真實語意的流動 — 運用會話分析方法詮釋 "六人行" 劇本中的語言機制

The Flow of True Language Meaning – Applying Conversation Analysis Approach to Illustrate the Language Mechanism in the Script of *Friends*

譚美珍 Mei-Chen Tan

德明財經科技大學 應用外語系副教授

Lecturer, Department of Applied Foreign Language, Takming University of Science and Technology

Abstract

Discourse analysis, differing from traditional pedagogy which teaches text structures in lexical, grammatical and phonological analysis, is fundamentally concerned with the relationship between language and its use in the social context. It is about language in everyday use and is above the sentence. This paper examines mainly the linguistic elements from spoken text and further analyses their functions in meaning dissemination. Turn-taking, back-channels, hedges, fillers, discourse markers, pause and hesitation devices are exemplified and demonstrated in real dialogues. The dialogues are extracted from the script of the sitcom *Friends* to illustrate how language mechanisms work. Conversation analysis is used to disclose how 'natural' talk works in context and makes sense of what is said in specific circumstances. This paper confirms that conversation analysis plays a critical role in the construction of a coherent communication. Also, EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers can extend their language pedagogy to use it as an aid to English teaching.

Keywords: conversation analysis (CA), discourse marker, linguistics, language mechanism

摘要

傳統教學法運用詞彙、文法及語音分析來詮釋文本結構。然而言談分析基本上著重語言及其在社會情境使用時的關係。言談分析是關於語言在一般日常的使用以及強調句子的意涵。這篇研究主要檢視口語文本裡語言學的成份，並進一步分析它們在意義傳遞上的功能。真實生活對話的相關例句解釋這些策略 turn-taking, back-channels, hedges, fillers, discourse markers, pause and hesitation 的使用。對話取材於情境喜劇六人行，並用來詮釋語言機制的運作。會話分析揭露真實生活對話，並且幫助

理解在特定情況下的對話的真正含意。這篇研究肯定言談分析在一個流暢的溝通中的重要角色。對於以英語為外國語言的英文老師而言，言談分析可以延伸其教學法朝向更多元化的發展並增進教學的效果。

關鍵字：會話分析、文本符碼、語言學、語言機制

I. Introduction

In the traditional pedagogy of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English teaching has concentrated on the three formal language systems, vocabulary, grammar and phonology and the way in which they function within the sentence, on the assumption that other aspects of communication will follow fairly automatically. The implicit assumption has been that conversation is simply the oral exercise of skills derived from the study of grammar and vocabulary. For a long time, English language teaching has always been taught in dedicated sentences; however, it does not happen in natural settings. EFL learners need to enter into long stretches of communication in real and complex situations. Despite that, it is not enough for EFL learners simply to be taught the acquisition of language. EFL teachers have to take into consideration other components of communication when applying teaching methods. They also need to help learners to integrate the components of communication and to understand the cultural variations which influence the meaning conveyed. It is about language in everyday use and is above the sentence. Conversation may be characterized as an informal speech event which is largely guided by the spontaneous wishes and interests of the participants and may occur for no other reason than to carry out social interaction. The combination of linguistics, sociolinguistics and conversation analysis manifests language in social function.

Based on these contexts, this paper uses conversation analysis to analyze language mechanism and language use in real social contexts. The first aim of this paper is to display the mode of analysis of talk-in-interaction. Real dialogues are quoted from the script of *Friends*. This paper stresses that conversation skills are in fact much more complex and subtle than we often assume. The study of conversation, like any other area of language study, has much to offer the language teacher. Conversation analysis discloses true meanings and patterns in spoken text which are not exhibited by the more traditional teaching structures in lexical, grammatical and phonological analysis. Therefore, the second aim of this paper examines mainly the linguistic elements from the spoken text and further analyses their functions in meaning dissemination, in this way, to highlight how teaching in the real functional units of language should be carried out.

II. Literature Review

Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation is a social, psychological and linguistic activity. Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) note that conversation is a set of speech exchange systems and Goffman (1963) refers to it as a form of focused interaction. 'Conversation is clearly the prototypical kind of language use, the form in which we are all first exposed to language the matrix for language acquisition.' (Levinson, 1983, p.284) Conversation analysis (CA) is a generic approach to the analysis of social interaction. It was first developed in the study of ordinary conversation but later, it has been applied to a wide spectrum of other forms of talk-in-interaction ranging from courtroom and news interview conduct to political speeches (Hutchby, & Wooffitt, 1998). The main feature of conversation analysis is how participants in interaction handle conversation: how they judge who can speak and when they can speak. Goodwin & Heritage (1990) addressed that CA links processes of interpretation to action within a reflexive, time-bounded process. Goffman (1963) provided two different definitions of conversation which can be taken into account. One of the definitions of CA is a casual talk in daily settings; alternatively, the term can be employed in a relaxed way which equals to a talk or spoken encounter. The other definition of CA is an investigation of the structural organization of casual conversation in order to systematically distinguish it from other forms of talk-in-interaction such as interviews or debates.

Sociolinguistics analyse how people actually talk to each other in everyday settings. Stubb (1983) stresses the functions of sociolinguistics as they incorporate analyses of how conversation works; how conversers make the conversation comprehensible and consistent; how people state and shift topics; how they disrupt, request questions and answer or evade questions. As a whole, how the conversation flow is maintained or disturbed. The social roles of people could be identified and carried on through conversational interaction and the give-and-take of everyday multi-party discourse. Conversational analysis has been consistently oriented to the discovery, description, and analysis of methodical occurrences, of the formal procedures that are used by members in accomplishing everyday social actions. Descriptions can achieve, in turn, a formal character, although the phenomena they describe are concrete, actual instances of mundane occurrences (Psathas, 1995).

However, CA is rather different from other forms of discourse analysis, the differences stemming in part from the fact that it was developed within a sociological rather than linguistic tradition, the school itself being known by the rather intimidating term ethnomethodology (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) pioneered conversation analysis, an approach to analysis derived from sociology and known as ethnomethodology. To some extent, CA expected the increasing contemporary interest in social interaction as a vigorous interface between individual and

social cognition, in addition, cultural and social reproduction. Therefore, CA is the result of applying ethnomethodological principles to naturally occurring talk. Ethnomethodology studies people's relations with each other and how social interaction takes place between people (Heritage, 1984b). The purpose of ethnomethodology is to study how socially shared methods of practical reasoning are applied to analyse, understand, and act in the common-sense world of everyday life. Ethnomethodologists have studied such things such as relationships between children and adults, interviews, telephone conversation, and turn taking in conversation (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990). 'Talk in interaction has become the accepted superordinate term to refer to the object of CA research' (Drew & Heritage, 1992b, p.4). It argues that conversation has its own dynamic structure and rules and looks at the methods used by speakers to structure conversation efficiently. This means they look, for example, at the way people take turns, what turn types there are, such as adjacency pairs and at discourse markers which indicate openings, closures and links between and across utterances. In summary, CA analyses the use of conversational practices, at the same time, it analyses action, meaning, context management and intersubjectivity because all of these features are simultaneously, if tacitly, the objects of the actors' actions.

III. Methodology

In this paper, conversation analysis is used as an analytic approach to describe and analyse the interaction between the characters in the script of *Friends*, *'The One Where Ross Finds Out'*. The conversation analysis approach attempts to describe and explain the ways in which conversations work; how conversational participants are able to produce intelligible utterance; and how they are able to interpret the utterances of others. Evaluated as one of the highest American sitcom broadcast from 1994 to 2004, *Friends* mainly demonstrates the relationships between six friends in the New York City borough of Manhattan. The ten seasons of series of *Friends* have made a large cultural impact worldwide. Because of its popularity, they have been used as materials for teaching English in Taiwan. This paper will examine how communication can be achieved in this script through turn-taking, back-channels, repairs and linguistic strategies which include hedges, fillers, discourse markers, pause, hesitation devices, etc., and how conversation itself actually works as a partly autonomous system. All of these mechanisms influence the message circulation and communicative development.

Research Questions

1. What is the talk in interaction mechanism in the script of *The One Where Ross Finds Out*?
2. What are the other functional units in the script of *The One Where Ross Finds Out*?

Preparation for Analysis: Transcription

The transcription of this script follows the transcription notation system developed by Gail Jefferson (1984). It is employed to transfer the text from spoken into written form. The principles of transcription as highlighted in Edwards (1993) are category design, readability, and computational tractability. The characteristics of speech delivery include punctuation symbols and forms of notation. A period indicates a falling intonation. A comma indicates a continuing intonation. A question mark indicates a rising intonation. Readability of the transcript refers to the visual prominence and spatial arrangement. Utterances are presented in a vertical format, with one line under the other. Computerized analyses require a systematic encoding to ensure that what is sought in the process of retrieval is not compromised. Spelling, spacing and capitalization are consistent across the transcription, as any variation would affect the number of instances on retrieval or automatic analyses. Fillers such as *um*, *um-hum*, *ooh*, *uh-huh* are transcribed.

IV. Analysis

One of the forms which data analysis undertakes in this text is the effort to explain and illustrate the structure of an articulated and naturally bounded phenomenon or sphere of phenomenon in interaction, its organizational structure and the methods by which it is created. The analysis of research question 1 is illustrated as below.

1. Talk–in-interaction

Conversation was developed to analyse talk (rather than written text) and more specifically the kind of talk that is thoroughly interactive. Comprehending the use of these linguistic skills for analysing spoken text could help speakers have a better communication and interaction. The mechanisms of turn-taking and different types benefit interlocutors to understand deeply how they make a conversation working on.

(1). Turn-taking System

During the interactive process, people use language to achieve communicative purposes. In order to avoid some collision, the participants have to follow some linguistic rules that are reciprocally adhered to in human discourse. 'A rule of speaking is thus a factor that operates for or against certain linguistic behaviour. Constructive communication requires cooperation concerning the various rules that build up the communicative network. Cooperative activity presupposes ethical considerations and shared attitudes towards these rules (Allwood, 1976, p.56)'. Therefore, these rules account for how

those interactions operate the turns such as taking the floor, pause and yielding the floor to keep a talk going on. 'When such a convention has been widely accepted in a speech community, it can be referred to as "standardized usage" (Cushman & Whiting, 1972, p.221)'. Through cooperation, the interlocutors take turns to speak and no one monopolizes the floor. We call this phenomenon as turn-taking.

The basic unit of the conversation is the "turn", that is, a shift in the direction of the speaking "flow" which is characteristic of normal conversation. Furthermore, conversationalists do not speak all at the same time; instead, they wait for their "turn". But how do people go about allocating turns to each other or themselves? This is the so-called "turn-taking mechanisms". A "transition relevant places" (TRPs) can be utilized by the speaker holding the floor. This may be done directly, for the purpose of allotting the right to speak to another conversationalist of his or her choice. All such mechanisms of "selection" (self- or other) are among the most important moving parts of the "turn-management system", the conversational machinery owned and operated by the actual and potential floor-holders and floor-getters (Orestrom, 1983).

In a turn-taking system, each turn is based on an act and a move to form a unit. An Act signals what the speaker intends to communicate. It is the smallest interactive unit. Move means what the speaker does in a turn in order to start, carry on and finish an exchange, i.e., the way s/he interacts. A move usually consists of one or more acts. In the turn-taking system, *who*, *when*, and *what* which are relevant with the talk are less important. In this sense, 'the system appeared to be context free, that is, unaffected by these contextual particulars (Psathas, 1995, p.36)'. Furthermore, the turn-taking system was mainly limited to the context and sensitive to what was occurring and the immediately preceding talk in that context. Thus the system of turn-taking was context sensitive.

We need to notice there are two types of utterances, speaking-turns and back-channel items. The concept of a speaking-turn is the conveyance of additional information which causes the expansion of the topic being discussed (Henne, 1978). How does the listener know when it is his turn to speak and how do the participants go about regulating their talk to promote smooth alternations of speaker and listener roles into well-synchronized exchanges? Taking the turn, holding the turn and yielding the turn are interactional strategies in turn-taking system.

A. Taking the turn

A speaker maybe is ready to start a turn with a clean start or unable to start a turn with a hesitant start such as using stalling devices which include filled pauses eg., *um, urm*..etc. or verbal fillers eg., *well, I mean, you know*. The action means the speaker takes over the conversation when s/he initiates the conversation. Subsequent turns may be explicitly connected by a response and follow-up moves,

the next speaker acknowledges receipt of what the previous speaker said and evaluates it before going on. Besides that, links also occupy an important place to initiate move in the turn. Links in grammar functions are conjunctions which connect sentences and clauses, such as *and, but, because* and *so*.

B. Holding the turn

Holding the turn means the continuation of talking. However the preparation carried out by the speaker at the beginning of the turn may not be adequate for the turn as a whole and seeing as it is hard to prepare what to say and speak simultaneously, the speaker may have to halt and begin to make alterations to the plan in the middle of the turn (Stenstrom, 1994).

C. Yielding the turn

The speaker will give the turn when s/he wants the other party to respond what s/he said. Or the speaker realizes that s/he has nothing more to say and s/he wants the listener to take the turn. We call this kind of act as yielding the turn. Sometimes, the speaker uses discourse acts prompt or appealing to indicate the other party to take the turn.

Example 1:

Chandler: *OK, what is it about me? Do I not look fun enough? Is there something. . . repellant..*
about me?
Rachel: *So, how was the party?*

In the conversation above, Chandler takes the turn to respond to Rachel's question about the party. "*Ok*" as a "starter" to begin the turn. Chandler utters how upset he is in the party. After the utterance, he holds the turn to ask Rachel's opinions about how he looks. At the end, he yields the turn to let Rachel take the turn to respond to his question. "*So*" is used as a linking device when Rachel takes the turn.

D. Back-channels

Back-channels 'represent rather special functions where the listener informs the speaker that his message has been received, understood, agreed to and/or has caused a certain effect thereby supplying him with direct feedback. Such utterances are normally not, if ever, picked up and commented on by the other speaker but are still important contributions as they help to sustain the flow of interactions (Orestrom, 1983, p.24)'. The speaker is not able to assure s/he is being listened to or not and whether

7

the communication function has been achieved or not if the listener does not give any responses such as *m, mhm, um-hum, uh-huh, yes, yeah, right, fine, ok, alright, I see, that's right,* etc.

Example 1:

Joey: *Let me get this straight. He got you to beg to sleep with him, he got you to say he never has to call you again, and he got you thinking this was a great idea.*

Phoebe: *Um-hum.*

Phoebe gives a back-channel with *um-hum* to agree Joey's surmise. It also indicates that she does not want to take the turn to interrupt Joey's utterance.

(2). Turn Types

In a turn-taking system, taking the turn, holding the turn, and yielding the turn and back-channel signal how the process of utterances keeps moving by turns. In addition to that, there are three different turn types which indicate how the interlocutors' interaction is structured on these three units.

A. Adjacency pairs

Adjacency pairs are, as Heritage (1984b, p.256) puts it, 'the basic building-blocks of intersubjectivity'. Adjacency pairs are typically questions/answers, requests/offers or requests/denials which are paired utterances produced by two successive speakers. The first part of utterance given is conditionally relevant with the second part of utterance which is identified and expected to follow up the first. That means some turn sequences are pragmatically more closely linked than others, with or without interactional signals. The simplest structure for an adjacency pair is initiation-response (IR), an initiation from one speaker and a response from another.

Example 1:

Chandler: *So, you feel like goin' for a run?*

Monica: *Alright.*

Chandler guesses that Monica wants to go for a run according to the previous conversation. So he asks Monica whether she wants to work out. Then Monica answers *alright* to respond Chandler's question. It is a typical initiation/response or question/answer structure.

B. Exchange (Adjacency triplets)

Adjacency pairs can also be extended into adjacency triplets. The adjacency pair is the minimal structural unit of interaction which consists of an initiation and a response structural unit of interaction, for example, a question and its answer, or a greeting and a return greeting. But this minimal condition is typically elaborated in casual conversation to include a third function, the follow-up. Then we call it exchange or adjacency triplets. It consists of initiation, response and follow-up (IRF) (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

Example: 1

Joey: *So, so how did it happen?*
Phoebe: *Well, I finally took your advice and asked him what was going on.*
Joey: *And what did he say?*

Joey's initiates his question about how things happened and then Phoebe answers with the cause. Then Joey takes the turn to follow up the previous cause to initiate another question. Therefore, all of these utterances are closely related with each other and represent a sequential arrangement of cause, consequence and follow-up question.

C. Transaction

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) use "transaction" in a very wide adaptation to tag talk extensions recognised by certain types of activity at their boundaries. A transaction consists minimally of one exchange dealing with one topic, but usually of a sequence of exchanges dealing with the same topic.

Example 1:

Rachel: *Hello, excuse me.*
Guy: *What?*
Rachel: *Hi, I'm sorry. I need to borrow your phone for just one minute.*
Guy: *I'm talkin'!*

There are two exchanges dealing with the topic about request. At the beginning, Rachel initiates a greeting to the guy. After the guy responds to her, the first exchange finishes. Then Rachel asks the guy whether she could borrow his phone. After the guy answers her request, the second exchange comes to an end.

2. Other Functional Units

In addition to the interactional strategies already mentioned above, this paper also deals with the functional units used in this script, such as hedge, hesitation device, filler and discourse marker to connect the meaning from the speaker to the listener in the context.　The research question 2 is analysed as below.

(1). Hedge

Hedge helps the speaker modify what s/he says. The strategy the speaker mainly uses to circumvent getting to the crux of the matter immediately, not appear to be blunt, not wish to seem imposing and to dodge committing oneself (Stenstrom, 1994). Hedge is achieved in a great number of ways, and it is sometimes difficult to pinpoint exactly what it is in a speaker's utterance that has the hedging effect. It may be one of the items referred to as interactional signals and discourse markers, or a modal verb, or a certain type of adverb, or an indirectly put utterance. The most often seen hedges in discourse are *sort of, probably, kind of, perhaps, actually, I mean, you know, at least, rather, slightly, usually, ought to , generally, quite, may, slightly, tag, hardly,* etc.

Example 1:

Chandler: *Ok, I don't mind the last pound. Ok. In fact,* ***I kind of*** *like the last pound. Ok, so don't make me do anything that I'll regret.*

Chandler expresses his opinion about the last pound during the period of losing weight. He seems to give up on losing the last pound but he does not want to speak straightforward to state he want to give up working out. *Kind of* here is a detouring strategy to avoid him involving in a very clear position.

Example 2:

Chandler: ***You know****,* ***I mean****, you can't tell your parents you were fired because they'd be disappointed.*

Another example of hedge here is that Chandler does not want to put himself in a face-threatening position. He suggests Monica not tell her parents the truth about her unemployment in order to circumvent hurting her parents' feeling.

(2). Hesitation Devices

Hesitation devices such as "erm" or "er" are extremely frequent in natural spoken discourse, as speakers attempt to keep the floor while formulating their next utterance. A pause by itself may give another interlocutor the chance to take over, but by saying "erm" the speaker indicates that he or she is not yet ready to relinquish the floor.

Example 1:

Chandler: *And it's not as if you have a boyfriend's shoulder to cry on.*
Monica: **Well** *no, but* **um**.

At the beginning, Monica wants to deny Chandler's comment that she does not have a boyfriend to rely on. *Well* here is not only an opening marker but also a hesitation device to show Monica's hesitation to tell the truth. And in the subsequent expression, Monica changes her attitude, so *um* here also indicates her hesitant attitude to admit her helplessness.

(3). Fillers

Fillers are semantically empty features, including pauses, non-words such as *ah, uh*, *um*, and *okay*. Filler pauses can be usually taken to indicate that the speaker has no intention to yield the turn but is actually planning what to say next.

Example 1:

Phoebe: *He said that,* **um***, he understands how sex can be like, a very emotional thing for a woman.…*

Um here signposts a pause when Phoebe's ex-boyfriend describes how he thought sex was for a woman. He uses *um* to indicate a pause which means he is still thinking what he is going to say next, besides that, *um* indicates he is not going to yield the floor.

Example 2:

Chandler: *Nothing, except tell you,* **uh***, I think it's wonderful how much energy you have.*

Uh does not mean anything here. It only indicates a pause before Chandler comes out with what he is going to say.

(4). Discourse marker

Discourse marker will be used when the interlocutor thinks a need to verbally express how the coherence fits together well in a conversation. Its function as Stubbs (1983) indicates is to relate

utterances to each other or to mark a boundary in the discourse. Discourse marker functions only in the situational context of language in use, between speakers and hearers. Thus, Schiffrin (1987) suggests that 'markers select a meaning relation from whatever potential meanings are provided through the content of talk, and then display that relation without emphasis" (p. 318)'. Briefly, discourse marker is also called utterance indicator. A discourse marker does not have any meanings. For its function, it signposts the structure of the conversation for the interlocutor, in addition to that, it helps the audience to understand what is being said.

Discourse marker functions as cues or guides to the hearer's interpretation in the communication context. There are two basic frameworks which signpost discourse markers from different perspectives but eventually the conclusions are very similar. The coherence framework puts focus on the textual functions and the relevance framework puts focus on cognitive processes. Blakemore (1988) terms discourse markers as that which determine a restriction on pragmatic inferences and leads the recipient in the analysis of what is being talked about.

Discourse markers are also said to mark 'propositional attitude or illocutionary force: as well as "interpersonal relations" (Andersen, 1998, p. 147)'. A discourse marker does not create meaning but only orients the hearer. In brief, the functions of discourse markers are to initiate discourse, mark a boundary in discourse, preface a response or a reaction, help the speaker hold the floor, to mark either foreground or background, and serve as a filler or hesitation strategy. Schiffrin (1987) outlines the contribution of discourse markers to coherence as discourse markers indicate an utterance in the local contexts in which utterances are created and decoded. They specify contextual coordinates for utterances.

The following is that different discourse markers provide contextual coordinates for utterances in the script. The discourse markers *so, and, because, you know, well, I mean, oh, like* which are focused on in this paper, are employed for pragmatic and interactional purposes.

A. So

In grammar, the use of *so* is as an adverb of degree or manner and *so* as a conjunction. In syntactic function, *so* is typically restricted to sentence-initial position, only loosely attached to the syntactic structure and optional, at least in the sense that the sentence containing it remains grammatically well-formed even without *so*. Additionally, *so* remains the issue of propositional meaning. The function of conjunction, s*o*, is "introducing the result or consequence/reason" (Cobuild,

1987), or "showing the reason/result for something" (Hornby, 2000) or paraphrasing its meaning as "accordingly, consequently, therefore" (COED, 1976).

In these sentences of this script, we see that *so* precedes information understood as resultative (the outcome of connections between reported events) or conclusive (the outcome of inferential connections).

Example 1:

Rachel: ***So, how was the party?***

In sentence A "*So, how was the party*", everyone knows Chandler comes back from a party, after Chandler expresses his frustration resulting from the party; Rachel shows her concern and asks Chandler what happened at the party. *So* here plays the role of discourse marker of inferring result for something. Rachel uses *so* to initiate her interrogative question after Chandler describes his unhappy experience from the party.

Example 2:

Phoebe: ***So, Scott asked me to come over for lunch today and I did.***

When Phoebe enters Chandler and Joey's apartment, she asks them how come they watch a rabbit playing an electric guitar. After Joey tells her the reason why they watch this program, Phoebe starts another topic. She uses *so* to take her turn as a completion of the last adjacency pairs and initiates to utter her dating with Scott.

Example 3:

Joey: ***So, so*** *how did it happen?*

In this sentence, "*So, so how did it happen*"? Joey repeats *so* to show his excitement and interest to understand the whole story. *So* is used here as a turn taking and attitudinal signal. Besides that, *so* here represents the function of "question". It conveys how curious Joey wants to know how Phoebe and Scott resume their relationship.

Example 4:

Phoebe: ***So*** *after a lot of talking…I convinced him.*

So is an opening marker here. Whenever a speaker uses *so* to express his or her opinion, this is categorized as "speech act marker—opinion" (Blackmore, 1988). *So* here also represents as a result or consequence. Finally, Phoebe persuades Scott to believe her.

Example 5:

Chandler: *Ok, **so** don't make me do anything that I'll regret.*

　　Like *so* functioning as a speech act marker for requests and questions, *so* marking opinions includes an element of result. The speaker presents his or her opinions as motivated by what s/he has said before. In the beginning of this script, Monica urges Chandler to work out to lose weight. In *"Ok, so don't make me do anything that I'll regret",* Chandler seems not to compromise with Monica's exhortation. He strongly expresses his opinion about the last pound that he has not lost for his weight.

Example 6:

Monica: *Y'know, I try to stay positive.*
Chandler: ***So**, you feel like goin' for a run?*

　　In this sentence, Chandler takes the turn with *so,* an opening marker to follow up Monica's response. *So* acts as a consequential relationship to the prior message that Monica wants to stay positive about working out. Therefore, he conjectures Monica wants to continue to carry out the plan of working out. *S*o reformulates what Monica has just said, summarising one point before going on to mark the next.

B. And

　　Schiffrin (1987, p.128) states that '*And* has two roles in talk: it coordinates idea units and it continues a speaker's action'. It can signpost a new idea or join separate ideas in a list.

Example 1:
Phoebe: *So, Scott asked me to come over for lunch today and I did.*
Joey: ***And**?*
Phoebe: ***And** we did.*

　　Phoebe mentions that her ex-boyfriend, Scott asks her out. Then Joey enquires the outcome with *and*. Then Phoebe responds with *and we did.* The first *and* plays the roles of coordination to extend Joey's question and Phoebe's continuation to answer the question. The second *and* operates as an opening marker. It marks the idea unit and the interaction unit in an adjacency pair.

Example 2:

Phoebe: *Well*, *I finally took your advice and asked him what was going on.*
Joey: ***And*** *what did he say?*

And here plays the role of linking the prior utterance of Phoebe about her intense relationship with her ex-boyfriend. Additionally, *and* facilitates to define the boundaries of this interactional slot in Joey's question.

C. Because

Because introduces sentence topics which play a subordinate role in the discourse. In semantics, *because* accounts for the 'cause'. 'A fact-based causal relation between cause and result holds between idea units, more precisely, between the events, states, and so on, which they encode (Schiffrin, 1987, p.202)'.

Example 1:

Chandler: *So*, *you feel like goin' for a run?*
Monica: *Alright.*
Chandler: ***Because***, *you know, you don't have to. If you want, you could just take a nap*
      right here.

'*Because* can be used to preface information when the status of that information as shared background knowledge is uncertain and when that information is important for understanding adjacent talk (Schiffrin, 1987, p.207)'. Chandler uses *because* to explain that Monica does not need to go for a run to correspond his surmise that Monica is going to go for a run. In the context, *because* correlates the 'cause' and 'result' of this event and offers 'follow-up' to make the discourse coherent.

D. You know (y'know)

In the 1976 edition of The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, the definition of y*ou know* is a colloquial expression reminding the hearer that he knows or should know a thing: or serving "as a mere gap-filler in conversation". Sometimes, *you know* is used as an almost meaningless expression when the speaker is thinking what to say next. In other cases, *you know* yields the floor to the hearer and thus assumes a function in turn-taking. Or it may occur within a sentence structure as a hesitation marker.

Example 1:

Phoebe: *No, you are not, you are very attractive. **You know** what, I go through the exact same thing. Every time I put on a little weight, I start questioning everything.*

When Phoebe wants to consolidate Chandler's confidence, *you know* serves as a qualifying function here. She feels the need to provide her own similar situation to comfort Chandler and to strengthen her comment that Chandler is still attractive.

Example 2:

Phoebe: *No, not weight…**y'know**, more like insulation.*

You know has two functions here. The first function is hesitation marker and the other one is false start. In Phoebe's position, *y'know* indicates she is hesitating what she is going to say next. In the other sense, *y'know* signposts a false start as Phoebe stops in the middle of her utterance and continues with a different syntactic structure.

Example 3:

Chandler: *Oh, **you know**, I would, but that might get in the way of my lying around time.*

You know here represents a gap-filler function. It is an empty meaning; in addition to that, it also indicates Chandler's hesitation to work out.

Example 4:

Phoebe: *He said that, um, he understands how sex can be like, a very emotional thing for a woman and he was just afraid that I was gonna get all, **y'know**, like, 'ohh, is he gonna call me the next day' and, **y'know**, 'where is this going' and, **y' know**, blah-la-la-la-la. So he said he wanted to hold off until he was prepared to be really serious.*

Phoebe describes her talk of sharing the notion of sex with her ex-boyfriend. In Phoebe's description, *y'know* serves as the function of gap-filler which indicates pause and the function of boundary marker which initiates next boundary. Phoebe interprets the part of the sex information as common ground that she assumes the hearer, Joey is supposed to know. After a long utterance, *y'know* indicates a pause to let Phoebe resume the rest of her utterance.

E. Well

Well functions in terms of discourse techniques as a floor holder, hesitator, or initiator (Schiffrin, 1987). The speaker senses some sort of insufficiency in his answer or to indicate that details have been omitted. It has been labelled filler, hesitator, initiator, particle and interjection. Svartvik (1980) classifies the functions of *well* into marking self-repair and reported speech. He regards it as a reflexive frame breaks and shift in orientation from description to evaluation of events. *Well* has its primary function in the participation framework because it anchors a speaker into an interaction as a respondent. It works at the fourth level: a marker of self-repair, it functions in the ideational structure; since it regularly occurs at turn-transitional points, it also functions in the exchange structure. Schiffrin (1987, p.316) points out that 'since individuals can respond to anything in talk which temporarily disrupts their expectations for upcoming coherence -- ranging from unexpected knowledge […] to a request with which they cannot comply -- *well* also functions in information states […] and action structures'.

Example 1:

Chandler: ***Well*** *it couldn't have been worse. A woman literally passed through me.*

Well in the adjacency pairs indicates "the beginning of direct speech". It functions like a boundary marker as at the beginning of Chandler's utterance to try to get everyone's attention, so Chandler uses *well* as holding the floor in the talk to describe how pathetic he experienced in the party because no girls wanted to talk to him.

Example 2:

Phoebe: ***Well****, I finally took your advice and asked him what was going on.*

Well in the adjacency pairs functions like a self-repair. Phoebe initiates her answer with minimal tokens of question acknowledgement, and then adds more information. She is indirect and non-straight to respond Joey's advice about how to remain a relationship with someone that you like.

Example 3:

Monica: ***Well****, thanks.*

Well in this sentence indicates an opening marker and accounts for an agreement, positive reaction that Monica responds to Chandler's compliment.

Example 4:

Monica: ***Well****, you know.*

Well here has two functions, the first one indicates that the speaker Monica takes the turn but without being fully prepared. Monica tries to say something but needs more time to put it into words. *Well* here also functions like a reinforcement to acknowledge Monica's position as Chandler mentions the work is hard for her to find now. Besides that, *well* also shows a reluctance to give a clear negative answer after a closed question.

Example 5:

Monica: **Well** *no, but um.*

Well here indicates that Monica does not agree with Chandler's viewpoints. The details that Monica wants to respond have been omitted. She does not want to express a complete and sufficient answer because she is reluctant to admit. So *well* is like a non-straight and insufficient response to express her inner thought.

F. I mean

In the participation frameworks of conversation, *I mean* defines the orientation of the speaker toward two categories, ideas and intentions. *I mean* also plays a role of remedy for prior talk. Speaker wants to repair and explain his/her idea or intention. Besides that, *I mean* is a hedge. It softens the tone of the sentence in the whole context (Schiffrin, 1987).

Example 1:

Chandler: *You know,* **I mean**, *you can't tell your parents you were fired because they'd be disappointed.*

Chandler uses "*you know*" and "*I mean*" in a series of his utterance to connect hearer and speaker's attention. *You know* at the beginning of the sentence marks the transition from the prior information to the latter information that the speaker orientates toward his/her own talk for upcoming modification of idea or intention.

Example 2:

Chandler: **I mean**, *if it were me, I think I'd have difficulty just getting out of bed at all.*

Here, *I mean* acts like an opening marker to get the hearer's attention. Chandler uses *I mean* as a start to emphasize his discreet attitude for his being unable to getting out of bed. *I mean* is used to establish a serious tone of a speaker.

G. Oh

Oh is conventionally regarded as an exclamation or interjection. It indicates strong emotional states, e.g. surprise, fear, or pain. *Oh* is usually employed in a repair speech activity where speakers locate and replace a prior information unit (Schiffrin, 1987).

Example:

Monica: *Chandler, I'm unemployed and in dire need of a project. Ya wanna work out? I can remake you.,*
Chandler: ***Oh**, you know, I would, but that might get in the way of my lying around time.*

In the prior information, Chandler really cares about his weight which made him upset and unattractive in the party. However, once Monica suggests him to work out, he obviously changes his attitude and becomes serious toward the issue of losing weight in the upcoming response. So he adjusts his orientation to what has been said before to respond Monica. *Oh* acts as a repair function and opening marker here.

H. Like

Approximator, exemplifier, hedge and in quotative constructions can account for the functions of *like* in a discourse. For example, the speaker utilizes *like* as an approximator to represent that s/he does not focus at any exact figure. Or *like* reveals a very loose fit between the utterance and thought of the speaker who does not have any definite form of his/her thought yet (Anderson, 1998).

Example 1:

Phoebe: *He said that, um, he understands how sex can be **like**, a very emotional thing for a woman and he was just afraid that I was gonna get all, y'know, **like,** 'oh, is he gonna call me the next day' and, y'know, 'where is this going' and, ya know, blah-la-la-la-la.*

Phoebe describes her ex-boyfriend thinks what sex could be. The first *like* in Phoebe's description indicates the meaning of 'sort of' or 'approximate'. And the second *like* functions as a lexical focuser by highlighting the following expression. It serves as an exemplifier to extend Phoebe's ex-boyfriend, Scott's thought about what negative outcome will result in if they have sexual relationship.

V. Conclusion and Implication

This paper displays the capacity of the form of CA to do what its underlying theoretical conception of talk in interaction requires, namely, to analyse single episode of talk in interaction and components. Through analysing the script of *Friends* by conversation analysis approach, we gradually have a clear picture about how 'natural' talk works in context and make sense of what is said in specific circumstances. Most EFL learners are vexed at the disturbing sensation of understanding every word, and the literal meaning, but somehow miss the point of the communicative meaning of language in context. The underlying structure of the conversation analysis may be a progression of functional units, and a breakdown in pragmatic interpretation may easily lead to a learner losing his or her way. Therefore, CA is to trace the development of intersubjectivity in an action sequence. The analysts keep track of how participants analyse and account for each other's actions and build up a shared understanding of the progress of the interaction. So CA practitioners aim to "discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of action are generated" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p.14). The other functional units of language such as discourse marker, pause, hesitation device, back-channel, filler, etc. influence how the speaker conveys the message to the listener and how the listener receives the message from the speaker. For EFL students, a problem emerging from the learning of language functional units is how the target language realises such marking in the language learning. Are the EFL students able to understand those used for marking purposes? Most of the English textbooks are reputably unreliable sources for such cross-linguistic information, and the EFL teachers may be best able to tackle both the awareness problem and the lexical problem via observations of real data. EFL teachers need to go further in examining how functional units of language in the English textbooks interact to create discourse, and how the EFL learners may be guided through them. Then the real meaning of English teaching is not only constructed on words and sentences but also especially on the stretches of language as a coherent discourse.

The aim of CA applied in analysing a text and then put into English learning has a very positive effect especially for EFL learning. EFL teachers could be released from traditional grammar, vocabulary and phonology teaching. With a more accurate picture of conversation analysis, EFL teachers are in a better position to evaluate the descriptions of their teaching, and teaching materials, what goes on in the classroom, and the end products of their teaching methods, whether in the natural form of spoken output or not. On the other hand, the application of CA approach has permitted students to determine empirically the functions of many types of conversational objects and to unlock the interior organization of a wide variety of conversational sequences.

References

Allwood, J. (1976). *Linguistic communication as action and cooperation.* Goteborg: University of Goteborg.

Anderson, G. (1998). The pragmatic marker *like* from a relevance-theoretic perspective. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers: Description and theory* (pp. 147-170). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Blackmore, D. (1988). 'So' as a constraint on relevance. In R. M. Kempson (Ed.), *Mental representations: The interface between language and reality* (pp.183-195). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Cobuild, C. (1987). *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary.* London: Collins.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cushman, D., & Whiting, G. C. (1972). An approach to communication theory: Toward consensus on rules. *Journal of Communication 22*, 217-238.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992b). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Introduction in institutional settings* (pp.3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse*. London, New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behaviour*. New Brunswick, London: Aldine Transaction.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology 19,* 283-307.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.* Melbourne: Deakin University.

Henne, H. (1978). Die Rolle des Horers im Gesprach. In I. Rosengren (Eds.), *Sprache und Pragmatik* (pp.122-134). Lund: Gleerup.

Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Herndl, C. G. (1993). Teaching discourse and reproducing culture: A critique of research and pedagogy. *Professional and Nonacademic Writing 44*(3), 349-363.

Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Hornby, A. S. (2000). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English* (6th ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Hutchby, I ., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcription notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of social action (pp.ix-xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, and Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Labov, W & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse*. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lotman, Y. M. (1990) *Universe of the mind: A semiotic theory of culture.* Trans by A. Shukman. London: Tauris.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1999). Explaining the role of norms and rationality in codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics 32,* 1259-7 1.

Myers-Scotton, C., & Bolonyai, A. (2001). Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society 30,* 1-28.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis.* London, New York: Penguin Books.

Orestrom, B. (1983). *Turn-taking in English conversation.* Lund: Cwk Gleerup.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis -- The study of talk-in-interaction.* Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.

Pridham, F. (2001). *The language of conversation.* London and New York: Routledge.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simple systematic for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language 50*(4), 696-735.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stenstrom, A-B. (1994). *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London, New York: Longman.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Svartvik, J. (1980). Well in conversation. In S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, & J. Svartvik (Eds.), *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk* (pp.167-177). London: Longman.

Thompson, D. (1976). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (6th edition). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Appendix

Script of *Friends* -- The One Where Ross Finds Out

Originally written by Michael Borkow
Transcribed by Josh Hodge
Minor additions and adjustments by Dan Silverstein.

[Scene: Monica and Rachel's apartment. Everyone is sitting at the couches, Chandler enters.]

CHAN: OK, what is it about me? Do I not look fun enough? Is there something. . . repellant. . about me?

RACH: So, how was the party?

CHAN: Well it couldn't have been worse. A woman literally passed through me. OK, so what is it, am I hideously unattractive?

PHOE: No, you are not, you are very attractive. You know what, I go through the exact same thing. Every time I put on a little weight, I start questioning everything.

CHAN: Woah, woah, I've put on a little weight?

PHOE: No, not weight... y'know, more like insulation.

MNCA: Chandler, I'm unemployed and in dire need of a project. Ya wanna work out? I can remake

you.

CHAN: Oh, you know, I would, but that might get in the way of my lying around time.

MNCA: Please.

ALL: C'mon. Let her. Yeah.

CHAN: Alright, OK, alright. But if we put on spandex and my boobs are bigger than yours, I'm goin' home.

PHOE: Your boobs are fine. Look, I never should have said anything. Come here. Come here. [hugs Chandler but holds her hands apart behind his back] Oh, can't make.... hands... meet....

[Outside the window, Monica and Chandler jog up. Monica playfully pushes him. They start pushing and slapping harder and harder until Monica pushes him down. Chandler stands up, with a serious expression, and chases her away.]

RACH: Hello, excuse me.

GUY: What.

RACH: Hi, I'm sorry, I need to borrow your phone for just one minute.

GUY: I'm talkin'!

RACH: I can see that. I... just one phone call, I'll be very quick, I'll even pay for it myself. [man is still reluctant] OK, you're bein' a little weird about your phone.

GUY: Alright, fine. [on the phone] I'll call you back. [hands the phone to her]

RACH: Thank you. OK. [dials] [to Michael] Machine. Just waiting for the beep.

MICH: Good.

RACHEL: [on phone] Ross, hi, it's Rachel. I'm just calling to say that um, everything's fine and I'm really happy for you and your cat who, by the way, I think you should name Michael. And, you know, ya see there I'm thinking of names so obviously, I am over you. I am over you and that, my friend, is what they call closure. [hangs up and tosses phone in the ice bucket]

COMMERICAL

[Scene: Chandler and Joey's apartment. Joey is watching a rabbi play an electric guitar on TV. Phoebe enters.]

PHOE: Hey Joey.

JOEY: Hey Phoebs.

PHOE: How come you're watching a rabbi play electric guitar?

JOEY: I can't find the remote. [Phoebe turns off the TV] Thank you.

PHOE: So, Scott asked me to come over for lunch today and I did.

JOEY: And?

PHOE: And we did.

JOEY: All right Phoebs, way to go.

PHOE: Yay me.

JOEY: So, so how did it happen?

PHOE: Well, I finally took your advice and asked him what was going on.

JOEY: And what did he say?

PHOE: He said that, um, he understands how sex can be like, a very emotional thing for a woman and he was just afraid that I was gonna get all, y'know, like, 'ohh, is he gonna call me the next day' and, y'know, 'where is this going' and, ya know, blah-la-la-la-la. So he said he wanted to hold off until he was prepared to be really serious.

JOEY: Wow.

PHOE: Yeah, so I said, "OK, relax please," y'know, I mean, sex can be just about two people right there in the moment, y'know, it's, if he wants to see me again he can call and if not, that's fine too. So after a looooot of talking. . . I convinced him.

JOEY: Let me get this straight. He got you to beg to sleep with him, he got you to say he never has to call you again, and he got you thinking this was a great idea.

PHOE: Um-hum.

JOEY: This man is my God.

[Scene: Central Perk. Rachel is closing up and Ross comes in. Get your Kleenex.]

RACH: Hi.

ROSS: I didn't get a cat.

CLOSING CREDITS

CHAN: Monica, it's 6:30 in the morning. We're not working out, it's over.

MNCA: No way, with one pound to go, c'mon. We're workin', we're movin', we're in the zone we're groovin'.

CHAN: OK, I don't, I don't mind the last pound. OK, in fact I kind of like the last pound. OK, so don't make me do anything that I'll regret.

MNCA: Ooh, what'cha gonna do, fat boy, huh? What?

CHAN: Nothing, except tell you, uh, I think it's wonderful how much energy you have.

MNCA: Well, thanks.

CHAN: I mean, especially considering how tough it's been for you to find work.

MNCA: Well, you know.

CHAN: You know, I mean, you can't tell your parents you were fired because they'd be disappointed.

MNCA: [sad] Uh-huh.

CHAN: And it's not as if you have a boyfriend's shoulder to cry on.

MNCA: Well no, but um.

CHAN: I mean, if it were me, I think I'd have difficulty just getting out of bed at all.

MNCA: Y'know, I try to stay positive. . .

CHAN: So, you feel like goin' for a run?

MNCA: Alright.

CHAN: Because, you know, you don't have to. If you want, you could just take a nap right here.

MNCA: OK. Just for a little while.

CHAN: OK. [Puts an afghan over her and dances into his room]