Looking for interactional competence in textbooks

Paul Stone, Matthew Kershaw, Asa Brinham

Introduction

In this paper, we discuss our search for materials to use in our university-level classes focused on developing students' English interactional competence (IC). In short, we are searching for commercially-produced English language teaching (ELT) textbooks that will help us to develop our Japanese students' interactional ability. With this in mind, the aim of the current project is to evaluate materials included in four textbooks for how these materials might be of use in our classes. Before we present our evaluation of the materials, we will first discuss research into textbooks, the concept of IC, and how we went about looking for IC in textbooks.

Textbooks

Textbooks are argued to be one of the most important resources available in ELT classroom education (Khodabakhshi, 2014, p. 959). The publishing of coursebooks is a multi-million dollar industry and textbooks are "the visible heart of any ELT programme" for both teachers and students (Sheldon, 1988, p. 237). Given textbooks' almost universal use (Hutchinson and Torres, 1994, p. 513) they not only affect the teaching that occurs in classrooms around the world (Najafi Sarem et al., 2013), but may even dictate the material covered in the curriculum (Ishihara and Paller, 2016, p. 1). Nonetheless, as Sheldon (1988) notes, teachers and students have ambivalent feelings towards textbooks. These range from the belief that textbooks are useful labour-saving tools to the idea that they are skillfully marketed "rubbish" (Brumit, 1980, p. 30).

One common complaint from teachers regards the "stilted and unnatural"

language presented in textbooks (Fujimoto, 2020). The problem, however, is not simply that language in textbooks is unnatural. Cunningsworth (1987) noted that, despite the shift to more communicative teaching styles, learners were still not being presented with "adequate models of language in use". The focus was on language items, but not how they were actually to be used and, as Kramsch (1981) observed, textbooks lacked materials that developed interactional skills. Cunningsworth and Kramsch were writing in the 1980s, but three decades later the situation appears to be not much improved (e.g. Ishihara, 2020).

Despite this dissatisfaction with textbooks, they can nonetheless be a useful classroom tool, and their use may be compulsory on some courses. Teachers and administrators will therefore need to make choices about the textbooks that best suit the needs of their students and align with the aims of their courses. Since the 1980s, there has been increasing recognition that EFL learners need to develop their interaction skills, and the study reported on in this paper is part of a series of projects investigating how teachers can help learners do this. In the current project, we have been searching for published materials to use in our classes focused on developing these interactional skills. The project aimed to analyze popular commercially-available textbooks to discover to what degree the materials presented in them could be used to develop learners' interactional competence.

In the following we will introduce both IC and conversation analysis (CA), which is a methodological framework often used in IC studies. We will then go on to present our analysis. We will start, though, by giving a brief introduction to the related field of pragmatics, and discuss how IC and CA relate to pragmatics.

Pragmatics

While it may seem a distraction to devote a section to pragmatics in a paper that focuses on IC, there are two main reasons for doing this. One is that pragmatics researchers have been particularly critical of the inauthentic language in textbooks, as well as the lack of activities designed to promote contextualized language use

(Ishihara and Paller, 2016, p. 1). Another is that pragmatics and IC are closely related, so much so that a chapter on IC appears in a pragmatics handbook (Young, 2019) and articles on IC appear in the Journal of Pragmatics (e.g Kecskes et al., 2018).

Pragmatics is a wide field, with its exact definition being a contentious issue (Kasper, 2006, p. 281). However, a very basic understanding is that it is the study of "how language is used" (Cutting, 2002, p. 396). As "a broad subfield of linguistics concerned about how language is used in social situations" (Talandis and Ronald, 2020, p. 3) pragmatics tries to get at what speakers mean, considering aspects of language use such as politeness, context, and culture. It can be considered the study of how language is used for particular goals, including how something is said and then interpreted.

The concept of *pragmatic competence* has been important in influencing approaches to teaching foreign languages. To be pragmatically competent means to make yourself understood as you intend, while also being able to accurately interpret someone else's intentions (Ronald and Fukazawa, 2020, p. 31). Many areas of pragmatics need to be learned when studying a language, but the most frequently researched, and probably also the most frequently taught, is speech acts (Kasper, 2006). Speech acts are utterances that perform particular actions, such as 'greeting' or 'requesting'.

Pragmatics and IC

IC can perhaps be thought of as one aspect of pragmatics. As such, a consideration of pragmatics, and what it has to say about ELT textbooks, can inform the current study, which aims to investigate how IC features in textbooks. Nonetheless, IC and pragmatics are not the same phenomenon (Young, 2019). While pragmatics research often focuses on a speaker's choice of linguistic forms, IC goes beyond the individual speaker and instead sees IC as being co-constructed by all participants in an interaction (Young, 2019). In other words, unlike pragmatic

competence, IC is not something that is possessed by a particular person, but is instead shared among participants. This is because a successful interaction is built through the collaborative efforts of the interactional partners (Kramsch, 1986, p. 367). For example, Shea (1994) shows how English learners with similar levels of communicative competence displayed very different knowledge of English when interacting with different partners.

Interactional Competence

As with pragmatics, there is lack of agreement as to what exactly IC is (Waring, 2018), and L2 researchers and practitioners have struggled with how to make use of it (Sandlund and Sundqvist, 2019, p. 357). The roots of IC are interdisciplinary, and current applications of IC to language learning take influence from ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972), communicative competence (Canale and Swain, 1980), and language socialization (Ochs and Schieffen, 1984) among others. This lack of a clear definition poses problems for the current study, as we attempt to search for IC in textbooks.

IC can perhaps be understood most simply as "competence to participate in interaction" (Kasper and Ross, 2013, p. 9). Joint management of an interaction is central to IC, and Young (2011, p. 428) has argued that IC is how interactional resources are "employed mutually and reciprocally by all participants in a particular discursive practice". Following these views, IC can be seen as the mutual use of interactional resources to organize and participate in an interaction. These resources, which are both verbal and embodied, are used by participants to help with taking turns to speak, repairing interactional problems, opening and closing interactions, initiating the telling of a story, and many other aspects of interaction (Pekarek Doehler, 2019, pp. 29-30).

But what does all of this mean for teaching IC? As Waring notes (2018, p. 57), IC is a "conceptually treacherous notion". One problem is the use of the word 'competence' which, following Chomsky (1965), has traditionally been used

to refer to a person's knowledge of a language rather than how a language is used. IC is very much about language use, and so the use of 'competence' is problematic. A further problem with the term 'competence' is that it "has often been taken to refer to a characteristic of an individual speaker that can deployed independent of context", while IC is interested in context-specific, shared practices (Young, 2019, p. 97).

Waring (2018) suggests that one way to develop a teachable understanding of IC is to shift the focus from knowledge and ability, to interactional *practices*. In other words, focusing on the observable manifestations of IC rather than its conceptual underpinnings. CA is a methodological framework often used by IC researchers when analyzing recordings of interactions, and Waring notes that the model of interactional practices developed by CA can serve as a template for specifying what IC is. The practices described by CA research include methods for turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring, and repair (Waring, 2018, p. 59). We will explain these concepts more clearly when we outline our criteria below.

Why use Conversation Analysis?

For a short introduction to CA, see Stone and Brinham (2022). Here, we will briefly outline why CA is a good fit for our current project investigating IC in textbooks, and also how some CA researchers have been critical of pragmatics. While CA's focus on social actions performed with language may make it seem a good fit for pragmatics (Brown, 2020), CA researchers have criticized aspects of pragmatics. A brief look at one of these criticisms can help to shed light on how IC differs from these aspects of pragmatics.

Pragmatics focuses on speakers' intended meanings as they choose from available linguistic resources. However, Kasper (2006) has argued that speech act research in particular places too great a focus on isolated examples of language use, without a careful enough consideration of the interaction. Although there are many speech acts studies that look at interactions, it is the way that speech acts are

theorised that is problematic. In short, Kasper (2016, p. 286) shows how speech act research requires the researcher to make assumptions about a speaker's intentions, rather than looking at what happens in the interaction itself to ground claims. Kasper gives as an example a speech acts study (Achiba, 2003) that coded the utterance "you can make it if you try" as a 'request', when it could equally have been understood as a 'suggestion'. This shows how, in a speech acts study, the researcher makes assumptions about the speaker's intentions.

Kasper argues that applying CA methodology would be a remedy for this. CA researchers do not attempt to speculate about what is happening in a speaker's head, and instead determine the meaning of an utterance by looking at how it is treated by the participants in the interaction. That is, CA researchers do not guess what a speaker intends, but rather look at what happens next in an interaction to ascertain the meaning of an utterance. Kasper (2016, p. 289) illustrates this with the following example (from Koshik, 2003), which has been slightly simplified for presentation here.

```
Debbie: I do'know, jus don't blow off your girlfriends for
        guys, Shel.
Shelly: Deb. I'm not.
```

Kasper argues that, from a rationalist perspective, Debbie's turn could be understood in different ways. For example, it could be an 'admonition', a 'request', a 'suggestion', or a 'complaint'. However, Shelly displays no ambiguity about the intended meaning in her response, which demonstrates that she treats it as an accusation (that she denies). As such, from a CA perspective, the 'accusation' is co-constructed as such by the participants themselves.

This makes CA a good fit with IC's focus on how participants work together to make meaning in an interaction. Hall and Pekarek Doehler (2011) stress the value of CA when discussing IC. They note how IC involves the ability to work with

others to both use and recognize patterns of turn-taking, and CA is a methodology that has done much to illuminate how participants enact these patterns. As such, in this study, we will turn to the findings of CA research when looking for IC in textbooks.

Looking for authentic interaction in textbooks

As discussed above, there is a widespread belief that language presented in textbooks is stilted and unnatural, and researchers have looked for examples of more natural interactional language in them. Pragmatics researchers have been particularly active in this endeavour, and given the close relationship between pragmatics and IC (despite the differences discussed above) it seems important to look at what this research has found.

Ishihara (2020, p. 21) has argued that "pragmatics is still rather neglected, often as no more than 'frills' in the L2 curriculum", with a mismatch between authentic and textbook language often being reported (e.g. Bernsten 2002; Ishihara and Paller, 2016; Nguyen and Ishitobi, 2012; Wong, 2002). This is not to say that pragmatics is completely ignored in textbooks. However, the way it is incorporated is inconsistent. Studies of speech acts in popular textbooks have found that while some speech acts (such as 'requests', 'giving opinions', and 'disagreeing') are often well represented, many are largely absent or randomly distributed across coursebooks (Delen and Tavil, 2010; Tavakoli, 1995). Diepenbroek and Derwing's (2013) study of 48 textbooks, for example, found that while some textbook series include many speech acts, their reasons for choosing these are not clear. And when speech acts are taught, they are often not pragmatically grounded with clear explanations and authentic example dialogues (Petraki and Bayes, 2013). There are not only problems with the way that language is presented, but also with the types of activities that are included. A number of studies have found that activities are often highly structured and focus on controlled practice with few opportunities for more open interaction (e.g. McGroarty and Taguchi, 2005). In short, pragmatics

and authentic language seem to be in short supply in textbooks.

The current project

The above should perhaps cause us some pessimism in our search for IC in commercially-available ELT textbooks. Nonetheless, teachers and administrators need to choose from what is currently available on the market, and an understanding of to what degree textbooks may include aspects of IC will be useful in helping to make informed decisions. The aim of the current project is to find published ELT teaching materials that we would be able to utilize in courses designed to develop our learners' English IC. To do this, we analyzed textbooks currently used in English courses taught at universities in Japan to see how far the language and activities presented in them are compatible with an IC approach.

Our rubric

As discussed above, in our analysis we will utilize the model of interactional practices developed by CA researchers (i.e. turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring, and repair practices). Also, given that a key defining feature of IC is that it is shared among participants, language and activities presented in the textbooks should stress the interactive nature of language use. And, as IC is seen as being specific to particular interactional practices, it would also be important to describe interactional contexts so that learners can understand the interactional norms of specific settings. Based on this, we have attempted to create a rubric that would allow us to evaluate the example language and activities presented in textbooks for their focus on IC. The rubric, which was designed to be simple to use so that we could efficiently evaluate the texts, is presented below.

CA's model of interactional practices			
	Main focus of the material	**Present in the material**	**Not present in the material**
Turn-taking practices			
Sequencing practices			
Overall structuring practices			
Repair practices			
The following questions are for example dialogues only			
	Yes	**A little**	**No**
Is the interactional context (e.g. participants, relationships, time, place, etc.) explained?	*The interactional context is sufficiently explained*	*Some of the context is introduced, but not sufficiently*	*None of the interactional context is introduced*
Do example dialogues resemble natural talk, as described in CA research?			
The following questions are for activities (including tasks, etc.) only			
	Yes	**A little**	**No**
Does the activity require students to collaborate to perform an interactional practice?			
Does the activity contextualize the language being taught?			

CA's model of interactional practices

The rubric is divided into three parts. The first part concerns the interactional practices described in CA research, and this part was used to evaluate every material presented in each unit that we analyzed. The next two parts contain questions specifically for example dialogues and activities respectively. To more fully understand the terms used in the first part, teachers unfamiliar with CA may wish to refer to an introductory text, such as Wong and Waring (2010), which introduces CA and how it may be used in second language pedagogy. Here, we will offer a brief outline of the terms.

Taking turns at talk is one the key elements of having an interaction, and *turn-taking practices* refers to ways of taking and allocating these turns. This includes methods for starting and ending turns (e.g. participants may use a turn-entry device, such as "well", to start a turn when they are not completely ready to speak, or they may use a phrase like "something funny happened today" to start a story-telling). It also includes practices for selecting the next speaker. A current speaker may use gaze, gesture, or a verbal nomination to select a next speaker, or may design a turn so that it is clear who the next speaker should be. Another participant may also self-select as next speaker, without being nominated.

Sequencing practices refers to the ways in which turns are arranged into sequences. The most basic sequence is the adjacency pair, such as a question and answer. This two-part sequence may be expanded with a third part, such as when someone thanks someone else for answering their question. Participants perform various social actions, such as requesting or inviting, through sequences and the sequences can be expanded (with pre-, insert-, and post-expansions). An insert-expansion, for example, can happen when someone who has been asked a question needs to confirm something with the questioner before giving their answer. Lines 2 and 3 in the following provides an example of an insert-expansion (the example is from Schegloff, 2007, p. 109, but presented here as modified by Wong and Waring, 2010, p. 60):

```
01 Cus:   May I have a Budweiser?
02 Ser:   Are you twenty-one?
03 Cus:   No.
04 Ser:   No.
```

Sequencing practices also include things like the concept of *preference*. This refers to the notion that certain types of turn are socially preferred. For example, an acceptance is generally preferred to a rejection, and an agreement is usually

preferable to a disagreement. Dispreferred actions are often delayed or mitigated somehow.

Overall structuring practices refers to larger patterns of organization, such as how to open and close an interaction. CA research has, for example, identified four basic sequences for opening a telephone conversation (Wong and Waring, 2010), and described how people do not just suddenly end an interaction, but perform *pre-closings* first so that they can end the interaction comfortably.

Repair practices refers to ways of dealing with problems in understanding. The use of repair does not mean that speakers are somehow disfluent, and repair is an important part of interaction and IC. A speaker may choose to repair a problem in their own turn, such as when they replace one word with another (e.g. "I'll see you Tuesday. Sorry, Wednesday."). This is referred to as *self-initiated self-repair*, as the speaker both initiates and provides the repair by themselves. Another speaker may initiate repair of something in someone else's turn if they do not understand (e.g. by asking "What do you mean?"), which is called *other-initiated self-repair* as another participant initiates repair about something in the speaker's turn, and the speaker then offers that repair themselves (e.g. by explaining more clearly). Other types of repair are *self-initiated other repair* and *other-initiated other repair*. Another important type of repair is the *word search*, which happens when a participant has trouble finding the right word to use in their turn.

Method

We selected four textbook series used by teachers at universities in Japan (as revealed in syllabus details published online), focusing on two levels of each series (e.g. beginner and intermediate). For each textbook, we selected three units for evaluation (the first unit, the last unit, and a unit from the middle of the textbook). We then used the above rubric to evaluate each activity and example dialogue presented in each selected unit.

Regarding CA's model of interactional practices, we first looked to see if we

could identify a particular practice as being the "main focus of the material", which is the first column in the first part of the rubric. We use "material" to refer to all of the activities, exercises, tasks, dialogues, and so on, that appear in the textbooks. The second column is for materials in which we could identify a CA practice, but it was not the main focus. The third and final column is for materials in which we could not clearly identify the presence of practices from CA's model.

As Waring (2018, p. 63-4) notes, CA has yet to make much influence on ELT textbooks, and as such we were not expecting to find CA terms explicitly used in the textbooks. Rather, we were looking for evidence of practices that could be understood (and therefore taught) in CA terms. For example, material in *Top Notch 1* (p. 115) asks students to listen to and repeat the following dialogue, focusing on the rising intonation in B's turn.

A: Could I have a look at those bowls?

B: **These small ones?**

A: No, the big ones.

The textbook does not use any CA terminology, and introduces this as an activity focused on "rising intonation for clarification", suggesting the influence of Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis rather than CA. However, from a CA perspective B's turn can be seen as initiating repair on A's turn, making this an example of other-initiated self repair, and a teacher with knowledge of CA could therefore use this activity to help teach other-initiated repair. It is in this sense that we consider repair practices to be the "main focus of the material".

The second and third turns in the above dialogue could further be understood as an insert-expansion, and so we also evaluated this material as being easily used in class to teach sequencing practices (we could, for example, ask students to think of different insert-expansions for this dialogue). As such, we would consider sequencing practices to be "present in the material" but not the main focus (which

is B's initiation of repair). However, we do not see how this interaction starts or ends, and so overall structuring practices are not present in the material.

Data

The four textbook series that we selected were the advanced and starter levels of *Cutting Edge New Edition* (2016), the elementary and pre-intermediate levels of *Keynote* (2018), levels 1 and 2 of *Active Skills for Communication* (2010), and levels 1 and 2 of *Top Notch 3rd edition* (2015). Here, we present our analysis of each textbook. The numbers in the tables represent the percentage of the total materials in the textbook for which that cell applies (i.e. if "100" is written in the cell for "turn-taking practices", it means that we could identify turn-taking practices in 100% of materials in that textbook).

Table 1. Cutting Edge

CA's model of interactional practices						
	Main focus of the material		Present in the material		Not present in the material	
Textbook level	**Starter**	**Adv**	**Starter**	**Adv**	**Starter**	**Adv**
Turn-taking practices	0	5	41	15	59	80
Sequencing practices	2	4	38	5	60	91
Overall structuring practices	1	4	13	4	86	92
Repair practices	0	0	5	9	95	91
The following questions are for example dialogues only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	**Starter**	**Adv**	**Starter**	**Adv**	**Starter**	**Adv**
Is the interactional context of example dialogues explained?	0	16	4	7	96	77
Do example dialogues resemble talk, as described in CA research?	0	8	4	19	96	73
The following questions are for activities (including tasks, etc.) only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	**Starter**	**Adv**	**Starter**	**Adv**	**Starter**	**Adv**
Does the activity require students to collaborate to perform an interactional practice?	17	18	4	12	79	70
Does the activity contextualize the language being taught?	0	0	3	12	97	88

Table 2. Keynote

CA's model of interactional practices						
	Main focus of the material		Present in the material		Not present in the material	
Textbook level	Elem.	Pre-I	Elem	Pre-I	Elem	Pre-I
Turn-taking practices	0	13	24	17	76	70
Sequencing practices	2	3	16	12	82	85
Overall structuring practices	0	0	13	5	87	95
Repair practices	0	0	0	0	100	100
The following questions are for example dialogues only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	Starter	Pre-I	Starter	Pre-I	Starter	Pre-I
Is the interactional context of example dialogues explained?	42	13	0	37	58	50
Do example dialogues resemble talk, as described in CA research?	25	12	0	13	75	75
The following questions are for activities (including tasks, etc.) only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	Starter	Pre-I	Starter	Pre-I	Starter	Pre-I
Does the activity require students to collaborate to perform an interactional practice?	24	25	0	0	76	75
Does the activity contextualize the language being taught?	9	8	0	7	91	85

Table 3. Active

CA's model of interactional practices						
	Main focus of the material		Present in the material		Not present in the material	
Textbook level	1	2	1	2	1	2
Turn-taking practices	13	0	57	58	30	42
Sequencing practices	21	20	43	45	36	35
Overall structuring practices	9	0	2	10	89	90
Repair practices	0	0	7	0	93	100
The following questions are for example dialogues only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	1	2	1	2	1	2
Is the interactional context of example dialogues explained?	53	87	13	0	34	13
Do example dialogues resemble talk, as described in CA research?	0	0	0	0	100	100

The following questions are for activities (including tasks, etc.) only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	1	Pre-I	1	Pre-I	1	Pre-I
Does the activity require students to collaborate to perform an interactional practice?	48	35	0	0	52	65
Does the activity contextualize the language being taught?	32	16	20	19	48	65

Table 4. Top Notch

CA's model of interactional practices						
	Main focus of the material		Present in the material		Not present in the material	
Textbook level	1	2	1	2	1	2
Turn-taking practices	7	0	34	52	59	48
Sequencing practices	8	0	31	45	61	55
Overall structuring practices	0	0	8	21	92	79
Repair practices	7	0	3	7	90	93
The following questions are for example dialogues only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	1	2	1	2	1	2
Is the interactional context of example dialogues explained?	5	4	11	11	84	85
Do example dialogues resemble talk, as described in CA research?	0	0	4	0	96	100
The following questions are for activities (including tasks, etc.) only						
	Yes		A little		No	
Textbook level	1	2	1	2	1	2
Does the activity require students to collaborate to perform an interactional practice?	30	33	0	19	70	48
Does the activity contextualize the language being taught?	0	5	3	7	97	88

Findings

The most striking finding was perhaps also the most predictable. The textbooks really did not include much focus on CA or on natural interaction. Most of the example language presented in the textbooks could indeed be described as "stilted" and did not resemble the interactions described in CA literature. Particularly, the language presented in both *Top Notch* and *Active* almost never resembled natural talk. While *Cutting Edge* also had very few example dialogues that resembled CA

talk, some units did come with video resources (produced to a high professional standard) that featured less-scripted language. Keynote perhaps faired best in this regard. This was due to the inclusion of TED Talks that, while not dialogues, were examples of "real-world" language that was not written and recorded especially for inclusion in the textbook.

Although the language presented was largely unnatural, *Active* was also the textbook that offered the most focus on the interactional practices described in CA (or, at least, the most potential for a teacher with knowledge of CA to focus on them). We could identify these practices, even if the way they were presented was perhaps unnatural. This was not only the case in *Active*, and all the textbooks included some activities and example language in which we could identify elements of CA's model of interactional practices (such as the example from *Top Notch 1* that we presented in the Methods section above). Again, this was the case even if the example language was not necessarily very natural. *Keynote* offered the fewest activities in which we could identify practices described in CA. Nonetheless, as noted above, the TED Talk presentations that form an important part of the *Keynote* series provide students with language that has not been especially scripted for the textbook, and the presentations include features of turn-taking described in the CA literature - particularly, language used to claim longer turns at talk.

Looking at the interactional practices, turn taking and sequencing practices were far-and-away the most frequently present. Sequencing practices included patterns for performing actions, such as agreeing or bargaining, and often featured adjacency pairs (such as a question and answer) and three-part exchanges. Turn-taking practices included turn-initial practices, nominations of the next speaker, and the use of intonation to perform a full turn at talk. For example, page 3 of *Top Notch 2* includes a dialogue in which one of the characters says "Hey, we should keep in touch". The "hey" at the beginning of the turn is a turn-initial misplacement marker (Levinson, 1983), and it tells us that this turn will not continue the previous

talk, but will instead initiate some new action.

Overall structuring practices were included much less frequently. These often appear in early units in the textbooks, which feature language for introducing and meeting people for the first time, but then are often neglected throughout the remaining units (although openings of telephone conversations were sometimes included in later units). Repair practices were almost completely overlooked, with only a handful of activities including some focus on them. Given the importance and prevalence of repair in everyday talk, this is perhaps surprising and disappointing.

When providing example dialogues and phrases, the interactional context is quite often not explained sufficiently, or even at all. *Keynote* did offer some explanations of the context of the example language, as the context of the particular TED Talk being focused on was introduced. According to our analysis, about half of the example language that was introduced in the *Keynote* units had some explanation of the context. *Active* featured more activities that included some introduction of the context of the example dialogues than *Keynote* did. This was due to the fact that many of the activities were preparation for the final task, and the textbook introduced the example dialogues with some context to prepare students for this task. *Top Notch* and *Cutting Edge* featured very little explanation of the context of example language. For example, on page 7 of *Cutting Edge Advanced*, students are asked to "Listen to six people talking about globalization". However, we do not learn who these people are, why they are talking about globalization, why they are talking alone (these are monologues, rather than dialogues), when and where they were speaking, who they were speaking to, and so on.

While example dialogues were often not contextualized, the language that students were asked to use in spoken activities was even less likely to be contextualized. That is, the textbooks often presented example phrases and language to use, but without paying much attention to when this language might be

used and who with. According to our analysis, only about 17% of all the activities across the textbooks offered an explanation of the context in which the language might be appropriately used. Again, the textbook that performed best in this regard was *Active*, which featured many activities that introduced language to be used in later classroom tasks. In these activities, the context of use was often sufficiently explained (the context being the upcoming classroom task), as the aim was to give examples of language that would prepare students for their own interactions.

Finally, as IC is something that needs to be developed in interactions, we wanted to see to what degree the activities in the textbooks required students to collaborate to perform interactional practices. Overall, about a third of all the activities in the textbooks required students to interact with one another to some degree. *Active* and *Top Notch 2* provided the most activities that required leaners to interact, with about half of the activities in these textbooks requiring interaction.

Discussion and conclusion

Our aim in doing this project was to evaluate to what degree the textbooks may be of use to us in our classes focused on developing learners' IC. To do this, we largely looked for elements of CA's model of interactional practices. As there are argued to be only traces of CA's influence in ELT textbooks (Waring, 2018, p. 63-4), we were not expecting to find many materials based on CA findings in our study. We were not, therefore, expecting to find textbooks that a teacher with no knowledge of CA or IC could use to teach these. Rather, we were looking for materials that teachers with some knowledge of CA/IC would be able to use and easily adapt in a class that focuses on developing IC. For example, dialogues presented in the textbooks may include features of CA's model of interactional practices without explicitly referencing or describing them, and a teacher familiar with CA can use and expand on these materials to help develop learners' IC.

Overall, as with the previous research conducted on textbooks discussed earlier, we did not find evidence of CA practices in most of the activities that we

looked at, meaning that these activities would not allow us to focus on CA and IC in our classes. Furthermore, when providing example phrases and dialogues, the contexts of use were often not sufficiently explained. Nor did the example language resemble naturally-occurring talk, as described in CA research. While many of the activities (about a third of all activities that we looked at across the textbooks) did require students to interact with one another, we felt that this percentage could be higher. If students were to study using these four textbooks, without any adaptations, they would spend most of their time working alone. As taking part in interactions is one important context in which IC can be developed, we feel that this would not be the best use of shared classroom time.

Particularly worrying from a teaching perspective was the relative lack of repair practices. These practices are a very important and common aspect of interaction (and therefore IC), and are of particular importance to language learners as they try to establish intersubjectivity in their interactions with others. It is therefore far from ideal that they should feature so little in the textbooks that we looked at. Teaching repair practices will equip learners with important resources that will help them successfully manage interactions in the L2, and these should be a central part of any course that aims to develop IC.

Nonetheless, all the textbooks we looked at did feature activities and example language that teachers with knowledge of CA and IC could draw upon in their classes. Teachers would, however, likely want to supplement the textbooks with CA data to better illustrate points. Textbooks can be a useful teaching tool and often feature well-designed activities that engage learners in the classroom. They also offer structure to a course in a way that may not always be achievable for a busy teacher without recourse to a textbook. In the absence of a textbook that draws upon CA research or theories of IC, and for teachers without the time and resources to develop their own courses from scratch, adapting existing materials to include a better focus on CA/IC is the most practical approach, and the textbooks we analyzed did include materials that teachers would be able to use in this way.

Evaluating which of the four textbooks would be best to use in a course that aims to develop students' IC is difficult, as each textbook has its relative merits and demerits in this respect. *Active* appears to be a strong contender, as we identified it as having the greatest presence of CA practices (again remembering that none of the textbooks used CA terminology or appeared to be directly influenced by CA research), the most interactive activities, and the most contextualized examples of language. However, we also evaluated it as the textbook with the least natural language examples. *Top Notch* similarly included many interactive activities and we could find CA practices present in the materials, but the language was also largely unnatural. While *Keynote*'s use of TED Talks meant that the example language was at times more natural, it also meant that there was less focus on dialogues and, therefore, CA practices were harder to find. There was also sometimes inconsistency across textbook levels. For example, *Cutting Edge Advanced* offered more contextual information that the *Starter* level, while we could find more evidence of CA practices in the *Starter* level compared with the *Advanced* level. This highlights the importance of checking each level carefully, as there may be differences between them.

In short, the available textbooks that we looked at are far from ideal for use in a course that aims to develop IC. Nonetheless, it is possible for a teacher with knowledge of CA to find interaction practices described in CA research present in the books, even if the language itself is not particularly natural. While the textbooks vary in precisely what they offer, they all introduce example phrases and interaction patterns, as well as interactive activities, that teachers can adapt and utilize.

References

Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Alemi, M., Jahangard, A., & Hesami, Z. (2013). A comparison of two global ELT

course books in terms of their task types. *IARTEM e-Journal, 5(2),* pp. 42-63.

Active Skills for Communication 1 (2010). Heinle, Cengage Learning

Active Skills for Communication 2 (2010). Heinle, Cengage Learning

Bernsten, S. (2002). *Using conversation analysis to evaluate pre-sequences in invitation, offer, and request dialogues in ESL textbooks.* Unpublished master's thesis. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Brown, A. (2020). Applying conversation analysis to the

development of interactional competence in a second language: A review. *Bulletin of Joetsu University of Education, 40(1),* pp. 275-284.

Brumfit, C. J. (1980). Seven last slogans. *Modern English Teacher, 7(1),* pp. 30-31.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1(1),* pp. 1–47.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Cunningsworth, A. (1987). Coursebooks and conversational skills. In L. E. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (pp. 45-54): British Council.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students.* London: Routledge.

Cutting Edge New Edition Starter (2014). Pearson Longman.

Cutting Edge New Edition Advanced (2014). Pearson Pearson.

Delen, B., & Tavil, Z. M. (2010). Evaluation of four course books in terms of three speech acts: Requests, refusals, and complaints. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9*, pp. 692-697.

Diepenbroek, L. & Derwing, T. (2013). To what extent do popular ESL textbooks incorporate oral fluency and pragmatic development? *TESL Canada*

Journal, 30(7), pp. 1-20.

Fujimoto, D. (2020). Pragmatics, pragmatics everywhere. In J. Talandis Jr., D. Fujimoto, & N. Ishihara (Eds.), *Pragmatics Undercover: The search for natural talk in EFL textbooks* (pp. 10-20). Pragmatics Special Interest Group of the Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1-15). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hutchinson, T. & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change, ELT Journal, *48(*4), pp. 315 –328.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ishihara, N. (2020). Going beyond the icing on the gingerbread: teaching pragmatics more regularly, systematically, and communicatively. In J. Talandis Jr., D. Fujimoto, & N. Ishihara (Eds.), *Pragmatics Undercover: The search for natural talk in EFL textbooks* (p. 21-28). Pragmatics Special Interest Group of the Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Ishihara, N. & Paller, D. L. (2016). Research-informed materials for teaching pragmatics: The case of agreement and disagreement in English. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *SLA research and materials development for language learning* (pp. 87-102). London: Routledge.

Kasper, G. (2006). Speech acts in interaction: Towards discursive pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer & A. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (pp. 281–314). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2013). Assessing second language pragmatics: An overview and introductions. In S. J. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing*

second language pragmatics (pp. 1–40). Bristol: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kecskes, I., Sanders, R. E., & Pomeratz, A. (2018). *Journal of Pragmatics, 124,* pp. 88-105.

Keynote Elementary (2018). Cengage Learning.

Keynote Pre-intermediate (2018). Cengage Learning.

Khodabakhshi, M. (2014). Choose a Proper EFL Textbook: Evaluation of "Skyline" Series. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98,* pp. 959 – 967.

Koshik, I. (2003). Wh-questions used as challenges. *Discourse Studies, 5*, pp. 51-77.

Kramsch, C. J. (1981). *Discourse analysis and second language teaching.* Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 70(4)*, pp. 366–372.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413–469). San Diego: Academic Press.

McGroarty, M. & Taguchi, N. (2005). Evaluating communicativeness of EFL textbooks for Japanese secondary schools. In J. Froedson & C. Holten (Eds.), *The power of context in language teaching and learning* (pp. 211-224). Boston: Thomson Heinle.

Najafi Sarem, S., Hamidi, H. & Mahmoudie, R. (2013). A critical look at textbook evaluation: A case study of evaluating an ESP course-book: English for international tourism. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, *4(2),* pp. 372-380.

Nguyen, H. T. & Ishitobi, N. (2012) Ordering fast food: Service encounters in real-life interaction and in textbook dialogs. *JALT Journal, 34 (2)*, pp. 151−185.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.),

Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2019). On the nature and the development of L2 interactional competence: State of the art and implications for praxis. In M. R. Salaberry & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 25−59). New York: Routledge.

Petraki E. & Bayes, S. (2013). Teaching oral requests: An evaluation of five English as a second language coursebooks. *Pragmatics, 23(3),* pp. 499-517.

Ronald, J. & Fukazawa, S. (2020). Beyond "I've got it!" or "It worked!": from teaching pragmatics to learning pragmatics. In J. Talandis Jr., D. Fujimoto, & N. Ishihara (Eds.), *Pragmatics Undercover: The search for natural talk in EFL textbooks* (p. 29-39). Pragmatics Special Interest Group of the Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Sandlund, E. & Sundqvist, P. (2019). Doing versus assessing interactional competence. In Salaberry, M. & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence* (pp. 357-396). New York: Routledge.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge University Press.

Shea, D. P. (1994). Perspective and production: Structuring conversational participation across cultural borders. *Pragmatics, 4(3),* pp. 357–389.

Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials, *ELT Journal, 42* (2), pp. 21-37.

Stone, P. & Brinham, A. (2022). Turn taking in student Zoom discussion. *Language, Culture and Society, 20,* pp. 1-30.

Talandis, J. & Ronald, J. (2020). Introduction. In J. Talandis Jr., D. Fujimoto, & N. Ishihara (Eds.), *Pragmatics Undercover: The search for natural talk in EFL textbooks* (p. 3-7). Pragmatics Special Interest Group of the Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Tavakoli, F. (1995). *Functional analysis of the dialogues in the Iranian*

senior high school English textbooks. Unpublished Master's thesis. Allameh University, Tehran.

Top Notch 1 3rd edition. (2015). Pearson Education.

Top Notch 2 3rd edition. (2015). Pearson Education.

Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse, 9(1),* pp. 57-67.

Wong, J. (2002). Applying conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks." *IRAL 40 (1):* pp. 37–60.

Wong, J. & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Taylor and Francis.

Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426–443). London: Routledge

Young, R. F. (2019). Interactional competence and L2 pragmatics. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 93-110). New York: Routledge.

教科書における相互作用能力の分析

Paul Stone
Matthew Kershaw
Asa Brinham

　本稿では、相互作用能力（Interactional Competence, IC）の観点から既存の EFL 教材について検討することを目的として行ったプロジェクトについて報告する。本プロジェクトの目的は、日本の大学で現在使用されている教科書が、IC の向上を主な目的とする授業において、どの程度有効であるかという点について分析することにある。ひいては、今回の研究結果が、学習者の IC 向上に関心のある教師が授業に適した教科書を選択する際に有用な情報となることを期待している。

　会話分析（CA）の分野での研究は、IC が具体的にどのようなものであるかを説明する上で大いに貢献してきたといえる。そこで、相互作用に関する CA の記述に基づいてルーブリックを作成し、それを用いて、日本の大学の授業で現在使用されている 4 つの教科書の分析を行った。この分析では、会話の例、話し方の戦略、様々な種類のアクティビティなどに焦点を当て、これらが IC アプローチとどの程度一致しているのかを調査した。その結果、教科書において、CA 研究の結果と合致するような会話の例は、あまり見受けられず、IC についてもほとんど注意が払われていないということが判明した。一方で、教科書中のアクティビティに関しては、CA を理解している教師であれば、学習者の IC を向上させる上で容易に応用可能であるということが明らかとなった。