Just listen to it, so the brain works automatically: the referential identifiability and accessibility of anaphors and ellipsis in discourse
as *it, this, that, do, do it, do this,* and *do that*

Eri Kondo
A researcher in linguistics, Nagoya-city, Aichi, Japan

ABSTRACT

The aims of this paper are to put forward that teachers should use listening textbooks in classrooms and to explore the analyses of the usages of anaphors and ellipsis in listening materials as our new attainment against old-fashioned teaching methods. First, this pilot research study gives details on what listening is and what discourse is to us. During listening, listeners keep tracking information as well as sound patterns. Surely it may be believed that revealing the discourse structures turns into a shift toward the education of listening. It is mainly because there are diverse stages on how to hear sounds and how to interpret conversations correctly. It does not mean that students get on top of complicated syntactic structures and vocabularies, but implies that they rather soon get used to understanding the structures of discourse more easily. However, it needs the quantity and quality of listening. These issues seem that they have not been known to teachers yet because old teaching methods are still alive. Second, this paper investigates that speakers certainly have the identifiability and accessibility of anaphors and ellipsis in discourse in minds, where a reference, *it,* a deixis, *this* and *that*, and ellipsis as *do, do it*, *do this* and *do that* are analyzed. In particular, *it*, *this* and *that,* which have an anaphorical feature in contexts, are shown in interactions of conversation. Naturally they include the statuses of co-referential conditions and discourse referents. Speakers can use the functions of anaphors and ellipsis when they are identifiable and accessible in thinking. This paper indicates that students should learn such structures in classrooms because the way of thinking in English can be learnt exactly. However, the analysis contains a controversial room, where a different in usages of *it* and *that* is found although theoretically the statuses are set in that *it* is in focus and *that* is activated here. The usage of *that* leaves a function of deixis as pointing something.

Keywords: anaphors, ellipsis, identifiability, accessibility, competitiveness

INTRODUCTION

This paper first argues that teachers need listening materials for developing listening abilities in classrooms as a credible issue in further language education. Usually they have kept listening exercises, using reading materials and dialogues. However, they seem not to be suitable for advancing an automatic ability of listening itself although the expressions of dialogues may include fillers in speaking as *like that*. In the view, the argument reveals what listening is and what listening abilities are. Technically, it is based on how sounds are heard and why every sound is not caught linearly although students have a large amount of knowledge of vocabulary. For listening well, what abilities are needed? A teacher may teach articulations and sound patterns, and do dictations in classrooms. With such instructions, students could get information about language features and interpret short conversations well. However, they could not get accustomed to listening to long lecture and narratives. Therefore, teaching in listening textbooks will play an important role in knowing what real conversation is. Moreover, this research depends on the idea that students have

an ability to realize a pattern of discourse through listening exercises [1]. It means they could judge what a feasible expression is in an appropriate context. It turns to a new realization that language learners must have metacognitive abilities in brains at the process of acquiring a second language if there is a hypothesis that the logical ability to propositions may develop.

The best way of listening well should be based on knowing discourse structures. The spoken language has particular features, which often includes conversational implicature and presupposition[2].The most important thing is that one of them is an anaphor. With pronouns which have clear antecedents, we could build conversations, where we would infer what might be pointed if we do not have wrong interpretations. Or anaphors are constructed through interactions. Without clear antecedents, they would often struggle to find meanings correctly. On deixis, we have cases that there are visible referents and that there are discourse referents. At the very least, it is a conversation. Speakers have accessed the identify ability between pronouns and antecedents, and their recovery of memory and interpretations can happen when they do not have accessibilities toward them. Their top priority there is for them to infer what is presupposed in discourse. Sometimes, it would become complicated things because it deeply relates with a topic continuity or topicality as another function. Changing a topic, they do not use such an anaphor they have already built any more.This research does not focus on the topic continuity, however on the identifiability and accessibility.

Ellipsis also has the same effect in discourse. It happens when there are no other competitive meanings. If speakers do not have the competitiveness or contrasts, ellipsis can be observed. The phenomenon has a grammatical correctness syntactically. In discourse, they will judge the relation between old and new information immediately. In the gap, they have to choose expressions of ellipsis. It means that they can access what is said. The ability depends on a grasp of apparent given information.

Anaphors and ellipsis in discourse are particular phenomena, where speakers use language syntactically and functionally simultaneously. Both anaphors and ellipsis are established by speakers; therefore, they have the identify ability and accessibility to antecedents. With a start of building a topic in discourse, speakers could manipulate a contrast, using anaphors and ellipsis. In that sense, learning such discourse structures and rules could advance listening abilities.

The education in Japanese senior high schools tends to focus on increasing still difficult vocabulary; however, actual conversations and everything are too plain to be caught for the present. If doing so, it will be amazing when students get such conversational strategies, and it can be possible. Then, the change and agreement in classrooms may become a tough shift; however the sets of teaching and learning can be quite enough with listening textbooks. Hoping the change will appear in the future, the author gives detailed analyses to us. Almost some of them are proposed as a sample of anaphors and ellipsis for an education of listening itself in classrooms. Therefore, this paper does not include a quantitative aspect on distributions of anaphors and ellipsis. The lack is divided into another issue.

Literature Review

Listening

What listening is means what hearing sounds is Cutler[3]investigated word recognitions in listening and indicates that English is a stress language and has vowels in syllables. Stressed syllables are easy to be perceived and the related prosodic structure is reliable for listeners. Listeners who do not have phoneme contrasts as /r/ and /l/, and /p/ and /b/have a difficulty in distinguishing them. Therefore, they often tend not to catch the meaning of words correctly. By contrast, they are likely to understand what is said easily when the listening contains high frequency words. On prosody, Büring [4],who believes in the prosodic theory of Bolinger[5], insists that there are prosodic semantic effects and meaning-related influences on prosody, which have the contrast, topicality, and givenness. The question in (1) has three optional answers. The focused prosodic phrase (F) has one stressed word. These prosodic features have semantic and emotional backgrounds. Learning these phonological features through listening

materials will play a significant role in knowing patterns of sounds and phrases if all obey these features.

(1) Who ordered shellfish?

a.   [JeROME] _F_ ordered shellfish.

b.   [My nextdoorNEIGHbor] _F_ ordered shellfish.

c.   [The guy at the table over by the WINdow] _F_ ordered shellfish [4].

Rost [1]explains that listening has neurological, linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic stages. First, the neurological stage shows the process and systems in hearing sounds with brain networks. The brain has the auditory small cortex for perceiving sounds and the auditory active nerve neurons toward stimulations. It recognizes patterns and rhythms as spatial balance; besides, it is affected on fatigue. It includes attentions. The brain has Wernicke's and Broca's areas, where people recognize syntactic structures and do calculations. They have individual differences in comprehension, memory retrievals and the speed, which is often named as intelligences. Second, as the linguistic stage, it is remarkable to know the phonemic knowledge of sound patterns as assimilation, vowel reduction, and elision for listening well. Frequency and durations also reach the ear. The speaker has phrasal units, and it is said that intonation units take two or three seconds. The syntactical cues speakers catch rely on sentence and discourse levels. In addition, the semantic stage brings us comprehension, which demonstrates that information in listening is distinguished between given and new one. Listening involves that listeners open cognitive schemata in minds semantically, in which they depend on their knowledge they have already had. Inferences happen during listening as the sentence (2). (2) may include an inference that 'I guess I'm not really her friend after all.' Finally, the pragmatic stage is relied on that listeners infer intentions with

(2) I thought we were friends, but all my friends came to my wedding and you weren't there [1].

social contexts, which refers to presupposition and deictic references. Deictic elements are interpreted in the situation having shared and common circumstances; therefore, the interpretations can often become controversial. Rost [1]indicates that deixis, anaphor and ellipsis, as (3) and (4) relate with the difficulty in listening. Listening is a laborious thing, where listeners should interpret, infer, and deal with a large amount of information. To this end, it is what listening is. This research investigates anaphors and ellipsis are used in understanding listening reasonably because they can be one of causes of difficulties in listening. Students cannot understand all meanings of vocabulary, however they may be able to access information we have in minds, which comes under the investigation that our brains may work automatically although the issue should be investigated later, having psychological experiments to test the technical side of brains. The consciousness during listening will be restless.

(3) Anaphor: My brother stayed at my apartment last week. *He* left *his* dog *here*.

(4) Ellipsis: I promised to take care of it, so I will (take care of it) [1].

Anaphors

Anaphors are put forward the argument that they make relationships between references and antecedents grammatically. Binding theory explains anaphors are bound; therefore, we usually have no ambiguities in any of them[6]. Noun phrases dominate anaphoric references[7,8]. Usually, references are co-referential and anaphorical when they have the antecedents as eventual statuses [9]. Anaphoric ambiguities often happen when indefinite references do not refer to identified referents [10]. When it is believed that "to identify reference is to identify knowledge and to identify presumption [11]," it means that "anaphora presupposes that the referent should already have its place in the universe-of-discourse, but deixis is not [12]," and that assertions always have presuppositions [13,14]. Anaphors need memories and knowledge of some existences or facts as it is said by Russell [15].

Discourse representation theory and file change semantics say that the beginning of discourse means to open a large number of files in minds and the continuing of conversation is taking new information [16, 17,18]. In that viewpoint, Givón[19] and Cornish [20]explore that anaphors depend on contexts in discourse. Firstly, Givón insists that, at anaphors from (5) to (8), speakers have a referential identifiability in the contexts, and that zero anaphors and unstressed pronouns are referential and have topic continuities, which means discourse structures. Moreover, Cornish [20]investigates that discourse has discourse anaphors beyond sentences and they need an interpretation which is dependent on the full context and that they have statuses that those anaphors

(5) Mary came into the room and [Ø] looked around.

(6) She was the only one there, she could tell.

(7) She hesitated, then [Ø] turned around and [Ø] walked out.

(8) [Ø] walking away, she saw someone approaching[19].

are constructed as discourse referential presuppositions. In a sentence (9) in Cornish [20], the anaphor, *it* does not refer to the antecedent, *an apple*, simply, but it presupposes that "the apple which Joe ate the night before the time of utterance." It is an example of building a discourse anaphor and it is similar for the description of usages of definiteness of Hawkins [21] who says that definiteness has a feature of associations, with shared knowledge of speakers. It is the same thing as the function of identify ability in discourse [19].

(9) Joe ate an apple last night, but *it* was much too acid for his liking [20].

Referential hierarchy in Figure 1 is referred by Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski [22, 23]. They say that *it* is in focus, *that, this, this* noun phrase are activated, *that* noun phrase is familiar, and the noun phrase is uniquely identifiable. Ariel [24]also defines references as having the degree of referential accessibility in discourse. Speakers remember all antecedents in minds, and the continuity of discourse relates with it.

in focus >	activated >	familiar >	uniquely identifiable >	referential >	type identifiable
it	*that* *this* *this* N	*that* N	*the* N	indefinite *this* N	*a* N

Figure 1: *The Givenness Hierarchy [22, 23]*

Ellipsis

The theory of ellipsis introduced by Gengel[25] has three syntactic derivations as pseudogapping in (10), VP ellipsis in (11), and gapping in (12). There, three main verbs are missing as *laugh* in (10), *meet* in (11), and *read* in (12). (13) is an example of VP ellipsis [25]. The noun, *Jane*, is not contrastive; and beside, the focus is not needed. Therefore, *Jane* could be deleted.

(10) This should make you laugh – it did me!

(11) Mary met Bill at Berkeley and Sue did too.

(12) Claire read a book, and Heather a magazine [25].

(13)a. John invited Jane, and Mary did too.

    b. John invited Jane, and Mary did ~~invite Jane~~ too [25].

METHODOLOGY

Data

In this study, two textbooks of listening are used for the analysis. They are for advancing a listening ability, in which many questions about what the speaker says are shown. The speed and accent are natural. The proficiency levels are B1 and B2. Each book includes Unit 1 to 20, where the topics are explored on lifestyle, family matters, school days, vacations, and sports and so on.

TB-A: Listening B1+ Intermediate [26].
TB-B: Listening B2+ Upper Intermediate [27].
(TB=Textbook)

Data Analysis

In this research, anaphors and ellipsis in listening textbooks are scrutinized. First, a reference, *it,* and deixis, *this*, *that*, are investigated, in which they are clearly built as anaphoric statuses among speakers. It means they have identifiable and accessible antecedents or presupposition. The way speakers use them is indicated. Moreover, ellipsis as *do, do it,* and *do that* is researched. This analysis notes that the usages are quite practical in the conversations.

RESULTS

***It*, *This* and *That* with Clear Antecedents**

To begin with, *it*, *this* and *that* are observed. In particular, the antecedents are clear enough to be identified in the discourse. In (14), an extract from TB-A, it refers to the antecedent, *filtered coffee.* There is no a referential ambiguity. The referent is in focus.

(14) Interviewer: So- so what do- what do you do when you're back in the States?
You don't drink tea?
Kara: Coffee purely…
Interviewer: Just coffee?
Jeremy: Just coffee.
Kara: …purely filtered coffee. A pot in the morning by myself and…
Jeremy: Yeah, you don't really make *it* for other people and people don't expect- expect to make *it* for you either.
You're on your own[26].

In (15) from TB-B, *it* means *to become a vegetarian.* The topic, *to become a vegetarian* is here introduced and in focus; besides the antecedent is quite accessible. Building an anaphor is natural in the conversation. This usage of *it* does not refer to a visible referent; therefore, it is likely to be a discourse anaphor. Or the speakers are successively constructing the topic.

(15) Freddy: So I hear you're a vegetarian?
Lily: Yeah.
Freddy: Ah, interesting. I've got a friend who … uh … has just decided to become a vegetarian.
Lily: Oh, really?
Freddy: Yeah- no- I don't understand *it*. I think *it*'s a fashion statement or something[27].

Next, the functions of *this* are investigated.

(16) Ron Oakes is the person who normally … um … programmes them and takes the photos as well. All the photos also go onto the intranet, which is the internal database. So …*This* is the … um … main reception. Anita is a receptionist and Kwadwo our security guard. Um, Anita is the best person with regards to … um … booking taxis or flower orders. All the relevant booking forms can be found on the intranet and once filled in have to be returned to Anita so that she can process them [27].

This function is apparently deixis although it is visible or not.

(17) We do lots of things. I mean, people know us because we've got nurses that go around to people and also they are based in hospitals, and they help people with cancer. But we also give … um … grant to – to people who need money and … um … for example … um … one of the … uh …. Lovely stories … um … I've heard of … um … I was on the you their stories. And there was *this lady* who … um … had been diagnosed with cancer and … um … we gave her a small amount of money to go and visit her son in the order end of the country, spend a couple of days with him, have a break, and tell him in person that she had been diagnosed. And we managed to do that. Um, there was another … um … story of this … um … uh … father who had small children to have a Christmas party with him. Uh, and we also pay for wedding dresses … uh … washing machines, anything.   So that's something to do. We've got a support line, people can phone us … uh … just talk to us and they may feel a bit better.   We can give them advice.   Um, we help people with benefits.   So for example, can they get some money form the government, get some help?   So it's quite … um … varied, but the – the stories are very touching … uh … they are not all sad stories[27].

In (17), the noun phrase of *this lady* is activated at the context, then, the story of this lady begins. It tells us how to talk fluently, using easy expressions.

(18) Ladies and gentlemen, your next train on platform two is your westbound Piccadilly line, calling at all stations to Heathrow Airport. *This train* will be calling at Acton Town and then all stations to Heathrow, terminals four, one, two, and three. When this train approaches the platform, please make sure you stand behind the yellow lines. Let the passengers off the train first, before boarding[26].

In (18), the noun phrase of *this train* is not competitive.

(19) No-one really, in --- except in few cases that – for example, for – for herding or for guarding, some – some people would keep dogs but it's not the common perception in here or the common idea in – in Britain where people will have their … uh … dogs live with them in the – the house. It's completely different in – in Saudi Arabia. So*this* is something also – to bear in mind[27].

In (19), the usage points the contexts the speaker of (19) have already talked successfully if the context is provided clearly.

(20) Salesman: Sure – I mean, I'll show you a touch – screen phone at the same time. Uh, there's two different phones, as you can see right in – in front of you. Phone A, for example, *this one.* Um,it's got touch-screen phone. Um, I mean it's quite … uh …user-friendly. Uh, it's got Wi-Fi, it's got GPS on there. So let's just say you drive, this comes in handy for you.
Freddy: Okay, yeah, that's be good. Salesman: Um, and you can download all sorts of different apps, for example

like Facebook, Twitter, and things like that … um … and different apps[27].

In (20), probably, at this context, the discourse referent is visible. These examples give us an exploration that *this* includes many propositional meanings although the usual function is taught at the sentence level having one propositional meaning.

The function of *that* is relied on clear deixis. In (21) from TB-A, *that* refers to a chance to be available for the hotel. Therefore, if it were not for the understanding, the anaphor of *that* or the function of deixis would not be established.

(21) Receptionist: Good morning, welcome to the hotel.

Nikki: Hi, there, I … uh … don't have a booking.   I wondered if … um … there was any chance you had availability this evening?

Receptionist: I'll just check *that* for you, madam?[26]

It and *That* in A Competitive Situation

On the other hand, the cases that *it* and *that* are used well at the same time are demonstrated. In (22) from TB-B, firstly, *that* refers to an attitude to leave the table during lunch. Second, the anaphoric status in focus with *it* is established. They deal with the identifiability and accessibility.

(22) Phillippe: Lunch is really, really different. Really different. Um, people don't wait each other- each other to go for lunch. Uh, people start their lunch … uh … without … uh … waiting colleagues to start their lunch the same time.

They would leave the table before you have even finish your meal, without excusing at all- without no reason at all, so *that*'s quite … uh … astonishing for me, from-… uh… from a French guy, that I am.

Ian: Do you find *it* rude?

Phillippe: Now not because I'm used.   But the first time I- I- I- I felt *it* was huge[27].

In (23) from TB-B, both *it* and *that* show events which *he was diagnosed* and *he died*. However, apparently, the interpretation of *that* seems to be rougher than that of *it*. In the manipulation, the identifiability and accessibility of *it* are clearer.

(23) My dad... um... he was diagnosed with cancer, and it- *it* all happened very quickly.

Um, he was diagnosed in July and he died in November. And *it* was a very tough time. And going through *that*- And also he- he was only 65- just 65 when he died. And *that* made me put things into perspective[27].

In (24) from TB-B, *it* and *that* are surprisingly contrasted. First, *it* can refer to the utterance, *they should never disobey the laws of the road,* by contrast, *that* can mean the utterance of Mike. As the extract indicates, speakers rather manage the flow of information, using the functions of anaphors and deixis.

(24) Mike: This morning I saw a cyclist go straight through a red light and I feel they have a complete disregard for the laws of the road.

Matt: No, I agree with you. Cyclists should never jump red lights, they should never disobey the laws of the road, there's always more to *it* than *that*, I think. A lot of time a cyclist will feel in danger and feel that they have to cross a red light to a –avoid being squashed by a car. I think it's more important – I mean, maybe if there were cycle paths everywhere, then – then it would be different[27].

In (25), the usages of *that* and *it* are clearly observed. Especially, the functions of it and its are provided as this natural observation.

(25) Nixon: Okay. Okay, *that*'s fine. Uh, let me get your details up here. [Thanks.] Okay, so your name is Megan, right? [Yeah.] Okay, Megan, so what would you like to do? Do you have insurance on the phone?

Megan: Uh, no I don't have insurance [You don't have insurance.] but I think *it* should still be under *its guarantee*, so – [27].

Do, Do It*, and *Do That

Finally, the usages of *do, do it* and *do that* are investigated. In (26) from TB-A, *do* refers to going to boarding school. Here there are no competitive meanings for the speaker. Therefore, the ellipsis is quite natural although it has a possibility that listeners may fail to catch the meaning correctly because another verb, *lived in*, exists.

(26) I went to boarding school from the age of seven. Um, my parents lived in Germany at the time, so it was the logical thing to *do*. They were moving around every two years … um … so the best thing for me was to- … um … to go and have steady friendship[26].

In (27) from TB-B, the topic is to legalize helmets. The speaker whose name is Matt, is uttering it once; however, he is establishing the meaning in his utterances, using *done it* and *do.* They meet the identifiability and accessibility enough.

(27) Matt: I think legalizing helmets could be an interesting path that we go down.

A lot of old-school riders won't go with it because they've never *done it*– they don't see it's something they should *do*[27].

In (28) from TB-B, first, *do that* indicates that it is impolite to use a mobile phone and to browse the internet. Second, *do it* refers to the same meaning. The difference between *do that* and *do it* might be in the clearness. The ellipsis of *do it* is clearly pointing to using a mobile phone and browsing the internet. The usage of *that* seems to include the preceding utterance of Philippe.

(28) Philippe: Uh, people, once they have finished their lunch, even if they are lunching with other people, with colleagues, they very often… uh… use a mobile phone … um …browse the internet [Uhuh.] even if you are in front of them. So that's quite unusual and quite impolite. *This* sort of thing would be quite impolite in France.

Ian: Okay, so – so people wouldn't *do that* in France?

Philippe: No. No, that's quite impolite, I would say.

Ian: Right. Or they would have to ask for permission, if you like, to do something or they just wouldn't *do it*?

Philippe: Even not, even not. There's no point to ask permission to – to browse Internet and to use mobile phone when – when you are lunching[27].

In (29) from TB-B, ellipsis, *do it*, happens twice in the dialogue, which means to become a vegetarian. In particular, speakers keep using the anaphoric reference, *it*, and the ellipsis, *do it*. This is one of features of topic continuity in conversation. In this conversation, speakers maintain the identify ability and accessibility of *it*.

(29) Freddy: I can't- Why else would you become a vegetarian? I mean why do People *do it*? Why?

Lily: Well- I suppose at the moment there seems- *it* seems to be quite trendy to kind of be [Exactly.] healthy, like *it*'s healthier, especially with, like- there's been a lot of talk in the newspapers about where meat comes from and what's in the food that we eat and stuff so I suppose if you're a vegetarian you know- it's a lot easier to know what's in the food that you buy.

Freddy: Yeah, I think she's just *doing it* because … um … she just wants to impress artists, probably greengrocers. I don't- you know- I've- I've never understood.

I mean, don't you miss meat?   Have you ever eaten meat?

Lily: Well, not really. I can't really remember the last time. I was probably three or four years old, [Ah. SO-] I was really young[27].

All in all, anaphors and ellipsis are taken into account. Undoubtedly, the usages of *it* are more transparent in the identifiability and accessibility. Therefore, it links with the argument of the subtle ambiguity in usages of *that*. Building anaphors of *it* is more manageable; however, *that,* with a function of deixis, is still controversial. The scope of meaning seems to be broad.

DISCUSSION

The Identifiability and Accessibility of Anaphors and Ellipsis

The results ingrained that speakers use anaphors and ellipsis quite well in conversations, in which they do not fail to build anaphors and ellipsis, but succeed to find right information, that is, clear identifiable and accessible antecedents. They are likely to be specific in discourse. However, the difference between *it* and *that* clarifies that *it* is one of referential pronouns and *that* has functions of deixis as well as anaphoric references.   Deixis has functions of pointing something.

First, let us consider the usages of *it* and *this*. They have two functions: to point out antecedents clearly and to refer to discourse referents through interpretations of speakers [20]. The case that speakers are pointing just nouns is quite normal. On the other hand, when speakers refer to events themselves uttered in the conversations, they need inferences and interpretations.

It is mainly because the function is not pointing an object, but referring to an event. In that sense, they have two separated meanings. In addition, the condition of the identifiability and accessibility must be in focus [22, 23]. Without the situation, precisely the identifiability and accessibility would be unclear. Ariel [28] indicates that speakers have an ability to judge whether salient antecedents are accessible in minds. Moreover, as a feature of conversation, anaphors are said to relate with turn-taking, and the interactions with using anaphoric references seem to make a strong tie among speakers [29,30]. Levinson [2]also insists that the usage of anaphors is governed by pragmatic aspects.

Second, the study of the usages of *that* gives us a controversial issue. Apparently, *that* is used as referring to some activated statements in conversations. In respect of referential functions, *that* does not have clear antecedents, nouns. It means *that* is deictic when *that* has a clear accessible antecedent. Lyons[12] notes that the use of *that* in (24) is deictic and anaphoric. When *that* is used as discourse anaphors, speakers seem to point some events. Bosch [31] demonstrates that discourse anaphors are constructed in the process of utterances. Surely speakers may manage the discourse anaphors well, using *that*. The statuses that *that* is activated, and *it* is in focus are dependent on the distribution of Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski[22, 23], however, the more detailed analyses should be investigated.   In addition, the difference between *this* and *that* is said to be complicated. It is not researched in this study because the usage of *this* is not found in the listening textbooks.

(30) You mustn't come at six: *that*'s when John is coming [12].

Lastly, ellipsis brings us a feature of conversations, as building a topic quite well. The usages of *do, do it,* and *do that* mean that speakers do not have other competitive meanings in the conversations. As *it* and *that*, the identifiability and accessibility of meanings are clear.

How Are Languages Learnt?

This research vehemently revealed that speakers had used anaphors and ellipsis in discourse. The finding did not need difficult syntactic structures and vocabularies. However, in interpretations of anaphors and ellipsis, speakers seemed to have an ability of identifying the accessibility to antecedents. In doing so, the work in listening to conversations correctly is to catch meanings which are in focus or activated. Listening itself involves many stages as neurological, linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic issues [1]. Some of those constrains are connected to interpretations of discourse. If this research takes the side of which the brain has a function on awareness and comprehension, it will suggest that senior high schools adapt students in classrooms to learning listening, using listening textbooks. The reason is that listening to real conversations and increasing the quantity and time will have an influence on developing listening abilities. The identifiability and accessibility of anaphors and ellipsis which are investigated in this paper can be taught through listening.

A second language learning has been always seeking for new effective methods [32]. Behaviorism of Skinner [33] has been widely known to the world, especially, in the United States and in Japan. The practices to imitate patterns as sounds and structures are explored in classrooms as making habits in language learning. These days, interactions and usage-based learning are put a special emphasis on a second language education[34,35]. Some teachers are still concerned about giving translations, and others tend to exploit activities for growing communicative attitudes in language teaching. This study does not deny those elements, but stands on a shift toward listening. The more students listen to listening materials, the more they will speak. Learning linguistic functions as anaphors and ellipsis is significant. Finally, the prosodic features and stress patterns which are also important in language learning can be leant through listening textbooks.

CONCLUSION

The aims of this study were to suggest that Japanese senior high school teachers should use listening textbooks which included long conversations about family topics, school lives, and tour reservations and to investigate the usages of anaphors and ellipsis in discourse, which accessed the antecedents. Firstly, this paper has revealed that listening abilities have interacted with neurolinguistic, linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic stages. It means that the development of listening itself involves a large number of steps. Secondly, for that, the main point of this study has picked the research of discourse structures as anaphors and ellipsis. It has shown that speakers have had the identifiability and accessibility to the antecedents. Furthermore, in the process of analysis, a significant difference between *it* and *that* was found. The usage of *it* was clearer than that of *that* because *that* had a meaning of deixis. This paper has insisted that teachers should use listening materials in classrooms although there can be some ambiguities on the usages of references.

There are still further possible research studies on discourse structures as anaphors and ellipsis. Ellipsis happens in discourse; however, the variety of forms in discourse has not been investigated. In particular, references and deixis have been demonstrated by many philosophers and linguists. The characteristics are to construct co-referential relationships with antecedents and to point shared knowledge and circumstances. The degrees may be divided into focus and activate statuses, for example. However, for clarifying the whole situations of references in discourse, grand investigations will be required if they contain *it, that, this,* and definiteness. The usage of language refers to what is presupposed and what is pointed in the discourse. Finding the universal feature is a quite hard thing in quantity and quality, with human inspirations of trucking information. The magnificent research studies engage us.

REFERENCES

1. Rost, M. (2016). *Teaching and researching listening.* New York and London: Routledge.
2. Levinson, S. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
3. Cutler, A. (2015). *Native listening.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
4. Büring, D. (2016). *Intonation and meaning.* Oxford University Press.
5. Bolinger, D. (1982). Intonation and its parts. *Language, 58*, 505-33.
6. Chomsky, N. (1982). *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
7. Reinhart, T. (1983). *Anaphora and semantic interpretation.* London: Croom Helm.
8. Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional syntax: anaphora, discourse, and empathy*. The University of Chicago Press.
9. Abbott, B. (2010). *Reference*. Oxford University Press.
10. Kreidler, C. (2014). *Introducing English semantics*. New York: Routledge.
11. Strawson, P. (1971). Identifying reference and truth-values. In Steinberg, D. & Leon J., *Semantics.* Cambridge University Press.
12. Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics 2*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Frege, G. (1892). On sense and reference in Geach, P. & Black M. (eds.), *Translations from the philosophical writings of Gottlob Frege*. Oxford University Press.
14. Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.
15. Russell, B. (1905). On denoting. *Mind, 14,* 479-93.
16. Heim, I. (1983). File change semantics and the familiarity theory of definiteness. In Rainer B. &Schwarze, C. &Stechow A. (Eds.), *Meaning, use an the interpretation of language.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
17. Kamp, H., &Reyle, U. (1993). *From discourse to logic: introduction to model theoretic semantics of natural language, formal logic and discourse representation.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.
18. Venhuizen, N. etc. (2018). Discourse semantics with information structure. *Journal of semantics*, *35,* 127-69.
19. Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax I.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
20. Cornish, F. (1999). *Anaphora, discourse, and understanding: evidence from English and French*. Oxford University Press.
21. Hawkins, J. (1978). *Definiteness and indefiniteness.* London: Croom Helm.
22. Gundel, J., & Hedberg, N &Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language, 69*, 274-307.
23. Gundel, J., & Hedberg, N &Zacharski, R. (2001). Definite descriptions and cognitive status in English: why accommodation is unnecessary. *English Language and Linguistics, 5*, 273-95.
24. Ariel, M. (1996). Referring expressions and the coreference distinction. In Fretheim &Gundel, *Reference and referent accessibility.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
25. Gengel, K. (2013). *Pseudogapping and ellipsis.* Oxford University Press.
26. Badger, I. (2012). *Listening. B1+ Intermediate*. London: Collins.
27. Badger, I. (2014). *Listening. B2+ Upper Intermediate.* London: Collins.
28. Ariel, M. (1994). Interpreting anaphoric expressions: a cognitive versus a pragmatic approach, *Journal of Linguistics, 30*, 3-42.
29. Sacks, H., &Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.
30. Fox, B. (1987). *Discourse structure and anaphora*. Cambridge University Press.

31. Bosch, P. (1987). Pronouns under control? a reply Liliane Tasmowski and Paul Verluyten. *Journal of Semantics, 5,* 65-78.

32. Lightbown, P., & Nina, S. (2013). *How languages are learnt.* Oxford University Press.

33. Skinner, B. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

34. Slobin, D. (1973). Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar.In C. Ferguson & D. Slobin (Eds.), *Studies of child language development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

35. Lieven, E., &Tomasello, M. (2008). Children's first language from a usage perspective. In P. Robinson & N. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.