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Abstract—Only through the materials reflecting the language used by native speakers, can language learners become pragmatically competent in a particular language. Traditionally, dialog as a special tool has been used by textbook writers to enhance learners' linguistic and pragmatic competence in EFL teaching situations. However, despite the need for such authentic materials, the content of most dialogs, in the Iranian EFL textbooks developed by the Iranian materials developers, seems to differ from the type of language used by native speakers. Therefore, the present study attempted to investigate the types and the numbers of speech acts included in Right Path to English and the New Interchange series. For this purpose, 225 utterances from each textbook were selected and analyzed based on the Searle's (1979) speech act framework. The reliability of results was checked by two independent inter-raters. To compare the speech acts included in the two textbooks, the Chi-square formula was employed. The results revealed that there is a meaningful difference between the speech acts used in the two textbooks.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics, which investigates the language use in communication. According to Leech (1983, p. 1), "we cannot really understand the nature of language itself unless we understand pragmatics". From pragmatic perspective, language is used to accomplish tasks. In other words, we do things by uttering words. According to Yule (1996), the act being performed as a result of uttering a sentence is called a "Speech-act" or a "Language function". Speech acts, as stated by Nunan (1999, p.131), are "simply things people do through language, for example, apologizing, complaining, instructing, agreeing and warning". This notion to the language resulted in the "Speech act Theory" which is considered the central debate in pragmatics. According to Bates (1996), the speech act theory was initiated in modern language philosophy by Austin in the 1962 and subsequently developed by others. This theory generally argues that when we use language, we are performing certain acts. As stated by Yule (1996), Austin in his speech act theory distinguished three different types of act involved in or caused by the utterance of a sentence: a locutionary act – speaker's production and hearer's perception of meaningful linguistic expression –, an illocutionary act – the speaker's intentions of uttering a sentence –, and a perlocutionary act – the result or the effect of speaker's utterance on the hearer or listener.

The consideration of pragmatics as a very essential aspect of language teaching and course content development in particular has been emphasized more than the past. According to Rose and Kasper (2001, p. 3), "in many second and foreign language teaching contexts, curricula and materials developed in recent years include strong pragmatic components or even adopt a pragmatic approach as their organizing principle". Textbook as a centre of curriculum and syllabus in most classrooms is not excluded from such considerations. The importance of textbook cannot be underestimated because it determines the students' both in-class and out-of-class learning activities.

One of the main problems of language teaching textbooks is artificiality of their contents. While, over the years, research on the problems in textbooks and course content has increased somewhat, the unauthentic materials in most textbooks continue to remain dominant. Lazaraton and Skuder (1997) claim that "even the most recent text fall short on the authenticity criteria used (formality, turn taking, quantity of talk, etc.). Grant and Starks (2001) believe that” not only is some of this textbook material out-of-date, it could also be criticized for not being an accurate reflection of the
language that learners hear being spoken outside of the classroom”. This artificiality is also observable in dialogues or conversation parts in most textbooks.

Dialogue is often considered as a central and more consistent part of most teaching textbooks because it is the most natural type of language that usually occurs among speakers of a language. Non-native speakers often try to acquire a native-like second or foreign language; therefore, they make any endeavor to produce language as it is used by native speakers of that language. On the importance of authenticity of language teaching materials, Boxer & Pickering (1995, p. 56) have claimed that "Only through the materials that reflect how we really speak, rather than how we think we speak, will language learners receive an accurate account of the rules of speaking in a second or foreign language”. Despite the need for such authentic materials, the content of most dialogues used in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks differs from the natural speech produced by native speakers. Even the textbooks including authentic conversations designed for communicative purposes are claimed to be inadequate. As a result, language teachers, materials developers and authors of textbooks have to investigate the type of speech used by native speakers in real life situations or analyze the textbooks authored by native speakers to explore appropriate materials required for their language teaching program.

The general sentiment related to the content of most textbooks is that they usually fail to provide the necessary and appropriate input in speech acts, and the materials they do present often differ from the type of speech used by native speakers in their everyday situations. It seems to the researcher that Iranian EFL course books are not excluded from this general view and they are not loaded with authentic natural speech acts.

Up to now, several qualitative and quantitative researches with various theoretical orientations have been conducted on ingredients of textbooks, particularly on the dialogues. The results of these studies helps teachers, content developers and textbook writers develop future textbooks with accurate contents and materials. Riverse (1981) has suggested that the teachers and textbook writers should test the learning materials and activities to see how they reflect or require normal uses of language within the classroom community. Previous research have investigated speech acts in real dialogues produced by foreign or second language learners compared to native speakers of that language. This study has compared the speech acts used in the dialogues of textbooks. Previous research have generally investigated the strategies used in producing one or more speech acts, but this study has attempted to determine the frequencies of speech act categories based on Searle’s (1979) paradigm.

Speech act analysis is essential to understanding a dialogue because speech acts are in fact speaker's intentions conveyed by utterances. According to Lazaraton (2001, P. 105), nowadays, oral skills classes at all levels are often structured around functional uses of language. She (2001, P. 112) also claims that by accumulating research on speech acts and different varieties of English, for example, we will be in a better position to teach and design materials based on authentic language and communication patterns. The role of instruction in promoting the students' pragmatic competence has been proved beneficial. Hence, the importance of textbook as the centre of curriculum especially in the EFL setting should not be underestimated. Teachers need to be critical consumers of teaching materials. Research findings show that even the most recent textbooks are inadequate samples of pragmatic information required for developing learners' pragmatic competence. In order for our future textbooks, especially those for EFL purposes, to be accurate and adequate samples of pragmatic information much research need to be done on the quality and quantity of speech acts. Speech act information included in locally-made Iranian EFL textbooks have not been studied comparatively yet. The researcher thinks that the quality and the type of speech acts is one pragmatic aspect of learning a foreign language, which may be neglected or given little attention to in designing Iranian current EFL English textbooks. The present study compares the speech acts used in the dialogues authored by native speakers with those used in the dialogues authored by non-native speakers of English to answer the following questions:

1. What types of speech acts have been used in the dialogues of 'Intro' (1998) authored by native speakers of English?
2. What types of speech acts have been used in the dialogues of 'Right Path to English' (2005) authored by Iranian non-native speakers of English?
3. Are there any correlations between the speech acts used in Intro and speech acts used in Right Path to English?

II. METHODOLOGY

The materials used in this study were the dialogue sections included in the two series of EFL course books. "Right Path to English” is a locally-made textbook series for national purposes written by Birjandi and Soheili (2005) who are native speakers of Persian. "New Interchange Intro” is a series developed for international purposes. This series has been written by Richards, Hull and Proctor (1998) who are all native speakers of English.

The instrument used in this study to analyze the materials was Searle's (1979) model of classifying speech acts. Assertives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives, and Declarations. Each of these categories consists of some sub-categories. As seen in the table 3.1, the category of Directives, for instance, includes several sub-categories like requesting, inviting, ordering, commanding, advising, recommending, suggesting, daring, defying, and challenging.
TABLE 1.
SEARLE’S (1979) CLASSIFICATION OF SPEECH ACTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td>stating, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting, asserting, describing, announcing, insisting, guessing, forecasting, predicting, introducing, calling, complimenting concluding, reasoning, hypothesizing, telling, insisting, or swearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>requesting, warning, inviting, questioning, ordering, commanding, advising, reassuring, summoning, entreating, asking, directing, bidding, forbidding, instructing, begging, recommending, suggesting, daring, defying, and challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>Greeting, thanking, apologizing, regretting, commiserating, congratulating, condoling, deploring, welcoming, surprising, blaming, praising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>Promising, vowing, offering, threatening, refusing, pledging, intending, vowing to do or to refrain from doing something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td>Declaring, christening, firing from employment, resigning, dismissing, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing, blessing, firing, baptizing, and bidding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Utterance as the smallest unit of analysis was considered a valid criterion for data analysis. Hence, the researcher selected the first 225 utterances from Intro, which were equal to the total number of utterances included in Right Path to English series. After the types of speech acts in the two groups were all determined, the frequency of occurrence and the percentage for each category, as indicated in Table 2, were determined to answer the first two questions raised in this research. The reliability of the results was also checked by two independent inter-raters.

TABLE 2.
FREQUENCY AND THE PERCENTAGE OF SPEECH ACT CATEGORIES OBTAINED BY THE RESEARCHER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act Category</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Assertives</th>
<th>Directives</th>
<th>Expressives</th>
<th>Commissives</th>
<th>Declarations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right Path</td>
<td>91(40%)</td>
<td>74(33%)</td>
<td>58(26%)</td>
<td>2(1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>118(52%)</td>
<td>57(25.5%)</td>
<td>50(22%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209(46.5%)</td>
<td>131(29%)</td>
<td>108(24%)</td>
<td>2(0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data, as is somewhat clear from the table 2, indicated that the most frequently used types of speech acts in both textbooks belonged to the three categories of assertives, directives, and expressives, respectively. The commissives, on the other hand, had the least frequency of occurrence. In Right Path to English series, there were just two commissive utterances. This number included about 1 percent of the whole utterances in this series. The same category was not found in Intro at all. The category of commissives, in general, covered only 0.5 percent of the whole data.

The category of assertives in Intro was greater in number than the same category in Right Path to English series. However, for the other categories Right Path to English outnumbered Intro. For example, the number of directives in Right Path to English was 74, while the number of the same category in Intro was 57.

In both series, the category of declarations was not found, at all. As a rule, any category with no frequency is normally deleted from SPSS data list. Therefore, the category of Declarations was not considered in statistical computations.

As mentioned in table 2, assertives as the most frequent category comprised 46.5 percent of the whole data, while both categories of commissives and declarations occurred 0.5 percent (see table 4.2). The main body of speech acts performed in both textbook series belonged to the three categories of assertives, directives, and expressives. The frequency of occurrence of these categories is 448, altogether. This number equals 99.5 percent of the total 448 speech acts. The frequency of occurrence and the percentage of each category have been presented in table 4.1.

The following diagram shows the percentage of each category of speech acts used in the total 450 utterances. As evident from the diagram, the category of assertives covers approximately half of the whole data. Directives and expressives are also the next two main categories of speech acts in the textbooks.
To answer the third question of this research or to verify whether there was any correlation between the uses of speech acts in the two series of textbooks, the Chi-square test was applied. The critical value of Chi-square with the 3 degrees of freedom and α=0.05 was set at 8.287. This value was more than 7.81 which is the chi-square value intersected for 3 degrees of freedom. As a result, the null hypothesis, which claimed for no significant difference in the use of speech acts between the two series, was rejected.

This study also investigated the number of direct and indirect speech acts used in the two series to see if there was any correlation between them. As indicated in table 4.4, Right Path to English comprised 163 direct and 62 indirect speech acts, while for Intro, there were 175 and 50 direct and indirect speech acts, respectively. Based on the table 3, in both series, the direct speech acts had been used more than the indirect speech acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Frequency and percentage of direct and indirect speech acts in Right Path to English and Intro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right Path to English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Speech act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Speech act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To verify if there was a relationship between the direct and indirect use of speech acts in the two series, the Chi-square formula was performed. As illustrated in table 4.3, the value 1.712 with 1 d.f at the level of 0.5 was resulted. Since the value obtained was less than the Chi-square value 3.84 intersected to 1 degree of freedom at 0.5, the claim for no significant relationship between the direct and indirect use of speech acts in the two series was rejected.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study revealed that dialogues used in these two series were different in the number of utterance included in each turn. For example, in 172 turns selected from Intro, there were 277 utterances. For Right path to English series, only 225 utterances were found. The mean number of utterance per turn used in Intro was 1.6, while the mean number of utterance per turn occurred in Right Path to English was 1.3. As the findings of this study shows, the dialogues of Right Path to English are generally shorter than the dialogues of Intro.

According to Kasper and Rose (2001, p. 5), "the main categories of communicative acts – in Searle's (1976) influential classification, representative, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations – are available in any community, as are such individual communicative acts as greetings, leave-takings, requests, offers, suggestions, invitations, refusals, apologies, complaints, or expressions of gratitude.

Previous research on speech act performance of native speakers of different languages with that of learners of those languages (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990; Beebe & Takanashi, 1989; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Garcia, 1989; Cohen & Oleshtain, 1993; Holmes, 1990; Nakai, 1999; Nakata, 1989; Sameshima, 1998) have revealed that the typology of speech acts appears to be universal; however, their realization can vary across cultures and languages. In other words, second or foreign language learners may access the same range of speech acts and realization strategies as do native speakers (Fraser, Rintell, & Walters, 1980; Walters, 1979), but they differ from native speakers in the strategies they use. In a comparative study on Chinese and English, Colvin (2002) concluded that the five different speech act categories were also found in Chinese language with the same frequencies as they were found in English, but the strategies used for some speech acts varied significantly.

Although the result of the present study is in line with the universality of speech act categories advocated by previous research findings, the frequencies found in the two textbooks showed discrepancies. One major difference, based on the
research findings, between Right Path to English and Intro was related to the category of commissives. The number of commissives occurred in Right Path to English was two, while this category did not occur in the Intro. It is tempting to say that in the Anglo-Saxonist culture speakers avoid involving themselves in a proposition. To put it differently, native speakers of English tend to use hedges, while native speakers of Persian seem to commit themselves in a proposition and use more commissives comparing to those employed by native speakers of English. This fact refers to the difference in the strategies employed by speakers of both languages.

Another striking finding was that indirect speech acts used in Right Path to English outnumbered those used in Intro. Following Brown and Levinson (1987), all cultures have been identified as being more or less direct. Bialystock (1993) suggests that languages themselves may differ in directness; however, the findings indicate that the types of structures used in Right Path to English are more polite compared to Intro. This is in line with Eslamirasekh (1993) stating that in a polite society like Persian, imperatives or directives are normally awkward and abrupt. In other words, Persian culture values indirectness. Although speech acts may be direct, the majority in everyday conversation are indirect.

According to Kasper and Rose (2001, p. 5), "the main categories of communicative acts – in Searle’s (1976) influential classification, representative, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations – are available in any community, as are such individual communicative acts as greetings, leave-takings, requests, offers, suggestions, invitations, refusals, apologies, complaints, or expressions of gratitude.

Previous research on speech act performance of native speakers of different languages with that of learners of those languages (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990; Beebe & Takanashi, 1989b; Blum-Kulk, House, & Kasper, 1989; Garcia, 1989; Cohen & Oleshtain, 1993; Holmes, 1990; Nakai, 1999; Nakata, 1989; Sameshima, 1998) have revealed that the typology of speech acts appears to be universal; however, their realization can vary across cultures and languages. In other words, second or foreign language learners may access the same range of speech acts and realization strategies as do native speakers (Fraser, Rintell, & Walters, 1980; Walters, 1979), but they differ from native speakers in the strategies they use. In a comparative study on Chinese and English, Colvin (2002) concluded that the five different speech act categories were also found in Chinese language with the same frequencies as they were found in English, but the strategies used for some speech acts varied significantly.

Although the result of the present study is in line with the universality of speech act categories advocated by previous research findings, the frequencies found in the two textbooks showed discrepancies. One major difference, based on the research findings, between Right Path to English and Intro was related to the category of commissives. The number of commissives occurred in Right Path to English was two, while this category did not occur in the Intro. It is tempting to say that in the Anglo-Saxonist culture speakers avoid involving themselves in a proposition. To put it differently, native speakers of English tend to use hedges, while native speakers of Persian seem to commit themselves in a proposition and use more commissives comparing to those employed by native speakers of English. This fact refers to the difference in the strategies employed by speakers of both languages.

Another striking finding was that indirect speech acts used in Right Path to English outnumbered those used in Intro. Following Brown and Levinson (1987), all cultures have been identified as being more or less direct. Bialystock (1993) suggests that languages themselves may differ in directness; however, the findings indicate that the types of structures used in Right Path to English are more polite compared to Intro. This is in line with Eslamirasekh (1993) stating that in a polite society like Persian, imperatives or directives are normally awkward and abrupt. In other words, Persian culture values indirectness. Although speech acts may be direct, the majority in everyday conversation are indirect.

The results of the study can have both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretical implications might be useful for researchers wishing to modify the existing theories of speech acts and teaching speaking. Practical implications can be beneficial to material designers, textbook writers, teachers and students.

The results of this study, which is unique in itself, are of great consideration to those who claim responsibility for EFL/ESL courses and syllabus designers. In choosing or developing textbooks and other kinds of teaching materials, textbook writers need to be aware of the research findings in order to select materials that are authentic and motivating for learners.

It seems that syllabus designers should consider the recent classification of speech acts such as requesting, inviting, complaining, apologizing, etc. in designing textbooks because it appears that these categories are universal in all languages and they deserve more attention.

The results of this study can be beneficial to those involving in textbook writing or the teaching career. One possible solution would be the using of successful dialogues reflecting the sociocultural norms of the target language to increase learners' understanding of linguistic behavior of the Iranian EFL learners. The second suggestion is modifying textbook dialogues authored by the Iranian textbook writers.

In general, both learners and teachers should be equipped with tools to make informed choices in negotiating effective communication and in presenting their intentions in a particular context. One suggestion is that teachers can select the materials in the classrooms that model the real language situations. To familiarize learners with different components of communicative competence especially in the use of speech acts, some activities such as tape recordings, role-playing activities, video films, and TV shows are suggested by the author.
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Textbooks as the major source of teaching and learning process in Iranian teaching settings should contain the adequate number of speech acts to promote teachers and learners' pragmatic competence. To design textbooks with sufficient number of speech acts conforming to the norms followed by native speakers of the language, EFL textbook writers should be linguistically and pragmatically competent in the target language in order to be able to incorporate the right numbers of speech acts in EFL textbooks. To recap, the speech acts deserve further attention when designing material and textbooks for Iranian learners of English.

This study was partly descriptive and partly comparative. In the descriptive part, it first attempted to determine the type and the number of speech acts used in two textbooks. In the comparative part, it tried to investigate if there was a correlation between the numbers and type of speech acts categories performed in the two series. Previous research proved that speech acts categories are considered as one of the universals of all languages and these categories are said to be found in all languages nearly with the same range or frequencies. The results showed discrepancies in the use of speech acts between the two series. The frequencies of speech act categories in the above mentioned textbooks were different.

**APPENDIX ONE. RIGHT PATH TO ENGLISH SERIES**

**BOOK ONE**

Lesson 5: Hello
1. A: Hello.1.(Expressives: greetings)
2. B: Hello.2. (Expressives: greetings)
3. A: How are you? 3.(Expressives: greetings)
4. B: I'm fine, 4.(Expressives: greetings) thank you. 5.(Expressives: thanking) And you? 6.(Expressives: greetings)
5. A: Fine, 7.(Expressives: greetings) thanks. 8.(Expressives: thanking)

Lesson 6: Are you a student?
6. A: Good morning! 9.(Expressives: greetings)
7. B: Good morning! 10.(Expressives: greetings)
8. A: Are you a student?1.(Directives: requesting inf.)
10. A: I am a student, too.2.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 7: Is this a desk?
11. A: Is this a desk? 3.(Directives: requesting inf.)
12. B: No, it isn't. 3.(Assertives: informing)
14. B: It's a table. 4.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 8: What is this?
15. Maryam: Hello Zahra. 11.(Expressives: greetings)
17. Maryam: How are you today? 13.(Expressives: greetings)
18. Zahra: Just fine. 22.(Expressives: greetings)
20. Zahra: That's an orange. 5.(Assertives: informing)
22. Zahra: No, this is an apple. 6.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 9: I have an umbrella.
23. A: Good afternoon. 14.(Expressives: greetings)
24. B: Good afternoon. 15.(Expressives: greetings) How are you?16.(Expressives: greetings)
27. A: I have an umbrella, too. 8.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 10: Have you English today?
31. Parvin: I have an umbrella, too. 10.(Assertives: informing)

**BOOK TWO**

Lesson 1: What colour is it?
Lesson 2: Many cars
8. A: Are there many cars in the street, Parvin*? 6.(Directives: requesting inf.)
9. B: No, there are not many cars in the street. 4.(Assertives: informing)
10. A: Are there many buses in the street, too? 7.(Directives: requesting inf.)
11. B: No, there aren’t. 5.(Assertives: denying) There is one bus in the street. 6.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 3: What's your name?
13. B: My name is Nasser Omidi. 8.(Assertives: informing)
15. B: No, it isn't. 9.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 4: What time is it?
21. B: Yes, I have. 12.(Assertives: informing)
22. A: What time is it, please? 12.(Directives: requesting inf.)
23. B: It's about 8 o'clock. 13.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 5: Please hurry up.
27. Hadi: It's late. 15.(Assertives: informing)
28. Akbar: Let's take a taxi. 16.(Directives: suggesting)
29. Hadi: OK. 16.(Assertives: admitting)

Lesson 6: I go to Farabi school.
31. Akbar: Hi. 8.(Expressives: greetings)
32. Mansoor: This is my school. 17.(Assertives: informing)
33. Akbar: I go to Farabi school. 18.(Assertives: informing)
34. Mansoor: I walk to school every day. 19.(Assertives: stating)
35. Akbar: But I go by bus. 20.(Assertives: informing)
36. Mansoor: Nice to see you. 9.(Expressives: farewell)
37. Akbar: Goodbye. See you tomorrow. 10.(Expressives: farewell)

Lesson 7: What's your father?
39. Ali: He is a teacher. 22.(Assertives: informing)
40. Reza: Does he teach Persian? 18.(Directives: requesting inf.)
41. Ali: No, he doesn't. He teaches English. 23.(Assertives: informing)
42. Reza: Do you study English every day? 19.(Directives: requesting inf.)
43. Ali: No, I don't. I study English on Sundays and Tuesdays. 24.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 8: Who is that man?
44. Reza: Who is that man, Ali*? 20.(Directives: requesting inf.)
45. Ali: He is Mr. Hamidi. 25.(Assertives: introducing)
46. Reza: What is he? 21.(Directives: requesting inf.)
47. Ali: He is our teacher. 26.(Assertives: informing)
49. Ali: He lives on Azadi Street. 27.(Assertives: informing)
50. Reza: How many students does he teach? 23.(Directives: requesting inf.)
51. Ali: He teaches many students. 28.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 9: Who is speaking?
52. Ali: Hello. 11.(Expressives: greetings)
55. Reza: This is Reza. 30.(Assertives: introducing)
57. Reza: I'm studying. 31.(Assertives: informing)
59. Reza: English. 32.(Assertives: informing)
60. Ali: Do you study English every day? 28.(Directives: requesting info.)
61. Reza: No, not every day. 33.(Assertives: informing) But I'm practicing it now. 34.(Assertives: stating)
63. Reza: Goodbye. 16.(Expressives: farewell)

Lesson 10: I was sick yesterday.
64. Mina: Hello, Maryam*. 17.(Expressives: greetings) Thank God you are all right. 18.(Expressives: thanking)
65. Maryam: Thanks, Mina. 19.(Expressives: thanking) I was in bed yesterday. 38.(Assertives: stating)
66. Mina: What was it? 29.(Directives: requesting info.)
68. Mina: Are you feeling well? 30.(Directives: requesting info.)
69. Maryam: Yes, I feel fine now. 40.(Assertives: informing)
70. Mina: OK*. See you later. 21.(Expressives: leaving)
71. Maryam: Bye. 21.(Expressives: leaving)

BOOK THREE
Lesson 1: Ahmad's wallet
2. Ali: No, it isn't. 2.(Assertives: informing) The colour of my wallet is brown, but this one is yellow. 3.(Assertives: informing)
3. Amir: Perhaps it's Ahmad's. 4.(Assertives: guessing) He is there at the bus stop. 3.(Assertives: stating)
5. Amir: He's tall and thin and has short black hair. 6.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 2: Our English teacher
8. Nahid: Mrs. Tehrani. 8.(Assertives: informing) She teaches us English. 9.(Assertives: stating)
10. Nahid: Yes, she is. 10.(Assertives: informing) All the students like her very much. 11.(Assertives: informing)
12. Nahid: No, she usually speaks English. 12.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 3: How much or How many?
13. - What are you doing, mother*? 8.(Directives: requesting info.)
14. - I'm cooking lunch. 13.(Assertives: informing) We have some guests today. 14.(Assertives: stating)
15. - How many guests do we have? 9.(Directives: requesting info.)
16. - Five. Your uncle and his family. 10.(Assertives: informing)
17. - Can I help you? 11.(Directives: requesting)
18. - Yes, 15.(Assertives: admitting) get me some rice. 12.(Directives: commanding)
19. - Where is it? 13.(Directives: requesting info.)
20. - In the closet. 16.( Assertives: informing)
22. - About two kilos. 17.(Assertives: informing)
23. - All right. 1.(Commitives: promising)

Lesson 4: I enjoyed the cartoons.
24. Mahin: Do you ever watch TV, Zohreh*? 15.(Directives: requesting info.)
25. Zohreh: Yes, I usually watch TV in the evening. 18.(Assertives: informing)
27. Zohreh: Yes, I enjoyed the cartoons very much. 19.(Assertives: informing)
28. Mahin: Did you watch the news, too? 17.(Directives: requesting info.)
29. Zohreh: Yes, I did. 20.(Assertives: informing)
30. Mahin: Oh, 1.(Expressives: surprising) when did you finish your homework? 18.(Directives: requesting info.)
31. Zohreh: In the afternoon. 21.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 5: I saw him this morning.
33. Reza: Not too bad. 4.(Expressives: greetings)
34. Ali: Did you see Peyman yesterday? 19.(Directives: requesting inf.)
35. Reza: No, I saw him this morning. 22.(Assertives: informing)
37. Reza: We talked about many things. 23.(Assertives: informing)
39. Reza: No, he is in grade two. 24.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 6: I was helping my mother.
40. Nahid: Did you see the film yesterday evening? 22.(Directives: requesting inf.)
41. Mehri: No, I didn't. 25.(Assertives: informing) I was helping my mother. 26.(Assertives: informing)
42. Nahid: What was she doing? 23.(Directives: requesting inf.)
43. Mehri: She was cooking dinner. 27.(Assertives: informing)
45. Mehri: I washed the dirty dishes. 28.(Assertives: informing)
46. Nahid: Did you wash all of them? 25.(Directives: requesting inf.)
47. Mehri: Yes, I did. 29.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 7: May I leave the classroom?
49. Teacher: Yes, 2(commissives: paying attention) what is it? 27.(Directives: requesting inf.)
50. Ali: Reza doesn't feel well. 30.(Assertives: informing)
52. Reza: I have a headache. 31.(Assertives: informing)
53. Teacher: Can't you stay in the classroom? 29.(Directives: requesting inf.)
55. Teacher: Sure. 33.(Assertives: admitting) But you should come back after the break. 31.(Directives: suggesting)

Lesson 8: He usually drives carefully.
56. A: Where is Hamid today? 32.(Directives: requesting inf.)
57. B: He's in hospital. 34.(Assertives: informing)
58. A: Why? 33(Directives: requesting inf.)
59. B: He had a car accident yesterday. 35.(Assertives: informing)
60. A: That's too bad.5.(Expressives: regretting) Is he a careless driver? 34.(Directives: requesting inf.)
61. B: No, he usually drives carefully. 36.(Assertives: informing)
62. A: Was he driving carelessly yesterday? 37.(Assertives: requesting inf.)
63. B: Yes, he was driving fast.38.(Assertives: informing)

Lesson 9: We'll go next week.
64. Amir: Look! 35.(Directive: getting attention) There are a lot of clouds in the sky. 39.(Assertives: informing)
65. Mehdi: Oh, yes. 40.(Assertives: admitting) It may rain tonight. 41.(Assertives: predicting)
66. Amir: Will you go to the country tomorrow? 36.(Directives: requesting inf.)
67. Mehdi: No, we'll go next week. 42.(Assertives: informing)
68. Amir: Why do you often go to the country? 37.(Directives: requesting inf.)
69. Mehdi: We have a lot of relatives there. 43.(Assertives: informing)
70. Amir: Good luck. 6.(Expressives: wishing) Have a good time. 7.(Expressives: wishing)
71. Mehdi: Thanks. 8.(Expressives: thanking) See you later. 9.(Expressives: leave taking)

APPENDIX Two. Intro

Unit 1
1. Michael: Hi! 1.(Expressives: greetings) My name is Michael Parker. 1.(Assertives: introducing)
2. Jennifer: I'm Jennifer Yang. 2.(Assertives: introducing)
3. Michael: It's nice to meet you, Jennifer. 2.(Assertives: responding to introducing)
4. Jennifer: Nice to meet you, too. 3.( Assertives: responding to introducing)
5. Michael: I'm sorry. 4.(Expressives: apologizing) What's your last name again? 1.(Directives: requesting infm.)
7.
8. David: No, I'm not. 4.(Assertives: informing) He's over there. 5.(Assertives: informing)
9. Jennifer: Oh, I'm sorry. 6.(Expressives: apologizing)
10. Jennifer: Steven?6.(Directives: getting attention) This is your book. 6.(Assertives: informing)
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13. Steven: It's nice to meet you. (Assertives: responding to introducing)
14. Steven: David (Directives: getting attention), this is Jennifer. (Assertives: introducing) She is in our math class. (Assertives: informing)
15. David: Hi, Jennifer. (Expressives: greetings)

Unit 2
3.
17. Wendy: Wow! (Expressives: surprising) What's This? (Directives: requesting info.)
20. Helen: You are welcome. (Expressives: complimenting)
21. Rex: Now open this box! (Directives: ordering)
22. Wendy: Ok. (Assertives: admitting) Uh*, what are these? (Directives: requesting info.)
23. Rex: They're earrings. (Assertives: informing)
24. Wendy: Oh! (Expressives: surprising) They're ... interesting. (Expressives: praising) Thank you, Rex. (Expressives: thanking) They're very nice. (Expressives: praising)

Unit 3
2.
35. Tim: Where are you from Jessica? (Directives: requesting info.)
36. Jessica: Well*, my family is here in the United States but we're from Korea originally. (Assertives: informing)
38. Jessica: No, we're not from Seoul. (Assertives: informing) We're from Pusan. (Assertives: informing)
39. Tim: So is your first language Korean? (Directives: requesting info.)
40. Jessica: Yes, it is. (Assertives: confirming)

Unit 4
3.
49. Pat: Are our clothes dry? (Directives: requesting info.)
50. Julie: Yes, they are. (Assertives: informing)
51. Pat: Where are my favorite socks? 22. (Directives: requesting info.)
52. Julie: What color are they? 23. (Directives: requesting info.)
53. Pat: They're white. 38. (Assertives: informing)
54. Julie: Are these your socks? 24. (Directives: requesting info.) They're blue and white. 39. (Assertives: describing)
56. Julie: Yeah. 43. (Assertives: admitting) The problem is this T-shirt. 44. (Assertives: stating) It's dark blue. 45. (Assertives: stating)
57. Pat: Is it Liz's? (Directives: requesting info.)
58. Julie: Actually, it's my T-shirt. 46. (Assertives: informing) I'm sorry. 31. (Expressives: apologizing)
59. Pat: That's OK. 47. (Assertives: admitting) It's not important. 48. (Assertives: complimenting)

60. Pat: Uh-oh! 32. (Expressives: surprising)
62. Pat: It's snowing, and it's very cold! 49. (Assertives: reporting)
64. Pat: No, I'm not. 50. (Assertives: informing)
65. Julie: Well*, you are wearing a coat. 51. (Assertives: stating)
66. Pat: But I'm not wearing boots! 52. (Assertives: complaining)
67. Julie: Ok. 53. (Assertives: admitting) Let's take a taxi. 27. (Directives: suggesting)
68. Pat: Thanks, Julie. 33. (Expressives: thanking)

Unit 5
1.
69. Debbie: Hello? 34. (Expressives: greetings)
70. John: Hi, Debbie. ? 35. (Expressives: greetings) This is John. 54. (Assertives: introducing) I am calling from Australia. 55. (Assertives: stating)
71. Debbie: Australia? 36. (Expressives: surprising)
73. Debbie: Oh, right. 57. (Assertives: informing) What time is it there? 29. (Directives: requesting info.)
74. John: It's 10:00 p.m. 58. (Assertives: informing) And it's four o'clock there in Los Angeles. 59. (Assertives: guessing)
75. Debbie: Right? 30. (Directives: requesting info.)
76. Debbie: Yes- four o'clock in the morning. 60. (Assertives: informing)
77. John: 4:00 A.M.? 37. (Expressives: surprising) Oh, I'm really sorry. 38. (Expressives: apologizing)
78. Debbie: That's OK. 61. (Assertives: admitting) I'm awake … now. 62. (Assertives: stating)

6.
79. Steve: Hi, Mom. 39. (Expressives: greetings)
80. Mrs. Dole: What are you doing, Steve? 31. (Directives: requesting info.)
81. Steve: I'm hungry. 63. (Assertives: reasoning), so I'm cooking. 64. (Assertives: concluding)
82. Mrs. Dole: You're cooking? 40. (Expressives: surprising) It's two o'clock in the morning! 32. (Directives: warning)
83. Steve: Yeah, 65. (Assertives: admitting) but I'm really hungry! 66. (Assertives: complaining)
84. Mrs. Dole: What are you making? 33. (Directives: requesting info.)
85. Steve: Pizza. 67. (Assertives: informing)
86. Mrs. Dole: Mmm, pizza. 68. (Assertives: admitting) So, let's eat! 34. (Directives: requesting)

Unit 6
2.
87. Ashley: Hey, Jason. 69. (Assertives: calling) What are you doing? (Directives: requesting info.)
88. Jason: Oh, I'm waiting for my mom. 70. (Assertives: informing) My bike has a flat tire. 71. (Assertives: stating)
89. Ashley: Is she coming right now? 35. (Directives: requesting info.)
88. Jason: Yeah. She works near here. 72. (Assertives: informing)
90. Ashley: Oh, that's good. 41. (Expressive: welcoming)
91. Jason: So what are you doing? 36. (Directives: requesting info.)
92. Ashley: I'm going home. 73. (Assertives: informing) I don't live far from here, so I walk to school. 74. (Assertives: stating)
93. Jason: You're lucky! 42. (Expressives: wishing)
8.
94. Jack: Let's go to the park on Sunday. 37. (Directives: suggesting)
95. Amy: OK, but let's not go early. I sleep late on weekends.


100. Amy: Do you eat breakfast then? I have breakfast every day.

102. Amy: Then let's meet at Harry's Restaurant at one o'clock. They serve breakfast all day on Sundays for people like us.

103. Linda: Guess what? I have a new apartment.

104. Chris: That's super. What's it like?

105. Linda: It's really beautiful. It has a bedroom, a bathroom, a kitchen, and a living room. Oh, and a big closet in the hall.


110. Chris: Oh, nice. Does it have a view?

111. Linda: Yes, it does. It has a great view of my neighbor's apartment.


115. Chris: And there's no sofa here in the living room.

116. Linda: And there aren't any chairs. There's only this lamp.

117. Chris: So let's go shopping next weekend!

119. Rachel: Where does your brother work?

120. Anela: He's a chef in the restaurant.


127. Richard: Hi, Stephanie. I hear you have a new job.

128. Stephanie: Yes. I'm teaching math at Linton high school.

129. Richard: How do you like it?

130. Stephanie: It's great. The students are terrific.

131. Richard: That's exciting! I'm an air traffic controller now, you know.

134. Adam: What do you want for the barbecue? Hmm. How about chicken and hamburgers?
136. Adam: OK. 110. (Assertives: admitting) We have some chicken in the freezer, but we don’t have any hamburger meat? 111. (Assertives: stating)

137. Amanda: And there aren’t any hamburger rolls. 112. (Assertives: stating)

138. Adam: Do we have any soda? 54. (Directives: requesting infm.)

139. Amanda: No, we don’t. 113. (Assertives: informing) We need some. 114. (Assertives: stating) Oh, (Expressives: surprising) and let’s get some lemonade, too. 55. (Directives: suggesting)

140. Adam: All right. 115. (Assertives: admitting) And how about potato salad? 56 (Directives: suggesting)
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