order to
promote efficiency of knowledge acquisition. Various types of impersonal
communication are observed including the greetings mechanically offered in
unison by an entire class of students, presentation and performances with no real
audience, and so on. Furthermore the arrangement of the desks in the
classroom seems to prevent the freedom of students' body motion. The students are required to remain at their predetermined desks and are forced to keep still and keep gazing at the blackboard. In this way, the classroom

Figure 11. Discourse production resources in foreign language classes in a Japanese junior high school

Figure 12. Disaccord between rhythm of discourse and rhythm of classroom communication
practices and rules based on the school's purpose of educating the masses, and the power structure between teachers and students, create a certain manner of place. These rules maintain the classroom communication and influence the rhythm of English discourse in the class (see Figure 11). As already discussed in section 3.4, the teacher's speech style can either stimulate or hinder conversation. In the same way, manner of place, that is classroom rules, can also serve as both a stimulus or a hindrance. In the case of Excerpt 15, the classroom rules seem to have a negative effect on the rhythm of conversation.

If the aim of conversation in English classes is to enable students to participate fluently in everyday communication just like that observed at the American dinner table in Chapters 1 and 3, the subject of research in English language education should be how to fix and fill the gap between this goal and the realities of classroom communication (see Figure 12). In short, communication in English classes can be established only when the rhythm of the classroom affected by the classroom rules and the rhythm of everyday discourse coincide.
CONCLUSION

Classroom communication research has traditionally emphasized the peculiarities of classroom discourse as opposed to everyday conversation. However, this paper argues that certain types of behavior similar to everyday conversation can be found in some English classes. These behaviors are: (1) cooperative efforts to get in rhythm with others at the change of the speaking turn, (2) the students' use of nods and glances that synchronize with the teachers' speech and (3) adjusting the length and rhythm of one's speech to fit with the previous speakers' rhythm. In the classrooms discussed in this thesis, teachers and students participated in classroom conversation by cooperating with each other through the shared senses of time and body motions. This is the same as everyday conversation, such as the dinner table conversation observed by Erickson.

The significance of classroom rules and teacher's speech style (in particular the use of E.B.). The author considers these two elements to be the resources that differentiate the classes where classroom conversation closely resembles everyday conversation and those where no such resemblance is found. With regard to classroom rules, an example was seen where the classroom rules requiring the students to stand up when called on obstructed the rhythm of verbal communication. An example of the significance of teacher's speech style was observed where the students repeated teacher's words or asked her questions without being required to do so. The author believes this is due to
the fact that the teacher's utterances were not meant to evaluate the students or
give them instructions. This ambiguity of teacher's utterance encouraged the
student to speak in an everyday manner and to maintain the conversation.

The injection of humor into the conversation constitutes another type of
E.B.. The attempt to create humor is necessarily an entrusting behavior, as one
can never be sure whether or not one's utterance will be interpreted as humor by
one's interlocutor. Thus the teacher's unexpected utterance combined with the
students' reaction to that utterance creates a special type of E.B.-G.B.. Though
this type of E.B.-G.B. may not be common in the classroom, it is a normal part
of everyday conversation. In a sense, the behavior of the JTE in Chapter 2 and
the ALT in Chapter 3 may be far from the typical teacher's behavior. In
addition, it could be said that as this type of behavior deviates from the
conventional classroom practices, it may confuse the students. However, the
two teachers' speech and behavior are consistent with those found in everyday
communication which is characterized by E.B. and G.B.. Furthermore, the
students did not appear to be confused by the teachers' entrusting utterances.

It is interesting to note the fact that the absence of clear instructions by the
JTE in Chapter 2 and the ALT in Chapter 3 led the students closer to the goals of
English language education, that is to develop students' ability to conduct
practical communication. This may be misinterpreted to mean that the teacher
should stop giving instructions all together. However, these teachers did not
simply leave the students to talk freely. They gave grammatical practices and
sometimes corrected student's errors even in the middle of conversation.
Furthermore, most of their lessons were conducted in the I-R-E (F) fashion.
The belief that communication rarely occurs in pattern practice seems to be
widely held by teachers. However, even the simple Q & A practice in Excerpt 12 appeared to be communicative in that E.B.-G.B. were used by teacher and student just as they are in everyday conversation. Some teachers observed in this thesis succeeded in creating and maintaining \textit{ikiga au} and \textit{hanashiga hazumu} conversation in the classroom while others did not.

The author believes the difference between the classrooms lies not only in the special techniques teachers employ to maintain conversation with the students, but also in the horizontal teacher-student power relationship found in successful classrooms. Usually in English classes, the students are so conscious of having to answer in line with the teachers' wishes that the timing of student's utterances gets delayed and silence continues longer. However, the asymmetrical relationship between students and teacher that is so obvious in most classroom interactions was not as apparent in the classes of the JTE mentioned in Chapter 2 and the ALT in Chapter 3. As the JTE and ALT created more horizontal relationship through E.B.-G.B. and unique classroom rules, the students were released from their customary subordinate position in the conversation and were thus able to participate more equally in the conversation.

By analyzing teachers' speech and behavior directed toward the students in more detail, it is possible to discover how to conduct classes where instruction and communication do not conflict. The author would like to address this issue in her future studies.
Notes

Chapter 1

1. Borrowing Wittgenstein's phrase "language game", Yako (2001) says, "In the language game called music, rhythm becomes the basis for the connection between those who create sounds and those who listen to them". Likewise in the "English language game", the give and take of everyday English conversation, rhythm has a similar importance.

2. However, Couper-Kuhlen (1999) reports that quantitative and rhythmic repetition in English are not necessarily accompanied by time-based accuracy and the rhythm varies widely even in the sequence of a piece of communication.

3. Refer to 2.3.1 in Chapter 2.

4. The Greek words Kairos and Chronos are Greek translations of two concepts of time distinguished by ancient Hebrews. Originally, Kairos defined time on a cosmic scale, encompassing such things as birth and death. Chronos referred to the continuance of time in the normal space-time.

5. This is called Arhythmia. The term indicates that some problem has occurred with the exchange of utterances, causing the participants to get embarrassed.

6. Just as there is an expression "one speaks as if one sings" or a theory that music originates from words, spoken language and music are closely related. The importance of musical elements such as pitch, sound volume and the timing of utterance in the act of speaking has been studied in the field of linguistics. However, it has not been clarified how such musical elements in language are organized in conversation. Erickson has shown it by transposing native English speaker's conversation into musical notation.

Chapter 2

1. The instructor was Mr. Goro Tajiri who was in the Matsue Municipal Daiichi Junior High School at the time. (At present he is in the Hirose Municipal Hida Junior High School.) The class consisted of 17 female students and 20 male students. They used Sunshine English Course 3, Reading 1 “Love is Action”. The class I observed was the sixth hour of this lesson. The theme of whole lesson was "charity projects".

2. When the beats are coordinated and integrated by periodically setting a psychological stress every certain number of beats a rhythm is created. This is realized by repeating an act every certain number of beat and at certain points. The strong and weak beats rarely signify the loudness of the sound itself. Instead, they are primarily
intended to raise psychological consciousness by the relative strength and height of the sound.

Chapter 3
1. This is the same teacher who gives the lessons discussed Chapter II.
2. This kind of JTE's behavior that brings up anticipated answer was observed also in his Spanish class. See Appendix 9.
3. Freire (1968) questioned whether knowledge is established through dialogue or by way of transmission. The word transmission is used in this instance to describe the acquisition of knowledge as explained by the gas station model, whereby knowledge is poured into the head of the learner just as gas in the container is poured into a car. In short, this model corresponds to the individual competence model which regards the cognitive system of human beings as a closed information processing system. This system characteristically focuses on the receptiveness of the learner to new knowledge: how fast the learner can acquire knowledge, how large a quantity of knowledge the learner can acquire and how long the learner can maintain newly acquired knowledge.
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Appendix 1: Voice analysis of conversation between JTE and female student

Voice analysis software used: Amadeus II
Martin Hirer, Switzerland
Appendix 2: Voice analysis of conversation between JTE and male student

Voice analysis software used: 'Amadeus II' Martin Hirer, Switzerland
Appendix 3: JTE and students conversation score with beats

3-1. Excerpt 3: Yukiko’s case

1T • • OK So
2 Yūkiko • Yūkiko •
3 Which would you put your coins in?
4S • A:h I can’t choice.
5T I can’t. choose.
5S choose a
6 vending machine or a charity box.
7 So I will run away from there.
8T You will run away from this place?
8S And I will buy the
9 • juice another place vending machine.
10T (laughing) In a different place
10S In a different place.
11T In a different place.
12 Any way you would buy juice.
12S Yes.
13T Thank you.

(T : Teacher, S : Student, : pause, _ : The underline denotes a stressed syllable.)

3-2. Excerpt 4: Tomo-chan’s case

1T OK. Tomo-chan, •
2 would you be a report er?
3S A:h Matsumoto would

(T : Teacher, S : Student, : pause, _ : The underline denotes a stressed syllable.)

3-3. Excerpt 5: Hayato’s case

1T You’d make a contri bution.
2 How •
2S Ten yen.
2T Only ten yen?
3S Yes.

(T : Teacher, S : Student, : pause, _ : The underline denotes a stressed syllable.)

※ The horizontal numbers from (1)–(4) represent one of the four beats. The vertical numbers show the progress of conversation.
Appendix 4 (Excerpt 6): Conversation between teacher and male student

T: OK. So, do you know the answer? OK? Yes?
S: Yes, yes.

T: Do you? Do you? OK, What country is Kumi in?
S: Yes, I do.

T: Why do you think so?
S: She, she lives in Canada.

T: Because um, American coin is not er twe-
S: Five cents, yeah.

T: twenty five cents? Five cents?
S: Twenty five cents. But
Canadian coin is all all all coins OK. Twenty five cents and one dollars.

(turning around his fingers three times)

Mm hm. How about America?

Two dollars. America is

(Scratching his nose)

Paper.

one dollars one dollars is um, paper. Paper.

(pointing at the tape recorder)

This this tape says all coins four charin charin charin.

(pointing at the tape recorder)

Hum very good. It's perfect.

Very good, good.

(giving a high-five to the teacher)
Appendix 5 (Excerpt 7): Conversation between teacher and male student one year later

So ~~, Kenta ro. You're the presi, you're the president student council?

Ah~, tell me your impression.

Yes, Ah~

Um.

That was very fast but, um, there're good memories for me and good experience for me.

What was the best memory? (?????)

Ah, for example, Taiikusai. (turning around his fingers)

Ah~ that are not activity, activity was

so fun But there were they have a lot of, ah~, tears and and smile. (touching his nose)
(18) (19)

Un huh~ wonderful!

There're good (?????)
Appendix 6 (Excerpt 9): Conversation between teacher and female student

T

Did you help her? Did you help her? Did you help her?

S

Ha? No. No.

((laughing))

((shaking her head))

T

No, you do- oh, I think I think you did. So did you what did you think ah, you were

S

((turning to her friend))

T

you were ah, one of the member of the student council right?

S

((nodding))

((looking right and left))

((sighing))

T

And ah what would you do if you ah, if you are

S

((biting her lower lip))

((nodding))

((nodding))

((nodding))

T

if you were a one of the member of the high school student council?

S

((nodding))

((nodding))

((nodding))

T

Mm

Yes, student council

S

So, if I will ah, if I'm a member of ah ~
student council, I can make contributions. But I can't make so many, so much contributions.

So, I would like many people to know the fact.

that people need many things and there are many troubles in other countries,

So ah ~ I would like to spread the news to other people like,

(licking her lips) (turning her eyes from left to right) (turning her eyes to the right)

for example, making newspaper from the school and ah umm

(turning her eyes to the right)

make videos about them like you. Thank you.

(laughing)
It seems English is a part of you, a part of you.

((nodding))

Great. English’s a part of you. It’s great, great.

((nodding))

((biting her lower lip)) ((looking at her friend))
Appendix 7: Chart of conversation score of a conversation between JTE and six students in which there is no pause in turn-taking

(T: teacher  S: student  •: pause)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>Hey, anyone, please</td>
<td>tell me your impression.</td>
<td>Impression.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2T</td>
<td>Anyone, please</td>
<td>tell me your impression.</td>
<td>Yes, Mei.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5T</td>
<td>Uh-hm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>What did you</td>
<td>think?</td>
<td>How did you feel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2T</td>
<td>Your comment</td>
<td>please.</td>
<td>Anyone is OK., Yeah,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3T</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Kaori.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5T</td>
<td>eighty-seven</td>
<td>yen</td>
<td>don’t full, one yen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6T</td>
<td>Hmmm.</td>
<td>OK.</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
<td>It’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7T</td>
<td>less than</td>
<td>under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>(noddings)</td>
<td>((opening his arms))</td>
<td>Yes, Saori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I felt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>it’s very</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>because we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>didn’t send</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>one-yen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T</td>
<td>Hmmm.</td>
<td>Less than one yen.</td>
<td>More than than than.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>Right?</td>
<td>Anyone else?</td>
<td>Yes, Yuri.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>surprised to</td>
<td>hear the fact</td>
<td>because Japan is much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3T</td>
<td>richer than</td>
<td>India.</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4T</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>contributions</td>
<td>more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>Anyone else?</td>
<td>Anyone else?</td>
<td>Yes, Kentaro.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was surprised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please look at me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>if we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5S</td>
<td>Indian people</td>
<td>will be</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6T</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>I was surprised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>Yes, Kazuki.</td>
<td>yeah,</td>
<td>Please say that Ah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>If we</td>
<td>make a</td>
<td>ten-yen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5T</td>
<td>Each person</td>
<td>from each person</td>
<td>our person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

※The horizontal numbers from (1)–(4) represent one of the four beats. The vertical numbers Show the progress of conversation.
Appendix 8 (Excerpt 12): Conversation between ALT and male student in Spanish class

(T: teacher S: student)

(1) T: 
Hola! (Hello!)

S: 
Hola! (Hello!)

(2) T: 
Como estas? (How are you?)

S: 
Bien, gracias, y tu? (Fine, thank you, and you?)

(3) T: 
Um muy gracias bien, (Um very fine thank you.)

(4) T: 
Tu familia? (Your family?)

S: 
(T: teacher S: student)

T: 
Un tio, uno tio. Ha, yo no tengo tios. (one uncle, one uncle.) (I have no uncles.)

(5) T: 
Um muy familia! (um, your family?)

S: 
(S: student)

S: 
Tengo una dos tres tias. Ah su nombre tres tias. (I have one, two three aunts. Her name three aunts.)

(6) T: 
Um tu aboe-ra (um, your grandmother.)

S: 
(T: teacher S: student)

T: 
Ah, una dos tres tias. (How many aunts do you have?)

(7) T: 
Tu abie-ro, tu ama-de-re. (grandfather, mother, many many.) (How many uncles do you have?)

S: 
(S: student)

S: 
Tengo tres tias. (I have three aunts.)

(8) T: 
Tio, tio Wha! Quanto tios tienes? (How many uncles do you have?)

S: 
(S: student)

S: 
Ah, su nombre tres tias. (Her name three aunts.)
Mayumi.

Su nombre es Mayumi. (Her name is Mayumi.)

Su nombre es Akiko. (Her name is Akiko.)

Su nombre es Masako. (Her name is Masako.)

Um y tienes primos? (Do you have cousins?)

Si, tengo. (Yes, I do.)

(19) (21)

T

es? is?

S

(22) (23)

T

Um

S

ha.

(24)

Ha, un hermano. Ah-huh. (one brother.)

(25) (26)

T

Um y tienes primos? (Do you have cousins?)

S

Sí, tengo. (Yes, I do.)

(27)

(31) (32)

T

Su nombre es Masako. (Her name is Masako.)

S

Su nombre es Kouki. (His name is Kouki.)

(34) (35) (36)

T

Kouki, ah nice. Mira mira, yo tengo un hermano, dos hermanos. (Look,look) (I have one brother, two brothers,

(30)

T

Ha. Tienes dos primos y hermanos? Tienes hermanos? (How about brothers?) (Do you have brothers?)

(20)

Mayumi.

(28)

(33)

T

S

S

(28)

T

S

Ha. Tienes dos primos y hermanos? Tienes hermanos? (How about brothers?) (Do you have brothers?)

(30)

T

S

S

S

(30)

T
T

una hermana, dos hermanas. Ah su nombre es Adori-a-na. (one sister two sisters. her name is Adoriana.)

((turning the page of the album))

S

Adori-a-na. Su nombre es Seisa. (Her name is Seisa.)

((nodding))

S

Adori-a-na. Seisa. (Her name is Seisa.)

((turning the page))

T

Dos. (Two.)

((turning the page))

S

Cuantas abuelos tienes? (How many grandparents do you have?)

((nodding))
Appendix 9: Conversation between JTE and students in Spanish class

(1) T
So, cuántos au-tos tie-nes? (how many cars do you have?)

S1

(4) (5) (6) T
Dos au-tos. (Two cars.) Si, Si

S2

(7) (8) (9) T
so and next OK. So tienes perros? (do you have a dog?)

S2

(10) (11) (12) T
Si, so cuántos pe-rros tie-nes? (how many dogs do you have?)

S2

(13) (14) (15) T
Uno pe-rro, uno pe-rro, uno pe-rro. OK. (One dog, one dog, one dog.)

S2

(16) (17) (18) (19) T
So please Tie-nes tele-fono ene ca-sa? (Do you have a telephone at home?)

S3

((nódando))
Appendix 10: Chart of conversation score of a conversation between JTE and student in which there is a long silence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1T</td>
<td>Please</td>
<td>stand up</td>
<td>thank you.</td>
<td>Please stand up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Please look at her</td>
<td>Please, everybody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>please</td>
<td>look at her.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Please</td>
<td>look at her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
<td>So, Miss Daiwa,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Which</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>do you like to go?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8S</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I like to go</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>I like to go to</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17T</td>
<td>OK, every body please listen to her</td>
<td>please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes? (nodding)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19S</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>I like to go to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Takamatsu.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23T</td>
<td>Takamatsu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>OK, you want to go to Takamatsu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>OK, Miss Daiwa, so what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>do you want to do in Takamatsu?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27S</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32T</td>
<td>What do you want to do in Takamatsu?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33S</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35T</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T: teacher S: student .: pause)

※ The horizontal numbers from (1)~(4) represent one of the four beats. The vertical numbers show the progress of conversation.
Appendix 11 (Excerpt 15): Chart of conversation score with beats, taken from the class where students stand up when they make comments

Saito-kun's case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 T</td>
<td>How about?</td>
<td>Saito-kun</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>Saito-kun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 S</td>
<td>Begins to stand up—→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finishes standing up</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>Tils his body forward</td>
<td>I don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>think</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>えっと</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>えっと</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>tree cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>rain forest loose</td>
<td>I loose</td>
<td>you loose</td>
<td>we loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>rain forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>We loose</td>
<td>rain forest</td>
<td>right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T: teacher,  S: student,  •: pause)

Nishizaki-kun's case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 T</td>
<td>Nishizaki-kun, what do you think?</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>What do you...?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 S</td>
<td>えっと</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
<td>Stands up</td>
<td>I,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>think</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>えっとと</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Were you shocked?</td>
<td>Were you surprised?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I think</td>
<td>Japanese people is</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Japanese people is</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>·</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
<td>え、なんていう</td>
<td>rich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 T</td>
<td>Rich.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T: teacher,  S: student,  •: pause)

※ The italicized letters show the non-verbal behavior of the student.
※ The horizontal numbers from (1)-(4) each represent one of the four beats. The vertical numbers show the progress of conversation.
Appendix 12: Transcription of conversation

YES!! capital letters indicate high volume.

((nodding)) double parentheses frame contextual information about the following talk.

(??????) a portion of talk that could not be heard accurately.

... untimed pause.

[... ] a portion of the transcript was left out.

( ) translated sentences.

※ The excerpts presented in this article are transcribed according to a modified version of the convention originally established by Grail Jefferson for the analysis of conversation. (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974. pp. 731-34)