



Non-native Students' Dismay in the Spoken Context in the United Kingdom

Mahmudul Haque Shah, *University of Central Lancashire, UK*

Abstract

Non-native English users may not be comfortable during their stay in a native context experiencing that English is used slightly in a different way from what they learnt from books. The differences between the English of text-books and the English of daily life in a native context can contribute to an experience of language shock for non-native English users who need to use English in a native context when they travel abroad for higher education. Though both native and non-native speakers can experience language shock in either a spoken or a written context, English users who have learned English mainly from text books are at a higher risk of language shock in a native spoken context than in an academic context. This paper will critically examine how naturally spoken English in a native context differs from the academic English of text books, illustrating why the experience of language shock is more probable in any spoken context than in any written context.

Keywords: language shock; languaculture; ellipsis; fillers; overlapping; back-channelling

Introduction

When non-native students come to the United Kingdom for higher education, they get dismayed experiencing some differences between academic English and spoken English under the impression that their prior linguistic skills learnt from books do not meet the requirements to communicate well enough in a native context: a feeling of self-blame for failure in communication can be tantamount to language shock for a non-native speaker in a native context (Marr, 2005). Apparently, language shock refers to the dissatisfaction of a language user regarding their underperformance while using a language; it is one of the most common experiences when a student travels abroad to pursue a higher education (Agar, 1994; Marr, 2005; Montes, 2014). This shock can be experienced either in the spoken or written context or in both, with Marr (2005) reporting Chinese students' language shock in the spoken context in London, while Montes (2014) revealed Chinese students' language shock in the academic context of Australia. Lewthwaite (1996) and Copland & Garton (2011) have identified that international students' academic English in English-speaking countries is adequate but their social English is not, and a language user can underperform when communicating beyond an academic context, making language shock more obvious in the

spoken context than in the academic context (Agar, 1994). This research investigates the extent to which students' experiences of language shock influence their communication in English in London, an English-speaking context. The study investigates how spoken language differs from academic language in order to enhance the communicative competence of students, with a view to minimising language shock among students living abroad and undertaking higher education.

Theoretical Framework

Defining Language Shock

Agar (1994) describes the dissatisfaction of a language user in their underperformance as 'language shock', which can occur in a first language or second language, in an academic setting or beyond, in the spoken or written context, in a native or non-native context, and in the same country or abroad. (Agar, 1994; Marr, 2005; Montes, 2014). When a language user travels from one country to another, they experience some differences in the usage of the same language, i.e. English use in Australia is different from that in the United Kingdom. Agar (1994) termed this 'languaculture' (LC), which is the cultural association of language, where the main reason for the difference between language users of different spoken communities is their different cultural origin, i.e. LC1 and LC2, which contributes to the underperformance of a language user. As the difference between LC1 and LC2 is the main reason for language shock, the wider the gap between LC1 and LC2, the higher the level of shock a language user is likely to experience.

In this paper, the main issue discussed is whether language shock is likely to be more common in the spoken or written context. As English is the only language which has more non-native speakers than native speakers (Grundy, 2008, p. 244), more varieties of spoken English are likely to emerge around the world in different geographical and cultural contexts. Kachru (1992) identified three forms of English: inner circle variety or native English, outer circle variety or English as a second language, and expanding circle variety or English as a foreign language. Language shock is likely to be more common in spoken English than in written English, as many English dialects are not written or are not believed to have been written (Hudson, 2001). This represents a high risk for a non-native speaker, for example Bangladeshi students, in a native context, for example London, because of their high dependency on books for learning English language with an emphasis on reading and writing but with no assessment of speaking and listening skills (Hamid & Baldauf, 2008, p. 17;

Ansarey, 2012, p. 77; Shams, Haider, Roay, Maumder, Razzaque & Shahzadi, 2012; Shahidullah, Islam, Mjid, & Shams, 2013). This research will delineate how spoken features of English differ from written English and identify the potential reasons for language shock in the spoken context. This research is very important for creating language awareness for second language learners, because the aforementioned elements are usually ignored while teaching English in a classroom.

Research Focus

Giving emphasis to spoken English, the main focus of the discussion will include fillers, ellipses, overlapping, turn-taking and back channelling, because these elements remarkably differentiate spoken English from formal written text (Carter & McCarthy, 1997). Fillers, for example, are not always a necessary part of a sentence but are inserted in a spoken sentence, whereas an ellipsis ensures the intended meaning even after the omission of some necessary parts of a sentence (McCarthy, 1997, p. 14). In addition, a spoken context is not like a Shakespearean drama where only one person speaks at any one time, with another person speaking only when the first speaker has finished; instead, interruptions are very common in a spoken context, either in terms of co-operation, i.e. back-channelling and overlapping, in terms of opposition, or for introducing a new idea, i.e. turn-taking. Elements like fillers do not take place in formal speech but during a natural conversation, and can create a significant difference in conveying an intended meaning. For example, the filler ‘you know’, is used when a speaker is sharing their idea with a listener, whereas when the same speaker uses ‘you see’, then they are assuming that the listener is not aware of what they are saying. Similarly, an ellipsis is very common with verbs of mental processing, including auxiliary verbs, and occasionally with forms, but they can appear as fixed expressions, such as ‘sounds strange’, ‘good job’, ‘absolutely right’ and so on (McCarthy, 1997, p. 15). In this manner spoken elements such as fillers, ellipses, overlapping, turn-taking and back-channelling are used not to hinder the intelligibility, but rather to enhance mutual understanding and cooperation among the speakers in a conversation.

Methodology

Conversation analysis (CA) of a natural conversation is the methodology employed in this research, because such an approach represents ‘tools of enquiry’ in a social context of a target culture (Gee, 2001a, p. 37; Cameron, 2010). In this study, a real-life-conversation has been recorded which took place after a casual Easter dinner. As a friend of an English family, I

was invited to that dinner but was running a little bit late, and so all the recording took place after the meal. The whole conversation lasted around 44 minutes but only a small section from 35:21 to 43:21 minutes is used in the analysis. This is primarily because people behave awkwardly when they know that they are being recorded, although their nervousness reduces after a few minutes; however, in case of inhibition due to the recording an extract from half an hour into the conversation has been analysed where the participants are talking naturally. In order to analyse this discourse, CA theory is utilised because this is an enquiry into the nature of the procedures that conversationalists follow to produce the orderliness of any casual conversation (Gee, 2001a ; Cameron, 2010, p. 49).

Daily communication is not simply a conversation; it is talking through interaction. CA is not intended to appeal to any evidence that comes from outside the talk itself, and it does not require the analyst to possess detailed knowledge of participants' identities, their daily routines, or their beliefs (Cameron, 2010, p. 88). Instead, it is highly text-dependent, and it is the conversation itself that is the subject of the analysis. While there are some similarities between CA and critical discourse analysis (CDA) since both take text as a part of their analysis, CDA is conducted by post-structuralists or post-modernists and go beyond the text by borrowing conceptual and analytical apparatus from both linguistic and intellectual enterprise, known as critical theory (Cameron, 2010, p. 50). Similarly, ethnography has some similarities as this also considers text, but an ethnographer is mainly concerned with the way a certain speech event fits into a whole network of social and cultural beliefs and practices, whereby the socio-cultural context is taken into account (Hammersley, 2006, p. 11; Cameron, 2010, p. 51). Therefore the difference between CA or CDA to ethnography lies in the focal issue; the focus is on the spoken discourse empirically in itself, not the detailed knowledge of the social context or intellectual enterprise. Renkema (2004) and Cameron (2010) have identified some related issues of CA, namely turn-taking, back-channelling, adjacency pairs, and discourse markers, in casual conversations. However, the author's participation in the discourse presented in Appendix necessitated an ethnographic tone, which legitimates the presence of 'I' (Canagarajah, 1993; Jordan, 2001; Agar, 2005; Starks & Brown, 2007) even though the entire approach is not ethnographic.

Participants

There were four participants in the conversation recorded: three were native English speakers and the fourth was a non-native speaker, an English user of Bangladeshi origin. The

participants are anonymous for ethical reasons (Dörnyei, 2003; Dörnyei 2007), but their permission has been obtained to use their conversation in this research. In Appendix the speakers are labelled SP 01, SP 02, SP 03 and SP 04; SP 01-03 are native English speakers, while I am the participant labelled SP 04 and the non-native English speaker. When the recording began, the conversation between the native speakers was not very lively, and it was only when I started to speak with them that they became less inhibited and the conversation became a lively one. The speakers were talking about pubs and gambling houses, and they were suggesting that the number of pubs was decreasing while betting shops were increasing, which they believed to be encouraging the vice of gambling and therefore adversely affecting public life. During this conversation there was extensive usage of ellipses, fillers, back-channelling and overlapping, which will be discussed using CA.

Results

Data in Discourse

As stated earlier, the main issues of discussion will include fillers, ellipses, overlapping, turn-taking and back-channelling, and the data from the discourse presented in the Appendix is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: *Spoken elements and their frequency*

Spoken Elements	Examples	Frequency
Back-channelling	yeah, hm, yes, That's right	10 times
Ellipsis	[I am] 'sorry', [He drives] 'drinking martini', [It is] 'so weird', [It is] 'so expensive', all [are] bat shops, [you can] 'never win'.	43 times
Fillers	you know, you see	5 times
Full sentence	'That's right', 'That's bad', 'That's how it is', 'I don't know', 'Did you use mathematics to win it?'	7 times
Non-lexical words	hm, hmm	8 times
Overlapping	examples provided within third bracket ([]) in Appendix	27 times
Repetition	and and, yes yes, no no, no ... no ... no, ha ... ha... ha...	7 times

The data analysis depends on normal mathematical calculations. Dörnyei (2007, pp. 99-100) recommends a group of 30 for any SPSS analysis, but as none of the spoken elements proposed (fillers, ellipses, over-lapping, back channelling etc.) appeared 30 times, SPSS analysis was not feasible. The relationship between fillers, ellipses, overlapping and back channelling in this research is therefore statistically insignificant.

Data Analysis

The high volume of ellipsis, i.e. 43 times in Table 1, represents the elliptical nature of spoken English in a natural conversation (Grundy, 2008, p. 245). The second obvious element of a spoken conversation is ‘overlapping’, which emerged 27 times, while the least obvious element was the presence of fillers at 5 times. However, some non-lexical words, such as ‘hm’ and ‘hmm’, have filler-like qualities because they provide a speaker with a ‘breathing space’ in which to think. If non-lexical words are considered as fillers, then the number of fillers is now 13. It is important to note that out of 174 lines that constituted the entire conversation, there were only seven full sentences, which were mainly fixed phrases or small groups of words (see Table 1), which is an indication that sentences in a spoken conversation are frequently grammatically incomplete yet meaning is successfully conveyed.

As the nature of spoken English is highly elliptical, the focus will now turn to the usage of ellipses in this conversation. The first appearance of a nominal ellipsis is in line 16 (Appendix), when SP 01 uses the phrase ‘the new young ones’, where the word ‘ones’ indicates someone who drinks, while the same word ‘one’, appears again in line 20 (Appendix), where SP 02 uses it to indicate pubs. Later, in line 32 (Appendix), SP 03 totally omits ‘they’ to indicate ‘the pubs’, and the meaning is not lost despite this omission. Two lines later, (Appendix, line 34), SP 03 says nothing after ‘all the’, which is another reference to gambling houses replacing the position of pubs; this is an example of a context-based reference where the speakers are suggesting that betting shops are replacing pubs. Again, the word ‘one’ is used by SP 01 (line 92, Appendix), which was assumed to refer to a celebrity, although SP 01 indicates that this is in fact an ordinary person, ‘Stephen Friar’, which becomes clear in the later lines. Afterwards, in lines 113 and 114 (Appendix) there is the omission of the word ‘illness’ when referring to gambling as indicated in the preceding line (line 112, Appendix). Moreover, in line 121 no noun or pronoun was used to indicate the gamblers who are obsessed by wanting to become a millionaire through gambling. Finally, in line 139 (Appendix) the word ‘you’ has been omitted when referring to SP 03 who had a £25

lottery win. The usage of the personal pronoun is quite common in written or spoken English, but the omission of such a pronoun indicates an informal situation and dependence on the immediate text for interpretability (Carter & McCarthy, 1997, p. 68).

Verbal ellipses appear for the first time in line 22 (Appendix), where the speaker actually wants to say that the pubs are closing down but does not use the word 'are' in her speech. This occurs again in line 23 (Appendix), where there is an omission of 'are' to indicate that betting shops are replacing pubs. Later in line 32 (Appendix), no verb has been used to indicate that the pubs are offering lunches, which is one of the few attractions of pubs. Similarly in line 48 (Appendix), the word 'win' has not been used to indicate the unlikelihood of winning in a betting shop, as these operate such that customers will lose. Afterwards, no verb has been used in lines 121 and 123 (Appendix) to indicate the urge to be a millionaire or to indicate their excitement: 'so the thing ...' or '...maybe it not even that'. Finally, another omission of a verbal ellipsis occurs in line 154 (Appendix), where SP 04 refers to whether SP 03 used any mathematical technique for her lottery win, but though an auxiliary verb is used, no principal verb is utilised. The omission of a subject or auxiliary verb is common in casual conversation (Carter & McCarthy, 1997, p. 127), whilst the omission of a principal verb is not very common, yet proper understanding has been conveyed due to the preceding text, thus this is another example of text dependency in informal English.

Clausal ellipses appear more frequently than any other type of ellipsis. Even the first sentence (Appendix) represents a clausal ellipsis: '...buy cheap alcohol' where the clause 'you can' has been omitted yet successful meaning has been conveyed to the listeners. Similarly, 'I am' has been omitted in line 4 (Appendix) where it indicates that SP 02 is worried that pubs are closing down. Later, clausal ellipses appear during the simplification of sentences: 'someone did' (line 11, Appendix) refers to 'the people who abused alcohol', while 'that's what they do' (line 40, Appendix) represents 'the practice of gambling as a vice', 'it doesn't' (line 47, Appendix) refers to 'one cannot win in betting to pay his debts', and 'who did' (line 136, Appendix) brings forward the fact that the speaker was the only person who won the bet. Similar to SP 02, SP 03 continues the omission of subject and verb in later parts of the conversation: '... so expensive' (line 14, Appendix) indicates that 'the alcohols are so expensive', while 'weird things' (line 74, Appendix) and '... so weird' (line 79, Appendix) indicate 'the practice of gambling and the probability of winning' but the speaker omits 'they are', which makes a fixed expression, a common practice in spoken English (Carter &

McCarthy, 1997). Later, SP 04 endeavours to use a sentence adverb ‘actually’ (line 125, Appendix) to indicate that the thrill of gambling is an obsession, but cannot continue because SP 01 takes over and continues to articulate about the further vices of gambling. SP 01 continued to use clausal ellipses in later lines, such as ‘when’ (line 129 and 131, Appendix) to enquire when SP 03 won a bet, who also answers with a clausal ellipsis saying that when they went to the horse racing the chances of winning a bet were ‘...incredible’ (line 151, Appendix). A bunch of clausal ellipses appear in lines 159 to 172, where every speaker participates with just a few words or fixed expressions to represent that James Bond, a movie character, is the only person who can win either by luck or due to his intellect: ‘winning’ (line 162, Appendix), ‘even card’ (line 162, Appendix), ‘gets the girl’ (line 163, Appendix), ‘lucky man’ (line 164, Appendix), ‘and the car’ (line 166, Appendix), and ‘drinking martini’ (line 169, Appendix). All of these are complements to James Bond via an anaphoric reference in line 159 (Appendix) to indicate that he is the only one who can experience winning, together with beautiful women, a sophisticated gun, the latest car, and an expensive drink. It is true that they are informal expressions, but they are formally informal with an anaphoric reference (line 159, Appendix).

Overlapping begins during line 2 (Appendix) and continues up to line 171 (Appendix), although the frequency is not high as for ellipses; there are 43 ellipses and 27 occurrences of overlapping. Overlapping refers to simultaneous acts with more than one speaker, and these unify with ellipses 12 times, indicating some form of relationship between ellipses and overlapping; four of overlapping occurrences come with noun ellipses (lines 15/16, lines 20/21, line 34/35, line 120/121, Appendix), one with a verbal ellipsis (lines 23/24, Appendix), and seven with clausal ellipses (lines 44/45, lines 47/51, lines 70/71, lines 125/126, lines 130/131, lines 151/152, lines 170/171, Appendix). Clausal ellipses show the highest level of association with overlapping, whereas verbal ellipses represent the lowest association. Overlapping occurrences are quite frequent (27 times) throughout the whole conversation, where one speaker sometimes takes a turn speaking rather than the former speaker selecting them. This is in contrast with the overlapping theory of Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974), because three out of the four participants (for example, lines 62, 63, and 64, Appendix) speak at the same time and no one stops to repair this afterwards; the repair-mechanism is not working here.

The usage of fillers is relatively low at 5 times. The filler ‘you know’, appears in lines 5, 126 and 157 (Appendix), and ‘you see’ is present in lines 57 and 112, a reflection of a sharing approach among the speakers, rather than the introduction of new ideas among them. Some non-lexical words, e.g. ‘hm’ and ‘hm’, or the act of repetition among the speakers, which appears seven times during the conversation, have got filler-like qualities, as their usage significantly gives a speaker a ‘breathing space’ to think before conveying their message to the listeners. Similar words occasionally appear, together with back-channelling. The speakers might not repeat themselves when asked to, another indication of the unpredictability of a spoken conversation in English.

Interpretation

It is important to note that the role of LC is evident in a spoken discourse; the usage of ‘pubs’ (line 6, Appendix), ‘betting shops’ (line 34, Appendix), ‘Coral’ (line 132, Appendix), ‘pounds’ (line 17, Appendix), ‘pension’ (line 111, Appendix), and ‘pensioner’ (line 110, Appendix) clearly indicate that the conversation is taking place in Britain. In terms of using fillers, both the native speakers and the non-native speaker used ‘you know’, whereas ‘you see’ (lines 57 and 112) was used by the non-native speaker, an indication of shared knowledge between the native speakers. Another remarkable difference is the usage of full sentences, as the non-native speaker has a tendency to formulate an entire sentence, although this rarely occurred in this discourse. The largest sentence of this discourse, ‘Did you use mathematics to win it?’ (line 154, Appendix) was spoken by SP 04, the non-native speaker, whereas small sentences, i.e. ‘That’s right’ and ‘That’s bad’, were used by the native speakers, an indication of the use of small-fixed-phrases and chunks in a spoken context by native speakers instead of a large sentence. Apart from seven full sentences, the whole discourse of 174 lines indicates the unpredictability of spoken English in a native context or LC2, through incomplete sentences in terms of fillers, ellipses, overlapping, turn-taking and back channelling.

Contrary to the elliptical nature of Spoken English, as evidenced in this research, a non-native speaker represent a habit of producing full-formed sentences, which can be an impediment for active participation in a lively conversation. Though Copland & Garton (2011) identify that non-native students grammatical competency is usually satisfactory, their research indicates that spoken grammar requires more attention for enhancing their communicative competence as it is very important to take a speaker’s turn when required with an appropriate

length and pause with the right person when required. Even the fillers, e.g. ‘you know’ and ‘you see’, of a spoken discourse bears pragmatic meaning in a social context where sociolinguistic elements, e.g. ‘coral’, ‘pub’, ‘betting shop’, ‘pensioneer’ etc., are very important for making sense of a conversation. Though such spoken elements are very simple for a language user with a living experience in the United Kingdom, they are little known to the non-native speakers who highly depend on books for learning English without any experience of living abroad. Due to the lacking in one of the competencies, non-native speakers are at a high risk of underperformance in the spoken context in LC2 which will eventually lead them to an experience of language shock in terms of their self-blame and dissatisfaction though an approach of repair or strategic competence can be occasionally useful to them (Canale & Swain, 1980). The discourse of Appendix, therefore, is an indication to consider Canale & Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) suggesting grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence in second language teaching in order to avoid a language user’s dismay or language shock in LC2.

Conclusions

The data from this conversation indicates that the nature of an informal spoken conversation is not as predictable as the written form of English. The usage of ellipses, fillers, turn-taking, back-channelling, overlapping, and non-lexical words is quite abrupt and all are frequent throughout the entire conversation in contrast to their limited presence in formal speech. The most remarkable feature is the elliptical nature of the conversation, which does not mean that the intended meaning was not conveyed, rather it is an indication of conveying the message to the listeners via a minimal approach. Nominal and verbal ellipses appear with almost the same frequency (nominal, eight times and verbal, seven times) but clausal ellipses appear far more often (28 times) during the conversation, which indicates that the popularity of clausal ellipses is much more than that of other ellipses. The usage of ‘one’ is popular as a nominal ellipsis, an auxiliary verb with verbal ellipses, and ‘do’ with clausal ellipses, and all bring fluency to a casual conversation. Overlapping shows a moderate association with ellipses by appearing at the same time but this does not mean that where there is an ellipsis there will also be overlapping. In this conversation it represents the close association among the participants, where the high dependency on clausal ellipses can contribute to the life of a casual conversation by appearing almost as frequently as overlapping does, though they do



not appear at the same time. Such unpredictability is not used to hinder the understanding of the language users, but instead to facilitate understanding in a cultural context. This is an important issue to consider when teaching English in an academic context, whereas the spoken nature of English receives little consideration in LC1. However, as non-native speakers learn English from text books with no assessment of listening and speaking, the spoken nature of a conversation is rather less familiar than the formal written context. Consequently, LC2 non-native speakers are at high risk of experiencing language shock in a native context while trying to communicate verbally with LC1 language users. Therefore, it is highly recommended that LC2 speakers undertake specific training in order to enhance their knowledge, especially in relation to the spoken nature of English following Canale & Swain (1980) and Canale (1983), with a view to minimising language shock during their stay abroad.

Limitations and Further Research Directions

As this study does not consider an equal number of native and non-native speakers in its conversation analysis, there is a further opportunity for research in terms of comparison and contrast using a sample group with equal numbers of native and non-native speakers, perhaps 6-8 members in total. Such a study could aim to show how much the native speakers differ from the non-native speakers in terms of spoken elements (fillers, ellipses, overlapping, turn-taking, back channelling etc.).

Biodata

Dr. Mahmudul Haque Shah completed his PhD in the University of Central Lancashire in December, 2017. His areas of interest include SLA, spoken English, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and EAP.

References

- Adunola, A. & Temitope, A. (2010). Illuminating the illuminator: A stylistic study of Obafemi's Illuminations. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 7(10), 95-103.
- Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow.
- Agar, M. (2005). Local discourse and global research: The role of local knowledge. *Language in Society*, 34(1), 1-22.



- Ansarey, D. (2012). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Teachers attitude and perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 61-78.
- Cameron, D. (2010). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 601-626.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In: Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. W. (Eds.), *Language and communication*, London: Longman.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheng, W. (2006). Describing the extended meanings of lexical cohesion in a corpus of SARS spoken discourse. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(3), 325-344.
- Copland, F. & Garton, S. (2011). I felt that I do live in the UK now: international students' self-reports of their English language speaking experiences on a pre-sessional programme. *Language & Education: An International Journal*, 25(3), 241-255.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garnham, A. A. (1987). Effects of antecedent distance and intervening text structure in the interpretation of ellipses. *Language & Speech*, 30(1), 59-68.
- Gee, J. P. (2001a). *Discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2001b). *Critical literacy as critical discourse analysis*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.



- Grabhorn, R., Kaufhold, J., Michal, M. & Overbeck, G. (2005). The therapeutic relationship as reflected in linguistic interaction: Work on resistance. *Psychotherapy Research*, 15(4), 470-482.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Hodder Education.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1983). *Cohesion in English*. Singapore: Longman Group Limited London.
- Hamid, M.O. & Baldauf, R. B. J. (2008). Will CLT bail out the bogged down ELT in Bangladesh? *English Today*, 24(3), 16-24.
- Hammersley, M. (2006). Ethnography: Problems and prospects. *Ethnography & Education*, 1(1), 3-14.
- Hudson, R. A. (2001). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, S. A. (2001). Writing the other, writing the self: Transforming consciousness through ethnographic writing. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 1(1), 40-5.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue*. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.
- Kuiper, K. & Allan, W. S. (2004). *An introduction to English language*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lewthwaite, M. (1996). Study of international students' perspectives on cross-cultural adaption. *International Journal for the Advanced of Counselling*, 19(2), 167-85.
- Marr, T. (2005). Language and the capital: A case study of English 'language shock' among Chinese students in London. *Language Awareness*, 14(4), 239-253.
- Montes, C. (2014). *Navigating language shock: Chinese students managing English academic writing in Australian higher education*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Queensland.
- Nakagawa, S., Kogure, S. & Itoh, T. (2000). A semantic interpreter and a cooperative response generator for a robust spoken dialogue system. *International Journal of Pattern Recognition & Artificial Intelligence*, 14(5).
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.



- Ruiter, M., Kolk, H. & Rietveld, T. (2010). Speaking in ellipses: The effect of a compensatory style of speech on functional communication in chronic agrammatism. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 20(3), 423-458.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), Part 1, 696-735.
- Shahidullah, M., Islam, J., Mjid, I. A. N. & Shams, N. (2013). *English for today: For classes 11-12*. Dhaka: National Curriculum & Textbook Board.
- Shams, R., Haider, M. Z, Roay, G., Maumder, S. J., Razzaque, M. A. & Shahzadi, N. (2012). *English for today*. Dhaka: National Curriculum & Textboard.
- Starks, H. & Brown, T. S. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), pp. 1372-1380.



Appendix

<SP 01> Speaker 01 (75 years)

<SP 02> Speaker 02 (53 Years)

<SP 03> Speaker 03 (18 years)

<SP 04> Speaker 04 (30 years)

[] Overlapping

{ } Back channelling with mild sounds

() Description, comments, time duration, indicating pauses

... Occasional stammering or pauses less than 0.4 seconds

The overlapping words of a speaker have been kept in the same margin of the other speakers' overlapping words to indicate with whom it (the overlapping) occurs. Due to the incomplete nature of the sentences, small letters have been used instead of capital letters when the speakers are starting to speak.

Lines Speakers Speeches

(35.21 of recording)

1	<SP 01>	...and now the drinks are cheaper you can go to supermarkets and buy
2		cheap drinks...[o still time they haven't yet]...not to that extend...no...
3	<SP 03>	[that's all... wrap up...]
4	<SP 02>	well I think... I mean...still worried... about the pub
5	<SP 01>	[oh]
6	<SP 02>	[and] super markets making it so cheap (1.1 seconds) and pubs can't
7		afford to keep going.. and therefore people are just drinking at their own
8		at home...since you haven't got this (0.6 seconds) I mean community
8		thing... for good or [bad...] even people did you know
9		

Lines Speakers Speeches

(35.21 of recording)

10	<SP 04>	[oh I see]
11	<SP 01>	some people abused alcohol...some we did not...some people might sit
12		at the pub with one pint whole night {SP 04 hm...hm...} but they want
13		to be out... without the people and having conversation...
14	<SP 03>	no... so expensive to buy drink at house... people just (1.5 seconds) get
15		so drunk at their own house [when men go out...]
16	<SP 01>	[that's all happening with the new young ones now]
17	<SP 03>	they cannot afford to buy [drink in their house]... it's about six pounds...
18	<SP 02>	[but the thing is]
19	<SP 02>	there are older people that used to go into the pubs... they are all closing
20		(1.3 Seconds) I mean there is one left in the high street now ... they used
21		to be (1.8 seconds) in 1980... there were like seven pubs in the street
22	<SP 04>	all closing down...
23	<SP 03>	all [bet shops]
24	<SP 02>	[they are] betting shops now
25	<SP 04>	o...you mean (1.2 seconds) from the cheap drink and cheap market ...it's
26		all closing down...
27	<SP 02>	I think it is partly that and partly the (1.1 seconds) tax the government
28		demands and business rate ... {SP 04 yeah yeah} and all the things...
29		around the business...and ...yeah... people cannot make a living...
30	<SP 03>	That's bad

Lines Speakers Speeches

(35.21 of recording)

31	<SP 02>	it is community thing goes
32	<SP 03>	and pubs like going... just puts of travelling...pub lunch...
33	<SP 02>	yeah
34	<SP 03>	me like pub...like me people now saw the betting shops being [all the...]
35	<SP01>	
36		[where you get poor]
37	<SP 03>	people touch things... which is that... 7:45... and I walk past...already
38		being drunk and I come back from school [about 5:30]
39	<SP01>	[they are tiring] their sorrows...because
40		they havent got jobs and all that...sounds ridiculous ... but thats what
41		they do... and the pond shops and pond shops over the place... ... {SP
42		03: yes} its always you have got poor people the poor new states at
43		things...and give you money ... yes.. things like that.. and betting
44		offices... o I and I will bet this money... I might win...then pay my
45	<SP 04>	[never win]
46	<SP 03>	thats what my dad said...if you did the maths and work it out...there is a
47		probability of your [winning something]and it doesn't... they designed to
48		make you lose ... like ...you can't... you are not going to win because it
49		is a profitable business...make you money... {SP 01 that's right that's
50		right } ...not there to win though of... what they made of...
51	<SP 04>	[Yeah yeah]

Lines Speakers Speeches

		(35.21 of recording)
52	<SP 01>	...well...we call them very well off...yeah
53	<SP 04>	and yeah...have you seen the film Casablanca...
54	<SP 02>	Yeah
55	<SP 01>	yes...yes
56	<SP 04>	in the roulette table {SP 02 yeah} its... the player can make you win and
57		he can make you lose (0.9 seconds) you see...Humphrey Bogart he
58		said...have you tried 22... {SP 02 hm}I said 22... ... {SP 02 hm}...he put
59		all his (0.9 seconds) money in the table... {SP 02 he...he} he won...cash
		it and dont come back here again....
60	<SP 02>	yeah (laughter, everybody moderately)... yeah yeah...
61	<SP 04>	That's how it is
62	<SP 02>	they do ban people actually... because some people have got luck [and]
63	<SP 04>	[yeah yeah yeah]
64	<SP 03>	[and good maths]
65	<SP 01>	[and they ban]
66	<SP 02>	[yeah yeah]
67	<SP 04>	if you are a mathematician [...then...] yeah yeah
68	<SP 03>	[you are not allowed either]
69	<SP 04>	you can be banned
70	<SP 01>	find your [good maths]
71	<SP 04>	[yeah]

Lines Speakers Speeches

		(35.21 of recording)
72	<SP 03>	then move to the roulette to (0.8 seconds) Monaco... the biggest casino...
73	<SP 04>	Monaco... yeah...hu...hu
74	<SP 03>	weird things... there is so high security... apparently (0.9 seconds) the
75		mathematicians are not allowed nearby
76	<SP 04>	Yeah
77	<SP 03>	I think... if I ever would...I am not a mathematically oriented person... I
78		might enjoy it.. it might have been (0.7 seconds) for every maths there is
79		a probability...only ...every this can like be calculated.. so weird... so
80		the different outcomes there is only like(0.9 seconds) one in all (0.7
81		seconds) ten in all...[whatever] chance of it..
82	<SP 02>	[yeah]
83	<SP 04>	...you can never win [actually]
84	<SP 01>	[no]
85	<SP 04>	in my chemist...Henry Friar and Stephen Friar... they are two brothers
86		(0.7 seconds) and Stephen Friar... very often comes to me and...can
87		you...(0.8 second) he lean on a stick and walk...(0.7 second) can you
88		lend me two pounds (1.1 seconds) I don't have no money to buy my
89		lunch (0.6 seconds) I lost all in the casino...
90	<SP 02>	hm...
91		(silence for 2.6 seconds)
92	<SP 01>	Steven Friar...that's not the one...

Lines Speakers Speeches

		(35.21 of recording)
93	<SP 02>	no no it is not the famous Steven Friar...
94	<SP 04>	no...no...no...
95	<SP 02>	it is just a name of the person...[Friar]
96	<SP 04>	the name of the person actually is [Friar]
97	<SP 04>	and I was shocked that he is over 60 now... and now (0.7 seconds) he
98		can't afford to buy his lunch...all he lost in the... (1.1 seconds) casino...
99		{SP 02: hmmm} all he lost in gambling house...
100	<SP 02>	hmm...
101	<SP 04>	I gave him the money to buy the lunch...its ok...
102	<SP 01>	he put a bet on it... (SP 01 laughs loudly)
103	<SP 04>	I don't know (SP 04 smiles moderately)
104	<SP 01>	ha... ha...ha...
105	<SP 04>	it became a habit of ... him....when he loses everything...he comes to me
106		(0.7 seconds) for lending money...
107	<SP 01>	you have (blurred, the speakers is smiling)
108	<SP 04>	sorry... I can't help you any more
109	<SP 02>	Hmm
110	<SP 04>	you have to give up this bad habit... (1.1 seconds) he was a pensioner...
111		he will get the money from his pension and he will get into bet into a gambling house...
112	<SP 01>	it is an illness you see



Lines Speakers Speeches

		(35.21 of recording)	
113	<SP 03>	that is	
114	<SP 03>	It is...I last look at the psychology of it...because as soon as you bet... I	
115		don't know...it must be complicated...people gamble their living [like	
116		new law and rational thought]	
117	<SP 01>		[I
118		know... ruin their family]	
119	<SP 04>	if you are a pensioner, government gives you a good house...you can get	
120		some money you can live well [enough...you do not need to win money]	
121	<SP 03>		[want to live like a
122		millionaire]...so the thing... that's all they think...	
123	<SP 02>	but maybe it not even that...may be actual design of [excitement of it	
		yeah yeah]	
124	<SP 01>		[it is a throw it is a throw thrill]
125	<SP 04>	thrill and [... actually]	
126	<SP 01>	[you can see] the horses race all the dogs you know	
127	<SP 04>	such a thrilling but never win ... you can never win	
128	<SP 04>	I won 25 pounds	
129	<SP 01>	When	
130	<SP 04>	[o you won]	
131	<SP 01>	[when]	
132	<SP 03>	when Coral went to the race horses	
133	<SP 02>	I remember	

Lines Speakers Speeches

(35.21 of recording)

- 134 <SP 04> [oh...]
- 135 <SP 02> [yeah yeah]
- 136 <SP 03> I won...I was the only person who did...and they will never let me long
 137 250 bet...all sitting in order
- 138 <SP 01> Yes
- 139 <SP 01> I know you won the lottery now...cannot get one number... but you
 140 cannot win barely...
- 141 <SP 03> I don't [know...]
- 142 <SP 01> [I don't bother] (SP 01 smiles)
- 143 <SP 03> when I saw in southern France... Coral...they walking on the beach ...
 144 just talking about my primary school and the girl called Sophie Howar
 145 (0.7 seconds) and I was talking about her...it is a runner...we were just
 146 talking talking talking and when I checked over the skull and looked on
 147 her towel ...and I looked down on the (1.2 seconds) Sophie and she
 148 saw...Jesmine (loudly)...you are on the beach in south of France...and
 149 we had no idea we were going at... we were just talking about what are
 150 the chances... [what are the chances...]
- 150 <SP 01> [talking about ...she... you fell over her ..ha...ha...]
- 151 <SP 03> what are the chances like [happening] ...incredible.
- 152 <SP 02> [yeah]
- 153 <SP 02> yeah it was incredible ...
- 154 <SP 04> did you use mathematics to win it....

Lines	Speakers	Speeches
		(35:21 of recording)
155		(laughter everybody)
156	<SP 04>	it may be by maths and ...one person can may be by (1.2 seconds){SP 02
157		coughing} luck win or by math win...you know who who is the person...
158	<SP 02>	no...
159	<SP 04>	James Bond
160		(everybody burst into laughter loudly)
161	<SP 04>	he always wins...even card
162	<SP 04>	...and even the girl...
163	<SP 01>	gets the girl...
164	<SP 03>	lucky man...
165	<SP 04>	Yeah
166	<SP 03>	and the car
167	<SP 02>	Yeah
168	<SP 04>	he drives smoothly...
169	<SP 02>	drinking martini
170	<SP 01>	[yeah]
171	<SP 04>	[yeah] ... uses most sophisticated gun...
172	<SP 01>	That's right...that's right
173	<SP 04>	...ok...it is quite late now...may be...we can...
174		(43:25 of recording)