

Pragmatic Misrepresentations in Secondary School English Textbook Dialogues: A Comparative Study of Third-turn Receipts

Yujong Park*

Nan Pan

*Sungkyunkwan University**Sungkyunkwan University*

This study was aimed at investigating the authenticity and pragmatic representations of the English language in textbooks by analyzing third turn receipts represented in secondary school English textbooks used in Korea and China. The findings showed that compared to massive occurrences of "oh" receipts in real time interactions reported in prior studies (Heritage, 1984, 2005), the target textbooks show a lack of this particle and the overuse of assessment terms (e.g., "great") and the "okay" acknowledgment token in the third turn position. Prior conversation analysis research has evinced the different actions that third turn tokens serve in ordinary conversation, which appears to be pragmatically misrepresented in the textbooks with respect to epistemic positioning and social relationships. This study argues that different claims to knowledge may be suggested by the use of different third turn tokens and makes suggestions for educating L2 students about the specific meanings for different types of receipts following question informed answers. The study proposes several pedagogical suggestions for writing textbook dialogues in EFL contexts.

Keywords pragmatic misrepresentation, Korean and Chinese middle school English textbooks, third-turn tokens / 화용론적 왜곡, 한국과 중국의 중학교 영어 교과서 분석, 세 번째 말차례에서 나타나는 담화 표지

* Corresponding author.

I. INTRODUCTION

Previous research in English language teaching has criticized English textbooks for not providing students with adequate opportunity for learning authentic language (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Gilmore, 2007; Nguyen, 2011; Wong, 2002). These studies highlight the ways in which textbook conversations, by drawing on native speakers' intuition about language use, fail to match findings from empirical studies on the structure of actual conversations (O'Keeffe et al., 2011). While the degree of authenticity required for commercial English textbooks is debated (Swaffar, 1985; Widdowson, 1996), recent research has argued that English textbooks should provide models of proficient L2 speakers who can effectively communicate with native speaker (NS) interlocutors rather than insisting on NS standards (Mckay, 2003). Studies have also examined types of pragmatic misrepresentations that English textbooks contain, most often in the EFL (English as a Foreign language) context where the textbook is often the main and only source of language input that learners receive (Jakupčević & Portolan, 2021; Nguyen, 2011; Richards, 2005).

The current study contributes to existing research on authenticity and pragmatic misrepresentations in English textbooks by analyzing linguistic devices that occur in a specific sequential context: third turn receipt tokens following question-elicited informings, in Korean and Chinese English textbooks. The target phenomena is exemplified in the following two extracts taken from a Korean and a Chinese secondary school English textbook. Target turns containing third turn receipt tokens are marked with arrows.

Excerpt 1. Korean 8th grade [Track 31 from Dong-A, p74]

- 01 B: How was your weekend, Suji?
02 G: It was wonderful. I did volunteer work at Hana Children's Center.
03 B: → That's great.
04 B: What did you do there?
05 G: I read books to the children.
06 B: → Wonderful!

Excerpt 2. Chinese 7th Grade [second volume, unit 1 2d, p2]

01 Jane: Hi, Bob. What club do you want to join?

02 Bob: I want to join a sports club.

03 Jane: → Great!

In both examples, the first speaker (B and Jane) asks a question inquiring about information that lies in the answerer's (G and Bob) epistemic domain (e.g., G's weekend, Bob's club choices). Following the answer, the questioner produces an assessment in the third turn (i.e., great, wonderful). Conversation analytic (CA) research on question-elicited informing has shown that parties in interaction employ different types of third turn receipts following answers to informing questions in order to negotiate and convey one's epistemic stance over the response (Raymond & Heritage, 2006). A question and answer sequence is frequently followed by a third turn that negotiates the parties understanding of the question and adequacy of the answer to achieve intersubjectivity (Heritage, 2005). This line of research (Heritage, 2005; Raymond & Heritage, 2006) has shown that assessments such as "great" index a questioner role that is not equal with that of the answerer, which may not be the intention of the textbook writer and is thus not pragmatically appropriate when used between friends. If students use these receipt tokens that are pragmatically misrepresented in the textbook when conversing with NSs, they may wrongfully convey an epistemic position that is troublesome by sending the wrong message (i.e., portraying a condescending attitude). This study aims to document the types of third turn receipts employed in Chinese and Korean EFL textbooks and compare them with their usages in real time interactional data between English NSs to provide suggestions for writing textbook dialogues in the EFL context.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Research on L2 Pragmatics and the Authenticity of Textbooks

Even though textbooks market themselves as offering authentic, natural language, or language which is true to life, some have been criticized for offering learners little opportunities for learning the pragmatics of the target language (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Limberg, 2016; Wong, 2002; Vellenga, 2004). For example, Park (2016) found that Korean college students in her study most frequently used "You're welcome" in response to the host's "Thanks for coming" whereas NSs did not use this expression in her collected data set. She contemplated that this over-usage may be due to Korean students having overlearned this expression as the correct way to respond to gratitude expressions (i.e., Thank you) in their English textbooks. Many textbooks have also been criticized for presenting speech acts unrealistically and providing unauthentic language (Bouton, 1996). This misrepresentation may arise because in contrast to intuition about language forms or grammar, NS intuition about language use is generally unreliable (Wolfson, 1989) and therefore cannot adequately inform instructional materials (Boxer & Pickering, 1995).

Pragmatic misrepresentation or inappropriateness occurs in a wide array of speech acts including gratitude, permission, sympathy, wishes and hopes, happiness and excitement, orders, suggestions, appointment-making, and direction-giving (Jung, 2017). In a study on Vietnamese English textbooks in the secondary school level, Nguyen (2011) showed that the Vietnamese culture tends to emphasize involvement, whereas the Australian culture tends to prefer personal space. Thus, the act of trying to change someone's mind might be perceived as more or less imposing and therefore requires more extensive face-work in the Australian culture. She suggested that learners can benefit enormously from the opportunities to explore NS speech samples and to reflect on the different ways in which politeness is realized in their L1 and the target language. In other words, she emphasized the importance of instructional

materials which provides learners with sufficient pragmatic information so that they can make informed choices that both fit their systems of values and beliefs and do not cause communication breakdown. Yu (2005) engaged in a three-way comparative study by comparing Korean EFL textbook dialogues with NS English conversations as well as foreigner talk discourse. He found that native speakers tended to talk about a certain topic much longer whereas topics more frequently changed in foreigner talk and EFL textbook dialogues.

Textbook authenticity in respect to its language or linguistic features has been discussed and debated extensively in the English language teaching literature as well. Several textbook investigations have addressed the gap between textbook dialogues and actual conversations by native speakers and have argued that learners should be exposed to natural language (Gilmore, 2007; Wong, 2002). Although some scholars (Widdowson, 1990) had argued that the authenticity of language in the classroom is 'an illusion' (p. 44), since the language intended for NSs cannot be authentic for the language-learner audience in the classroom setting, it is now well accepted that students can benefit from being exposed to language that pragmatically represents its usage among NSs or in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) contexts (Evans & Imai, 2011). More recent research have begun to recognize the need for textbooks to include global Englishes or ELF usages that is closer to what the learners actually will be using in their everyday lives (Pinner, 2019; Siegel, 2014). For example, Pinner (2019) positioned authenticity on a continuum that is inclusive of global Englishes rather than relying on NS norms. Siegel (2014) questioned the definition of 'authenticity' and problematized the lack of teaching materials based on L2 user norms. He investigated which topics arise in English conversations between Japanese and non-Japanese speakers of English outside the classroom, and suggested that textbook writers should bridge the gap with the textbook topics used in the Japanese EFL classroom.

The current study aims to show that English textbooks may misrepresent the pragmatics of the target language that are important for students in order to engage in successful real-world communication in the English language. While recognizing the importance of global Englishes and L2 user norms, our main goal

is not to argue that textbooks should include these usages but rather to argue that instructional materials should first provide learners with appropriate pragmatic information representative of L1 use (Nguyen, 2011) which can later be adapted to use in different ELF interactions. We chose to analyze textbooks written in the EFL context (i.e., China and Korea) because students in this context more heavily rely on the textbook for learning L2 English and have less opportunity to encounter the target language outside of the classroom. In the next section, a brief review of research on third turn receipts is provided before reporting on the main findings.

2. Research on Third-turn Receipts following Question-and-Answer Sequences

Conversation analysis (CA) unlocked fundamental structural and procedural features of social interaction as orderly and systematic (Goffman, 1983; Heritage, 2005). A substantial body of CA research exists on third turn receipts following question-and-answer sequences both in everyday and institutional interactions (Beach, 1993, 1995; Heritage, 1984, 2005; Lee, 2007; Park, 2014; Waring, 2008).

One particle that have achieved great attention is the English particle "oh" produced in response to prior turns at talk to make a change-of-state proposal of knowledge or information, particularly in the conversational environment of informing (Heritage, 1984). According to Heritage (1984), question-and-answer sequences that involve the transmission of information in ordinary conversation is massively followed by a third turn receipt "oh" that confirms the answer as an action that has involved the transmission of information from an informed to an uninformed party. In proposing a change of state, the "oh" receipt is nicely fitted to the Q-A sequence in which the production of "oh" confirms an answer as an action that has involved information transfer. Although it is but one of a variety of resources for such proposals, Heritage (1984) shows through detailed analysis of actual occurrences how this particle is an economical resource for the accomplishment of information transmission in the English language.

The informed or uninformed epistemic status of recipients is commonly the

object of active negotiation throughout the course of informing. A storyteller, for example, makes great effort to first determine that the recipients are uninformed with respect to what she will be reporting (Goodwin, 1984). In this context, a particle such as "oh" that proposes that its producer has undergone a change of state may be responsive to prior turns at talk that have transmitted a story. With the use of "oh," recipients thus confirm the presupposition, relevance, and upshot of the prior act of storytelling as an action that has involved the transmission of information. "Oh" is thus a means by which recipients can align themselves to, and confirm, a prior turn's proposal to have been informative and newsworthy. Furthermore, by the addition of specific types of turn components, such as assessments or requests for further information, recipients can proceed to treat the local trajectory of the informing as complete (i.e., with assessments) or incomplete (i.e., with requests for further information). The significance of the "oh" receipt can also be shown in instances where the production of an "oh" receipt may be avoided by questioners so as to propose that they have not been informed (Heritage, 1984).

Receipt objects such as "okay," on the other hand, may initiate movement toward closure (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), or mark acknowledgment and understanding of what prior speaker's utterance was taken to be projecting (Beach, 1993). Thus, CA research has argued that "okay" (and "right") has a fundamental projecting quality (Beach, 1993, 1995; Gardner, 2007). In the third turn position, "okays" are employed by current speakers who initiate a question, and having received an acceptable answer from the recipient, may affirm its correctness in the third slot. In pre-closing contexts, "okay" works as a topic closure, marking how the speaker intended to move to another area of business and that there is nothing new to add to the current topic (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Finally, evaluative third-turn tokens such as "great" and "wonderful" have been most widely investigated in the classroom setting that positively assesses a student answer following a test question from the teacher in the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence. In ordinary conversation, third-turn assessments such as "excellent" may display the questioner's stance toward the given answer (Schegloff, 2007) which is not found in singular "oh" receipts.

In sum, "oh" tokens in third turn are most commonly used in NS interactions

to receipt answers to questions as informative, while withholdings or substitutions of "oh" receipts may be used to imply either that an answer was not, or not yet, informative or, alternatively, that a prior question formed utterance did not request information. Other tokens such as "okays", "yes" or assessments are used to perform specific actions in their moment-by-moment sequential and institutional context. In general, these third tokens other than "oh" convey that their producers were not completely unknowing participants concerning the just delivered information.

Drawing on the body of cross-cultural pragmatics research on textbooks and conversation analytic studies on the structure of interactions, this study will examine the distribution of the receipt tokens following question informings included in Korean and Chinese EFL textbooks and compare the key third turn tokens that occur in both textbooks and real time conversations by analyzing the epistemic status of participants and the sequential contexts. The sections that follow first describe the dataset and the analytical framework within which the data were examined. After showing the frequency distribution of third turn tokens in the textbook dialogues, the paper analyzes the pragmatic misrepresentations encoded in their usage in comparison with how it is used by NS interlocutors. The study concludes with a discussion of both implications of the findings and notes its limitations.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The textbook set analyzed in this study include 1) three English textbooks for Korean middle school grade 1 (aged 14), grade 2 (aged 15), and grade 3 (aged 16) students published by Dong-A publisher, Korea and 2) five English textbooks for Chinese 7th grade (aged 14), 8th grade (aged 15), and 9th grade (aged 16) students published by the People Education Press, China. All textbooks targeted students who have been studying English for at least three years by the time they reached middle school. In total, the Korean textbooks provided 24 units for

3 grade levels and the Chinese textbooks consisted of 50 units (2 books for 7th Grade, 2 books for 8 th Grade and one book for 9th Grade). The choice of textbooks was motivated by the high number of students using it nationwide and also the availability of corpus to the researchers.

For comparison, authentic conversations from transcripts available in previous conversation analytic research (Heritage, 1987; Schegloff, 2007), and approximately five hours of English interactions from CA Bank within the Talk Bank Database (<http://www.talkbank.org>) were consulted. CA Bank consists of conversations between adult speakers of different languages including English, Japanese, Yiddish and Mandarin Chinese. Among the data set, British and American conversations that occurred between friends (acquaintances) and family members were selected for analysis in the current study. One hundred and five question-answer sequences followed by third turn receipts were identified in the collected English NS conversations from CA Bank. Although the database includes CA transcriptions of the data as well as audio, all transcripts were re-transcribed and reviewed for correctness (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). The final transcripts were checked by a second researcher to identify whether the third turn receipts were truly connected to and responsive to the prior question answer sequence. In order to make the data comparable, the number of sequences were matched as shown in the following table. In other words, the English database was restricted to 97 question-elicited informing sequences even though there were more occurrences available for analysis.

TABLE 1
Number of Q-A-3rd turn sequences across data sets

	<i>Korean English textbook</i>	<i>Chinese English textbook</i>	<i>English corpus</i>	Total
Q-A-3 rd turn sequences	61	75	97	233

As shown in the table, we also restricted our analysis to Q-A sequences that were followed by third-turn receipts. It should be noted that the English textbooks included more cases where Q-A sequences were not followed by a

third-turn receipt, which amounted to 245 and 198 instances in the Korean and Chinese English textbooks, respectively. These sequences were not included in the analysis because the focus of our analysis was on third turn receipts rather than on types of questions and their answers. The current analysis focused on a total of 233 Q-A-3rd turn sequences collected from the target Chinese and Korean English textbooks and NS English conversations.

IV. RESULTS

In this section, the distribution of the receipt tokens following question informings included in the Korean and Chinese textbooks are first presented followed by a comparative analysis with NS data. The findings show that the most frequently used tokens in third positions in both Korean and Chinese textbooks are assessment terms such as "great" and "wonderful" followed by "okay" tokens. This frequency does not represent the frequency of occurrences of third tokens found in ordinary conversation, whose position is massively occupied by "oh" and "oh" accompanied by additional turn components. The question-answer-third turn sequences that occur in Korean and Chinese English textbooks and real time conversations represented by NS interactions show differences in the way the information is received by questioners which evinces pragmatic misrepresentation in the usage of third-turn receipts in the target textbooks.

1. Distribution of Third-turn Tokens following Question-Answer Sequences

The following Table 2 shows the frequency of third turn tokens that were most commonly found in Korean English textbooks, Chinese English textbooks and English corpus analyzed for this study.

TABLE 2

Frequency of third turn tokens that occur in the data set

<i>Third turn tokens in Q-A sequences</i>	<i>Korean English textbook</i>	<i>Chinese English textbook</i>	<i>English corpus</i>	Total
Okay	17 (15.6%)	11 (10.6%)	14 (14.3%)	42
Wow/great /wonderful Sounds great	28 (24.1%)	26 (23.9%)	13 (9.5%)	67
Oh/ Oh + assessment Oh yeah/Oh really	10 (8.7%)	20 (17.2%)	36 (37.3%)	66
Yeah	1 (0.9%)	10 (9.6%)	18 (17.1%)	29
That's bad	1 (0.9%)	0	0	1
Really?	1 (0.9%)	3 (2.9%)	5 (4.8%)	9
Mm hm /Ah hah	3 (2.7%)	5 (4.8%)	11 (13.7%)	19
Sum	61	75	97	233

Table 2 shows that following question informed answers, NSs used "oh" most frequently whereas in Korean and Chinese textbooks, assessment terms such as "wow/great/wonderful" and "okay" were most frequently employed. When "oh" and its uses accompanied with assessment and "yeahs" were combined, 37.3% of third tokens following question and their answers included the "oh" token in the NS data. In the textbook dialogues, however, "oh" only occurred 8.7% and 17.2% of the time and when they occurred they were mostly employed singularly, on its own. What is interesting is the overuse of assessment tokens (e.g. wow/great/wonderful) in the collected English textbooks when compared to the NS corpus, which only contained 9.5% of such instances. Assessment terms occupied 24.1% of third turns in Korean English textbooks and 23.9% of the third turns in Chinese English textbooks. Other noticeable differences include the higher frequency of "yeah" and "mhm" found in the NS data when compared with the textbook dialogues, which showed only several usages of these terms.

In the next section, we explore the sequential environment in which "oh" and other third tokens, including assessments and "okays" occur by comparing the textbooks and NS conversations to reveal the type of pragmatic misrepresentation

that were found in the focal EFL textbooks.

2. The Use of "Oh" in NS Conversations and Textbooks

In the previous section, the use of "oh" showed the largest difference in frequency of occurrence. In the textbook dialogues "oh" occurred in 8.7% and 17.2% of the third turn positions following question informed answers, and almost always occurred on its own with no additional turn components. In NS conversations, more than one third of third tokens (37.3%) following question and their answers had "oh" often combined with additional turn components. Past CA research has shown that "oh" is overwhelmingly used to index that what has been said is news for the recipient, as in the following case, where Mum acknowledges Lesley's news with "oh yes" (line 5 and 9).

Extract 3. Heritage (1984)

- 01 Mum: Is she still friendly with the boy f'm
02 ()bury,
03 Les: .h Yes he's coming over f'r a dinner
04 t'↓morr[ow,
05 Mum: 3rd→ [Oh yes.
06 (0.5)
07 Les: But she's gon'to get that I:'m gonna cook um (.)
08 (0.5).h chicken a'la ki:ng fer Gordon'n Mark,=
09 Mum: 3rd→=Oh yes.

Mum's first "Oh yes." (line 5) is a third-positioned acknowledgment of the answer to her question (lines 01-02). The use of "oh" in freestanding form and, more commonly as in this case, with continuative items like "yes", or brief assessments such as "oh dear," is extremely frequent in the NS data, perhaps because news is often delivered in chunks which can be acknowledged or assessed in their own right. CA research (Heritage, 1984) has shown that "oh" receipts of question-elicited informings are commonly combined with assessment

components to give an oh-plus-assessment turn structure (e.g., "oh, that's great") or oh-plus a newsmark (e.g., "oh, did she"). By combining with additional turn components, such as assessments or requests for further information, the particle can accomplish associated sequential tasks such as acknowledging the answer as news and evaluating it in a positive or negative light. In the following example from NS data, as well, M treats J's answer to his question as complete and informative by employing an "oh" followed by an assessment (line 03 "oh: good").

Extract 4. (1) [Lerner:SF:I:2:SO]

01 M: Q→ Why what's goin on this week.

02 J: A→ Oh nothing. I'm j'st inna: really good mood

03 M: 3rd→ Oh: good.

As such, a questioner treats the informing as complete with the "oh" news receipt followed by an assessment. By not employing an "oh" receipt, the questioner may treat the status of the prior question as one that did not request information. Therefore, when an "oh" receipt is missing, the answerer may adjust or revise their answers to provide additional information until an "oh" is produced, which shows the important roles served by "oh" following questions and their answers.

In the textbook dialogues, "oh" followed by assessments were found in the same position to accomplish that the news delivered by the answer have been acknowledged. Among the 30 instances found in the textbook dialogues, two instances from both Korean and Chinese textbook dialogues are provided below. The following two excerpts show the usage of third turn "oh" tokens to acknowledge that the answers were informative and shows that a change-of-state in information status had occurred. The question-answer sequence followed by the third turn receipt is marked with arrows respectively.

Excerpt 5. [Track 11 form Dong-A, P29]

01 W: Q→ Excuse me. Do you know Kevin Baker?

- 02 B: A→ Yes, I do. He's my classmate.
 03 W: 3rd→ Oh, good.
 04 W: Q→ Where is he? I'm Kevin's mother.
 05 B: A→ He's in the art room. He's painting a picture.
 06 W: Q→ Where's the art room?
 07 B: A→ It's on the second floor.
 08 W: 3rd→ OK.

In line 3, *W* acknowledges *B*'s answer to her question ("Do you know Kevin Baker?") with a change of state "oh" token plus an assessment turn structure ("oh, good") which marks *B*'s answer as being informative and also assessing it as being helpful for her following request. *B*'s affirmative answer allows *W* to ask a follow-up question regarding her son's whereabouts. It is interesting, however, that *W* receives *B*'s answer regarding the location of the art room with a third-turn "OK" (line 08) which is not commonly employed in the sequential context following question informed answers. In third turn positions following question-answer sequences, "okays" are used to affirm the correctness of the answer in the third slot (Beach, 1998), which is not possible for *W* to do here. Because *W* is not familiar with the location of the art room, it would be more appropriate to follow *B*'s answer ("It's on the second floor") with a change-of-state token "oh" combined with words of gratitude ("Oh thanks") as she did in line 3. The use of "okay" in third turn may lead to pragmatic misrepresentation which can affect students' usages of a pragmatically appropriate third turn token.

In the following example, taken from a Chinese English textbook, Peter and Eric are conversing about Eric's trip to the countryside. Peter asks a series of questions regarding Eric's trip and is informed by each of his answers. In line 3, Peter employs "oh nice" that acknowledges Eric's answer as news.

Extract 6. [2d, p 62 from People's Education Publisher]

- 01 Peter: Q→ Hi, Eric. How was your trip last week?
 02 Eric: A→ It was excellent. I visited my grandparents in the countryside.
 03 Peter: 3rd→ Oh, nice.

- 04 Peter: Q→ What did you do?
05 Eric: A→ I went fishing every day. And I fed the chickens with my grandpa.
06 It was so much fun.
07 Peter: 3rd→ Sounds good.
08 Peter: Q→ How was the weather there?
09 Eric: A→ It was great, and the air was so clean. I watched the stars at night.
10 They were so beautiful.
11 Peter: 3rd→ Lucky you.

In this dialogue, Peter employs third turn tokens following each of the question informed answers produced by Eric. "Oh, nice" in line 3 acknowledges Eric's answer as being informative and as newsworthy. The second third token employed is "sounds good" (line 7) following Eric's answer regarding his experiences and evaluation of his trip ("It was so much fun"). Here, Peter's third turn assessment may be affiliating with Eric's own evaluation by providing a matching action. The final third-turn token employed in line 11 ("Lucky you") following Eric's answer regarding the weather is odd given that Eric's answer ends with an assessment on how beautiful the stars were at night. An "oh" token in combination of other turn components would be more appropriate in both of these latter positions following questions that ask for information regarding the answerer's own experiences (e.g., Oh, how fun, Oh, lucky you).

As such, the textbooks contained usages of "oh" receipts that were similar to NS usages in several occasions. However, there was no instance of "oh" occurring more than once in a series of question answer sequences whereas in actual NS conversations participants employed a series of "oh" tokens to receive the answers rather than use a variety of third-turn resources. In the target textbook dialogues, a variety of third-turn tokens appeared and "oh" was the least preferred (see Table 2). Exposing students to wide range of third token types may be done at the cost of engaging in pragmatic misrepresentation regarding epistemic knowledge and negotiation of relationships (e.g., sounding like a condescending person, appearing disinterested), which are subtly conveyed through different usages of third-turn tokens in conversation.

3. The Use of "Great" and "Okay" following Question-informed Answers in Textbooks

The previous section analyzed the use of "oh" tokens in the third turn position by comparing its usage in NS conversations and textbook dialogues. In this section, the two most frequently used third-turn tokens found in the textbooks, assessments (i.e., "Great," "Sounds good") and "Okays," are analyzed in greater detail to reveal the pragmatic misrepresentations that may be present in textbook dialogues.

In both Chinese and Korean textbooks, "Wow/great/wonderful" and assessment turns such as "Sounds great" appeared the most frequently following question-informed answers. They were employed almost three times more frequently (approximately 25%) when compared to the NS corpus (9.5%) which may suggest pragmatic misrepresentation in the use of these tokens. The following shows the textbook dialogues which contain their usages. The first example is taken from the Chinese 7th grade textbook.

Extract 7. People's Education Publisher 9. unit 9 2d, p50

- 01 Frank: Hi, Bob, how's your day?
02 Bob: It's OK. I like Monday because I have P.E. and history.
03 They are my favorite subjects.
04 Frank: Q→ Who's your P.E. teacher?
05 Bob: A→ Mr. Hu. He always play games with us.
06 Frank: 3rd→That's great! But why do you like history? It's boring.
07 Bob: Oh, I think history is interesting. What's your favorite day?
08 Frank: Friday.
09 Bob: Why?

Here, Frank asks Bob who his P.E. teacher is (line 04) and Bob gives his teacher's name ("Mr. Hu.") followed by an account as to why he likes the P.E subject in connection to the teacher ("He always play games with us"). Following this answer, Frank produces a third-turn evaluation "That's great!" (line 06) and asks a related question regarding history. ("But why do you like

history?"). In the NS data, third-turn evaluations are mostly found in instructional discourse when the questioner has a correct answer in mind, such as a child-directed question with a known answer, and the questioner evaluates the appropriateness of the response in third turn (e.g., Mom: "Can you read this?" - Child: "Zebra" - Mom: "Great"). This is not the case in extract 7 as Frank does not have epistemic upper ground in terms of Bob's own experiences. CA research has also shown that assessment terms may be used to close down the sequence and move to a different trajectory (Heritage, 2018). However, Frank does not close down the sequence with his assessment but rather extends it by asking a subsequent question regarding Bob's favorite subject at school. The following provides a comparable example taken from NS interaction between two sisters, Emma and Lottie, whereby Lottie provides an assessment of Emma's answer in third turn. Emma has been suffering from a toenail infection and Emma asks about the foot that is not troublesome (line 1).

Extract 8. [NB:I:6: 239-243]

- 1 Lot: Q→ How'r yuh How's yer foot.
- 2 Emm: A→ .t.hh OH it's healing beautif'lly
- 3 Lot: 3rd→ Goo:[;d.
- 4 Emm: [The other one ma:y haftuh come o:ff

Here, the foot Lottie asks about (line 1) is much less important to Emma than the other foot that was not inquired into. Following her oh-prefaced, unelaborated response to the question (line 2), Emma immediately proceeds to shift the focus of the conversation to the more problematic, but not inquired about, second foot (line 4). Lottie collaborates in this movement with her closing-implicative assessment at line 3 ("Goo::d"). Here, the assessment in third turn closes down the sequence and is followed by an alternative topic in the next turn by the answerer rather than the questioner. When third turn assessments are used in NS conversations, they frequently perform a closing-implicative and topic shifting action whereas textbook usages of third-turn assessments are frequently followed by a follow-up question by the questioner as

shown in Extract 1 and Extract 7 above. For example, in Extract 1 (reproduced below) the third turn assessment ("That's great") is followed by B's follow up-question regarding the details of Suji's volunteer work.

Extract 9. Korean 8th grade [Track 31 from Dong-A, P74]

01 B: Q→ How was your weekend, Suji?

02 G: A→ It was wonderful. I did volunteer work at Hana Children's Center.

03 B: 3rd→ That's great.

04 B: Q→ What did you do there?

05 G: A→ I read books to the children.

06 B: 3rd→ Wonderful!

After G's answer in line 5 ("I read books to children") B provides another positive assessment ("Wonderful") in line 6. It is not easy to find these types of positive assessments in third turn after question informed answers in the NS data unless some kind of instructional activity is going on. Between friends with equal epistemic status, it is more likely that a questioner would employ a change-of-state token along with additional assessment tokens (e.g., "oh wonderful") in the third turn to first indicate that the answer was informative and only then move on to assess the value of the information.

Along with assessment tokens, the textbooks examined also showed a greater number of "OK" usages in the third turn when compared to NS data. In the following extract taken from a 7th grade Chinese English textbook, Bill receives Ken's question-informed answer with "OK great" (line 11), which is a combination of "okay" and a positive assessment term "great."

Extract 10. People's Education Publisher 7th Grade 1 8. unit 8 2e, p44

01 Bill: Hi, Alan. Happy birthday!

02 Alan: Thank you, Bill.

03 Bill: So how old are you?

04 Alan: I'm twelve. How old are you?

05 Bill: I'm thirteen.

06 Alan: When is your birthday?

- 07 Bill: My birthday is in August.
 08 Alan: Well, do you want to come to my birthday party?
 09 Bill: Q→ Oh, yes. When is it?
 10 Alan:A→ At three this afternoon.
 11 Bill: 3rd→ OK, great! See you!

When Alan invites Bill to his birthday party, Bill accepts the invitation and asks when the party begins. After Alan's answer ("At three this afternoon"), Bill accepts it with a third turn "OK. great" followed by a farewell message ("See you!"), which insinuates that Bill is in a great hurry to end this conversation. Prior CA research has shown that what differentiates "okay" from other acknowledgement tokens is its preliminary character or shift in orientation (Beach, 1996). Therefore, it could be considered rather abrupt for Bill to close the sequence immediately after producing the third turn "OK." Again, it would be pragmatically more acceptable to have used the oh-receipt ("Oh, great") in this context. The following two extracts taken from 9th grade Chinese English textbooks contain a similar usage of "OK" in third turn.

Extract 11. [2c from People's Education Publisher 9th Grade, p 74]

- 01 Jeff: Q→ Hey, Ben. For the party next week, should we ask people to bring food?
 02 Ben: A→ No. let's order food from a restaurant.
 03 If we ask people to bring food, they'll just bring potato chips and
 04 chocolate because they'll be too lazy to cook.
 05 Jeff: 3rd→ OK.

Extract 12. [3a from People's Education Publisher 9th Grade, p 19]

- 01 [Alice and Wei walk up to a staff person at the door.]
 02 Wei: Q→ Excuse me, could you tell us when the band starts playing this evening?
 03 Staff: A→ Eight o'clock. The restaurant is always busy at that time,
 04 so come a little earlier to get a table.
 05 Wei: 3rd→ OK. Thank you

In Excerpt 12, Wei asks for information regarding the time of the band

performance and the staff provides an answer (as well as a suggestion to come earlier for seats). In third turn, Wei accepts the answer with an "OK" followed by an expression of gratitude ("Thank you") which could be considered rather rude considering that the staff had provided helpful information out of good will. A change-of-state token "oh" accompanied by a gratitude expression would have been more proper in this context (e.g., "Oh thanks"). A comparative example from NS interaction below shows a different usage of "Okay" after a question informed answer. Here, T's "Oka(h)y" in line 3 both initiates a new topic and prefaces a first reporting.

Extract 13. UTCL: J10.1 (Beach, 1995, p. 335)

01 T: You r(h)eady for today's go rou:nd?

02 F: Sure h

03 T: Oka(h)y hih hih hhhh well- I just had a call from Joe and he says ((continues))

Here, the free-standing "okay" in line 3 prefaces what is soon to be revealed as a next topical matter (i.e., receiving a phone call from a friend). Notice how "Okay" is infiltrated with laughter as well as being followed by it before a new topic is introduced. While "oh" receipts in third turn inform the answerer that a change-of-state in knowledge has occurred, the "okay" token performs an alternative action, that is, prefaceing a shift in orientation. Thus, it does not suggest that the answer was informative for the questioner as strongly as the "oh" token does. "Oh" in third turn is frequently and closely associated with the emergence of new information, and of discovery, recollection, and realization (Heritage, 1984). On the other hand, "okay" is often used to claim that a change of state in information has not occurred. This is why "okays" are used by interviewers in news interviews to suggest that the interviewer is asking questions for the overhearing audience rather than indicating that a change-of-state in information has occurred (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

In NS conversations, assessments or evaluations following question informed answers were preceded by "oh" to deliver the prompt registration of information transfer prior to evaluating it. For example in the following example, taken from

a conversation between two friends Nancy and Hyla, Nancy first indexes the information as being registered with an "oh" and only then moves on to produce an evaluation "Very clever."

Extract 14. [HG:II:25]

- 01 Nan: How didju git 'iz number,
02 (.)
03 Hyl: I(h) (.) c(h)alled infermation'n San
04 Fr'ncissc(h)[uh!
05 Nan: -> [Oh:::
06 (.)
07 Nan: Very cleve:r, hh=

Nancy acknowledges Hyla's method of obtaining a boy's phone number (line 5, "oh:::") and follows this news receipt with an evaluation of it (line 7, "very clever:"). In comparison, evaluations such as "great" in the third turn without an "oh" particle, are frequently employed in instructional discourse, most often through the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence, to assess the appropriateness of an answer (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Thus, third turn evaluations are frequently used by a questioner who holds a higher epistemic position regarding the information being pursued. In a similar vein, "Yes" and "mm hm" in the third turn following a question informed answer avoid or defer treating prior talk as informative (Heritage, 1984). Thus, "yes" is regularly, and in contrast to "oh," associated with additional turn components that assert prior knowledge of just delivered information (e.g., "Yes, I know.") The textbooks contained very few usages of "Yes" and "mhm" in third turn: thus, we did not examine these tokens in greater detail. If one of the aims of the textbook is to provide learners with a wider range of linguistic materials, these third turn tokens could be included to show the actions that they achieve in comparison to "ohs" or "okays."

In sum, the EFL textbooks examined in this study lacked the "oh" particle following question informed answers although it played a key role in NS conversations to indicate news receipt and change-of-state in knowledge about a

questioned topic. The textbooks showed a greater usage of assessment tokens and "okay" in the third turn that did not accompany the "oh" receipt and it was shown that these usages gave the impression that the questioner already knew the answer. In order to avoid pragmatic misrepresentation and to avoid appearing rude or abrupt, we suggest that future textbook dialogues carry more "oh" receipts in combination to additional turn components such as "great" and "okay" following the question-and-answer sequence.

V. CONCLUSION

The goal of this study was to investigate what follows question-informed answers in target Korean and Chinese EFL textbook dialogues when compared to NS conversational data to make suggestions for future EFL textbook material development. The findings showed that compared to massive occurrences of "oh" receipts in real time interactions (Heritage, 1984), the textbooks showed a relative lack of this particle and the overuse of assessment terms such as "great" and acknowledgement tokens such as "okay." Many of the dialogues resembled an interview with a series of question and answer sequences following each other with an absence of "oh" in third position (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Because "oh" indicates that the recipient or the hearer has received new information about the situation, thus transitioning the hearer from not knowing (K-) to a position of knowing (K+), it is an important tool for achieving intersubjectivity in English conversations (Heritage, 1984, 1998; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). The overuse of "okays" and other assessment tokens may also lead to pragmatic misrepresentations such as appearing disinterested in the conversation (via premature closure of the conversation) or portray a condescending attitude due to the evaluative nature of these tokens. Therefore, we suggest that the "oh" particle could be represented in the textbook much more frequently following question informed answers. If used in combination with other tokens (e.g. "oh, great", "oh, okay"), the inclusion of more "oh" receipts will not compromise the diverse representations of third turn tokens.

Again, it should be emphasized that the goal of this study is not to claim that textbook writers should incorporate NS usages of third turn tokens and only use "oh" instead of other available devices. Students do need to be exposed to a variety of usages of the target language; therefore, it would be beneficial to familiarize them with a variety of linguistic terms. However, we argue that diversity should not come at the cost of pragmatic misrepresentation of the target material. If diverse third turn tokens are used in the textbook, they should be represented in a pragmatically appropriate manner. For example, the "OK" receipt should be used to pre-close a sequence (e.g., A: "Okay" - B: "Okay" - A: "Bye") or before engaging in topic-shift (e.g., "Okay but what about...") rather than to end a conversation in third turn position. Assessment tokens (e.g., Sounds great!) would be more appropriately employed in combination with "oh" receipts to indicate that the answer had been registered first before evaluating it (e.g., "Oh, sounds great!"). English textbooks in EFL countries including Korea and China can serve as a powerful tool for equipping learners with knowledge of English pragmatics and intercultural communication skills. This article examined the extent to which a set of locally produced English textbooks in Korea and China may prepare students to use English for intercultural communication and the extent to which pragmatic misrepresentation occurred in question-answer-third turn sequences, in particular. Even though one of the primary goals of these textbooks were to prepare students to use English for communication with English users, it appeared that they only partially met this goal by not always presenting the English language in a pragmatically appropriate way.

This study offers several implications for application. Prior research has argued that L2 learners should be exposed to natural language use in order for effective communication with other speakers of English. Textbook writers may benefit from the wealth of existing CA research that investigated the actions performed by different linguistic devices to address the problem of pragmatic misrepresentations in English textbooks. There exists an abundance of CA research on question and answer sequences (Heritage, 2010; Schegloff, 2007), which is one of the most frequently employed sentence types in the EFL

textbooks examined for this study. Other speech acts examined in CA include accepting and rejecting invitations or assessments (Drew, 2018; Pomerantz, 1984), telling a story (Goodwin, 1984), requesting (Kitzinger & Firth, 1999), and complaining (Drew & Holt, 1988), whose findings may inform the development of English textbook dialogues. For example, findings from existing research can inform textbook writers and students about the ways in which particles such as "oh" and "okay" convey important information about the participants' epistemic knowledge about the world vis-à-vis each other. The current study is limited because the range of textbooks examined and the cultural context represented by the textbooks are confined to the Korean and Chinese cultural context. English textbooks from other EFL countries or commercial ESL textbooks may show a different pattern and may be more reflective of the ways in which third-turn receipts are employed in real time conversations. In addition textbooks published by other publishers in Korea may show a different pattern. Despite these shortcomings, this study could contribute to prior research on textbook analysis by using findings from CA on linguistic devices that have been largely neglected so far, to argue for the importance of proper pragmatic representation in Korean and Chinese EFL textbooks.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge University Press.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 325-352.
- Beach, W. A. (1995). Preserving and constraining options: "Okays" and "official" priorities in medical interviews. In B. Morris & R. Chenail (Eds.). *Talk of*

- the Clinic: Explorations in the Analysis of Medical and Therapeutic Discourse* (pp. 259-290). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bouton, L. F. (1996). *Pragmatics and language learning*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign.
- Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: the case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49(1), 44-58.
- Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (2018). Equivocal invitations (in English). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 125, 62-75.
- Drew, P. & Holt, E. (1988). Complainable matters: the use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems*, 35, 398-417.
- Evans, B. E., & Imai, T. (2011). 'If we say English, that means America': Japanese students' perceptions of varieties of English. *Language Awareness*, 20(4), 315-326.
- Gardner, R. (2007). The right connections: Acknowledging epistemic progression in talk. *Language in Society*, 36, 319-341.
- Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40, 97-118.
- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 225-246). Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order: American Sociological Association 1982 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, 48(1), 1-17.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1987). Ethnomethodology. In A. Giddens & J. Turner (Eds.), *Social Theory Today* (pp. 224-272). Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society*, 27, 291-334.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In R. Sanders, K &

- Fitch, (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 103-146). Erlbaum.
- Heritage, J. (2010). Conversation analysis: Practices and methods. In D. Silverman, (Eds.) ,*Qualitative Sociology* (pp. 208-203). Sage.
- Heritage, J. & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities and institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jakupčević, E., & Portolan Čavar, M. (2021). An analysis of pragmatic content in EFL textbooks for young learners in Croatia. *Language Teaching Research*. DOI: 10.1177/1362168820986936.
- Jung, W. (2017). Textbook analysis: Pragmatic inappropriateness in the realization of speech acts. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 16(3), 46-76.
- Kitzinger, C. & Frith, H. (1999). Just say no? Conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 293-316.
- Lee, Y.-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1204-1230.
- Limberg, H. (2016). Teaching how to apologize: EFL textbooks and pragmatic input. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(6), 700-718.
- McKay, S. (2003) Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Nguyen, MTT. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence. *RELC Journal* 42(1), 17-30.
- O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing pragmatics in use*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203830949>.
- Park, Y. (2014). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 145-167.
- Park, Y. (2016). Pragma-linguistic differences in Korean EFL student productions of conventional expressions. *English Teaching*, 71(4), 3-26.
- Pinner, R. (2019). *Authenticity and teacher-student motivational synergy*. Routledge.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Raymond, G. & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society*, 35, 677-705
- Richards, J. (2005) The Role of Textbooks in a Language Program. Available at <http://www.professorjackrichards.com/work.htm>
- Schegloff, E.A. & H. Sacks, (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289-327.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Siegel, A. (2014). What should we talk about? The authenticity of textbook topics. *ELT Journal*, 68(4), 363-375.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Swaffar, J. (1985). Reading authentic texts in a foreign language: A cognitive model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 69(1), 15-34.
- Talk Bank Database (accessed 2022, March, 16). <http://ca.talkbank.org/>
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Learning Pragmatics from ESL & EFL Textbooks: How Likely? TESL-EJ*, 8(2).
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using Explicit Positive Assessment in the Language Classroom: IRF, Feedback, and Learning Opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 577-594.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1996). Comment: authenticity and autonomy in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 67-68.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). The social dynamics of native and non-native variation in complimenting behavior. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.) *The Dynamic Interlanguage. Empirical Studies in Second Language Variation* (pp. 219-236). Plenum Press.
- Wong, J. (2002). 'Applying' conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40(1), 37-60.
- Yu, J. (2005). Comparison of questions in conversational English, foreigner talk discourse and Korean EFL textbook dialogues. *English Teaching*, 60(1), 29-40.

THE AUTHORS

Yujong Park is currently associate professor in the English Language and Literature department at Sungkyunkwan university. Her research interests include the analysis of institutional talk using conversation analytic methodology and classroom discourse analysis. (Email: yujpark@skku.edu)

Nan Pan received a MA from the English Language and Literature department at Sungkyunkwan university in 2020. He is interested in second language learning and teaching. (Email: npan587@gmail.com).

THE AUTHORS' ADDRESSES

Yujong Park
English Language and Literature department
Humanities and Social Science Campus
Sungkyunkwan university
25-2 Sungkyunkwan-ro, Jongno-gu
Seoul110-745, Korea
Phone: 02-760-0255

Nan Pan
English Language and Literature department
Humanities and Social Science Campus
Sungkyunkwan university
25-2 Sungkyunkwan-ro, Jongno-gu
Seoul110-745, Korea

Received on December 22, 2021

Reviewed on February 13, 2022

Revised version received on March 17, 2022