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Abstract

When we speak, we speak in different ways to achieve different purposes. The aim of this paper is to show how a genre-based approach can assist students to develop diversity in oral communication by speaking in different ways. First, a brief outline of the theory that underpins this approach will be examined. Reference will be made to genre theory from Systemic Functional Linguistics. Following this, a variety of genres that commonly occur in casual conversation will be identified and discussed. These include anecdotes, recounts, opinions and gossip. Next, a curriculum cycle will be presented that focuses on the roles of modeling and scaffolding in language learning. After this, a variety of genre-based teaching materials will then be examined. These are derived from movies, the radio, and authentic dialogs of conversation. The importance of text structure as a tool for speaking in different ways will be illustrated by these materials. Finally, a discussion will be conducted, focusing on the implications of this approach to facilitate different ways of speaking and the teaching of casual conversation in general. Specific suggestions for teachers are provided. It is hoped that this paper will provide readers with broader insights into the potential applications of Systemic Functional Linguistics to language teaching, as well as new ideas for the teaching of conversation in general.

Theory of Language: Systemic Functional Linguistics

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a social interactionist view of language (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 1989). This means that, within this paradigm, language is both learned and developed through the various ways it is used in social interactions. Language is not viewed in the psycholinguistic sense of being an innate, cognitive process for creating syntactical rules (Chomsky, 1965). Language is considered to be the result of a sociocultural process, and is derived from its many uses in societies and cultures from around the world. It is viewed as a resource for making sense of the world around us, and for making sense of our place in the world in which we live.

The term genre represents the various social purposes of language (Slade, 1996). Within an SFL paradigm, genre is defined as a staged, goal-oriented, social process (Martin & Rose, 2003). In this definition, the term “staged” refers to the patterning of a spoken text. That is, the steps that a text moves through to achieve its purpose (Egginss & Slade, 1997, 2004). Some of these steps are compulsory; other steps, however, are optional (Slade, 1996). The stages of a text are referred to as its generic structure. The generic structure or patterning of each genre is organized in such a way as to achieve its social purpose. For example, the social purpose of an opinion genre is to argue a point of view. Typically, in English-speaking cultures, an opinion genre would usually have a pattern that begins with a reaction (to the opinion being expressed), followed by evidence to support the reaction, and finally a resolution that re-emphasizes the initial reaction (Egginss & Slade, 1997, 2004). However, the social purpose of an anecdote genre is to tell a story, with an open-ended conclusion (see Appendix A). Therefore, because the purpose is different, the generic structure of an anecdote genre is typically very different from that of an opinion genre. According to genre theory (Martin, 1989), the generic structure or text patterning reflects the social purpose of the genre. As the purpose changes, so too does the text’s generic structure.
Therefore, if students want to develop diversity by speaking in different ways, it is important to make explicit the generic structure of different genres. Learners need to know how to organize their language in different ways that are appropriate to their different social purposes of speaking.

In SFL, meaning occurs at the level of a text. Thus, SFL is referred to as a text-based grammar (Slade, 1996; Martin & Rose, 2003). In this paper, different kinds of texts that reflect different social purposes will be referred to as genres. A text can be either spoken (such as a conversation dialog) or written. In this paper, focus will be placed on the construction of four spoken texts that are common in casual conversation (see Appendix A). SFL goes beyond the sentence level of most traditional grammars and is concerned with how texts are constructed to achieve their social purposes. That is, how texts are organized to speak in different ways to achieve different purposes (Slade, 1996; Eggins, 2004). Traditional grammars and descriptions of language used in language classes have often been derived from the written word and have operated at the sentence level (Thornbury & Slade, 2006). These traditional grammars have attempted to describe syntactical relationships within and between sentences. However, SFL concerns itself with creating meanings by constructing texts. Therefore, the basic unit of meaning in SFL is the text, not the sentence. Thus, in an SFL teaching framework, learners are encouraged to go beyond the level of a sentence and construct their own texts. Models of conversation texts are described and analyzed, and are then independently constructed by students. Teaching materials are designed based on a genre and its generic structure, because these highlight the various social purposes of speaking. By making these explicit, it is argued that students can recognize different ways of speaking and hence develop greater diversity in their use of spoken language.

Eggins and Slade (1997, 2004) have identified and described a variety of genres of casual conversation within an SFL paradigm. According to Slade (1996), casual conversation consists of different types of talk; the chat and the chunks. The chat sections are those types of casual talk that do not display generic structure or patterning. The chunks are those types of talk that have an identifiable, generic structure. It is the chunks that this paper will focus on, as these have a structure that can be made explicit in the teaching of casual conversation.

In this section, a brief overview of some of the key points of SFL theory that are relevant to this paper, has been presented. In the next section, a genre-based syllabus will be described that focuses on four common genres of casual conversation; anecdote, recount, opinion, and gossip. Each of these genres represent different social purposes and therefore reflect different ways of speaking.

A Genre-based Syllabus of Casual Conversation

Teaching casual conversation has become an important part of general English programs in EFL contexts. As Thornbury & Slade (2006) point out, this is conducted in different ways, using many different methods and approaches. In a genre-based approach, students develop diversity in their speaking by constructing various genres of conversation. As a result, students learn how to talk in different ways in order to achieve different purposes.

In this syllabus, four common genres of casual conversation have been selected. These were based on the perceived needs and interests of the students in casual conversation. The genres selected were anecdote, recount, opinion, and gossip (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004). The generic structure, the social function, and the language features of each of the four genres have been described in Appendix A.

Anecdote

According to Eggins and Slade (1997, 2004), storytelling is an important part of casual conversation. An anecdote is one of these story-telling genres. The social purpose is to tell a surprising story that has a crisis point. Past-time grammar is a feature of this genre. However, the crisis finishes without any clear resolution. Importantly, there is a reaction(s) by the speaker or the participants to the crisis that unfolds in the story. Focus is placed more on the reaction to the crisis, rather than on the resolution of it. Appendix C is an example of this genre. In Appendix C, a father is telling his friend about his son’s skiing accident. The crisis culminates when his son inadvertently goes over a ski jump by mistake and lands all bruised and scraped in the snow. The reaction
(with much laughter) of his father’s friend is to say: “And they say rugby’s rough!” The reaction here implies that skiing can be just as rough as rugby (Slade, 1996).

Typically, an anecdote has a generic structure that starts with a statement about the main point of the story (an abstract), though this is optional. Then follows the orientation or the background information to the story. The orientation is concerned with the “who, what, where, when and why” elements of the story, that orientate the listener to the events that are about to unfold. After this, comes a series of events that climax with an open-ended crisis. This means that the conclusion of the story is left somewhat open-ended or unresolved. This is then followed by a reaction to the crisis. Finally, a coda or final comment about the story as a whole is usually given, though this too is an optional element (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004).

**Recount**

A recount is also one of the storytelling genres. The social purpose is to merely retell a story in a sequence of steps. It has no crisis. That is, the events do not build up to a climax (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004). Because the purpose is different, the generic structure of a recount is different from that of an anecdote. Past-time grammar reference is also a language feature of this genre, the same as an anecdote. Typically, the generic structure of a recount starts with an optional abstract, the same as an anecdote. After this, comes the orientation, which again is the same as an anecdote. Following this, is the record of events that do not build up to a climax. For example, the events are a sequence of steps arranged in sequential or logical order. This is different from an anecdote. Finally, an optional coda is usually given, the same as an anecdote (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004). While there are similarities between a recount and an anecdote, there are also differences because they reflect slightly different purposes of storytelling. By making the purpose and the generic structure of these genres explicit, students are able to recognize the different ways of storytelling that are common in casual conversation.

**Gossip**

Eggins and Slade (1997, 2004) point out that gossip is yet another kind of storytelling genre. It is different from both anecdote and recount. The broad social purpose of gossip is to exert social control and reinforce group membership (Slade, 1996; Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004). The specific social purpose of gossip is to describe and to comment on the anti-social behavior of a person, who is usually absent. The comments made by the speaker and/or participants are usually negative comments. These are referred to as perjorative comments (Slade, 1996). Topics involving boy/girl friends and romantic affairs are common. The grammar feature is past-time reference. The generic structure of gossip typically starts off with a third person focus on the absent person that is being gossiped about. Then, it moves towards a sequence of events involving the person’s anti-social behavior. Negative or perjorative comments usually occur both during the sequence of events and at the end of the story. Gossip usually concludes with a wrap-up of how the story ends, focusing on the consequences of the person’s anti-social behavior (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004).

Some teachers may feel that teaching students the genre of gossip is not a suitable classroom activity. However, Slade (1996) points out that gossip is one of the most universal of all genres. Teaching students how to gossip is only one part of the task. By focusing on gossip, students are also learning how to participate appropriately in a conversation, if and when gossip occurs. This would appear to be an important real-world task.

**Opinion**

Opinions are common in casual conversation and are expressed about a wide range of topics (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004). The social purpose of this genre is not to tell a story but to express a view or to argue a point. Hence, the generic structure of an opinion is very different from that of the storytelling genres. Unlike the storytelling genres, the typical grammar feature is modality. It is through the grammatical item of modality that we are able to express strong and weak opinions in English (Halliday1985a, 1994, 2004; Slade, 1996). The generic structure of an opinion typically starts off with a reaction to a comment or a question that has been raised. This reaction represents the speaker’s point of view. Then follows reasons or evidence to back-up the point of view. As an option, some speakers may choose to give examples or data to support their reasons, and thus strengthen their argument. This is often referred to as support. Finally,
a conclusion or resolution is usually reached, particularly when there has been a difference of opinion (Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004).

In each of the four genres described in this syllabus, the generic structure of each is different because the social purpose of each is different (Slade, 1996; Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004). Consequently, the implication of this for students is that they need to recognize that if the purpose for speaking is changed, then so too must the generic structure change. By making the patterning of these genres explicit, students can recognize how to organize their language in order to speak in different ways and for different purposes.

In the next section, a curriculum cycle will be described that can be used in a genre-based approach to the teaching of casual conversation. The cycle focuses on the independent construction of different kinds of genres.

Curriculum Cycle: Modeling, Joint Negotiation, and Independent Construction

SFL is a theory of language, not a theory of learning. However, in recent years, a curriculum cycle has been developed (DSP Literacy Project, 1989) from sociocultural learning theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Gibbons, 1999) that compliments an SFL description of language.

According to Vygotsky (1978), learners learn best when the learning goals are modeled for them and made explicit. Furthermore, learners cannot be given immediate and full responsibility for the achievement of tasks. They must share this responsibility with a ‘skilled expert’ (Vygotsky, 1978), such as a teacher or other students. As the learning develops, the amount of support or scaffolding is decreased, and learners are then expected to take increasing responsibility for their own performance (Gibbons 1999, 2002). Thus, the concepts of modeling, explicit learning and scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978; Gibbons 1999, 2002) are considered to be important issues in this curriculum cycle.

The notion of support or scaffolding (Bruner, 1986) leads to the idea of shifting responsibilities within the classroom (Gibbons, 1999). That is to say, in some phases of a lesson teachers will have the main responsibility for what is happening in the classroom. At other times they will share the responsibility with the learners. And at other times again, the responsibility may lie wholly with the students. From this notion of shifting responsibilities, the three phases of the curriculum cycle have been developed; the modeling phase, the joint negotiation phase and the independent construction phase (DSP Literacy Project, 1989).

The movement from one phase of the curriculum cycle to another is not necessarily in one direction. It is possible to move backwards and forwards between any of the phases according to what the teacher is trying to achieve in the lesson, and how much support or scaffolding is required. Also, the overall cycle is likely to be repeated a number of times during the whole program. The phases of responsibility in a teaching sequence start with the explicit modeling of the target genre by the teacher, and end when the scaffolding is finally removed, and the students take responsibility for their own independent construction of the target genre. A brief explanation of these three phases will now follow.

In the modeling phase, students analyze the model text (Gibbons 1999, 2002). This text represents one of the target genres. The main focus of this phase is to identify the social purpose and the generic structure of the model genre (Gibbons 1999, 2002). Once the purpose has been identified, students would then be given tasks to identify the generic structure of the text. In this phase, there is maximum scaffolding or maximum support by the teacher for the students. The teacher usually controls the learning tasks. As such, the main responsibility for learning in this phase is often with the teacher (Gibbons 1999, 2002).

In the joint negotiation phase, students begin to move away from the model text. They start to construct their own text, with the support of the teacher and other students. This is known as the co-construction of language (Vygotsky, 1978; Gibbons 1999, 2002). Students construct the same generic structure as the model, but now start to work on their own text. That is, they construct the same genre but work on their own story. As a result, in this phase, more responsibility for the construction of the text is usually given to the students. However, the degree of support or scaffolding that is required, will vary from student to student, and task to task. In some tasks, some students will require more assistance, while others will require less. As previously mentioned, this
pattern of shifting responsibility and shifting scaffolding, will move backwards and forwards on an ‘as required’ basis. For example, if the model text was an anecdote of a surprising holiday story, then students would now start to construct their own anecdote of a surprising holiday story that happened to them. While it may be the same situation as the model text, students would essentially be co-construcling their own story with other students, and / or the classroom teacher. In the joint negotiation phase, students are following the same generic structure as the model. However, they are now moving away from the model and beginning to construct their own texts. The degree of scaffolding would be constantly shifting backwards and forwards for each student, on an ‘as required’ basis.

In the independent construction phase, the scaffolding is removed and full responsibility for the construction of the text is given to the students (Gibbons 1999, 2002). That is, the students independently produce their own texts, without any prompts or assistance from the teacher or other students (see Appendix B & Appendix F). The practicing and rehearsing is now finished. The main focus is not on memorizing the exact words or on correct grammar. Using ‘correct’ grammar is a secondary focus. The main focus is on independently producing a whole text, and using a generic structure that is appropriate to its social purpose. In this phase, the learner scaffolding or support is now completely removed (Gibbons 1999, 2002). Total responsibility is given over to the learners to speak in a way that reflects the social purpose of the genre. In a typical curriculum, the three phases of the cycle would then be repeated, either for the same or different genres of conversation.

In this section, an explanation of the main elements of the curriculum cycle was given. This cycle facilitates the students to speak in different ways and for different purposes, by focusing on the construction of different genres of conversation. In the next section, some useful teaching materials will be discussed.

**Teaching Materials**

A variety of genre-based, teaching materials can be designed by classroom teachers. These are based on the teacher’s understanding of text types and generic structure. While teachers need not be experts, a knowledge of genre theory would be an advantage. The goal is to make explicit the generic structure of the target text. The importance of generic structure as a tool for speaking in different ways, should be illustrated by these materials.

Teacher-generated materials are usually more relevant to the modeling phase of the curriculum cycle. The joint negotiation phase and the independent construction phase of the curriculum cycle tend to focus more on student-generated materials, as the responsibility for learning is gradually handed over to the learners. Materials can be designed from a wide range of resources that are relevant to conversation, such as movies, music, the radio, as well as authentic-like dialogs of conversation. Some of these materials will be examined in this section.

**Modeling Phase Materials**

In the modeling phase, guided sequencing activities that focus on the generic structure of the model text, are very useful. Appendix C is an example of this. In this task, students are working on a model anecdote, taken from an authentic conversation (Slade, 1996). The generic structure of the text has been highlighted by functional labels in bold, which illustrate the main generic stages of the text. As is illustrated, it is not necessary to use technical terms (or metalanguage) for each generic stage. For example, the term “main point” might be more appropriate for beginner level students than the term, “abstract.” Furthermore, as this type of task is, in all likelihood, culturally different from other tasks that students have previously encountered, it is useful to cue the type of response that you want from students in each task. Otherwise, they may not understand how to do the task (see Appendix C & D). For example, by giving students one correct answer, they can then predict what they need to do in order to complete the task. Also, by cuing the response in this way, the purpose of the task is made more explicit to students.

The student task in Appendix C is to listen to the anecdote and put the information that is listed, into the correct part of the text. Before students do this, the teacher would usually pre-teach the key vocabulary for lower level students. After listening two or three times depending on the difficulty level of the text, the teacher would then provide feedback for the students. The teacher could replay the conversation, stopping
the tape at each relevant stage, and highlighting the correct answer. Thus, the connection between the generic structure and the speaking purpose is made explicit.

This kind of generic structure task can be adapted to suit all levels. For example, lower level students would usually require a lot more scaffolding than higher level students. This could include pre-teaching vocabulary, listening to the text three or four times (not just once or twice), using non-technical labels for the generic stages, and providing more answers and fewer choices in the tasks for the students. Hence, the complexity of the task is reduced. Higher level students, however, may not need the same degree of support. Therefore, the task complexity may need to be increased by omitting some of the scaffolding tasks mentioned above. By using the same model text but adapting the complexity of the task, generic structure activities can be adapted to suit all levels.

Furthermore, this type of guided generic structure task can be used with many kinds of resources. Appendix D is an example of an opinion genre taken from the radio. Appendices B, C, E and F are all anecdote genres derived from face-to-face dialogs. Similar tasks can be designed from other resources and other genres, by focusing on their generic structure. These include narratives, exemplums, explanations, procedures, reports, and discussions (Eggins & Slade 1997, 2004). Syllabuses need not be limited to only four genres, as described in this paper (Thornbury & Slade, 2006). Also, sources need not only come from authentic dialogs. The same type of materials can be designed from movie texts, as long as they exhibit an appropriate generic structure (see Appendix G). This can be highly motivating for students, as well as facilitating them to speak in different ways (see Appendix G, “Student Task”). In all cases, the teaching materials focus on the importance of generic structure as a tool for speaking in different ways. Exposing students to different genres, increases their ability to speak in different ways and hence to develop greater speaking diversity.

Joint Negotiation Phase Materials

In the joint negotiation phase, students begin the process of constructing their own texts. Typically, students could fill in a guided outline of their text that highlights the generic structure. This could be prepared by the teacher or by the students themselves. Students could then practice their texts in pairs and groups with other students, drafting, editing and rehearsing, as required. Students can work in pairs and groups, and complete a peer editing sheet, where they rate specific elements of each student’s text. For example, students could place a rating of between one and three as to how clear was the crisis, how appropriate was the reaction, or how relevant was the final comment.

In addition to rating each other’s texts, students can work together on the same text. They can discuss the generic structure, as they co-construct their text. Appendix E is an example of this. In Appendix E, there is a dialog between two students. They are trying to work out the main point (or abstract) of their text, as well as suitable reactions and suitable final comments. It is clear that by working together, they are providing important support for each other. At the same time, they note some of the cultural differences between English and their mother tongue of Japanese. They question whether or not they construct texts the same way in Japanese, as they are doing in English. This tends to make them more aware of how language works and therefore what they need to do in order to be more effective communicators in English.

Independent Construction Materials

In the independent construction phase, the scaffolding is removed completely. Independent role plays or small group discussions, with students providing feedback focusing on the generic structure, are useful classroom activities. Students produce their own text, without support from the teacher or the teaching materials. Appendix B is an example of this with a higher level student. Appendix F is another example of this with a lower level student. In both cases, the students were constructing an anecdote genre. Significantly, both students used the same model text, in the modeling phase of the cycle. While the level of sophistication of the language produced in their own texts is very different, both students have independently constructed texts with an appropriate generic structure. As such, it is argued that both students have successfully achieved the learning goal, albeit at their own level of language proficiency.
Implications for the Classroom

Using a genre-based approach to develop diversity in speaking has many implications for the classroom. Some of these will now be discussed in relation to an EFL context.

The first implication is the issue of speaking for a purpose. Learners can develop diversity in their speaking by recognizing how we need to organize our language in different ways, to achieve different purposes. As discussed in this paper, the speaking purpose is reflected by the generic structure. Hence the generic structure of texts needs to be made explicit. In this way, students can recognize that speaking is not just a matter of grammar and vocabulary, or questions and answers. Rather, effective speaking means organizing their language in a pattern that reflects their purpose for speaking. The more genres they are exposed to, the greater the potential for developing diversity in speaking. Thus, the issue of using language to speak in different ways and for different purposes is an important implication of this approach to teaching casual conversation.

Another implication of a genre-based approach is knowledge of genre theory. The role of generic structure as a tool for speaking in different ways, is an important issue in this paper. That is, teachers need more than an anecdotal understanding of how texts work. Teachers need to have an understanding of how texts work, based on a solid theory of language. However, this knowledge is readily available (for example, see Eggins & Slade, 1997, 2004, for an overview of spoken genres; see Derewianka, 1990, 1994, for an overview of written genres). As Burns and Joyce (1997) state, the way in which we think we talk and the way in which we actually talk, is usually very different. Artificial models of speaking are often invented by textbook writers to teach particular language items. However, when analyzed based on criteria from authentic-like models of speech, these artificial models often bare little resemblance to the nature of authentic spoken language (Gardner and Slade, 1993). Consequently, EFL learners tend to be exposed to simplified, artificially constructed dialogs that are often based on intuitions or assumptions of how we speak (Burns, Joyce & Gollin, 1996). Artificial textbook models appear to reinforce a misguided view to EFL learners that speech is a spoken version of writing (Burns, Joyce & Gollin, 1996), and that good speech is a matter of producing grammatically correct sentences, in sequences of questions and answers (Wajnryb, 1997). Thus, to make the generic structure of texts explicit to learners, teachers should have at least acquired a basic understanding of genre theory, and a knowledge of how texts are organized to achieve their social purposes.

A third implication is the issue of producing whole texts. Using a genre-based approach to achieve greater diversity in speaking implies moving beyond the level of the sentence, and producing a whole text. Derewianka (1990, 1994) defines a text as an extended stretch of language, often with a particular type of beginning, middle and end. It can be either spoken or written. Hence, a genre-based approach is often referred to as a whole language approach (Derewianka, 1990, 1994) to language teaching. This is something that many EFL students seem to have difficulty with. Consequently, textbooks tend to focus on the sentence level, rather than a ‘whole language,’ text level approach to learning (Wajnryb, 1997). A curriculum cycle, such as the one outlined in this paper, provides learners with the opportunity to work with texts, to analyze the structure of texts, and to independently produce their own texts. As students work through the cycle, the scaffolding is gradually taken away. Students move from maximum teacher support to maximum student independence, as they move through the cycle constructing their own texts. To achieve greater diversity in speaking, students need to move beyond the level of the sentence towards a more holistic approach to language learning.

The fourth implication is the role of modeling in language learning. That is, the issue of learning from appropriate language models. In this paper, the term model has been used to refer to a particular genre. That is, if teachers want students to produce an opinion genre, they should give them an opinion model to analyze. However, it appears to be quite common teaching practice to give learners one genre as a model (for example, a report from a newspaper) and then ask them to construct another kind of genre (for example, to give an opinion about the newspaper report) (Wajnryb, 1997). However, a report genre is not the same as an opinion genre. As such, learners would not be able to draw from the language
resources of the model text, to assist them in the construction of their own text. In a genre-based approach, model texts are chosen primarily on the basis of being the same type of genre as the target text. By exposing learners to a model text of the same genre, learners are provided with the opportunity to work with the text, to analyze the structure of the text, and to independently produce their own text in the same genre. Thus, the issue of modeling is an important implication of this approach.

A final implication is the role of scaffolding in the language learning process. If teachers want students to produce whole texts, then they must be given adequate support to do this. Teachers cannot expect that most learners would be in a position to independently construct texts without the necessary assistance (Gibbons, 2002). In this paper, assistance was provided by the curriculum cycle. This cycle has been designed to provide shifting support for learners. In the modeling phase, the teacher usually provides maximum scaffolding for students. This is gradually removed in the joint negotiation phase, as students begin to move away from the model text, towards the construction of their own. Varying degrees of help, from both teacher and students, are provided. Finally, in the independent construction phase, the scaffolding is removed, as the student independently produces the target genre. The independent construction phase is more likely to be successful if adequate assistance has been given in the curriculum cycle; if not, then it is likely to be unsuccessful. Thus, the issue of scaffolding is an important implication of this approach for the classroom.

**Conclusion**

A genre-based approach develops diversity in oral communication by preparing learners to speak in different ways and for different purposes. With the emphasis on explicit learning, the framework for speaking becomes clearer. Students recognize the different ways of speaking by understanding the generic structure of a text. They also recognize what they need to do in order to speak in a way that is appropriate to a particular purpose. It tends to make them more aware of how language works and therefore what they need to do in order to be more effective communicators. As students become exposed to a wider range of genres, their speaking diversity is likely to increase. Texts no longer become a formless mass of words and sentences. Texts become something with shape and structure, and above all, a speaking goal. Thus, conversation in an SFL framework empowers learners by de-mystifying the speaking process. It shows that speaking is not formless and erratic. It shows that speaking has a system that can be described, can be analyzed and can be learned. The classroom benefits of this for EFL learners would appear to be significant.
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APPENDIX A

Four Genres of Conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Generic Structure</th>
<th>Social Function</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|Anecdote   | (abstract) ^ orientation ^ remarkable event ^ reaction ^ (coda) |To tell a surprising story | · Story with a crisis point  
· Conclusion is open-ended  
· Grammar: past time reference |
|Recount    | (abstract) ^ orientation ^ record of events ^ (coda)  |To recount a past event | · Story with no crisis  
· Events are sequential  
· Grammar: past time reference |
|Opinion    | reaction ^ (evidence) ^ (resolution)  |To argue in support of a viewpoint | · Opinion is supported by reasons  
· Grammar: modality |
|Gossip     | third person focus ^ substantiating behavior ^ perjorative comment(s) ^ (wrap-up) |To tell a story about anti-social behavior | · Story may involve recursive substantiating behaviors and perjorative evaluations  
· Grammar: third person reference; past time reference; all-inclusive time |

Key:
^ = followed by; ( ) = optional element

APPENDIX B

Independent Construction Phase
Student-generated Anecdote of a Surprising Holiday
Higher Level Student

Abstract
M: Let me tell you about a scary experience of my friend ... of my sister's friend.
G: Aha.

Orientation
M: You know, my sister is now studying in America, in Oklahoma.
G: Mm, yeah.
M: And there are a lot of Japanese.
G: Yeah.
M: And one of the Japanese guys …
G: Aha.
M: … driving, while driving in the night …
G: Aha, mm.
M: … with his friend …
G: Aha.
M: … and there were … I don’t know how many guys in that car, but they were just driving, along the bus road.
G: Aha.
M: And there is nothing around because Oklahoma is country side.
G: Aha! (laughter) I see.

**Events**

M: And they are driving and they met a girl, a little girl.
G: Aha.
M: A little girl was there. There was a little girl …
G: Aha.
M: … on the road.
G: Aha! (laughter)
M: And a … my, my sister’s friend thought… ah, she is just around 11 or 7 or something like that.
G: Aha.
M: And she is, she wear, she wore a white dress so she, they could see that girl easily.
G: Aha.
M: Her face was pale.
G: Aha.
M: She rushed to that car … at the car and she …she asked them: “Please drive me to the city.” But my sister’s friend thought it’s, it was scary. So they refused the … that girl and just continued driving again. And then they met a man and that man asked, asked the guys: “Did you see a girl in a white dress?”
G: Mm, aha.
M: But my, my sister’s friend said… it’s better to say “no.”
G: Aha. (laughter)
M: They said “no.” And a … they went back home.

**Remarkable Event**

And the next day, they saw that guy’s face on TV. And that … the girl in white dress, was killed by that guy.

**Reaction**

G: Ehhh! What!

**Conclusion**

M: And that guy, I don’t know if he is … he was taken by the police or not. But, so their choice was right … I think.

**Reaction**

G: Ehhh! (laughter)
S: It was too scary, that news! Sorry to react like that!
G: Yeah! (laughter)
M: So their choice was right, I think.
G: Yeah. Aha.

**Coda**

M: Maybe if my friend … my sister’s friend, took that girl in the car, maybe the friend would … would be killed too.
G: Mm, I see.

**Key:**

M = Mayumi; G = group; S = Sachiko; (real names not used)

**APPENDIX C**

**Modeling Phase**

**Generic Structure of the Model Text**

**Anecdote of a Surprising Holiday**

1. Listen to the conversation and put the letters (A,B,C, …) in the correct section. One is done for you.

**Main Point**

......

**Background Information (who, what, where, when)**

......

**Things that Happened**

First, But, Then, And then,
...... (Surprising thing) ...... ......
......

**Reaction (surprise)**

......

**Final Comment**

(about the story)
......

A. My son landed head first.
B. And they say rugby’s rough!
(Wow! That’s amazing!)
C. He and his friends went to Guthega.
D. The hill was a ski jump.
E. My son went on a skiing trip.
F. It was the first time to go over a ski jump!
G. His mate hit a tree on the way down and landed all bruised and scraped.
H. They walked up a little hill.

2. Now, work with a partner and follow the guide above. Take turns being Willie and John, and tell the story again.

(Adapted from Slade, 1996)

**APPENDIX D**

**Modeling Phase**

**Generic Structure of the Model Text**

**Opinion About Michael Jordan (Basketballer)**

**Radio Interview**

1. Listen to Vance K’s opinion about the comeback game of Michael Jordan. Put the letters (A,B,C, …) in the correct section. One is done for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason1 (FOR)</th>
<th>Reason2 (FOR)</th>
<th>Reason3 (AGAINST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You know, …</td>
<td>And, …But,</td>
<td>hey, …E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Mm, I think …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Support**

   | I mean, …     |

   **Conclusion**

   | So, …         |

A. At times, he looked a little rusty.
B. He’ been out of the game a long time.
C. Give him a bit of time.
D. Some people were a little disappointed.
E. The guy’s not superman.
F. Going down by two.

2. Follow the pattern and give your opinion of Michael Jordan’s game? (You can change the number of reasons and support)


**APPENDIX E**

**Joint Negotiation Phase: The Co-construction of a Text**

**Anecdote of a Surprising Holiday**

M: *Main point* is here or what? … here, which one?
J: Ehhh! I think here.
M: Nnnn.
J: It’s …
M: Nnnn.
J: Maybe … I trust you. You can do it!
M: Nnnn, I think so too.
J: Haaa.
T: OK, two minutes, then I’ll see what you’ve got.
This is a kind of speaking model.
M/J: Nnnn.
M: Nnnn. I’m not sure.
J: I don’t think when I speak Japanese, I think ahhh … I speak in this way.
M: Nnnn.
J: I don’t think so. *Main, main point* … I don’t this … “sotsuken.”
M: Final exam?
J: Ha, OK. Reaction? We have to think about reaction?
M: Ehhh, maybe, no … reaction is … OK, it’s up to you.
J: Just comment?
M: *Reaction.* Yeah, and *comment … comment.* I think final comment is most difficult thing!
J: [points to text] “Tekito?”
M: We do such kind of thing in Japanese?
J: Nnnn.
M: Do we?
M/J: [laughter]

(M: Mayumi; J: Jun; T: Teacher)

**Appendix F**

**Independent Construction Phase**

**Student-generated Anecdote of a Surprising Holiday**

**Lower Level Student**

**Abstract**

T: I went to fishing.
S: Ah hah.

**Orientation**

T: I went to grandfather’s and grandmother’s boat in
Hyogo.
S: Ah hah.
T: First, I was on my grandfather’s ship. But a jellyfish
was caught in the net.
S: Oh really!

**Surprising Event**
T: Then I was stung by the jellyfish.
S: Wow!
T: And then, I was get many normal fish.

S: Oh really!
**Reaction**
T: It was a … it’s amazing!
S: Hah ha (laughter).

**Final Comment**
T: It was the first time to be stung by a jellyfish.
S: Hah ha ha (laughter).

---

**Appendix G**

**Genre-based Movie Syllabus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movie</th>
<th>Genre / Segment</th>
<th>Social Purpose</th>
<th>Generic Structure</th>
<th>Student Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gump</td>
<td>Anecdote: How Forest Gump</td>
<td>To tell a surprising story</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ Orientation ^ Remarkable Event ^ Reaction ^ (Coda)</td>
<td>To tell a story about something surprising that happened to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>became rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armageddon</td>
<td>Explanation: How to stop the</td>
<td>To explain how something is done</td>
<td>Phenomenon ^ Explanation Sequence</td>
<td>To explain a daily routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asteroid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titanic</td>
<td>Recount: How Titanic sank</td>
<td>To re-tell a past event</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ Orientation ^ Record of Events ^ (Coda)</td>
<td>To re-tell a famous event that has happened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Park</td>
<td>Discussion: Should Jurassic</td>
<td>To give a 2-sided opinion</td>
<td>Reaction ^ Reasons for ^ Reasons against ^ Resolution</td>
<td>To give a 2-sided opinion: Should animals be cloned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park be opened?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
( ) = optional element
\^ = followed by