The Francis-Hunston Model of Discourse Analysis: Applicable to EFL Classrooms?

Tom Jernstad[*]

Contents

1.0 Introduction

> "I'm not sure I agree with you a hunnert percent."
>
> Police Chief Marge Gunderson

Three weeks into a laborious attempt to "Francis-Hunstonize" a telephone conversation between two garrulous interlocutors, I remembered a scene from the Coen brothers' black comedy *Fargo*. Brainerd Police Chief

*) Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Soong Sil University.

Marge Gunderson is driving her Prowler down a highway in snow-swept Minnesota; sitting in the passenger seat is Lou, her partner. They are discussing a grisly triple homicide that had just taken place. One of the victims was a fellow police officer:

Line of Dialogue		Act[1]	E.S.	Move	E.S.	Exchange	No.
Marge	You look in his (the murdered police officer's) citation book?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	1
Lou	Ya-ah. (Pause.)	i	h	informing	R		
Lou	(Lou looks at his notebook.) Last vehicle he wrote in was a tan Ciera at 2:18 a.m. Under the plate number he put DLR. I figure they stopped him or shot him before he could finish fillin' out the tag number.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	2
Marge	Uh-huh.	(eng)					
Lou	So I got the state lookin' for a Ciera with a tag startin' DLR. They don't got no match yet.						
Marge	I'm not sure I agree with you a hunnert percent on your police-work, there, Lou.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	3
Lou	Ya-ah?	m.pr	h	eliciting	R/I		
Marge	Ya-ah. I think that vehicle there probly had dealer plates: D-L-R...	conf com	h post-h	informing	R		
Lou	Oh.... (Lou gazes quizzically out the window.) Geez!	rec	h	acknowledging	F		

For better or worse, and perhaps for weeks to come, I will have to stifle the urge to look at movie dialogues like the one above, and puzzle:

Shouldn't Lou's remarks in "Inform Exchange No. 2" have been coded a comment

---

1) See Appendix B for a detailed explanation of the codes used in the arcane world of the Birmingham School of Discourse Analysis.

realizing the post-head of an informing move at R in "Elicit Exchange No. 1"? Ya-ah?[2]

Most likely Francis-Hunston would not "agree a hunnert percent" with the code-work decisions made in the telephone transcription that follows (see sample, Appendix A, below). The entire tedious effort was stymied by a combination of factors that may help explain why certain codes didn't seem to fit. For example:

1) The Francis and Hunston article (1992) was scattered with perplexing typographical errors. This is not the place, of course, to bellyache over proof-reading oversights or authorial carelessness, but some of the mistakes caused considerable head-scratching. I will cite only one of the more egregious errors:

Note 7 in Francis and Hunston (1992: 161; boldface added) reads:

> The sign "&" at the end of 1.80 and the beginning of 1.83 indicates that this is seen
> as a continuous eliciting move by B. B finishes his **neutral** proposal after A has
> spoken,...

But *Line 78* of the same article (1992: 158) reads:

78 B: It was written helium that	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	26[7]
79　　he -er that was what was						
80　　written on the um &						
81 A: No	Rej	h	informing	R		

While I would not place this typographical error — "m.pr" vs. "n.pr" — in the same category of mistakes as the one made famous by the "WICKED BIBLE" of 1631, which reported the Seventh Commandment as "Thou shalt

---

2) The *Fargo* dialogue is literally strewn with delightful Minnesotan patois: e.g., "hunnert" (hundred), "probly" (probably), and especially the ubiquitous "ya-ah" (yes).

commit adultery,"[3] nonetheless, to newcomers to the arcane world of Birmingham-style discourse analysis, such typos are somewhat discombobulating.

2) There is a relative paucity of relevant resources available in Korea. Although CELS's bookshelves no doubt groan under the weight of copious monographs devoted to detailed analysis of recorded conversations, after a quick swing around Korean university libraries, I could scrounge up only three:

- Sinclair and Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse* (with one chart based on an analysis of two texts: pp. 61, 63-110);
- Brazil. 1995. *Classroom and Spoken Discourse* (pp. 42-44, 45, 122-123, 124, 125-126); and
- Francis and Hunston. 1992. "Analyzing Everyday Conversation" (pp. 157-161). In Coulthard (ed.). 1992. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.*[4]

Distressingly, all three sources exhibited different styles of labeling. Brazil and Francis and Hunston depart radically from Sinclair and Coulthard, which is understandable because the former were struggling to adapt the original system (1975) to fit everyday conversation. For example, on pp. 122-123 of Brazil (1995), a chain of exchanges (2-10) contain *rec* in the R slot of the Element of Structure (apparently the *rea* in 5 is a typo). In Francis and Hunston, on the other hand, *rec* is used very rarely (only thrice

---

3) King Charles was so incensed by the mistake that he ordered all copies burned; he also imposed a hefty fine on the printers.

4) I did unearth one web site (http://hpsg.stanford.edu/rob/talk/node7.html) where the author employed the Sinclair-Coulthard model to analyze multi-party discourse (Robert Malouf, "Towards an Analysis of Multi-party Discourse," October 2, 1995).

in a transcript three times as long). And to make matters worse, *Note 6* in Brazil (1995: 123; boldface added) reads:

> The analysis here [6] actually departs from the FH model. According to them, the structure of the exchange is I (R/I) R (F). This means that **both** the initiation (I) and the response (R) are obligatory, since they are not bracketed in the summary of the exchange structure. The suggestion here, however, is that we have an exchange which consists only of an informing move. **There is no R.**

B: And if you're off for one day at a time or whatever, you just need to ring me	i	h	informing	I	Informing	6
B: I think you should have my number.	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Eliciting	7
A: Yeah	rec	h	informing	R		

"There is no R"? Question: are discourse analysts allowed to do this, that is, make up the rules as they go along? Francis and Hunston state the following ironclad rule: "As I (Initiation) is predictive, it must be followed by R/I or R.... [T]he structure I (R) is a contradiction in terms.... R is obligatory whatever the exchange type" (1992: 146–147). Confusion reigns.[5]

---

5) There are other examples, too numerous to mention, e.g.: why do Francis and Hunston (1992: 160) introduce out of the blue a chain of four observation acts in "Exchanges 38-41," when four simple informatives would have done just as well? Francis and Hunston's definition of *informative* ("Its function is to offer 'information' which is already part of the shared knowledge of the participants in the conversation. In other words, it has a predominantly phatic function" [1992: 131]) doesn't seem applicable because the "information" was not necessarily "already part of the shared knowledge of the participants." Furthermore, how is a third party (the discourse analyst) supposed to know this to begin with? See *Line 145*, below (1992: 160):

145	Still Ben had a nice time	**obs**	h	Informing	I	Inform (incomplete)	40

2.0 Discourse Analysis and the Birmingham Six

"[T]he greatest conspiracy in the annals of criminal history."

Lord Bridges, 1975

Old habits are indeed hard to break. For almost half a century, I have been looking at spoken and written discourse with **sub**-sentential blinders, so to speak. Halfway through Coulthard's *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (1985; Chapter 4: "Conversational Analysis," to be exact), there was an epiphanic moment: discourse could be analyzed **supra**-sententially, and the applicability of such a linguistic perspective became more apparent after reading Coulthard's intriguing article, "Forensic Discourse Analysis" (1992: 242-254), about the trial of the Birmingham Six.

After more than 16 years in jail for terrorist bombings they did not commit, the British Court of Appeal in 1991 freed the Birmingham Six — Hugh Callaghan, Paddy Hill, Gerry Hunter, Richard McIlkenny, Billy Power and Johny Walker. Forensic discourse analysis had played an important role in overturning this miscarriage of justice.

During the court proceedings, Prof. Coulthard, one of the "world's leading forensic discourse analysts," was asked why one of the Six admitted to carrying "one white plastic carrier bag" of explosives, and then described another bomber as carrying "two white plastic carrier bags" of explosives. Prof. Coulthard argued that the words recorded in the confessions were not those of the suspect but those of the police (who were positive the explosives were carried in "white plastic carrier bags"). How was the professor able to ascertain this? Because no one in ordinary speech would use and repeat such "abnormally long phrases." The professor was able to buttress his argument with several pieces of evidence: 1) none of the Six spoke that way during the trial, and 2) no example of such a usage was ever found in the

University of Birmingham COBUILD database of language usage.[6]

In the article on forensic discourse analysis mentioned above, Prof. Coulthard wrote:

> As our insights into discourse structure deepen, so will our ability to **distinguish the authentic from the falsified.** Equally, in working on the non-authentic we should gain more insight into how the authentic is structured (boldface added; p. 253).

My curiosity was piqued by this statement because it was secretly hoped, naively in retrospect, that some of the utterances in the recorded telephone conversation that were "Francis-Hunstonized" were in some way falsified, tampered with, doctored, whatever, as were the police interviews were regarding the Birmingham Six. This matter will be mentioned again in **5.0**, below.

3.0 The Sinclair-Coulthard Model of Discourse Analysis

"Let me test your brains."
Mrs. "H"[7]

Along with his important contributions to forensic linguistics, Prof. Malcolm Coulthard, partnered with Prof. John Sinclair, has also played an important role, perhaps at first unintentionally, in helping emancipate another group of unjustly shackled prisoners: second language learners.

---

6) "Forensic Linguistics," by L.J. Hurst. This review appeared in the University of Birmingham Guild of Graduates West Midlands Branch *Newletter*, 1998 (http://dialspace.dial.pipex.com/l.j.hurst/forling.htm).

7) One of several primary school teachers whose classroom discourse was carefully analyzed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 104).

In a "pioneering and influential study" (Cook 1989: 46), the "most significant contribution to the rigorous socio-linguistic analysis of naturally spoken discourse at present available to linguists" (Burton 1981: 61), Sinclair and Coulthard analyzed the transcripts of several British primary school lessons.

Because I haven't seen it stated explicitly in any of the materials available here in Korea, I am going to go out on a limb somewhat to assert that the Sinclair-Coulthard 1975 study, though it was based on teacher-centered L1 classrooms, has had a profound impact on EFL teachers who became convinced that L2 classrooms must be made more "communicative" and more student-centered. Jane Willis wrote:

> Sinclair and Coulthard chose the classroom as the setting for their original analysis because the clearly defined roles of teacher and pupil and the teacher's responsibility for control offer **a stark and comparatively simple discourse structure**. But it is precisely because the tight control in the sort of lessons I analyzed fails to reflect the complexities of discourse and language use outside the classroom that teachers are turning towards communicative activities in their lessons (boldface added; 1992: 177-178).

Although the Sinclair and Coulthard study was intended to be basically descriptive (1975: 15), and though it was based on relatively homogenous data, L2 teachers who became familiar with the Sinclair-Coulthard analysis of L1 texts were dumbfounded by the lock-step rigidity of the IRF exchanges that permeated the transcripts.

Presented below is a sample of a particularly depressing lesson taught by Mrs. "H" to a class of eight-year-olds using materials prepared by the Schools Council Project for the Teaching of English to West Indian children (Sinclair-Coulthard 1975: 104-106; 163):

Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up	Act
Boundary	Now FRAME ^	m				
	Let me test your brains. Let me see if you can think of the materials that I'm going to ask you about. FOCUS	ms				
Elicit	If your mummy was going to make a frock what material would she use? Hands up. NV Marie.	el cu b n	Cloth.	rep	Cloth. Good girl.	e
Elicit	If you mum was going to make a cardigan or a jumper what material would she use?	el	Wool.	rep	Wool. Good girl.	e
Elicit	If your dad was going to make a cupboard, what material would he use?	el	Wood. (CHORUS)	rep	Wood. Yes.	e
Elicit	If your dad was going to have a suit made, what material would the tailor use?	el	Cloth	rep	Cloth. Fine. Yes.	e
Elicit	If you mum was going to make a cake, what material would she use?	el	...			
Elicit	She was going to make a cake. Yes.	el n	(INAUDIBLE)	rep		
Elicit	What material would you use for a cake?	el	— Flour —	rep	Yes, you'd use flour.	e
Elicit	What else would you use?	el	Icing. Icing.	rep rep		
Re-Initiate	Can't hear you if you shout out.	cu	Eggs.	rep	Eggs. Well done, Trevor.	e
Elicit	Flour and eggs and what else? What other materials?	el	— Butter. Water. Sugar.	rep rep rep	Butter and sugar, that's good. Yes. Eggs, flour, butter and sugar. You'd have all sorts of things like that.	e com
	...					
P–Elicit	Sir. Sir. Can I go to the toilet?	b, b el	...			
P–Elicit	(INAUDIBLE)	el	Yes. If you've got a printed one you shouldn't have.	rep com		
P–Elicit	Sir, can I go to the toilet?	el⟨n⟩	...			
P–Elicit	Please can I go to the toilet?	el	Climb over that way.	rep		
Direct	Now er. Let me see. Carys, you come and get some for your lot.	m z d⟨n⟩	NV	rea		

Initially the Sinclair–Coulthard model of discourse analysis was criticized, Brazil writes, for seemingly offering an endorsement of a "certain kind of classroom practice which teachers were at that time seeking to replace by others.... In a sense, such criticism missed the point..." (1995: 61). Although Sinclair and Coulthard did not launch their project to condemn entrenched pedagogical practices, nor to trumpet the merits of the fledgling Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) movement, their findings were widely discussed by most researchers of Teacher Talk in the L2 classroom.[8] If with Hymes (1972) one agrees that the goal of language teaching is to develop "communicative competence," then a perusal of the Sinclair–Coulthard text analysis will reveal that several pedagogical behaviors displayed by Mrs. "H" above have no place in a "communicative" classroom. For example,

1. there is exclusive or excessive use of display questions;

2. there is form-focused feedback (the teacher is concerned only with the correct formation of the students' contributions, rather than with the content);

3. there is an "echoing" of the students' responses (the teacher repeats what a student has just said for the benefit of the whole class — this rarely happens in "authentic" social intercourse); and

4. there are sequences of predicable **IRF** (Initiation–Response–Feedback/Follow-up) discourse chains so graphically revealed by the pioneering work of Sinclair and Coulthard (Cullen 1998: 182):

	I		R		F	
Elicit	If you mum was going to make a cardigan or a jumper what material would she use?	el	Wool.	rep	Wool. Good girl.	e

---

8) See also Sinclair and Brazil, 1982, *Teacher Talk*, Oxford University Press.

This rigid sequence does not in any way reflect the reality of "authentic" discourse spoken outside of "chalk-and-talk" L1/L2 classrooms. The linguistic patterns prominent in real-world discourse are far more complex and flexible than this (Hoey 1992), much to the discomfort of a poor soul who attempted to Francis-Hunstonize a telephone transcript produced by two gabby interlocutors. It is to this endeavor I now turn.

4.0 The Francis-Hunston Model of Discourse Analysis

"Such a solution, however, wreaks havoc with a hierarchical system of analysis."
Francis and Hunston (1992 : 151)

The Sinclair-Coulthard model of discourse analysis is relatively useful for analyzing patterns of interaction ubiquitous in formal situations, such as those between teachers and pupils, parents and children, doctors and patients (Coulthard and Ashby 1975), but "all sorts of complications arise" when one tries to apply the model to data collected in more informal situations (McCarthy 1991: 23; and Burton 1981: 61). Sinclair and Coulthard were, of course, well aware of this:

> What it [the S-C model] cannot handle, and of course was not designed to handle, is pupil/pupil interaction in project work, discussion groups, or the playground (1975: 6).

For example, McKnight (1976, to large groups), McTear (1977, to pre-school children) and several papers emanating from Birmingham ELR[9] chronicled the woes of discourse analysts who have attempted to apply the Sinclair-Coulthard model to the hurly-burly world of everyday conversation,

---

9) See Coulthard and Montgomery (1981: 187, 190-192) for references.

where an IRF pattern would be absurd, except perhaps as a sarcasm device (Burton 1981: 63).

Yet "[d]espite the lack of general applicability, the Sinclair-Coulthard model was widely used as a descriptive system for spoken interaction..." (Sinclair 1992: 80), albeit after several modifications. A chronological list displaying the evolution of the model is presented below.

1. **Sinclair**, J. et al. 1972. *A Course in Spoken English: Grammar.* Oxford University Press.

2. **Sinclair**, J. and M. Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils.* Oxford University Press.

4. **Coulthard**, M. and D. **Brazil**. 1979. *Exchange Structure,* Discourse Analysis Monograph No. 5. ELR, University of Birmingham.

   Burton, D. 1980. *Dialogue and Discourse.* Routledge & Kegan Paul.

   Burton, D. 1981. "Analyzing Spoken Discourse." In Coulthard and Montgomery (eds). 1981: 61-81.

5. **Coulthard**, M. and D. **Brazil**. 1992. "Exchange Structure." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 82-106.

   Berry, M. 1981. "Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: a Multi-layered Approach to Exchange Structure." In Coulthard and Montgomery (eds). 1981: 120-145.

   Willis, J. 1981. "Spoken Discourse in the ELT Classroom: a System of Analysis and a Description." Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Birmingham

   Carter, R. and D. **Burton** (eds.). 1982. *Literary Text and Language Study.* Edward Arnold.

   Willis, D. 1983. "The Implications of Discourse Analysis for the Teaching of Spoken English." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Birmingham.

   Stenström, A. 1984. "Questions and Responses in English Conversation." Lund

University Press.[10]

Tsui, A. 1986. "A Linguistic Description of Utterances in Conversation." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Birmingham.

7. Coulthard, M. (ed.). 1987. *Discussing Discourse*. ELR, University of Birmingham

8. Francis, G. and S. Hunston. 1992. "Analyzing Everyday Conversation." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 123-161. This article was first published in Coulthard. *Discussing Discourse*. 1987: 107-48.

6. Coulthard, M. and D. Brazil. 1992. "Exchange Structure." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992 : 82-106. This article is a revised version of Coulthard and Brazil. 1979.

3. Sinclair, J. and M. Coulthard. 1992. "Towards an Analysis of Discourse." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 1-34. This article is "a slightly modified version" of Chapter 3 of Sinclair and Coulthard. 1975.

To date perhaps the two most ambitious attempts to adapt the original Sinclair-Coulthard model to "natural, everyday" discourse have been done by

Coulthard and Montgomery. 1981 (esp. chapters 3 : Burton, and 4: **Coulthard** and **Brazil**, 5: **Stubbs**, 6 : **Berry**, and 7 : **Brazil**),

and by

Francis and Hunston. 1992. ("Analyzing Everyday Conversation," pp.123-161, in Coulthard (ed.). 1992. The article was first published in Coulthard (1987: 107-48)).

The latter authors' pedagogical and theoretical aims of their efforts were

... to define precisely the analytical categories so that the students could apply them

---

10) Her book is based on data from the London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English; she analyzed conversation via a modified version of the Sinclair-Coulthard model of discourse analysis.

with confidence, but at the same time present a system which would be flexible and adaptable enough to cope with a wide variety of discourse situations: casual conversations between friends and family members, child-adult talk, commercial transactions, professional interviews, radio phone-ins, and even air-traffic controllers' talk.

> ... to interpret, integrate and systematize the various adaptations and refinements of the original Sinclair-Coulthard model (1975) which have emerged from Birmingham over the past ten years. The sheer quantity and range of our data (over a hundred transcripts) provided us with an opportunity to formulate a substantially revised version of the model which, we feel, reflects accurately the nature of different types of talk while remaining true to the spirit of the original model and its fundamental underlying principles (p. 123).

Space limitations prevent a detailed examination of the differences between the two models. I would like to mention one area, however, that caused considerable confusion when I attempted to code the above-mentioned telephone transcription. Perhaps the most complex revisions involved the all-important elicit exchanges. According to the Sinclair-Coulthard (1975) system of discourse analysis, the elicits are relatively straightforward and easy to code (due in part, of course, to the type of data being analyzed):

Elicit	If you mum was going to make a cardigan or a jumper what material would she use?	el	Wool.	rep	Wool. Good girl.	e
Elicit	If your dad was going to make a cupboard, what material would he use?	el	Wood. (CHORUS)	rep	Wood. Yes.	e
Elicit	If your dad was going to have a suit made, what material would the tailor use?	el	Cloth.	rep	Cloth. Fine. Yes.	e

But according to the Francis-Hunston (1992) system of analysis, the coder is required to juggle a whole assortment of vaguely defined eliciting acts (*inquires, neutral proposals, marked proposals, loops,* and so on) when

analyzing far more complex interactions (see especially *Lines 76–86*, below):

54　A: Why doesn't it float any	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit (incomplete)	18	
55　　more (1.5)							
...							
56　　It doesn't float any more	i	h	informing	I	Inform	19	

57 B: What do you mean	ret	h	eliciting	Ib	Clarify (incomplete)	20	
58　　it doesn't float							
...							
59 A: I mean you know it's not	i	h	informing	I	Inform	21	
60　　(la) important it's just er					(incomplete)		

61 B: What do you mean it	inq	h	eliciting	Ib	Re-initiation	22[6]	
62　　doesn't float any more					(incomplete)		
｜　　｜							
｜···｜							
63　　a peculiar physical fact that							
64　　helium yesterday was lighter than							
65　　air and today it's heavier							
66 B: Really?	m.pr	h	eliciting	R/I			
67 A: Yeah (high key)	conf	h	informing	R	Elicit		
68　　isn't that weird	com	post-h					
...							
69　　I mean nothing could have	i	h	informing	I	Inform (incomplete)	23	
70　　happened to it (high ter)							
...							
73 B: Well	m	s	eliciting	I	Elicit	25	
74　　unless they weren't using	m.pr	h					
75　　helium							
76 A: They were	rej	h	informing	R			
77　　I saw them fill it	com	post-h					
...							
78 B: It was written helium that	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	26[7]	
79　　he -er that was what was							
80　　written on the um &							
81 A: No	rej	h	informing	R			
82　　but I mean-(uncodable)							
83 B: & on the tank or something							

201

...

84 A: Well what was it then	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	27	

---

85 B: Sorry?	l	h	eliciting	Ib	Repeat	28	
86 A: What was it then	inq	h	eliciting	R/I			
87 B: I don't know you know	s	pre-h	nforming	R			
88 I mean I'm just trying to							
89 work out and see I I mean it							
90 could be anything wh-							
91 helium doesn't get converted	i	h					

Presented below is a summary of findings obtained from analysis carried out via the two models, Sinclair-Coulthard (S-C) and Francis-Hunston (F-H):

S-C Analysis of Classroom Discourse suggests that:	F-H Analysis of Everyday Discourse suggests that:
1. Teachers talk a lot / pupils very little.	1. Many of the moves which are a natural part of everyday conversation do not take place in the classroom.
2. Only teachers initiate / pupils do not ask questions or provide information except when it is asked for — exception when one poor lad asked to go to the bathroom.	2. The structure of conversational exchanges — I (R/I) R (Fⁿ) — is **much more complex** than the structure of teaching exchanges — I (R) (F).
3. Teachers control the discourse; the teacher produces the boundary exchanges; the teacher marks the successful conclusion of exchanges by offering evaluations.	3. Roles switch during conversational interaction; either participant may control and initiate.
4. Pupil moves are usually one act moves; teachers use pre- and post-head acts to organize turn-taking and direct attention, which pupils do not.	4. Moves tend to be **more complex** in conversational interaction.

Table 1: A Comparison of the Findings of the Sinclair-Coulthard / Francis-Hunston Models of Discourse (Brazil 1995: 136)

"Much more complex" indeed. To let the cat out of the bag, in the next section I will discuss and conquer with several arguments advanced by scholars who insist that the Sinclair-Coulthard model, modified or otherwise, is of limited pedagogical and linguistic value in particular when

analyzing "more complex" conversational interactions.

5.0 The Lewinsky-Tripp Tapes: An Analysis

"I'd be careful what I said on the phone to her."
Linda R. Tripp[11]

There are at least four reasons why I attempted to Francis-Hunstonize a transcription of the now infamous Lewinsky-Tripp tapes:

1) The tapes constitute a very convenient, fascinating, and historically significant[12] corpus of fresh data (about 20 hours worth) that can be easily accessed on the Internet at numerous web sites, e.g.,

- audio available at http: // www.cspan.org / guide / executive / investigation / tapes.asp (see image);

- written transcript in PDF format downloadable from http: // www.house.gov / icreport / 105-316 / 105-316.htm (only 64 megabytes!).

Hordes of discourse analysts may descend one day on the tapes looking for something juicy to write a research paper on. Surprisingly, very few discourse analysts have done much work on the audio-tapes and transcripts resulting from a previous U.S. impeachment brouhaha. One interesting analysis of the Watergate transcripts was done by Lerman (1980), who focused on U.S. President Richard Nixon's foul language.

Because transcription is an enormously lengthy and tedious business

---

11) Etta Hulme, *The Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, 1998.
12) Tripp's taped recordings of her young "friend" Lewinsky led directly to Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's charges of impeachable offenses against U.S. President Clinton and to the resulting media circus that became known as Monicagate.

(Stubbs 1983: 232), the Lewinsky-Tripp tapes are a godsend. However, the 40-minute session of telephone conversation I chose still had to be typed line by line and even tidied up: based on the audio-tapes, I found numerous mistakes even in the "official" transcript. Interestingly, Birdwhistell (1970: 13) found that even skilled secretaries when asked to do transcriptions of tape-recorded conversations made about one mistake every five words! Thus, although Francis and Hunston make a point of mentioning

> a) The sheer quantity and range of our data (over a hundred transcripts) (123),.... [and]
>
> b) The data collected by our students ... consists largely of two-party conversations. Singaporeans make up the vast majority of participants, and the data contains many examples of features of **Singapore English** (boldface added; 125),

it is safe to assume that overall their data is less "authentic" vis-à-vis the Lewinsky-Tripp tapes.[13]

2) As mentioned above, the tapes are authentic; i.e., they are apparently (and unfortunately; see 4), below) not fabricated or doctored, so when the coding gets complex there is no chance the coder can succumb to temptation and fudge on the labeling. Another plus is that the Lewinsky-Tripp tapes share numerous similarities with the Francis-Hunston sample transcript:

> The data presented and discussed in this chapter is a **complete telephone conversation between two native speakers of English** [pp. 157-61]. The two

---

13) I am well aware that considerable controversy swirls around the issue of authenticity in language learning, and that this is not the place to debate the problem (see Widdowson 1998: 711-712). Suffice it to say that much of the Singaporean English in the data obtained from Francis and Hunston's students is virtually incomprehensible (see *Example 40*, below).

participants are close friends and call each other frequently (boldface added; 1992: 124).

McCarthy notes: "One of the major contributions of discourse analysis has been to emphasize the analysis of real data,.." (1991: 50). Yet real data is very hard to come by because once you tape someone while they are aware of the taping, the resulting data is not really "authentic" (see footnote 14, above). Enter Labov's Observer's Paradox:

> The aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation (1972: 209).

This is a stern reminder of the perennial problem in spoken discourse research on how to observe without being observed, how to collect data unobtrusively. Preston wrote: "The more aware respondents are that speech is being observed, the less natural their performances will be" (1989: 7). Hence, the paradox suggests that the behavior of the observed will inevitably be contaminated *in some way* by the presence of the observer: you cannot observe people when they are not being observed. Consequently, the Lewinsky-Tripp tapes are of some value because one of the interlocutors was unaware that her conversation was being secretly recorded.

3) It is illegal in Korea to tape someone without his or her permission.[14] And

---

14) The Korean National Assembly passed an anti-bugging law in September 1998. Maryland, where Linda Tripp lives, is one of 12 U.S. states where it is illegal to tape someone without his or her permission. Tripp was recently under investigation by the Maryland state prosecutor, but he dropped his wiretapping charges against her in October 2000, saying he was left with no case after a judge barred most testimony from his star witness, Monica Lewinsky.

again, how can one obtain *real* spoken discourse if the interlocutors are conscious of the recording devices? Also, in Korea there is a relative scarcity of native-speakers who are patient enough to sit down for an hour or so and engage in a make-believe telephone conversation. Furthermore, I am somewhat dubious about the efficacy of using transcripts and making theoretical statements based on dialogues produced by non-native speakers, Singaporean or otherwise. If one wishes to question this, please examine Francis-Hunston's *Example 40* (p. 154), below:

Example 40 (A customer [A] is attempting to negotiate a lower price with a shop assistant [B])

B: Actually the cost price for this it should be ten seventy we selling you see actually we don't earn much from the customer we need to have more customer.	i	h	informing	I	Inform
A:⊙	(rec)	h	(acknowledging)	R	

...

A: Then how is it NTUC is selling at fifty you see.	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit
B: No, because for the meantime ah they calling in more you see.	i	h	informing	R	

The dialogue is virtually incomprehensible (L1 interference?). Now compare this with some of the Lewinsky-Tripp conversations in Appendix A (for starters, *Lines 45-76*: incomprehensible, no; weird, yes).

4) Naively, as it turned out, I had hoped that I would find something on the tapes to show that U.S. Independent Council Kenneth Starr had somehow doctored them,[15] hence, my interest in Coulthard's article on forensic discourse analysis mentioned in 2.0, above.

---

15) On Feb. 1, 1999, when Monica Lewinsky was summoned to testify for the 23rd time about her "conversations" with U.S. President Clinton, it was widely reported in the press that she possessed "almost total recall" of the events. Prof. Coulthard would undoubtedly question this assertion: "Their [interlocutors'] ability to reproduce verbatim," it such situations, "can be as low as 1 per cent. (1992: 245).

Francis and Hunston present an entire telephone conversation that is neatly bracketed at one end by a *Summon*, followed by a *Greet*, a *Structuring* (1992: 158), three more *Greets* (two of which are incomplete!), and finally at the other end by a *Structuring* and three *Greets* (160–161; one of which is incomplete). In order to examine the structure of a telephone conversation, and for the purposes of comparison, it was necessary to transcribe the entire conversation, which is about three times longer than Francis–Hunston's. Please consult Appendix A and examine the Lewinsky–Tripp tapes from *Lines 1 to 72*, which display fairly frequent alternations of speakers.[16]

For the past few weeks, it has been required literally to memorize chunks of Francis and Hunston's paper (in particular pages 125–139, and 141–156) and to scour various other materials (see 4.0, above) in a frantic search for clues that would help explain why many of the categories proposed by Francis and Hunston did not seem to fit when applied to the Lewinsky–Tripp transcription. Below are several factors that may help explain just what the problem was.[17]

1) This may sound like a carpenter blaming his or her tools, but with all due respect to Francis and Hunston, who insist that "... the system we present applies particularly to everyday conversation" (p. 125), the tools in this case are very much to blame. I am well aware that the reader may

---

16) Upon hearing Monica Lewinsky and Linda Tripp both use the word *meshuggah* (Yiddish for "crazy"), I recalled a comment made by Coulthard: "a typical feature of New York Jewish style is for speakers to overlap the utterances of others as a way of showing enthusiasm and interest" (1985: 56). Perhaps it is understandable, then, why the frequent alternations and interruptions of speakers found throughout the Lewinsky–Tripp tapes are enough to drive even a patient coder half-crazy.

17) I will address these issues collectively, instead of testing the reader's patience with a tedious one-by-one list of problems that basically share the same characteristics. See Appendix A for specific categories.

expect this assertion to be backed up with solid evidence. Well, although a majority of the numerous "mis-fits" were undoubtedly due to ineptitude as a coder (recall Lou's police-work mentioned in 1.0, above), it is my opinion that the system itself is partially at fault for its inability to handle telephone conversations, albeit chaotic ones. Thus, I am convinced that the Sinclair-Coulthard model is a tool efficacious only when analyzing highly structured discourse exemplified by teacher/pupil, doctor-patient, parent/child relationships; conversely, it is a tool, despite valiant attempts to modify it, inefficacious when analyzing highly unstructured discourse exemplified by everyday conversation. Sinclair and Coulthard write:

> Our system of analysis was designed to handle discourse produced in one type of classroom situation, although we have since discovered that with minor modifications it can handle a wide range of **classroom situations** (boldface added; 1975: 112).

The key words here are "classroom situations." Simply a) omitting "the categories more typical of 'formal' situations," for example, "the element of move structure 'select' and the acts which realize it (*cue, bid* and *nomination*), on the grounds that it is a feature whose use is restricted to the classroom, formal discussions ..., and certain types of quiz game," because "[i]t does not occur in two-party everyday conversation" (p. 125), and b) adding in a seemingly ad hoc manner several more "precise" categories of acts,[18] not only aggravates the coding problems, but also in a sense renders the entire exercise virtually meaningless. The analyzed discourse produced by the Sinclair-Coulthard model is of some linguistic and certainly pedagogical value, namely to L2 teachers who advocate more

---

18) Francis and Hunston admit: "Each new set of data will inevitably require adaptations and additions at [the] act level" (1992: 134).

communicative approaches to language learning (see 3.0, above). However, there seems to be very little other practical use to justify the enormous effort involved in labeling even highly structured discourse, not to mention chaotic everyday conversations, which frequently do not seem to fit.

In the early 1980s, several scholars (e.g., Wells *et al.* 1981, Levinson 1983; though "rebuted" by Tsui 1986) questioned the applicability of what has come to be known as the Birmingham School (Cook 1989: 46) to discourse other than highly structured situations, such as British primary school classrooms, where the original research took place. To reiterate what has been mentioned above, the Sinclair–Coulthard approach "is primarily applicable to relatively formal situations in which a central aim is to formulate and transmit pieces of information," but is less obviously applicable to "**casual conversation** between social equals, where the general function of much of the discourse may be phatic and social" (Stubbs 1983: 146, quoted in Brazil 1995: 109). McCarthy writes:

> Because of the rigid conventions of situations such as teacher talk and doctor-patient talk, it is relatively easy to predict who will speak when, who will ask and who will answer, who will interrupt, who will open and close the talk, and so on. But **where talk is more casual**, and among equals, everyone will have a part to play in controlling and monitoring the discourse, and the picture will look **considerably more complicated** (boldface added; 1991: 23).

But as Brazil reminds us, this is the kind of discourse L2 students are most likely to hear:

> The "untidiness" of informal conversation ... results from apparently random back-channel activity combines with the "thinking time" combinations of level tone and pause to make much authentic dialogue very difficult to use for teaching purposes. It is

important, however, to keep in mind that this is the kind of discourse students are most likely to hear (1995: 133).

2) Francis and Hunston, as mentioned in 4.0, above, formulated a "substantially revised version" (1992: 123) of the original Sinclair-Coulthard model, the most ambitious attempt so far to adapt the model to everyday conversation.[19] The Achilles heel of both models, however, still involves "... the vexed question of **multiple coding**" (Sinclair 1992: 84), also called **double labeling**. Brazil writes:

> ... the aim of the kind of description Sinclair and Coulthard propose is to reduce them to a finite set in such a way that **all users of the system will agree** about what each and every act counts as (boldface added; 1995: 27).

Francis and Hunston write:

> One criticism often leveled at the Sinclair-Coulthard system is that it assumes that each utterance or part of an utterance has one and only one function (e.g. Open University 1981: 23). So each answer must be either, say, a *qualify* or an *informative*, a move must be either eliciting or acknowledging, and so on. Yet, the critics claim, in practice a single act or move can perform **two functions at once** (boldface added; 1992: 149).

Yet in Footnote 2 on p. 26 (1995; boldface added) Brazil states:

> This [i.e., the **com**] could be coded as a separate *inform*. It is sometimes **very difficult**

---

19) One is left with the distinct impression that Sinclair and Coulthard have decided to go on to greener pastures, forensic linguistics by the latter, and corpus linguistics, among other things, by the former.

to distinguish between an act which supports another by giving supplementary information, and an act which stands as an inform in its own right.

Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up	Act
Elicit	Why did they build Pyramids? Paul.	el n	When they were dead they put all their riches and everything they owned in their Pyramid.	rep	Yes, they did, yes. Right in the depth, in the heart of the Pyramid there was a special little room where they had their personal belongings. Precious special things that belonged to them.	e com

(Source: Sinclair and Coulthard 1975: 82)

"Very difficult," indeed. Thus, as McCarthy and Carter note: "... a good deal of subjectivity is often involved in labeling ... discourse structure" (1988: 186). For example, how should one code *Line 20*, "Yeah, pretty late," in the following?

18	Why (#)	s	pre-h	eliciting	I	Elicit	8
19	did you wake up late today	n.pr	h				
20	A: Yeah, pretty late	?	h	informing	R		
21	B: Oh dear	end	h	acknowledging	F		

Because one of the theoretical principles of the Sinclair and Coulthard Model of Discourse Analysis is that an "utterance is coded according to its 'dominant' function" (1992: 14), Francis and Hunston coded the utterance as a *qualify*:

18	Why (#)	s	pre-h	eliciting	I	Elicit	8
19	did you wake up late today	n.pr	h				
20	A: Yeah, pretty late	qu	h	informing	R		
21	B: Oh dear	end	h	acknowledging	F		

(Source: Francis and Hunston 1992: 156)

211

I was faced dozens of times while coding the Lewinsky-Tripp transcription with uncertainty over deciding which is the "dominant function" in the utterances (recall McCarthy and Carter's comment: "a good deal of subjectivity" is always involved in these matters). If this is the case, and if some functions are "covered" by other "dominant" functions, resulting in the impossibility of using a single label,[20] doesn't this pludge the entire laborious effort into a trivial albeit descriptive exercise, a criticism made already by Labov and Fanshel (1977), who used the words "superficial" and "obvious" for the resulting analysis? Thompson complains that the model is "formalistic" (1984: 106-108) and Mountford describes it as little more than "a descriptive apparatus that is applied to the data *ex post facto*" (1975). At the end of the day, after the excruciating ordeal of labeling an entire transcript has been completed, what linguistic insights have been discovered, what pedagogical principles have been elucidated? Sinclair and Coulthard's 1975 data was at least put to some good use, namely by L2 teachers. Perhaps the time has come to go on to greener pastures.

3) The third general factor that may help explain why frequently things didn't quite seem to fit according to the Francis-Hunston system of analysis centers around the complex problem of determining where exchanges end and where new ones begin. Stubbs (1983: 132) asks whether "... exchanges [are] always well-defined units, with clear-cut openings and closings. Or do they have well-defined openings, but ill-defined ends?"

---

20) With all due respect, Prof. Sinclair's two arguments in favor of single labeling (in Coulthard [ed.] 1992: 84) are not very convincing, evidenced by the fact that very few applied linguists outside of Birmingham have struggled with the model; since the early 1980s (after "[t]he model ... attracted considerable published and unpublished criticism" Coulthard 1985: 142), it seems even fewer linguists have attempted to criticize it.

Is all conversational data analyzable into exchanges, or is the concept applicable only to a narrow range of discourse (e.g. teacher-pupil dialogue), whilst other discourse (e.g. casual conversation) drifts along in a less structured way? Can one exchange be embedded within another, giving discontinuous exchanges? An so on. Any work which makes structural claims about the organization of spoken discourse must provide answers to such questions (132).

Conversations are not well-defined, unitary events, and no exhaustive account of their organization is possible. **Categorization is always problematic,** and it is never possible to say in so many words exactly what is meant. Some aspects of language are inherently indeterminate, and therefore all conversations are less determinate than formal methods of analysis can admits (boldface added; 135).

4) This frequent indeterminacy leads into the fourth general factor: incomplete exchanges. Francis and Hunston write that where a "predicted element of an exchange is missing, the exchange must be classified as incomplete" (1992: 152). Cynics may view this as a sort of *deus ex machina* called upon whenever the data doesn't seem to fit. *Example 35,* below, is a list of the incomplete exchanges which occur at various places in Francis and Hunston's data (1992: 152), which is remarkable considering the relative shortness of the telephone conversation: i.e., 10 incompletes out of a total of 50 exchanges (20%):

Example 35

(i)	3	B: Hello	I	Greet (incomplete)
(ii)	6	A: Hello	I	Greet (incomplete)
(iii)	9	A: So I've got to get him off to school	I	Inform (incomplete)
(iv)	18	A: Why doesn't it float any more	I	Elicit (incomplete)
(v)	20	B: What do you mean it doesn't	I^b	Clarify (incomplete)
(vi)	22	B: What do you mean it doesn't float any more	I^b	Re-initiation (incomplete)
(vii)	23	A: I mean nothing could have happened to it	I	Inform (incomplete)
(viii)	24	A: But I	?	? (incomplete)
(ix)	40	A: Still Ben had a nice time.	I	Inform (incomplete)
(x)	48	A: Bye-bye	I	Greet (incomplete)

In this writer' s data (Appendix A) there were 39 incompletes out of a total
of 201 exchanges (14%).

5) Coulthard warns: "... discourse analysts ignore intonation at their
peril..." (1985: 119), and Brazil advises: "Intonation ... should be taken into
account from the start" (1992: 7). Yet elsewhere he admits:[21]

- There is **no generally agreed method** of describing how the intonation system of
  English works" (boldface added; 1994: 7).
- In some kinds of spoken discourse, **such as casual conversation between
  intimates,** it can be difficult to make a confident judgment about what is happening
  intonationally (boldface added; 1995: 55).
- In some kinds of discourse, like that produced in classrooms, most intonation choices
  are fairly clearly distinguishable, presenting few problems for the transcriber.... In
  other discourses, like much **desultory conversation** [esp. telephone conversation],
  the reverse is the case (boldface added; 1985: 242).

The reader may have noticed (see esp. Appendix A) that I have avoided
affixing labels pertaining to intonation or key to the analyzed transcription.
This accounts for the lack of variety and the frequency of *conc* in my
labeling. Interestingly, Brazil himself did the very same in the dialogues
presented for study in *Course Notes* (see pp. 122-123, 124, 125-126)!
Furthermore, without the audio tapes, how is one to tell the difference
between *Line 142* and *Line 144,* below?

---

21) Brazil is not the only one to lament this fact. McCarthy (boldface added; 1991: 99,
    101) writes: "In actual fact, it is not at all easy to isolate tone groups in natural data,
    especially in rapid, casual speech, and some linguists have abandoned the attempt
    altogether.... [N]ot all linguists are agreed that it is a straightforward matter to
    isolate tone groups. Evidence shows that even trained native speakers find it **very
    difficult** to break talk up into such units and to identify tonics in speech (Brown and
    Yule 1983: 158).

140 We we don't walk enough	obs	h	Informing	I	Inform	38
141 my feet really hurt (2)						
142 B: Mm (low key)	ter	h	acknowledging	R		

143 Yeah bit of a let–down	obs	h	Informing	I	Inform	39
144 A: Mm (mid key)	rec	h	acknowledging	R		

(Source: Francis and Hunston 1992: 160)

I have briefly discussed five factors that may help explain why frequently a category did not seem to fit (Appendix A presents the data is a more systematic form), thereby "creating an awkward problem for linear analysis" (Francis and Hunston 1992: 161). Without space constraints other factors could certainly have been mentioned: back–channel responses, implied elements, the Ib Clarify, Repeat, and Re–initiate exchanges, and so on. To summarize: I believe the Francis–Hunston model is too unwieldy a tool to use when analyzing everyday conversation, especially chaotic discourse like the Lewinsky–Tripp transcription. At the end of their article, Francis and Hunston make this astonishing admission:

We leave the reader with two concluding points, the first of which is that many of the concepts we have discussed above remain sadly underdeveloped;... All these areas are in need of further clarification (1992: 156).[22]

---

22) Francis and Hunston write that if the "... reader as analyst wishes to abandon these theoretical principles ... we suggest that he/she needs to think in terms of constructing **an alternative description** which would account for the data of everyday conversation in a more satisfactory way. We are not claiming that it cannot be done. All that we can say is that while the Sinclair–Coulthard system has its critics, very few of them have attempted to suggest viable alternatives. To suggest, as some do, that everyday conversation cannot be subjected to linguistic analysis is not a solution" (boldface added; 1992: 156). The revised model is a cumbersome tool that can subject everyday conversation to descriptive linguistic analysis. This is granted. But are the "findings" which result from this analysis worth all the enormous effort involved? Clearly they do not.

6.0 Implications for EFL Classrooms

Discourse analysis "... is a field about which so little is known."

D. Brazil (boldface added; 1995: 25)

In "Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching," Brazil (1995) asks whether discourse skills should be taught directly in L2 learning programs. Should a structural syllabus be designed that incorporates the "findings" obtained from the model pioneered by Sinclair-Coulthard and revised by Francis-Hunston? Should discourse structures (*m.pr* and *n.pr, reacts, loops, confirms, reformations,* etc.) replace or supplement the grammatical structures still taught in many L2 classrooms? Wouldn't this be the first step down the stony path to a discourse analysis version of the Grammatical-Translation Method? McCarthy writes: "We shall, as always, not necessarily assume that, because something can be described, it must therefore be taught" (1991: 119).

Discourse analysis in not a method for teaching languages; it is a way of describing and understanding how language is used (1991: 2).

Hoey (1992: 66, 82) adds:

Discourse structure is not something that needs normally to be taught explicitly in the classroom,.... There is no need to teach discourse structures in the classroom.

Brazil argues that perhaps indirectly, via a form of consciousness-raising, the "findings" produced by the above-mentioned models might be useful in helping students become conscious of natural conversation skills:

> Just as you can have consciousness-raising activities to make students more aware of grammar, so you can have activities to increase awareness of discourse (1995: 137).

Brazil then lists several possibilities, for example (and this writer picked the most interesting one here), have students focus on pre-and post-head acts, particularly discourse markers like *Well* and *So* (p. 137). I cannot speak for EFL teachers in other countries, but if I ever attempted to do something like this in one of my Korean EFL classrooms, I would have a full-scale riot on my hands!

7.0 References

Austin, J. 1962. *How to Do things with Words.* Oxford University Press.

Berry, M. 1981. "Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: a Multi-layered Approach to Exchange Structure." In Coulthard and Montgomery (eds.). 1981: 120-145.

Brazil, D. 1985. *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English.* ELR, University of Birmingham.

Brazil, D. 1992. "Speaking English or Talking to People." Adapted from "The Nature of English Conversation," a lecture given at Sophia University, Tokyo, Jan. 1992.

Brazil, D. 1994. *Pronunciation for Advanced Learners of English.* Cambridge University Press.

Brazil, D. 1995. *Course Notes (MA TEFL): Classroom and Spoken Discourse.* University of Birmingham.

Brazil, D. 1995. *A Grammar of Speech.* Oxford University Press.

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

Burton, D. 1980. *Dialogue and Discourse.* Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Burton, D. 1981. "Analyzing Spoken Discourse." In Coulthard and Montgomery (eds.). 1981: 61–81.

Carter, R. and D. Burton (eds.). 1982. *Literary Text and Language Study*. Edward Arnold.

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

Coulthard, M. 1985. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Longman.

Coulthard, M. (ed.).1992. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. Routledge.

Coulthard, M. 1992. "Forensic Discourse Analysis." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 242–258.

Coulthard, M. and M. Montgomery (eds.). 1981. *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. Routledge.

Coulthard, M. and D. Brazil. 1979. *Exchange Structure*. Discourse Analysis Monograph No. 5. ELR, University of Birmingham.

Coulthard, M. and D. Brazil. 1992. "Exchange Structure." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 82–106.

Coulthard, M. and M. Ashby 1975. "A Linguistic Description of Doctor-Patient Interviews." In Wadsworth *et al.* (eds.). 1976: 72–86.

Cullen, R. 1998. "Teacher Talk and the Classroom Context." *ELT Journal* 52/3: 179–187.

Francis, G. and S. Hunston. 1992. "Analyzing Everyday Conversation." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 123–161.

Hoey, M. 1992. "Some Properties of Spoken Discourse." In Bowers and Brumfit (eds.). *Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching: Review of ELT* 2/1. Macmillan.

Hymes, D. 1971. "Sociolinguistics and the Ethnography of Speaking." In Ardener (ed.). *Social Anthropology and Linguistics*. Association of Social Anthropologists Monograph 10. 1971: 47–93.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1993. "Maximizing Learning Potential in the

Communicative Classroom." *ELT Journal* 47/1: 12–21.

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

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

McCarthy, M. and R. Carter. 1988. *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching.* Longman.

Mountford, A. 1975. *Discourse Analysis and the Simplification of Reading Material for English for Special Purposes.* Unpublished M. Litt. Thesis. University of Edinburgh.

Nunan, D. 1987. "Communicative Language Teaching: Making it Work." *ELT Journal* 41/2: 136–45.

Searle, J. 1969. *Speech Acts.* Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. 1992. "Priorities in Discourse Analysis." In Coulthard 1992: 79–88.

Sinclair, J. *et al.* 1972. *A Course in Spoken English: Grammar.* Oxford University Press.

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

Sinclair, J. and D. Brazil. 1982. *Teacher Talk.* Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. and M. Coulthard. 1992. "Towards an Analysis of Discourse." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 1–34.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Blackwell.

Stenström, A. 1984. "Questions and Responses in English Conversation." Lund University Press.

Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis.* Blackwell.

Tsui, A. 1987. "The Description of Utterances in Conversation." In Verschueren (ed.). *Pragmatics at Issue: Selected papers of the International Pragmatics Conference, Antwerp,* August 17–22, 1987: 229–248. John

Benjamins.

Tsui, A. 1989. "Systemic Choices and Discourse Processes." *Word* 40:163-187.

Widdowson, H. 1998. "Context, Community, and Authentic Language." *TESOL Quarterly*. 32/4: 705-716.

Willis, J. 1981. "Spoken Discourse in the ELT Classroom: a System of Analysis and a Description." Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Birmingham.

Willis, J. 1992. "Inner and Outer: Spoken Discourse in the Language Classroom." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 162-182.

Willis, D. 1983. "The Implications of Discourse Analysis for the Teaching of Spoken English." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Birmingham.

Willis, D. 1992. "Caught in the Act: Using the Rank Scale to Address Problems of Delicacy." In Coulthard (ed.). 1992: 111-122.

8.0 Appendices

A. Excerpts from a Lewinsky-Tripp Telephone Conversation (Monday Oct. 6, 1997):

Bold = Monica S. Lewinsky; Italics = Linda R. Tripp;
Bold Code = Uncertain; (R) = Redacted

Line of Dialogue	Act	E.S.	Move	E.S.	Exchange	No
1. (Phone ringing.)	sum	h	opening	I	Summon	1
2. Hello.	re-sum	h	answering	R		
3. Hi.	gr	h	opening	I	Greet (incomplete)	2
4. Ah, I just walked in the door!	i	h	informing	I	Inform	3
5. How is that possible?	inq	h	eliciting	R/I		

6.	Because I met Beth.	i	h	informing	R		
7.	What?	l	h	eliciting	Ib	Repeat	4
8.	I met Beth in Bethesda.	i	h	informing	R		
9.	Remember, I told you?	com	post-h				
10.	Oh, no!	m	s	eliciting	I	Elicit	5
11.	You know what?	m.pr	h				
12.	Something's wrong with your phone then.						
13.	No.	rej	h	informing	R		
14.	Are you sure?	ret	h	eliciting	Ib	Clarify	6
15.	No.	conc	h	informing	R		
16.	It was off the hook.	com	post-h				
17.	Oh.	rec	h	acknowledging	F		
18.	The dog knocked it off the couch.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	7
19.	Oh, my God!	end	h	acknowledging	R		
20.	It was driving me (R) crazy, because you know what?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	8
21.	You call waiting doesn't work.						
22.	You're kidding!	rej	h	informing	R		
23.	When it's off the hook?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	9
24.	No.	conf	h	informing	R		
25.	So it's like this voice mail woman comes on.	com	post-h				
26.	Oh-ho!	end	h	acknowledging	F		
27.	Wait a minute.	fr	pre-h	opening	I	Structuring	10
28.	Don't go anywhere, my dinner's heating.	ms	h				
29.	I am starving.	com	post-h				
30.	Oh.	acq	h	answering	R		
31.	Hold on.	ms	h	opening	I	Structuring	11
32.	It's just in the oven. (Pause.)						
33.	Just a minute. (Television (a football game!)) is heard in the background.).						
34.	⊙	(acq)	h	(answering)	R		
35.	Get down, Cleo (Tripp's dog)! Get down, get down, get down, get down!					(uncoded)	
36.	Are you there?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	12
37.	Hi.	i	h	informing	R		
38.	The phone was on the couch in the family room.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	13

39.	Uh-huh.	(eng)					
40.	And when I came in, it was sprawled all over the floor.						
41.	Oh, my God.	end	h	acknowledging	R		
42.	So she must have knocked it down at one point.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	14
43.	Oh.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
44.	So, I am so hungry.	ms	h	opening	I	Structuring (incomplete)	15
45.	Oh, did you have a good time?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	16
46.	No.	i	h	informing	R		
47.	How's your hair?	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	17
48.	Oh, well,	m	s	informing	R	Inform	
49.	he took forever on it, but, he, I kept telling him — I want to grow out the bangs, right?	i	h				
50.	And he cut the bangs.	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	18
51.	Oh, no.	rej	h	informing	R		
52.	It's not that he cut the bangs. He just like trained it to the other side.	com	post-h				
53.	Oh.	rec	h	acknowledging	F		
54.	My hair does not want to do that.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	19
55.	Yeah.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
56.	So, uhm, it's in my face.	m	s	informing	I	Inform	20
57.	It's driving me nuts.	i	h				
58.	Yeah.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
59.	He said you were coming?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	21
60.	Yeah.	i	h	informing	R		

61.	Did you?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	22
62.	Yeah.	i	h	informing	R		
63.	Well, yours is beautiful.	m	s	informing	I	Inform (incomplete)	23
64.	I told him I've never seen hair like yours.	i	h				
65.	What's going on?	inq	h	eliciting	I	Eliciting	24
66.	Oh, God!	rej	h	informing	R		
67.	Ha, ha, ha, ha. That bad?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	25
68.	Yeah,	conf	h	informing	R		
69.	it is that bad.	com	post-h				
70.	Well —					(uncoded)	
71.	You're lying, right?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	26

72.	No.	rej	h	informing	R		
73.	It's, it's — I — you know what?	s	pre-h	informing	I	Inform	27
74.	I can't win for losing. I can't — I freak out when I think about not talking to him (Clinton).	i	h				
75.	I know.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
76.	Not having him in my life. And I freak out when I think about what's going on. I can't (R) win. I can't win.	i	h	informing	I	Inform (incomplete)	28

Snip …

77.	You there?	n.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	131
78.	Yeah.	conc	h	informing	R		
79.	What about this …	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit (incomplete)	132
80.	But wait. Let me finish my thought, just while I have it in my head. I don't think that's intentional on his part, part, like, "If I say this, then she'll know." I don't, I don't think that. What I do believe is he doesn't want to face the confrontation of having to face that, yes, he's not able to do this because it would be very politically expensive for him. So, by admitting that, it also admits that you're kind of (R). And I don't think he has it in him to say, "I meant it. I meant it. I wanted you back. I want you in my life, but I can't do it." I don't think he can do that. I don't think he wants to let you down that way.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	133
81.	Why else would he waste all this time promising you it's going to happen?	i	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	134
82.	I don't know.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	
83.	It's because he can't, he can't do it. He just can't do it.	i	h	informing	I	Inform (incomplete)	135
84.	Okay. Do you think if I — oh, boy, here we go. This is an original thing. Are youready?	s / n.pr	pre-h h	eliciting	I	Elicit	136

223

85.	Write a letter?	n.pr	h	eliciting	R/I		
86.	Yes.	conf	h	informing	R		
87.	Ha! (Laughing.)	prot	h	acknowledging	F		
88.	Send him a note making the atmosphere acceptable for telling me that.	s	pre-h	eliciting	I	Elicit	137
89.	Do you see what I mean?	n.pr	h	informing	R		
90.	Yes.	rec	h	acknowledging	F		
91.	Like saying, "Look, okay? It is clear to me this is not going to happen. Can we please get together and work on some way so that I can come out of this situation not feeling the way I do?"	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	138
92.	Yes, I think that is acceptable.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
93.	You have to be willing to face two things. You have to be willing to face that you have to acknowledge you're never going back there.	i	h	informing	I I	nform	139
94.	That's a very hard thing for me to do.	rej	h	informing	R		
95.	I know that.	end	h	acknowledging	F		
96.	So think about that before you do this.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	140
97.	Well, I think — I don't think I have a choice. I think it's either acknowledge it, or live in La-La Land.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
98.	But how long can La-La Land go on, too?	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit (incomplete)	141
99.	Assume Kate —					(uncoded)	
100.	Ha, ha, ha. Look how long I did that. I mean, Linda — (incomplete)	i	h	informing	I	Inform	142
101.	Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Assume Kate doesn't know her ass from her elbow, just for — for the moment.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	143
102.	Uh-huh.	rec	h	acknowledging	R		
103.	It's still out there that what's-her-name is working with what's-his-name. Therefore, a reasoning person would think that before too long, we would have some sort of indicator. Correct?	s n.pr	pre-h h	eliciting	I	Elicit	144
104.	I don't know. I don't know.	i	h	nforming	R		

105. You can't (R) someone over for an extended period. It's now her job to deal with this other guy, and that's still hanging out there. There has been no resolution. I kind of, kind of, am curious what they're going to come up with that.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	145
106. I don't think they're going to come up with anything. I mean —	rej	h	informing	R		
107. Well, you can't leave it out there in La–La Land forever.	i	h	nforming	I	Inform	146
108. I know.	end	h	acknowledging	R		
109. But they will just keep coming up with excuses. Just like he's been all along. Just like he's been all along. You know what it probably will be? That Erskine's going to leave. Okay? Erskine will leave before this is done, and then it's when the new guy comes.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	147
110. Oh, ho, please.	rej	h	informing	R		
- -						
111. What do you mean, "Please," Linda? Come on. A year ago you would have said to me — in February, had I told you this was the scenario in November or October, you would have said, "Please."	ret	h	eliciting	Ib	Clarify (incomplete)	148
112. Well, I think the logical shoo–in for Erskine is the one that's already in the problem already. I think he'll be the successor.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	149
113. Do you think?	n.pr	h	eliciting	R/I		
114. Yes.	i	h	informing	R		
- -						
115. JP?	ret	h	eliciting	I	Clarify	150
116. Uh–huh.	conc	h	informing	R		
117. A shoo–in.	qu	post-h				
118. Are you serious? I haven't even heard his name floating around.	inq	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	151
119. Oh, he's — because let me tell you, he has been intimately involved with every single thing that — he headed the meetings —	i	h	informing	R		

120. Right.	(eng)				
121. — twice a day where my friend, you know, the one that —					
122. Mm-hmm.	(eng)				
123. — Uh-huh, headed those meetings. So he, he just knows everything. I mean, there is not a thing he doesn't know other than—obviously, a couple of things, but he would be the one — he's their troubleshooter. And, no, no, no. I don't mean you're the trouble. I just mean —+					
124. I know.	conc	h	acknowledging	F	
125. + — to preclude trouble. Get down, Cleo, you're driving me nuts.					

Snip ⋯

126. No, it should not be cold.	rea	h	acknowledging	F		
127. Okay.	ter	h	acknowledging	F		
128. You're not cold.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	196
129. The truth is —this is the truth. Okay. The truth is that — I know you're going to get mad.	conc com	h post-h	informing	R		
130. What?	l	h	eliciting	Ib	Repeat	197
131. You notice how we do that to each other all the time.	m.pr	h	eliciting	R/I		
132. Yes, I do.	conc	h	informing	R		
133. Is that having him in my life is more important to me than a job.	i	h	informing	I	Inform	198
134. I've always known that.	i	h	informing	R		
135. Okay.	rea	h	acknowledging	F		
136. But can I say that?	m.pr	h	eliciting	I	Elicit	199
137. Yes.	i	h	informing	R		
138. Okay, fine. Thank you.	end	h	acknowledging	F		
139. I'm going to write, and I will call you back in 15, 20 minutes.	ms	h	opening	I	Structuring	200
140. All right. I'll be here.	acq	h	answering	R		
141. Good-bye	gr	h	opening	I	Greet (incomplete)	201

B. Acts (Everyday Conversation) used in Francis–Hunston (pp. 128–133):

Label	Symbol	Realization and Function
framer	fr	Realized by a **closed class** of items: (i) 'OK', '(all) right', 'anyway' and their variants, where the item **precedes an exchange-initial move head** ('anyway' may also be embedded in a **move head**); (ii) 'well', 'now', 'good' and their variants, where the item **precedes an exchange-initial move head** and is said with **high key falling intonation** followed by silent stress. When it **precedes an** *ms* **or** *con* it realizes the pre-head of an opening move in a Structuring exchange; when it **precedes any other exchange-initial move head** it realizes the **head of a framing move in a Boundary exchange.** Its function is to mark boundaries in the conversation, where such an interpretation is consistent with considerations of topic.
marker	m	Realized by the same **closed class** of items as fr: (i) 'OK' etc. where the item **precedes a non-exchange-initial move head;** (ii) 'well' etc. (also 'oh', 'er(m)' and 'look') where not said with <u>high key</u> falling intonation. Realizes the **signal element of all moves.** Its function is to mark the onset of a move.
starter	s	Realized by **statement, question, command** or moodless item. Realizes the **pre-head** of an **opening, answering, eliciting, informing, directing or behaving move.** Its function is to provide information about or **direct attention towards** the act realizing the move head.
metastatement	ms	Realized by **statement, question** or **command.** Realizes the **head of an opening move in a Structuring exchange.** Its function is to structure the conversation **prospectively** in some way, and to obtain a warrant for doing so.
conclusion	con	Realized by a **statement** or **question** often with anaphoric reference. Realizes the **head of an opening move in a Structuring exchange.** Its function is to 'tie up' a particular topic, and to obtain a warrant for doing so.
acquiesce	acq	Realized by 'yes' and other items indicating assent, both verbal and **non-verbal.** May also be realized by silence, interpreted as a default mechanism whereby failure to protest (rej) is an indication of acquiescence. Realizes the **head of an answering move in a Structuring exchange.** Its function is to provide a warrant for a suggestion as to prospective

		(ms) or retrospective (con) structuring made by the other participant in a two-party conversation.
greeting	gr	Realized by a **closed class** of items which form the **first-pair parts of the adjacency pairs** used in the rituals of greeting and leave-taking: 'hello', 'hi' 'good morning', '(good)bye(-bye)', 'have a nice/good day', 'be seeing you' and their variants. Realizes the **head of an opening move in a Greet exchange.** Its function is self-explanatory.
reply-greeting	re-gr	Realized by a **closed class** of items which form the **second-pair parts of the adjacency pairs** used in the rituals of greeting and leave-taking: 'hello', 'hi', 'good morning', '(good)bye(-bye)', 'fine thanks (and you?)', 'thank you', 'same to you', 'yeah, see you', and their variants. Realizes the **head of an answering move in a Greet exchange.** □ □ Its function is self-explanatory.
summons	sum	Realized by the ringing of the telephone, a knock at the door, etc., or the calling of somebody's name. Realizes the **head of an opening move in a Summon exchange.** Its function is to engage another participant in a conversation or to attract his/her attention.
reply-summons	re-sum	Realized by the items used to answer a telephone ('hello', the giving of one's number, etc.) or the door (opening it, calling 'come in', etc.) or by 'yes', 'what?' and other indications of attention (both verbal and non-verbal) given upon hearing one's name called. Realizes the **head of an answering move in a Summon exchange.** Its function is to indicate willingness to participate in a conversation, or that one is giving one's attention.
inquire	inq	Realized by <u>questions</u> which **seek information as opposed to a 'yes' or 'no' answer,** i.e., wh-questions and ellipted forms of these. Realizes the **head of an eliciting move** (<u>except</u> at Ib in **Clarify and Repeat exchanges).** Its function is to **elicit information.**
neutral proposal	n.pr	Realized by <u>questions</u> which **seek a 'yes' or 'no' answer,** i.e., questions beginning 'so you', 'Are you', etc, and ellipted forms of these. Realizes the **head of an eliciting move** (<u>except</u> at Ib in **Clarify and Repeat exchanges).** Its function is to **elicit a decision** between 'yes' and 'no'.
marked proposal	m.pr	Realized by <u>questions</u> which seek a 'yes' or 'no' answer, where the form of the question indicates the polarity of the expected answer, i.e., questions beginning 'Don't you', 'Aren't you', etc.

		It is also realized by declaratives said with 'questioning' intonation and declaratives followed by **tag questions.** Realizes the **head of an eliciting move** (<u>except</u> at Ib in **Clarify** and **Repeat exchanges**). Its function is to **elicit agreement.**
return	ret	Realized by <u>question,</u> often ellipted. Realizes the **head of an eliciting move** at Ib in a **Clarify exchange.** Its function is to **seek clarification** of a <u>preceding utterance.</u>
loop	l	Realized by a **closed class** of items: 'pardon', 'what', 'eh', 'again', and their variants, said with rising intonation. Realizes the **head of an eliciting move** at Ib in a **Repeat exchange.** Its function is to elicit the repetition of a <u>preceding utterance</u> which was not clearly heard.
prompt	p	Realized by a **closed class** of items: 'hah' (with rising intonation), 'come on', 'go on give me an answer', 'guess' and their variants. Realizes the **head of an eliciting move** at Ib in a **Re-initiation exchange,** or the post-head of any other eliciting move, or the post-head of a directing move. Its function is to reinforce the point of a preceding utterance, whether this was to elicit an *i*, a *conc* (etc.) or a *be.* When it realizes a **move-head**, it follows a silence on the part of 'B'.
observation	obs	Realized by **statement.** Realizes the **head of an informing move** at I (**Inform exchange**). Its function is to offer 'information' which is **already** part of the shared knowledge of the participants in the conversation. In other words it has a predominantly phatic function.
informative	i	Realized by **statement** or by 'yes' and 'no' items and their variants, both verbal (e.g. 'I (don't) think so') and non-verbal (e.g. nods and shakes of the head). Realizes the **head of an informing move** at I (**Inform exchange**); or at R/I or R (**Elicit exchange**) where the head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by either *inq* or *n.pr.* Its function is to supply information or to give a decision between 'yes' end 'no'.
concur	conc	Realized by <u>low</u> or <u>mid key</u> 'yes' end 'no' items and their variants, both verbal and non-verbal; or by repetition or paraphrase. Realizes the **head or post-head of an informing move** at R/I or R (**Elicit exchange**) where the head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by *m.pr.* Its function is to **give agreement.**
confirm	conf	Realized by <u>high key</u> 'yes' and 'no' items and their variants, both verbal

		and non-verbal; or by repetition or paraphrase. Realizes the **head of an informing move** at R/I or R (Elicit exchange) where the **head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by** *m.pr*. Its function is to give or assert agreement.
qualify	qu	Realized by 'qualified' **statement** or by tentative 'yes' and 'no' items (where tentativeness is intonationally signaled) and their variants, both verbal ('to some extent yes', 'no not really', 'well I suppose so (not)', etc.) and non-verbal (e.g., shrugging the shoulders). Realizes the **head of an informing move** at R/I or R (Elicit exchange) where the **head of the eliciting move at I or R/I is realized by** *n.pr* or *m.pr;* or the **post-head of an answering, informing or behaving move.** Its function is to qualify a decision or an agreement by indicating that its polarity is not unconditional, or to detail conditions and exceptions.
reject	rej	Realized by **statement** or by 'yes' and 'no' items and their variants, both verbal and non-verbal. May also be realized by silence, interpreted as a default mechanism whereby failure to supply a *re-gr, re-sum, i, conc, conf, qu* or appropriate *be* is an indication of rejection. Realizes the **head of an answering move in a Structuring, Greet or Summon exchange;** or the **head of an informing move at R/I or R (Elicit exchange);** or the **pre-head of a behaving move in a Direct exchange.** Its function is to refuse to acquiesce to a suggestion as to the structuring of the conversation; or to refuse to give an appropriate answer to a *gr* or a *sum*, or to reject the underlying presuppositions of an *inq, n.pr* or *m.pr;* or to indicate unwillingness to comply with a *d*.
terminate	ter	Realized by <u>low key</u> 'yes' and 'no' items, and their variants, both verbal and non-verbal; or by <u>low key</u> repetition. Realizes the **head and/or post-head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F.** Its function is to acknowledge a <u>preceding utterance</u> and to terminate an exchange (although it **may be followed by further acknowledging moves**).
receive□	rec	Realized by <u>mid key</u> 'yes' end 'no' items and their variants, both verbal and non-verbal; or by <u>mid key</u> repetition. Realizes the **head or pre-head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F;** or the **pre-head of an informing move at R (Elicit exchange);** or the **pre-head of a behaving move.** Its function is to acknowledge a <u>preceding utterance</u> or (as pre-head) to indicate that the appropriate i, be, etc., is forthcoming.
react	rea	Realized by <u>high key</u> 'yes' and 'no' items and their variants, both verbal and non-verbal; or by <u>high key</u> repetition.

230

		Realizes the **head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F**. Its function is to indicate positive endorsement of a preceding utterance.
reformulate	ref	Realized by **statement** which **paraphrases** a preceding utterance. Realizes the **head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F**. Its function is to acknowledge a preceding utterance or offer a revised version of it.
endorse	end	Realized by **statement** or **moodless** item. Realizes the **head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F**. Its function is to offer positive endorsement of, sympathy with, etc., a preceding utterance ('good idea', 'you poor thing', 'well I never', 'very interesting', etc.).
protest	prot	Realized by **statement** or by 'yes' and 'no' items and their variants. Realizes the **head of an acknowledging move at R and/or F**. Its function is to raise an objection to a preceding utterance; it acknowledges the utterance while disputing its correctness, relevance, appropriateness, the participant's right to have uttered it, or anything else.
directive	d	Realized by **command**. Realizes the **head of a directing move**. Its function is to request a **non-verbal** response, i.e., an action.
behave	be	Realized by **action**. Realizes the **head of a behaving move**. Its function is to provide a **non-verbal** response to a preceding *d*, whether this involves compliance, non-compliance, or defiance.
comment	com	Realized by **statement**. Realizes the **post-head of all moves except framing**. Its function is to exemplify, expand, explain, justify, provide additional information, or evaluate one's own utterance.
engage	eng	Realized by 'mm', 'yeah' and low or mid key 'echoes'. Does not realize any element of move structure (hence it **always appears in parentheses** in the 'act' column of an analysis). Its function is to provide minimal feedback while not interrupting the flow of the other participant's utterance.

231

Abstract

The Francis-Hunston Model of Discourse Analysis: Applicable to EFL Classrooms?

Tom Jernstad

The following paper is a summary and evaluation of the Francis–Hunston Model of Discourse Analysis. For the sake of comparison, mention was also made of the Sinclair–Coulthard Model of Discourse Analysis. An attempt was made to code an excerpt from a now infamous telephone transcript using the Francis–Hunston Model. The paper concluded that the Francis–Hunston Model has little if any applicability to EFL classrooms.