



A Survey of High Schools English Textbooks in Terms of Using Varying Types of Speech Acts

 **Ehsan Namaziandost,¹**
 **Arash Hashemifardnia,¹**
 **Syed Esmail Hosseini¹**

¹Assistant Professor,
Department of English, Faculty
of Humanities, Shahrekord
Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Shahrekord, Iran

Corresponding Author: Ehsan
Namaziandost

Phone: +98-921-0773832

e-mail: e.namazi75@yahoo.com

Article citation: Namaziandost, E.,
Hashemifardnia, A., & Hosseini, S.
E. (2019). A survey of high school
English textbooks in terms of using
varying types of speech acts, *Applied
Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(4):
24–32.

Received Date: 11 November 2018

Accepted Date: 3 May 2019

Online Date: 5 September, 2019

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2018 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629

ABSTRACT

Although English textbooks are regarded as a crucial part in English language teaching programs, they have been criticized for not offering classroom learner's sufficient opportunity for learning authentic language (Vellenga, 2004). This is because, instead of making use of language samples that native speakers actually produce, many textbooks have drawn on native speakers' intuition about language use, which might not always be reliable. This study investigated the use of speech in conversation parts of Iranian Junior High School English Textbooks (Prospect One, Prospect Two, and Prospect Three) which are usually popular in Iranian language schools and institutions. To this end, the researchers selected and counted all speech acts to see which speech acts were more frequently used based on through Searle's (1976) speech act model. After taking percentage and frequency, Chi-square was also used due to the nominal nature of the data. The results indicated that Assertives and Declaratives were, respectively, the most and the least frequently used speech acts in the Prospect Books. The results of Chi-square test revealed that the speech acts were not distributed equally in the Prospect Books. The findings of this study can assist the material designers to include different types of speech acts in high school English textbooks in order to help the EFL learners develop their communicative and pragmatic knowledge.

Keywords: Speech acts; Pragmatics; Prospect series.

1. Introduction

Recent decades have witnessed main shifts in our understanding of knowledge about language learning and teaching, which have resulted in a new concentrate in the way the languages are learned and taught. One of the most consequential incentives behind this shift of focus has been considered to be the major departure from earlier theoretical frameworks toward a more communicative point of view, which regards language more than an isolated set of grammatical rules.

In parallel with this paradigm shift, education policy passed through a drastic change, as well. As Galvin (2003) states, individuals came to realize the need to be educated and learn different languages to take advantage of the opportunities available in today's fast-paced world. For the L2 learner, a significant amount of time is spent pondering how exams will be structured and contemplating which grammatical features will be

the focus of assessments as chosen by the instructor. A common approach to learning a language may include tasks such as memorizing endless vocabulary lists and grammatical paradigms. And, while this may suffice for students enrolled in a beginner-level course, frustrations arise when they then find they are unable to use the language creatively as they progress to more advanced levels. Why, a student might inquire, have I just successfully constructed a sentence that is grammatically correct yet unable to successfully convey the message I wish to express?

In the contemporary world, given the prevalent cross-cultural communication within and beyond countries, language instruction is expected to focus on communicative use of the target language. In this regard, Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, and Reynolds (1991) contend that when we approach the language class as an opportunity for learners to expand their communication across cultural boundaries, we, as teachers, have the responsibility to equip them with not only the structural aspects of the language, but with the pragmatics as well: more simply, the right words to say at the proper time.

Language pedagogy, therefore, should promote language learners' pragmatic awareness and competence in the target language, especially in terms of emphasis on one of the significant pragmatic features, speech acts, through adequate pedagogical practices. It should be noted that languages have various lexico-syntactic means to realize speech acts, hence established, conventional forms for performing them in a polite, acceptable manner which poses serious problems for EFL learners, for example, in making and mitigating requests (Takahashi, 1996).

Pragmatic competence, one of the core components of communicative competence, is defined as knowing social, cultural, and discourse conventions that have to be followed in various situations. Yule (1996) states that pragmatics generally deals with the intended or invisible speaker meaning. He additionally asserts that pragmatics is the study of "the contextual meaning" ... "how more gets communicated than is said" ... and "the expression of relative distance" (p. 3). Indeed, pragmatics, here, belongs to that part of linguistics that tries to probe into those meanings beyond what is literally conveyed in concrete speech events and situations.

Verschueren (1999) believes that pragmatics is the study of language use, or the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage properties and processes. Leech (1983) believes that pragmatics explores the language use in communication. One of the pragmatics branches is speech act which was first developed by Austin (1962) to explain an utterance with a natural language to get a feedback. Speech acts can change the social reality not only describing a given reality. Speech act is a term usually used for making statements, giving commands, asking questions, or making promises. According to Hurford, Heasley, and Smith (2007), the alleged distinction between speech and act can cause misleading oversimplification because when a speaker makes an utterance in appropriate circumstances, it leads to a misunderstood interpretation of the hearer.

According to Nastri, Pena, and Hancock (2006), the function of speech act is a functional unit of language that informs people to do things with words, which means the speaker performs an act of saying something in order to participate in a communication. Another function of speech act according to Ahmed (2005) is to visualize the spoken words. Speech act makes all the materials of an utterance can create the impression of saying something, as in an utterance has feelings and thoughts, so the utterance becomes more interesting and comprehensible.

Speech act referred to as utterances that can be classified into three aspects; they are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression (Yule, 1996). In other words, locutionary act can be defined as the act of making a meaningful utterance and using a referring expression. The speaker usually uses the identifiable expression to produce a meaningful expression to the hearer. In other words, locutionary act is an act to produce meaningful and understandable utterances. Every utterance expressed is meaningful and understandable so the utterance will be identified further to decide if it is illocutionary act or perlocutionary act. The speaker who tongue tied cannot speak properly so he or she failed in making locutionary act because the language is not understandable.

Example: *Please come to my birthday party.* This is an example of locutionary act of

inviting.

Illocutionary act is a complete speech act, an act of doing something which means the specific purpose of the speaker's intention in mind such as promising, stating, commanding, denial, prediction, request, confirming, etc. (Yule, 1996). "I swear that I will give it back to you" is an example of illocutionary act of promising.

Perlocutionary act is the reaction of the hearer, the consequences of saying something, intended or not (Yule, 1996). The effect after the speaker says something to the hearer; an act is performed as a reaction. The action of the hearer depends on what the speaker says. The effects may be actions, thoughts or feelings. Example: There is something walking on your hair. This utterance may cause a panic situation to the hearer. This perlocutionary act is to cause an emotional and panic situation. Example Hey, you've just won a lottery! This utterance of perlocutionary act may cause a happy and shocking situation to the hearer.

To sum up, 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), nowadays, oral skills classes at all levels are often structured around functional uses of language. She also claimed 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 center of curriculum especially in the EFL setting should not be underestimated.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1 Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory was formulated by the British philosopher John Langshaw Austin in his posthumously published book entitled "How to do things with words in 1962". Searle, who was one of Austin's students in the 1950s, further developed the theory (Jaszczolt, 2002). The emergence of speech act theory is attributed to a growing dissatisfaction with the assumed deficiencies of logical positivism and truth conditional semantics. Logical positivism claims that if a sentence can be verified, or objectively assessed as true or false, then that sentence is said to be meaningful. Similarly, truth conditional semantics considers sentences to be true if they correctly describe states of affairs and false if their description is incorrect (Thomas, 1995). Austin (1962) was among the first to disagree with this approach in a series of lectures in which he argued that sentences like (1) to (3) are used to do certain things and not to describe correctly or incorrectly the states of affairs:

- (1) I apologize for being late,
- (2) I sentence you to five years in prison,
- (3) I name this ship the Princess Elizabeth.

He labeled these acts of apologizing, passing sentence, and naming as speech acts because they are performed through speech. Austin (1962) referred to sentences given above as performative sentences. He further observed that even though these utterances cannot be assessed as true or false, they depend on appropriate circumstances or conditions in order to take effect. He called such conditions felicity conditions.

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.

For the purposes of defining and evaluating our work, we created detailed annotation guidelines for five of Searle's speech act classes: Declarative, Directives, Expressives Commissives, and Representatives.

A) Declarative: A declarative is a kind of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. In using a declaration, the speaker changes the world via words (Wicaksono, 2018). The declaratives utterances can be divided into some sub-categories such as declaring, confirming, blessing, approving, betting, dismissing, naming, etc. Example: Judge: *I sentence you to death*. This utterance expresses a criminal court's verdict that declares a death penalty to the suspect. In this case, the judge's declaration has a legal binding as it meets the felicity conditions in which the judge is taking his role as a presiding judge in a criminal court session (Searle, 1976).

B) Directives: A directive speech act occurs when the speaker expects the listener to do something as a response. For example, the speaker may ask a question, make a request, or issue an invitation. Directive speech acts are common in message board posts, especially in the initial post of each thread when the writer explicitly requests help or advice regarding a specific topic. Many directive sentences are posed as questions, so they are easy to identify by the presence of a question mark (Searle, 1976). However, the language in message board forums is informal and often ungrammatical, so many Directives are posed as a question but do not end in a question mark (e.g., *what do you think*). Furthermore, many directive speech acts are not stated as a question but as a request for assistance. For example, a doctor may write "I need your opinion on what drug to give this patient." Finally, some sentences that end in question marks are rhetorical in nature and do not represent a directive speech act, such as "Can you believe that?"

C) Expressives: An expressive speech act occurs in conversation when a speaker expresses his or her psychological state to the listener. Typical cases are when the speaker thanks, apologizes, or welcomes the listener (Searle, 1976). Expressive speech acts are common in messages because writers often greet readers at the beginning of a post (Hi everyone!) or express gratitude for help from the readers (*I really appreciate the suggestions*). We also found Expressive speech acts in a variety of other contexts, such as apologies.

D) Commissives: A commissive speech act occurs when the speaker commits to a future course of action. In conversation, common commissive speech acts are promises and threats. In message boards, these types of commissives are relatively rare. However, we found many statements where the main purpose was to confirm to the readers that the writer would perform some action in the future. For example, a doctor may write (*I plan to do surgery on this patient tomorrow*) or (*I will post the test results when I get them later today*). We viewed such statements as implicit commitments to the reader about intended actions. We also considered decisions not to take an action as commissive speech acts (e.g., *I will not do surgery on this cat because it would be too risky*). However, statements indicating that an action will not occur because of circumstances beyond the writer's control were considered to be factual statements and not speech acts (e.g., *I cannot do an ultrasound because my machine is broken*) (Searle, 1976).

E) Representatives: According to (Searle, 1976), a representative speech act commits the speaker to the truth of an expressed proposition. It represents the speaker's belief of something that can be evaluated to be true or false. These types of speech acts were less common in our data set, but some cases did exist. In the veterinary domain, we considered sentences to be a representative speech act when a doctor explicitly confirmed a diagnosis or expressed their suspicion or hypothesis about the presence (or absence) of a disease or symptom. For example, if a doctor writes that "I suspect the patient has pancreatitis." then this represents the doctor's own proposition/ belief about what the disease might be. Many sentences in our data set are stated as fact but could be reasonably inferred to be speech acts. For example, suppose a doctor writes "*The cat has pancreatitis*." It would be reasonable to infer that the doctor writing the post diagnosed the cat with pancreatitis. And in many cases, that is true. However, we saw many posts where that inference would have been wrong. For example, the following sentence might say the cat was diagnosed by a previous vet but brought to me due to new complications or (the cat was diagnosed with it 8 years ago as a kitten in the animal shelter). Consequently, we were very conservative in labeling sentences as Representative speech acts. Any sentence presented as fact was not considered to be a speech act. A sentence was only labelled as a Representative speech act if the writer explicitly expressed his belief.

In summary, teachers need to be critical consumers of teaching materials. Research findings

(Moradi, Karbalaei, & Afraz, 2013; Nourdad, Mohammadnia, Roshani Khiabani, 2016) 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. We think 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. Regarding the stated literature, the present study was designed to answer the following research question:

RQ 1. Which types of speech acts (Directives, Assertives, Commissive, Declaratives, and Expressives) occurred more frequently in Iranian Junior High School English Textbooks (i.e., Prospect One, Prospect Two, and Prospect Three)?

RQ 2. Is there relationship among the speech acts used in Iranian Junior High School English Textbooks?

3. Method

3.1. Materials

In this study Iranian Junior High School English Textbooks (*Prospect One, Prospect Two, and Prospect Three*) were selected and surveyed. Then, speech acts of Directives, Assertives, Commissive, Declaratives, and Expressives in conversations of these books were selected and analyzed based on Searle's (1976) speech act model.

3.3 Data Collection Procedure

As mentioned previously, to do this study, the researchers examined *Prospect Series* including *Prospect One, Prospect Two, and Prospect Three*. Then, they selected and evaluated speech acts of Directives, Assertives, Commissive, Declaratives, and Expressives in conversations of the mentioned books to see which speech act was used more frequently. It should be noted that the three mentioned books were at the pre-intermediate, intermediate, and advance levels. Only conversation parts of the books were chosen for analysis. Another important point is that the researchers firstly analyzed the textbooks separately and make the relevant comparisons. By comparing the speech acts in the books, one can see which speech acts are more prevalent in Iranian Junior High School English Textbooks. The second rater was asked to count and categorize the speech acts to make sure of inter-rater reliability. The raters were university professor who taught English for more than 10 years and they were completely familiar with speech acts. The reliability was calculated through inter-rater reliability by means of Pearson correlation analysis as ($r = .899$). This was done since the researchers might have made a mistake in counting and categorizing the speech acts.

3.4. Data Analysis

To analyze the data, Searle's (1976) speech acts model was used to categorize the data at the beginning of the analysis. Then, frequency and percentage were used to see which speech act was used more frequently in Iranian Junior High School English Textbooks. Then, a Chi-Square test was run to show the distribution and any potential differences of the speech acts. Finally, the question of the study that asked which type of speech acts (Directives, Assertives, Commissive, Declaratives, and Expressives) occurred more frequently in Iranian junior high school English textbooks (Prospect One, Prospect Two, and Prospect Three) was used to analyze the data.

4. Results

The research questions of the study aimed to investigate whether there are any significant differences in the distribution of each speech act in the conversations of *Prospect 1, Prospect 2,*

and *Prospect 3*. To this end speech acts of all the conversations in the three books were codified according to Searle's (1979) classification of speech acts, then frequency and percentage of each speech act in each book was identified. Table 1 presents the related data.

Table 1. *The Frequency and Percentage of Speech Acts in Prospect Books*

Speech Act Type	Frequency	Percentage
Assertives	128	50.5
Directives	79	31.2
Expressives	41	16.2
Commissives	5	1.97
Declaratives	0	0.00
Total	253	100%

Table 1 shows the frequency of speech acts used in Prospect Books. After counting the speech acts in *Prospect Books*, 253 speech acts were found. Assertives (128) (50.59), Directives (79) (31.22), Expressives (41) (16.20), and Commissives (5) (1.97) were the most frequent speech acts, respectively. As it can be seen clearly, no Declaratives speech acts were used in Prospect Books.

Table 2. *Chi-Square Results: Comparing the Frequencies of Speech Acts in Prospect Books*

	Speech Acts
Chi-Square	131.680 ^a
Df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 63.3.

Based on Table 2, the difference between the frequencies of the speech acts is significant ($P < 0.05$). In other words, the speech acts in the Prospect Books were not distributed equally and not at the same or close levels of frequency.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

By counting and comparing the speech acts in the Prospect Books, we can see that the number of Assertives is more prevalent than other speech acts. The total number of speech acts which were found in Prospect Books were 253; among 253 speech acts, Assertives (128) (50.59), Directives (79) (31.22), Expressives (41) (16.20), and Commissives (5) (1.97) were the most frequent speech acts, respectively. As it can be seen clearly, no Declaratives speech acts were used in Prospect Books. Assertives and Declaratives speech acts were found to be two extremes; the former being the most prevalent speech act with the maximum percentage 50.59 and the latter one with the minimum percentage 0.00.

The absence of enough Expressives and Declaratives speech acts in the Prospect Books can be regarded as an important issue. As Cutting (2002) explained, expressives and declaratives speech acts are used frequently in everyday communication. Therefore, the lack of the Expressives and Declaratives speech acts may harm the learners' speaking competence in those pragmatic contexts in which these speech acts are needed to be used.

In fact, the speech acts were not distributed equally in the Prospect Books. We think that the distribution of all speech acts in the English books is necessary to get the students familiar with all sentences and their functions. Through learning different types of speech acts and their functions, students can use English language in the real context, for example, through learning expressives speech act, students can greet the people in the real situation and they can congratulate to the people for their success. Through learning commissives speech acts, students can how to promise and how to refuse some suggestions in the authentic context.

The findings of this study are in line with Toolabi (2002) who did a study on the use of speech

acts existing in the English textbooks for Iranian high School and New Interchange series. Using speech act model of Searle's (1975), they analyzed speech acts within the conversations to find the way of their presentation. The results indicated that the New Interchange series applied 1100 different speech acts whereas for high school textbooks it was only 275 speech acts. As the high school English textbooks used in Iran are not communicatively oriented; it can be concluded that different types of speech acts are not included in them. On the other hand, since New Interchange series are written by natives, they are pragmatically rich.

The findings of the present study are in contrast with Soozandehfar and Sahragard (2011) who analyzed the conversation sections of Top-Notch Fundamental textbooks based on the pragmatic dimensions of language functions and speech acts. The results showed that the conversations in these newly-arrived textbooks were pragmatically efficacious and functional. It can be claimed that since the Top-Notch Fundamental textbooks are written by natives, they are pragmatically efficacious and functional.

The researchers of this study think that the books should be rich and communicative since if English textbooks are not communicatively oriented, the books may not develop the pragmatic competence in the language learners or students. Although English textbooks are considered to be a key component in ELT programs, they have been criticized for not offering classroom learner's adequate opportunity for learning authentic language (Vellenga, 2004). Language pedagogy, therefore, should promote language learners' pragmatic awareness and competence in the target language, especially in terms of emphasis on one of the significant pragmatic features, speech acts, through pedagogical practices.

Searle (1976) asserted that all types of speech acts are frequently used in everyday communication, and stated that different kinds of situations or contexts lead us to use different types of speech acts in order to maintain the basic relationships in our social lives. As a result, to become pragmatically competent and functional in almost all the contexts of communication, learners need to gain the knowledge of all types of speech acts so as to be able to apply pragmatically appropriate speech acts in different communicative contexts.

The goal of the present study was to identify different types of speech acts in the conversations of Prospect textbooks. After counting all speech acts in the books, it was revealed that Assertives were the most frequently used illocutionary speech act. The results obtained indicated that Declaratives type of speech act was the least used type, a Cinderella, in the conversations of Prospect textbooks.

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 (Moradi, et al., 2013). To recap, the speech acts deserve further attention when designing materials and textbooks for Iranian learners of English. Previous research (Moradi, et al. 2013; Nourdad, et al., 2016) proved that speech acts categories are considered as a universal feature of all languages and these categories are said to be found in all languages nearly with the same range or frequencies.

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 the conversations of Prospect textbooks. In the comparative part, it tried to investigate which speech act is more frequent in the Prospect textbooks. The results showed the speech acts were not equally distributed in the Prospect textbooks. The most frequently used speech acts were Assertives while the least used speech acts were Declaratives. The lack of frequent use of Declaratives and Commissives speech acts in the mentioned books can be regarded as a pitfall. It seems that ELT textbooks are quite imbalanced regarding their inclusion of a proportionate number of speech act types. This may have come from the ignorance of the frequency of such speech acts in authentic real life to be incorporated in such textbooks.

What matters is the fact that ELT textbooks fall short of providing language learners with the

chance to learn how speech acts are naturally employed when it comes to the representativeness of such units of pragmatic language. It seems unfair to focus on some speech acts to the disadvantage of others as this may deprive language learners from the reality of language and the various functions it may serve according to the context and various needs ensued.

Although this is a stern mistake which has been committed in ELT materials the fact that such materials suffer from their lack of success in incorporating other aspects of language use has never escaped from the scholars' attention and this further necessitates a general endeavor to satisfy the learning needs of English learners.

All in all, upon attributing this inconsistency between the real language and the language depicted in ELT materials to the reluctance of ELT publishers to be more open to scientific findings, one may readily conclude that the remedial work must be done to compensate for this ominous negligence to the disfavor of effective language learning.

The present study contributes to the growing research on Interlanguage Pragmatics, specifically on pragmatic development of speech acts on the part of learners in EFL contexts. The study suggests the necessity for the high schools to address this particular gap in their language learners' pragmatic competence, and, if need be, revise their materials on offer, as well as reconsider related pedagogical practices. Furthermore, somewhat limited pragmatic repertoire of Iranian EFL learners seems to require explicit metapragmatic teaching of speech acts in general. The findings also necessitate introduction of authentic spoken data into EFL classrooms.

It is hoped that other English language institutes in Iran will benefit from the findings as well as pedagogical implications of this study into Iranian EFL learners' realization of speech acts. Importantly, language educators should bear in mind that the adoption of socio-cultural rules as one's own in L2 pragmatic production is an individual decision. However, it is our responsibility to equip the learners with enough knowledge to make an informed choice and to not inadvertently convey messages they did not intend.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2005). The non-performativity of anti-racism. *Borderlands e-Journal*, 5(3), 33-51.
- Austin, G. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bates, E. (1996). *Language and context: The acquisition of pragmatics*. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Hurford, J. R., Heasley, B., & Smith, M. B. (2007). *Semantics: A course book*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841668>
- Jaszczolt, B. (2002). Against ambiguity and under specification: Evidence from presupposition as anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5), 829-849.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00064-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00064-9)
- Lazaraton, A. (2001). Teaching oral skills. (Ed.) Celce-Murcia, M., *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 103-137. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Moradi, A., Karbalaei, A., Afraz, S. (2013). A textbook evaluation of speech acts and language functions in high school English textbooks (i, ii and iii) and interchange series, books I, II, and III. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 323-335
- Nastri, J., Pena, J., & Hancock, J. T. (2006). The construction of away messages: A speech act analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 2(4), 54-71.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00306.x>
- Nourdad, N., Mohammadnia, Z., Roshani Khiabani, L. (2016). Evaluation of speech acts in the newly developed Iranian EFL English textbooks. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, 4(2), 1-10
- Nunan, D. (1999). Introducing discourse analysis. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(4), 23-40.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). *Indirect speech acts*. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 59-82). New York: Academic Press.
- Soozandehfar, S. M. A., & Sahragard, R. (2011). A textbook evaluation of speech acts and language functions in Top-Notch series. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12), 1831-1838.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.12.1831-1838>
- Tavakoli, M. (1995). Encouragement and punishment in Iran high schools. *ROSHD: Teacher Education Journal*, 15 (5), 77-91.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Toolabi, J. (2002). *Characterization of language functions in the Iranian high school English textbooks*. (M. A Thesis), Shiraz University, Shiraz.
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL and EFL textbooks: How Likely? *TESL-English Journal*, 8(2), 22-56.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.