TOUR GUIDING CONVERSATIONS: WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM THEM?

Gusti Astika*

Program Pendidikan Bahasa dan Literatur, Universitas Satya Wacana Salatiga

Abstract*: This research presents conversations between guides and tourists during guiding tours. The data were taken from a larger research on tasks in tour guiding, collected from observations of several tours. The conversations were discussed in terms of how the guide and the tourist developed the topics of the conversations. This paper also analyses problems in the conversations using the framework from Varonis and Gass (1985). They suggest that problems in communication can be identified by looking at the 'trigger' and the 'indicator' of problems in conversations. The analysis of the conversations indicated that the guide and the tourist in their conversations were actively engaged in the topic. They gave opinions, contributed to the conversations, and provided information to the topic. The analysis also indicated that there were four types of indicators of communication problems: (1) explicit questions, (2) clarification requests, (3) confirmation checks, and (4) rephrasing.*

Keywords: *trigger, indicator, communication, communication problem*

INTRODUCTION

This research is part of a larger research on tour guiding tasks with a particular focus on the language aspects of tour guiding. The paper presents authentic conversations between the guides and the tourists during guidEd tours. The guides in this study were non-native speakers of English and the tourists were native speakers of English from different English speaking countries. Many studies about interactions between native and non-native speakers have been documented but most of the research in this area is confined to classroom settings under experimental conditions. While these studies have contributed significantly to our knowledge oflanguage use in communication, they may not be able to reveal how language is used in an authentic, real interaction between non-native and native speakers of English. This paper describes how conversations between the guide and the tourist developed in authentic settings and how they solved communication problems in the conversations. The study was conducted in Bali from May to September 1999.

The function of language as a social means of communication is widely acknowledged. Effective communication requires that the speaker has to have the skills to employ communication strategies appropriately. Strategic competence as one component of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) is defined as verbal and non-verbal strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or insufficient competence.

*****Alamat korespondensi**: Jalan Diponegoro 52-60 Salatiga 50711, Salatiga

Communication is defined as an exchange and negotiation of information between at least two individuals using language, oral and or written (Canale, 1983:4). Communication between individuals also involves the use of non-verbal means through visual modes. During communication processes the participants produce and comprehend messages being communicated. Canale characterizes communication as a form of social interaction. Therefore, it always involves some degree of unpredictability, taking place within discourse and sociocultural contexts, using authentic language with a purpose. The success of communication is judged on the basis of its results.

The success of communication depends upon several factors (Richards, 1985). First, a speaker should be able to name things, states, events, and to link words together to express ideas or propositions. To acomplish this, a speaker should have adequate knowledge of grammatical and discourse system ofthe language. Besides expressing meanings, a speaker should know that language use is also constrained by some conventions, or instance, telling the time (it's five past two), greetings (how are you?), or memorized phrases (I see). Communication also requires that the speaker takes into account his or her relationships to the hearer, the setting where the communication is taking place, and other aspects such as time and means of communication. The use of appropriate utterances in communication implies that communication is not just an exChange of meanings but also a form of social encounter between speakers through which the speakers interact using verbal or visual signals.

This is similar to Yule (1997) theory of communicative effectiveness. It comprises two dimensions: (i) the identification of referent dimension, and (ii) the role taking dimension. According this theory, effective communication should reflect these two dimensions. The first of these suggests that speakers should be able to encode the referent being communicated, notice specific attributes of the referent, distinguish one referent from another using necessary linguistic ability. The second dimension suggests that speakers need to be able to take into account their partners in communication. They need to be able to see their partner's perspective, make inferences, and attend to the feedback provided by their partner. Thus, communication effectiveness is determined by both the nature of the topic being talked about and the speaker's factors such as personality and cognitive style.

Non-native speakers who do not have adequate linguistic means to express ideas or propositions, find it difficult to cope with communication demands. To communicate meanings, which are often complex, they adopt communication strategies by way of bringing propositions to the surface, or expressing aspects of meanings lexically (Richards, 1985:84). These strategies are indications of language mechanisms that non-native speakers try to work out to achieve their communication purposes. Since communication takes place within discourse and socio-cultural contexts, communica-tion problems are identifiable through la-nguage use such as conversations.

Brown & Yule (1988) distinguishes two purposes of conversational interaction: (1) Transactional function, with the primary focus is on the exchange of information. The main purpose is to get the message across, therefore, accuracy of the message to be communicated and understanding of the message are most important. Content, clarify and coherence of the message are very crucial. Transactional uses of the language may include activities such as writing down a message or carrying out an instruction, lecturing, describing something, etc; (2) Interactional function: the primary purpose is to establish and maintain social relations rather than communicating messages or information. The goal of interaction is to create a comfortable and non-threatening feeling between the interlocutors and promote good will. Although message or information is also important during the process

of interaction it is not the main purpose that the information should be passed on in an orderly and accurate manner as it is in a transactional interaction. Examples of interactional uses of language are greetings, small talk, telling jokes, giving complements, etc. These kinds of interactional interactions make people feel comfortable.

In tour guiding, both types of interactions are important in order to explain things that tourists are interested in and to promote good social relations between the guide and the tourists. Language in its interactional function is needed in order to interact with the tourists while the guide is doing his task. Language in its transactional function is needed in order to describe objects, explain certain phenomena, or present information to the tourists. In most cases, it is often difficult to draw a line between both types of interactions because of the nature of the tasks where the guide often switches back and forth between the two types of interactions. n other words, the interactions between the guide and the tourists may focus on the message (information) or the social needs of the tourists.

Richards (1990) describes conversation as a joint work between two speakers. In order to keep the conversation going, the speakers should work collaboratively. Conversations progress as a series of 'turns'. The speaker, at any moment, may become the listener. Turn-taking system characterizes the collaborative process in conversations. Generally, as a basic rule, only one person speaks at a time. Successful conversations and the turn taking process in conversations involve a number of strategies, such as: (1) Strategies for taking a turn. These are ways of entering into a conversation or taking over the role of speaker. These include the use of interjection, facial or other gestures, accepting a turn, or contributing something said by the speaker; (2) Strategies for holding a turn. These involve indications that one has more to say, for example, through intonations or by using expressions to suggest continuity, such as 'first', 'another thing', 'then', etc.

In addition to turn taking strategies, speakers also use other strategies in order to succeed in conversation. Bejarano, (1997) mentions two strategies: (1) Modi-fied interaction strategies. They involve a number of strategies which enable both the listener and the speaker to modify their interactions in order to help comprehension of the intended message. Examples: (a) checking for comprehension and clarification, (b) appealing for assistance, (c) giving assistance and (d) repairing; and (2) Social interaction strategies. The use of social interaction strategies may improve interaction. These are necessary for maintaining the flow of conversation in which the speakers react and contribute to each other's messages. Examples: (a) elaborating, (b) facilitating the flow of conversation, (c) responding to what is heard, (d) seeking more information from the speaker, and (e) paraphrasing what is heard. Speakers in conversation need to acquire these strategies to effectively participate in conversations so that they can negotiate meanings more successfully. In many cases these strategies can be effective to compensate for the weaknesses in the language or when proficiency in the language constrains the interaction.

RESEARCH METHOD

The data for the study were collected from several tours. Prior to joining the tour, I went to a travel agency and met with the director to ask for permission to join a tour and conduct the study. At this meeting, I explained the purpose of the study and the nature of participation. Then after obtaining the consent from the travel agency director, a tour arrangement was made together with the guide; where to meet, what time and what tour to join

On the day of the tour, before the tour started, the guide and I met the tourists at the hotel early in the morning because the tour would last the whole day. After having a small talk, and explaining my purpose of joining the tour and asking their permission to record their conversations with the guide,

we began the tour, using a minibus since there were only two or three tourists. The guide was sitting at the front of the bus, beside the driver. The tourists were sitting behind the driver and the guide, approximately about one meter. This distance allowed the guide and the tourists to talk and hear each other quite clearly. I was sitting at the back seat and the recording of their conversation was done from that section of the bus.

In this study, I assumed a researcher-participant role (Gans, 1999: 39) because I took part in the tour as a participant. It allowed me to get an 'insider perspective' (Lynch, 1996:121) or to 'see reality from the participant's point of view' (Johnson, 1992:143). Although I took this participation role, I was, at appropriate times, trying to distance myself psychologically in order to retain neutrality This happened when the guide was commenting on topics I knew very well but his commentary was not appropriate. I did not correct him for wrong information that was given to the tourists. Although I was physically present, I was aware that I should not interfere when the guide gave incorrect information to the tourists.

The tour observations allowed me to participate formally without total emotional or psychological involvement. This stance is expressed nicely by Gans (1999: 40) who states that "it participant-observation requires the surrender of any personal interest one might have in order to be free to observe it ...". There were occasions during the tour when I had a strong desire to comment on something that the tourists were interested in but I had to restrain myself from giving any commentary that belonged to the domain of tour guiding. However, there were also times when the need to build rapport and maintain good relationships with the guide and the tourists during the tour outweighed complete neutrality. In such a case, I felt under pressure to give comments or personal opinions about a topic under discussion. But I always reminded myself to limit comments to areas that were not directly related to the domain of guiding tasks.

Each time I joined a tour, I always had a brief meeting with the guide and the tourists and asked for their approval. At the meeting I explained to the tourists the purpose of the research and the voluntary nature of their participation. I also asked for their permission to record their conversations with the guide. At each different meeting with different tourists I always told them right from the start that I was doing research and I hoped that they would allow me to observe the tour and record their conversations. Disclosing myself as a researcher from the beginning of each tour was helpful because it made me feel easier to do what I had to do such as preparing the tape recorder, taking notes, or occasionally asking questions to the guide or the tourists. The announcement of doing research also in itself facilitated changing my role from being a participant when I was part of the tour group and did my recording, to an observer when I was observing them from outside of the group. In that way, I could observe and write notes about any relevant events that could not be captured by the tape recorder.

After gaining entry to the tour, another problem I had to solve was entry to artsshops and cultural shows that were part of the tour itinerary. Gaining entry to the tour did not automatically guarantee my smooth entry to an arts shop without arising suspicion from the arts shop manager who saw me carrying a tape recorder following the guide and the tourists. Selling arts work such as silver and gold jewelleries or woodcarving was a highly competitive business in the tourism industry and any unusual activity observed within the premise would catch the attention of the   shop manager. Therefore, before entering the arts shop, the guide and I met the shop managerand explained to him that I was conducting research and it would not in any way relate or interfere with his arts business. Introducing myyself to the arts shop manager and telling him about what I did was helpful and

could eliminate unnecessary suspicion on the following visits during the tour. This entry even allowed me to have an interview with the local guide (special guide for the arts shop) about the process of making silver jewelleries. I used a similar approach to gain entry to the 'barong dance' performance. The guide and I met with the managing director of the performance and explained my research to him. This initial introduction gave me easy access to the show each time I joined the tour group.

The guide began his commentary as soon as we got on the bus and left the hotel. The guide's commentaries covered a wide range of topics such as daily life of the people in Bali, their arts, customs and culture. The tourists also asked about many objects that they saw on the way. Many of the objects were ordinary things or activities that the guide was not always prepared to comment on. His commentaries on topics that were part of his 'guiding package' such as culture, customs, and arts were reasonably 'fluent' because it had been well planned and practiced many times and yet, his language still showed problems commonly produced by language learners. His job to comment on cultural topics seemed to be less cognitively demanding than those topics about common sights on the way or ordinary daily activities of the people. The guide did not seem to have adequate language to describe everyday common knowledge. All these commentaries were made on the way amidst the heavy traffic, which often caused problems in comprehending the guide's commentaries.

When we arrived at the destination, we got off the bus and walked to the site. The guide gave his commentary about the objects on the site and his commentary was flawless because it was part of his 'information package'. Unlike the commentary on the way, the guide's commentary on the site was much easier to understand because there was no noise problem.

The recording was done from the back section of the bus (where I was sitting) using a mini tape recorder with a small micro-phone so that the recording was not obtrusive to both the guide and the tourists. The recording was done only when the guide gave his commentaries (he was facing the tourists when giving commentaries). There were times when the guide did not say anything and the recording was paused. It was turned on again when the guide started his commentaries. The recording on the site was done in a similarway as we were walking around. Being a member of the group, it was easy for me to record their conversation. I chose an active participation role with occasional brief remarks to the guide's or the tourists' commentaries in order to keep the conversations going.

The transcription of the data did not show full details of the tour guiding commentaries. Descriptions ofaspects such as physical settings of a particular commentary, use of interpersonal space to communicate attitude, length of silence during conversations, or variations of voice quality were not recorded. There were sections on the tapes where the recording quality was poor due to the traffic noise that was picked up by the recorder orthe speakers did not speak clearly or loudly enough. For instance, when the bus was creeping up a steep road, the noise from the engine was very loud and the guide continued with his commentary. In such a situation, what got recorded was the noise from the engine and the guide's commentary was unintelligible. Another instance of poor recording quality was when the guide was talking to a tourist who sat at the front of the bus and the guide did not use the microphone. His voice did not get recorded clearly since I was sitting at the back of the bus. It was the suggestion of the guide that I took a back seat in order to avoid distraction. This section of the recording was not transcribed.

I did not make any alterations of the data in order to show how it should look like in terms of grammar. There were many examples of grammatical errors in the recording and the errors were not fixed in the transcript. The transcript was, in that sense, a verbatim account ofwhat was recorded.

Besides grammatical errors, there were also many instances of mispronounced words and phrases. The guides were non-native speakers of English and it was to be expected that they would sometimes mispronounced English words. These pronunciation problems were notphonetically represented in the transcript because they were not relevant for analysis. Mispronounced words and phrases were spelled correctly in the transcript in order to understand the message intended by the speakers (guides).

Another problem in transcribing the data was that the guides often talked in run-on sentences. This presented me with a judgement problem as to when the guide began and ended sentences.

Therefore, I decided to mark sentence boundaries on the bases of pauses or completion of sentence idea. Very often I had to use common sense judgement to decide the end of sentences.

Background noise of heavy traffic was another problem in transcribing. Much of the guide's commentary was given on the way to the destinations through a crowded traffic condition. Consequently, the traffic noise was picked up and it reduced the audibility ofthe recording. The placement of the tape recorder was sometimes a problem especially when there were four tourists in the group and a minibus was used. A minibus could only hold six passengers. In such a situation, I had to sit on the back seat of the minibus and the tape recorder could not pick up the guide's commentaries clearly. These technicalities presented problems in the transcription process and the sections that were poorly audible were not used.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Conversations between the guide and the tourist. The first part of the analysis presents some samples of conversation segments and their analysis ofhow the guide and the tourist developed the topics in the conversations. The second part presents how the guide and the tourists solved problems in the conversations.

Conversation 1

In general, the conversation is initiated by the guide by asking a question to the tourist. Then the tourist answers the question by providing the information, and then the guide gives feedback to the answer from the tourist. However, other examples of conversations show different variations such as indicated by the two segments below. (1) The tourist waits for a bus. She wants to go shopping. T =tourist. G = guide. T We saw the bus waiting outside the hotel and we got on and we had no idea where it was going. So we jumped on. G: You didn't ask? 2) The tourist expresses her opinion about the hotel. T But besides that, beautiful, nice hotel, very pleasant. It's done very nicely. G: The people are very friendly, and they are asking you everything you like.

These two segments illustrate the way the guide responds to the statement from the tourist. If the tourist makes a statement which provides information (segment 1), the guide responds to it by asking a question or, in other examples, giving a statement as a follow up to the information, or giving feedback indicating acknowledgment or agreement to the information given by the tourist. If the tourist makes a statement which expresses her opinion about what she sees or experiences (segment 2), the guide gives his own opinion which is similar to the tourist's opinion, or gives supports to the feurist's opinion. This is how the guide develops the topics at the beginning of the tour and to make the tourist feel that her opinions are appreciated. These conversations took place in a minibus where there were only two or three tourists. This minibus setting made it possible for the guide and the tourists to interact to each other.

Conversation 2

The conversation below is about prices of souvenirs. The tourist wants to know about the prices of jewellery and woodcarving in the arts shops at a village. The conversation is initiated by the tourist.

T : And is it very expensive or not?

G : Well the price here you can do bargain. Of course if the quality of the jewellery

is good it's a little bit high. The same as you buy the watch.

T : Ya?

G : If you need the good watch, of cour-se, the price is high. You know, the price is a little bit expensive. If you need, you know, what we call low quality, ya, like from the hustler, of course the watch from there not really good.

The tourist begins the conversation by asking a question to the guide. The purpose of the question is to seek information. The guide does not provide the information with a 'yes/no' answer, but instead, he informs the tourist that they can bargain the prices. This may be an indirect way of telling the tourists that the prices are expensive. The tourist responds to the guide's information (Ya?) and this response could have been understood by the guide as asking for more information about the prices. Then, he develops his information by describing the quality of the jewellery in the shop and compares it with the quality of jewellery sold in other places by street vendors.

Conversation 3

The following conversation is about Tegalalang village. This village is famous for its beautiful view of rice fields. The guide describes this village in a conversation with the tourist.

1. G : And on the way back from here, on the way back we don't pass to this way, we pass to this way (guide points to the map). This is the scenic road. You know scenic road?

2. T : Oh, isn't that something.

3. G : You can see the terraces rice field.

4. T : Oh......

5. G : Where you can take your picture.

The guide begins the conversation with a statement, providing information about the route they are going to take on the way back to the hotel, after lunch. He also describes the quality of the road they are going to take (This is the scenic road). He asks the tourist if they know what a scenic road is. This question may have been intended to check if he has used the term 'scenic' correctly In turn 2, the tourist responds to

the guide's information with a statement, (implicitly) indicating an agreement to the guide's plan to take the route. Then in turn 3 the guide provides more information, then feedback from the tourist (turn 4), and finally another piece of information from the guide (turn 5).

Conversation 4

One advantage of describing objects conversationally is that tourists do not only ask questions but also contribute to the development of the conversation. This is evidenced in the conversation below when the bus was caught in a traffic jam and the tourist initiated the conversation by refer-ring to the traffic condition.

T : Oh, look at this? (tourist: referring to the traffic jam). If we did that in Australia ... bip, bip, bip, bip, You're sealing me.

G : That happens here everyday. It is very different. So that's why you know, the people come from other place should careful.

T : We have to give way to what's on the right. Traffic coming across the right, these got the way He goes first.

Besides initiating the conversation, the tourist also contributes information to the conversation. Another example of the tourist having contribution to the conversa-tion is the conversation about newspaper boys who were selling newspapers at a cross road. This conversation was also initiated by the tourist, as seen below.

T : They always selling paper in that traffic?

G : They are used to that.

T : Ya. they used to try to do that in Aus-tralia. And then they said no.

G: Are you not allowed selling newspaper on the road?

T: No, no not in the traffic. If you try, you could get killed.

G : Oh. That's why

T : Ya.

G : How come if some people selling on the traffic?

T : On the road?

G : Yes.

T : On the corner, on the corner, not in the middle of the road. Too dangerous. Too

dangerous. They could be on that side and car could pull over.

G : I see.

T : We have the paper man, come early in the morning and he throws the paper to the lawn. It's a delivery.

These two conversations show how the guide and the tourist contribute to the conversations. In the 'news paper conversation, it is the tourist who contributes more to the conversation, and the guide's role is to provide feedback to the tourrst's information.

Conversation 5

The following is a conversation about Balinese women. The guide presented this topic when he saw some women on the road carrying things on their heads.

1. G: Do you know the Balinese woman work very hard than the man?

2. T : Yes?

3. G: Ya. Work very hard. You know as you know, the Balinese woman life not like you.

4. T : No, she is not.

5. G: Ya. So, you know atfive o'clock they have to get up from the bed where they are going to the market.

6. T : Ah, they go to the market at five.

7. G: Yes. Sometime they walk from where they live. It depend how the distance the market. Ya, and after that, cooking, washing, look after the children.

The guide initiates the topic by asking a question to the tourist. This question is not intended to seek information from the tourist, but to provide information about the job of women in Bali. The answer from the tourist in turn 2 is more appropriately understood as a request for more information from the guide because the guide's question is only the beginning of what he is going to tell. In the following turns (turn 3, 5, 7) the guide gives more information about the job of Balinese women. He says that Balinese women have a hard life by describing the kinds of household chores they have to do. The responses from the tourist serve as feedback to the guide's information. In this conversation the guide initiates the to-pic by asking a question to the tourist and then develops the topic by describing the women's jobs.

Conversation 6

Conversation 6 consists of informati-on and information. Conversations having this pattern are initiated by the guide or the tourist by first giving information about a topic, then the response to the first infor-mation is another piece of information from the second speaker. The conversation conti-nues in this way; information is followed by information. Unlike other conversation patterns where the tourist gives feedback to the guide's information, the conversation developed in this pattern conveys ano-ther role of the tourist. Instead of giving feed-back to the information from the guide, the tourist contributes to the development of the topic in the conversation. This pattern is exemplified in the following conversation about the road condition in some parts of Kuta village.

1. G: The street here is busy everywhe-re, this is a little bit serious problem we have in this places. Our government anticipate this problem in the future, they are trying to build a new road down at the beach.

2. T : When they get the benefit of the tourist, you'll have to make better road so they can move around.

3. G: Ya, we did already, we have already good condition around Legian, where there are nice park everywhere.

4. T : Well, everywhere is all right except for Kuta area where the road is so narrow.

5. G: Yes, we already anticipate for the peddlers selling the staff right on the footpath area. We already anticipate for that.

The guide initiates the conversation by making a statement providing informati-on about the road condition and what the local government has been trying to do to deal with problem. The tourist responds to the guide's information with a statement of her opinion about what the government should do. The conversation develops as the guide and the tourists give more informati-

on and opinions concerning road problems. This conversation does not develop from questions and answers but from the statements given by both the guide and the tourist.

There are instances in the conversations where the tourist seems to have problems understanding the message or information from the guide. The analysis of communication problems in the conversations between the guide and the tourists uses the model developed by Varonis & Gass (1985). This model was used to investigate conversational interactions between native and non-native speakers. Their model basically consists of two parts. The first part is the trigger (T), the second part is the resolution, which consists of an indicator (I), a response (R), and a reaction to the response (RR). The trigger is an utterance or portion of an utterance on the part of the speaker which results in some indication of non-understanding on the part of the hearer. The indicator signals that an utterance has caused a nonunderstanding. It provides an input to the speaker that his or her utterance is in some way deviant or unacceptable or has some element that is not understood by the hearer. The response is the speaker's response to the indictor, acknowledging the non-understanding. The reaction to the response is an optional element in the model. The model is visually represented in the figure below (Varonis & Gass, 1985:74).

According to this model, there are two options for the hearer in a conversation. The hearer may not give any indication of non-understanding in spite of the fact the he/she has a problem in the conversation, hoping for more information from the speaker, or may not respond for some reason. The other option is to respond to the trigger in some way with some overt indication of something such as a question or a statement. The analysis here focused only on the trigger (T) and the indicator (I) because the purpose was to identify the kinds of sources of language problems in the conversations between the guide and the tourists. The analysis aimed to identify only those instances in which there were some overt markers on the part of the hearer (the tourist), indicating some sort of problem in the conversation.

The data for the analysis were taken from the conversations between the guide and the tourists in different settings such as on the bus when they were on the way to the destinations or on the sites; in the temple or the house compounds. The topics in the conversation varied according to the tasks that were being carried out in those settings. Using the model above, there were four types of indicators of communication problems identified in the conversations. These indicators were mostly made by the tourists and only a few indicators were made by the guide. Those indicators were: explicit questions, clarification requests, confirmation checks, and rephrasing of guide's utterances. Each indicator is presented below with examples of conversational extracts.

Explicit questions were used to signal problems in the conversations. The problems occurred because of the following reasons: The guide did not understand the term used by the tourist

T: Did they make it busier with the millennium? (T)

G : Pardon? (I)

T : With the millennium, the end of the year 2000? (R)

G : Ya. (RR)

In this conversation, the guide and the tourist talk about the number of tourists who were coming to Bali by the end of the year 2000. In her question, the tourist uses the word millennium which causes the problem in the conversation. The guide's question (Pardon?) is the indicator. He does not understand the meaning of the word millennium. The response from the tourist is an expansion of the meaning of the word millennium. Yet, the guide does not seem to understand it although he says 'Ya' (yes) as a reaction to the response from the tourist. My note to this conversation indicates that the guide keeps quiet after responding to the tourist. His silence could have been an indication of his non-understanding of the

word, in spite of the tourist's response (R). The response to the tourist's second question (R) should have been some explanation about what would happen by the end of the year, but the guide fails to do this. In this conversation, it is the guide rather than the tourist who is experiencing the difficulty The guide's response was not appropriate.

T : Is this always wet or when the plant is young then you have the water?

G : Well, when the rice paddy condition like that, they still, you know, put the water, and mainly the water's coming from the mountain and we do crops a...almost three times a year. (T)

T: Yes, but what my question was does it have to be very wet? (I)

G: Oh, yes. (R).

In this conversation, the guide and the tourist talk about the rice field and the rice that had been planted about a week before. The tourist wants to know if the rice field is always wet even before the rice is planted. The tourist does not consider the response to the question appropriate. This response is the trigger of the problem in the conversation. The tourist repeats her question for the second time. This is the indicator. The problem in this conversation may result from the fact that the question is complex and the guide only pays attention to the second part of the question, while the focus of the tourist's question is on the first part as indicated in the second question.

Clarification request is another type of indicator of communication problem in the conversations between the guide and the tourist. Clarification request signals a problem with the message or information from the guide. In the following are some examples of conversations in which there are requests for clarification. The tourist did not understand the term used by the guide.

G: Starting from June, July and August, here in Bali is the peak season (T).

T : What was that? (I)

G : The peak season of the tourist. (R)

T: Oh, ya.

In this conversation, the guide and the tourist talk about the number of tourists who came to visit Bali. The tourist may not know what the peak season means, or the tourist may not hear it clearly This is the trigger. The tourist's question (What was that?) is the indicator. The problem in this conversation is caused by the special term used by the guide, evidenced from the tourist's response (Oh, ya) after the guide clarified the meaning of peak season by saying the peak season of the tourist. The tourist did not know the name of an object being described by the guide.

T : What kind of tree is it?

G : This is guava(T)

T : What? (I)

G : Guava. (R)

This conversation took place in the Balinese house compound where there was a guava tree. The guide mentions the name of the tree (This is guava) as an answer to the question from the tourist. The guide's answer is the trigger. The tourist does not know it and asks the guide a question 'What?' This is the indicator. The problem is caused by the object that the tourist is not familiar with. The tourist had difficulty understanding the language of the guide. There were several examples of this difficulty Below is one of them.

G: If bite, a ... dead or not? (T)

T : Sorry? (I)

G: If they bite, we get dead? (R)

The conversation took place on the bus, on the way to the destination. The guide asks the tourist about poisonous spiders in Australia. The guide's question is linguistically deviant and difficult to understand. This is the trigger. The tourist's question is the indicator of the problem caused by the language of the guide.

Confirmation check is another type of indicator that the tourist uses to ensure understanding of the guide's message or information in the conversations. The difference between confirmation check and clarification request is that confirmation check presupposes a positive answer, while clarification request is more open ended. One reason for using confirmation check is because the presentation of information from

the guide is not effective. In the following are three examples of conversational extracts in which the tourist asks questions of this type.

On the way to the destination. The guide and the tourist talked about the boys who were selling newspapers on the road.

G: How come if some people selling on the traffic? (T)

T : On the road? (I)

G: Yes. (R)

T : On the corner, on the corner, not in the middle of the road. Too dangerous. (RR)

In this conversation, the guide asks the tourist what happens if people in Aus-tralia (where the tourist comes from) sell newspapers in the middle of the road. This question is deviant from the language point of view. This is the problem in the conversation (the trigger). The question made by the tourist (the indictor) indicates that the tourist wants to confirm what the guide means by on the traffic. Again, the problem in this conversation is the question from the guide that is not acceptable grammatically.

In the temple. The guide and the tourist talked about the obligation for temple membership.

G: No, no. Even the people fifty years old but still single not obligation to be member. (T)

T : You are free? (I)

G: You are free. You are getting free. That's the regulation. (R)

In this conversation, the guide tells the tourist that people are not obliged to be members of a temple organization if they are single even though they are fifty years old. They are released from any temple obliga-tions. In other words, they are free from any temple related duties. This information is not well presented (the trigger) and the tourist wants to confirm that the member-ship is free for single people. The tourist's question (the indicator) shows that there is a problem with the way the guide presents his message.

Another type of confirmation check is repeating the 'key' words or phrases in the description or information presented by the guide with rising intonation. The following are three examples of conversational extracts where the tourist repeats the 'key' words orphrases.

On the way to the destination. The guide and tourist talk about the population in Bali.

G: Bali is still densely in population. Now about three million people. (T)

T: Three million? (I)

G: Yes, three million. (R)

In this extract, the 'key phrase is three million. This is the trigger. The tourist repeats this phrase with rising intonation. This is the indicator. The tourist wants to ensure that what he heard is correct. This is confirmed by the guide by saying yes, three million. This is the response to the indicator.

In the temple. The guide and the tourist talked about the meanings of colors.

T : What do the colored ribbons represent?

G: These? It does not mean. (T)

The trigger in this conversation is a response to the tourist's question about the meanings of colours of the cloths used in the temple. The tourist repeats the key phrase in the trigger (does not mean?). This is the indicator. The tourist wants to confirm what he heard from the guide by repeating the phrase.

In the temple. The guide told the tourist about the history of the temple.

G: Excuse me. Do you know this temple was build on thirteen century?(T)

T : Thirteen? (I)

G: Ya, thirteen, one three. Ya, on thir-teen century. How long ago? (R)

T : Seven hundred. (RR)

In this conversation, the guide gives information in the form ofa question. This is the trigger. The tourist repeats the key word (thirteen). This is the indicator. He wants to know if what he heard from the guide was correct. In the response to the indicator, the guide confirms the tourist's question.

There are many instances in the con-versations where the tourist rephrases the guide's ideas. This is another indication of communication problem where the tourist reformulates what the guide intends to say.

Following the tourist's reformulation, there is a response from the guide which is an acknowledgment of the reformulation indicating that the tourist understands the guide's ideas in spite of the language problem. In the following are three examples of conversations where the tourist reformulates the ideas or information from the guide. The conversation below took place in a temple where the guide and the tourist talked about an election of the village head.

T : They choose what there?

G :To choose the president. We do by voting. Do you know voting? Because, you know, three candidates. (T)

T : Ya, you have to vote between the three. (I)

G: Ya. We can choose which one, you know...(R)

The trigger in this conversation is the response to the question from the tourist. The response from the guide is not expressed effectively and the tourist reformulates the guide's idea (Ya, you have to vote between the three). This is the indicator in the conversation. It signals the problem with the language of the guide. In anothersegment of the same topic, the guide describes the voluntary nature of the job of a village head. But the message is not presented effectively.

T : Can they stand again?

G : Yes, ofcourse, as long as the member of the village still like. Because, you know, they don't have a special activities. Or they don't have the fee from the member. (T)

T : The village head is not paid. It's voluntary. (I)

G: Ya ... (R)

In this segment, the trigger is also a response to the tourist's question (Can they stand again?). The indicator is the reformulation of the guide's response and it is acknowledged by the guide in the following turn. This indicator shows how the guide should have expressed his ideas.

Another example of rephrasing is in the conversation about Balinese women. This took place on the way to Singaraja, a destination on the northern part of Bali.

G: Ya, so you know, at five o'clock they have to get up from bed where they are going to the market. (T)

T : Ah, they go to the market at five. (I)

G: Yes. Sometimes they walk from where they live. It depend how the distance the market. (R)

Here, the trigger is the statement from the guide about the job of the women in Bali. The statement is not expressed in the way that is acceptable from the language point of view. This is, then, rephrased by the tourist in the following tum, which is the indicator. This is the reformulation of the guide's statement by the tourist. The refor-mulation shows how the information should have been presented.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The discussion in this research illustrates that conversations in tour guiding involve not only the ability to produce short tum speech but also long tum speech with transactional and interactional functions (Brown & Yule, 1988). This ability is also true in any speech situation where the focus of interaction is not on the language features but the meanings or the transference of information. Another feature of the conversations cited above is that the feedback given by the tourist is mostly on the content ofthe conversations, rather than the language problems of the guide. These types offeedback reflect the kinds of inter-actions strategies suggested by Bejarano, Olshtain, & Steiner (1997) and Richards (1990). This is in contrast with what usually happens in language classrooms. The inter-action in language classrooms is generally characterized by short tum utterances with the 'question-answer' pattern where the first speaker asks a question, then the second speaker answers the question with little or no development. This pattern usually dominates throughout classroom conversations. The role of the second speaker is restricted to answering questions from the first speaker. It does not mean that

the practice to produce short utterances in an interaction should be abandoned. It is necessary, but not sufficient if the students are expected to be able to produce long utterances in interactions whore they have to give information or to describe an object, orto give an opinion about a certain issue, or to tell a story. It should be realized that training students only to produce short utterances will not automatically help them to be able to produce long tum utterances.

Another important finding in this study that is useful from the pedagogical perspective is the kinds of feedback that speakers (the guide and tourists) provide in the conversations. It may be necessary to focus feedback in classroom interactions on the content rather than language structures. Providing feedback on the content of conversations would draw on the students' attention to the message or information being transferred, not on the language structures.

REFERENCES

Bejarano, Y, Levine, T., Olshtain, E., & Steiner, J. (1997). "The Skilled Use of Interaction Strategies: Creating a Framework for Improved Small-Group Communicative Interaction in the Language Classroom". *System*, 25 (2), 203-214.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1988). *Teaching the Spoken Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M. (1983). "From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy". In J. C. Richards &R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp.2-21). Essex: Longman.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing". *Applied Linguistics,* 1 (1),1-40.

Gans, H.J. (1999). "The Participant-Observer as a Human Being. Observations on the Personal Aspects of Field Work". In A. Bryman & R.G. Burgess (Eds.), *Qualitative Research* (Vol. II, pp.39-54). London: SAGE Publications.

Johnson, D.M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning.* London: Longman.

Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language Program Evaluation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (1985). *The Context of Language Teaching.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

_____(1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Varonis, E.M. & Gass, S. (1985). "Non-native / Non-native Conversations: A Model for Negotiation of Meaning". *Applied Linguistics,* 6 (1),71-90.

Yule, G. (1997). *Referential Communication Tasks.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.