Modern English Education, Vol. 16, No. 2, Summer 2015
http://dx.doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2015.16.2.01

Coherence Problems in Secondary School English Textbook Dialogues*

Woo-hyun Jung
Yeungnam University

Jung, Woo-hyun. (2015). Coherence problems in secondary school English textbook dialogues. *Modern English Education, 16*(2), 1-24.

This study is a qualitative analysis of coherence problems in middle school English textbooks, with a focus on whether coherence is achieved successfully in the textbook dialogues. To this end, eighteen middle school English textbooks were analyzed on the basis of coherence principles such as clarity, logicality, and informativeness. The results showed that coherence problems exhibited in the textbook dialogues cover lack of clarity, violation of logicality, and violation of the principle of informativeness. The lack of clarity was evident in the textbooks when a vague or general statement was chosen in the situation where a specific statement is appropriate, and when a wrong choice of grammatical items led to semantic ambiguity. The results also revealed different facets of logicality problems: (a) the absence of logical connections between ideas, (b) inconsistent temporal frames, and (c) the illogical order of information structures from a specific statement to a general one, which is the opposite of what is normally sequenced. With respect to the principle of informativeness, two major problems were identified in the textbooks: (a) the presentation of more information than is required and (b) the presentation of less information than is needed. The coherence problems were also found to be attributable to such factors as L1 interference and a disregard of world knowledge. On the basis of the findings, helpful suggestions are provided for curriculum developers to cope adequately with the coherence problems.

**[textbook analysis/coherence/authenticity/discourse competence/
교과서 분석/일관성/실제성/담화 능력]**

* This research was supported by the Yeungnam University research grants in 2014-2015.

I. INTRODUCTION

Coherence is defined as sequences of sentences that hang together (Nunan, 1999) or interrelatedness of underlying content or continuity relations (Hellman, 1995). If a text is coherent, all of the ideas are both logically and fluently connected and elaborated, so the reader can make sense of the meaning of the text (J. Bae, 2012). While these definitions are appealing in their own ways, they are overly simplistic. As many researchers agree, there is no consensus on the definitions and features of coherence (Johns, 1986; Swales, 1990), as it is of a very complex nature. Some researchers even went so far as to say that coherence is a fuzzy and elusive concept that remains difficult to teach and hence difficult to learn (Connor, 1990; Connor & Johns, 1990, as cited in I. Lee, 1998).

Since the previous studies have paid so much attention to discussing the definitions and nature of coherence in different perspectives that empirical studies have not been fully carried out to evaluate coherence (Khalil, 1989). Even the data-based analyses carried out to date have focused on coherence in L2 leaners' production with little attention to coherence in instructional materials. Far less attention has been directed to coherence in spoken discourse since the traditional concept of coherence is largely modelled upon a post-hoc analysis of written products (Hellman, 1995).

This study is, therefore, a qualitative analysis of dialogue coherence in ELT materials. The specific purpose of the study is to explore whether dialogues are coherent in middle school English textbooks. The main focus is laid on incoherent dialogues covering inconsistent, illogical, and disorganized ideas (Johns, 1986; I. Lee, 2002). In the present study, coherence problems are evaluated on the basis of American English.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Relationship Between Cohesion and Coherence

The landmark publication of Halliday and Hasan's (1976) *Cohesion in English*, has evoked heated debates on the relationship between cohesion and coherence over the past few decades. One of their major claims is that cohesion serves a basis for coherence. Some researchers have lent credence to this claim. For example, in an investigation into cohesion and coherence with special attention to how Canada-born Chinese students use lexical and referential discourse markers, K. Leo (2012) found that cohesive devices facilitate coherence. In particular, synonyms and content words were the differentiating variables that distinguished essays that received a satisfactory score and those that were graded as unsatisfactory.

Other researchers have challenged Halliday and Hasan's claim. For example, Carrell (1982) made a strong stance against their claim, arguing that semantic coherence can be guaranteed even without cohesive devices. She underlined the importance of schemata for the enhancement of coherence, saying that all the cohesive ties will not help a text cohere for the reader, if he/she does not have appropriate background schema underlying the text. Carrell's claim was backed up by Khalil's (1989) statistical results, which showed that the correlation of coherence score with the number of cohesive ties was quite low. Enkvist (1990) took a similar position, revealing that texts which lack overt cohesion markers are still coherent. He further argued that interpretation of a text varies, depending on the situation and interpreter. This emphasizes the importance of situational relevance for coherence.

On the other hand, some attempts were made to analyze data from different genres to explore the influence of cohesive devices on coherence. In this line of research, J. Bae (2001) analyzed writing data and showed that referential and lexical cohesion correlate highly with coherence, but ellipsis and substitution show the opposite. In another study, J. Bae (2012) analyzed letter and story data and indicated that in the former data, only three types of cohesion (conjunction, ellipsis, and collocation) have a significant influence on coherence, whereas in the latter data, pronominals in addition to these three also exert a significant effect. She concluded that cohesion markers make different contributions to coherence according to different types of cohesion devices and types of genres.

In what follows, previous research on coherence is further discussed in two parts: coherence in written discourse and coherence in spoken discourse. Lautamatti (1990) made a distinction between coherence in written and spoken discourse, saying that propositional coherence is more prominent in written discourse, whereas interactional coherence can be found in spoken discourse. The former is based on the organization of the propositional content of the discourse, whereas the latter is based on a meaningful chain of communicative acts.

2. Coherence in Written Discourse

Previous research has attempted to define coherence in different perspectives, which is usually based upon written discourse. Earlier, Johns (1986) provided the following definitions: (a) Coherence is text-based and consists of the ordering and interlinking of propositions within a text; (b) Coherence is reader-based: As the reader processes the text, the reader-selected schemata are modified to establish consistency with text structure or content.

The 1990's was the heyday of research on coherence. I. Lee (1998) provided a coherence checklist covering the following items: Is the purpose of the writing made clear

to the reader?; Does the text show an awareness of the context of situation in which the writing takes place?; Is the information appropriately arranged?; Is the propositional content clear?; Are propositions logically linked?, among others. He argued that this checklist can make the learning of coherence more manageable for ESL learners. In another study, I. Lee (2002) investigated the effect of instructions on coherence in Hong Kong ESL contexts. For this purpose, he paid attention to the following features of coherence: connectivity, information structure, relation between propositions, macrostructure, and metadiscoursal features. The findings showed that at the end of the explicit teaching of coherence, students improved the coherence of their writing.

Research on the features of coherence was also activated in Korean EFL contexts. K.-O. Kim (1995) proposed principles of coherence based on the previous studies: a) transparency (Text should be as clear as is needed.); b) parsimony (Text should be as informative as is needed.); c) topicality (Propositional sequences should be logically relevant to the purpose of the text throughout.); d) continuity (Text should be ongoing and continuously progressing.); and e) integrity (Text should be temporally and logically connected throughout.)

The proposed principles and features of coherence have stimulated researchers to delve into coherence problems in L2 learners' writing. One noteworthy study in this regard is Wikborg's (1990) study, which reported coherence problems in Swedish student writing. He identified two major types of coherence problems: topic-structuring problems (unspecified topic, unspecified topic change, misleading paragraph division, irrelevance, etc.) and cohesion problems (uncertain inference ties, misleading sentence connection, malfunctioning cohesive tie, too great a distance between the cohesive items in a cohesive chain, etc.).

In a similar study, Y. Choi (1991) examined coherence problems in American and Korean students' argumentative texts. She revealed that the distribution of coherence problems in Korean ESL and EFL groups' essays was similar to that found in English native speakers' essays, but the number of lexical problems was much larger in the Korean groups. The most dominant types of coherence problems were justification, reference, and topic and text structure problems.

3. Coherence in Spoken Discourse

Coherence in spoken discourse, without doubt, has something in common with coherence in written discourse, but it also has its own features. Garrod and Doherty (1995) noted that, whereas coherence in a written text reflects the way in which the different sentences stick together and connect in a consistent fashion, coherence in spoken dialogue has to reflect the way in which the utterances from each participant mesh together to form

a co-ordinated exchange. They also argued that dialogues are considered coherent in different ways: *Interactionally* coherent dialogues only need to hang together at a superficial level, whereas *transactionally* coherent dialogues can only come about through a deep co-ordination of the language processing system.

Earlier, Grice (1975) argued that conversational coherence is based upon four conversational maxims: maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false.); maxim of quantity (Make your contribution as informative as is required.); maxim of relation (Be relevant.); and maxim of manner (Be clear.) These maxims have exerted great influence upon later studies on conversational discourse, forming their theoretical underpinnings.

More recently, Hellman (1995) discussed the notion of coherence in conversation and argued that coherence largely concerns relations that could be subsumed under the notion of continuity: Adjacent sentences in a text tend to involve reference to events and situations that are close in time and space and parts of the same 'flow of events'. He further argued that in naturally occurring conversation, incoherent discourse occurs when people do not agree on what they are talking about and that is reflected in abrupt topic shifts, topic resumption and topic drifting.

There was also an attempt to examine how conversational coherence is collaboratively achieved between the interlocutors. In this line of research, Geluykens (1999) showed that question-answer adjacency pairs can provide the framework through which topical coherence is achieved, and they can do this in two different ways. First, the current speaker can propose a new topic in his/her question, giving the next speaker the opportunity to accept this proposed topic. Alternatively, the current speaker can ask a question which elicits a potential new topic from the next speaker.

In Korean EFL settings, M.-H. Kim (2003) examined the coherence and cohesion of spoken narratives by Korean EFL learners and found that learners do know how to tell a story, but that they lack the ability to give continuity and consistency with the previous theme in their story. While the above-mentioned studies are appealing in their own right, they have directed scanty attention to coherence in textbook dialogues. This motivated the present study.

III. METHOD

1. Selected Textbooks

This study analyzed a total of eighteen middle school English textbooks. They were newly written under the 2007 National Curriculum and authorized by the Ministry of

Education in Korea. These textbooks were selected mainly because they will be compared with the textbooks designed under the 2009 National Curriculum in future studies. They were randomly chosen out of the textbooks widely used across the country. They were the same textbooks as those analyzed in W.-H. Jung's (2014) study, which dealt with a different research theme, that is, communicative functions. Thus, detailed information of the textbooks was taken from the study, as summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Detailed Information of the Textbooks Analyzed

Code	Author & Year	Title	Publisher
A1	Chang, Y., Jung, S., Lee, K., Choi, D., & Brown, M. (2011)	*Middle School English 1*	Neunglyule
A2	Chang, Y., Jung, S., Lee, K., Lee, J., Kim, Y., & Roszell, W. (2011)	*Middle School English 2*	Neunglyule
A3	Chang, Y., Choi, D., Lee, S., Lee, H., & Kim, S. (2011)	*Middle School English 3*	Neunglyule
B1, B2	Lee, B. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 1, 2*	Doosan
B3	Lee, B. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 3*	Doosan
C1	Kim, D., Ahn, B., Oh, J., Shin, I., Kim, S., & Kim, H. (2011)	*Middle School English 1*	Chunjae
C2, C3	Kim, D. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 2, 3*	Chunjae
D1	Kim, I. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 1*	Kyohaksa
D2	Kim, I. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 2*	Kyohaksa
D3	Kim, I. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 3*	Kyohaksa
E1	Lee, D., Kim, K., Chang, Y., Han, H., & Lee, S. (2011)	*Middle School English 1*	Jihaksa
E2	Lee, D. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 2*	Jihaksa
E3	Lee, D. et al. (2011)	*Middle School English 3*	Jihaksa
F1	Park, J. et al. (2009)	*Middle School English 1*	Daekyo
F2, F3	Park, J. et al. (2009-10)	*Middle School English 2, 3*	Daekyo

The textbooks were published by six publishing companies, randomly coded, ranging from A to F. Each publisher designed three levels of textbooks: *Middle School English 1, 2,* and *3*. These three levels were designed for three school grades: 7th grade, 8th grade, and 9th grade, respectively. The number of textbooks was equally divided into six in terms of school grade: six for 7th grade, six for 8th grade and six for 9th grade. Each series designed by each publisher was written by a team of five to twelve, which consisted of professors, secondary school teachers, and one native speaker or bilingual speaker (W.-H. Jung, 2012, 2014).

2. Procedure and Data Analysis

The evaluation of the textbook dialogues for coherence underwent careful procedures. At the initial stage, the Korean researcher sorted out all the dialogue samples which he

thought were not coherent according to the proposed principles of coherence. He then worked together with American English native speaker raters. Native speaker judgment about coherence was widely employed in the previous studies such as Khalil (1989), H. Lee and K. Park (2008), and K. Leo (2012).

The native speaker raters were analogous to those who participated in the author's previous studies (W.-H. Jung, 2012, 2014) and thus demographic information about these raters was taken from them, as summarized in Table 2. It is, however, important to note at this point that the raters' evaluation items were totally different in the previous and present studies, because each of the studies had different research purposes.

TABLE 2

Information about the American Student Raters

Name	School grade	Gender	Major	Region
Aimee	Senior	F	Education	Illinois
Chris	Junior	M	Criminal justice	Michigan
Emma	Junior	F	English	Indiana
Emily	Grad. assistant	F	Speech pathology	Indiana

Table 2 presents information about the student raters. Three American undergraduate students and a graduate assistant were willing to participate in the textbook evaluation for coherence. They were tutoring students in English in the Learning Center or the Writing Center at a university in Indiana at the time of the evaluation.

While different scholars have put forward different principles of coherence, this study employed a modified version of K.-O. Kim's (1995) framework, which was in turn based upon Grice's (1975) conversational maxims and other researchers' features of coherence. The principles of coherence employed in this study boil down to three major components, as presented below:

a) Clarity: Dialogues should be as clear and specific as is required.
b) Logicality: Dialogues should be semantically and sequentially logical, relevant, consistent, and well organized from the beginning to the end.
c) Informativeness: Dialogues should be as informative as is required; however, there should be neither too much nor too little information.

This study focused primarily on the above three principles mainly because they constitute significant components of coherence. The raters were asked to determine whether or not textbook dialogues are coherent, considering the above principles and what they actually say in their lives. Since they were tutors in the Learning Center or the Writing Center, they had enough background knowledge about these coherence principles.

Violations of the above-mentioned principles were interpreted as leading to incoherent dialogues. More specifically, violation of clarity involves the choice of vague and ambiguous expressions, whereas violation of informativeness indicates the presentation of too much information (over-informativeness) or too little information (under-informativeness) in the dialogues (Davies & Katsos, 2013). The former focuses on whether a given utterance is interpreted as being clear or vague, whereas the latter focuses on whether a given utterance conveys adequate amount of information. On the other hand, violation of logicality occurs when ideas are "logically incompatible" (Coates, 1995).

After the student raters' evaluation was done, the researcher had in-depth discussions about coherence problems with an American professor at the same university. Since she was a specialist in the field of discourse analysis, she provided insightful ideas about coherence problems in the textbooks. Her evaluation was confirmed by an American English instructor in the field of TESOL. While there were some different points of view among the raters, this study included only items which showed 100% interrater reliability across all the raters in the evaluation results, as done by many researchers such as W.-H. Jung (2014) and H. Lee and K. Park (2008). After the evaluation, all of the incoherent samples of dialogues were categorized in terms of coherence principles.

IV. RESULTS

Coherence problems are discussed in the following categories: lack of clarity, violation of logicality, and violation of informativeness.

1. Lack of Clarity

Lack of clarity involves a violation of the principle that dialogues should be as clear and specific as is needed (K.-O. Kim, 1995), which is akin to Grice's (1975) maxim of manner: "Put what you say in the clearest manner" (Grice, 1975). Lack of clarity leads to vague, ambiguous, or unclear dialogues. Consider the following excerpts:

(1) → A: I'm visiting a Thai family. <u>What should I do</u>?
B: You should eat with your right hand.
A: Thanks. I'll do that. (C2, p. 63)

(2) A: I'm going to visit *Korea* this summer.
→ <u>What should I do there</u>?
B: I suggest you visit *the Korean Folk Village*. (E2, p. 91)

These two chunks of talk are taken from different textbooks, but speaker A's questions of "What should I do?" in example (1) and "What should I do there?" in example (2) are too broad and too vague in such contexts, especially at the beginning of the conversation, according to native English norms. This vagueness stems from the choice of the verb 'do' which has a generic meaning covering all kinds of actions. In such a context, native speakers prefer a specific word: "Is there anything special I need to *know*?" in example (1) and "What should I *see* there?" in example (2). This should not be taken to mean that the choice of 'do' is totally wrong, but mean that the choice of the specific words conveys clearer meanings, reflecting the actual patterns of native speakers. The above examples are unequivocal evidence of L1 transfer, seeing that Korean speakers tend to favor a general or broad statement in the situation where an American English speaker expects a more specific statement. This inappropriate choice of generic items weakens the clarity of the speaker's intended meanings.

At times, a coherence problem occurs due to inadequate choice of cohesive devices. This is exemplified in the following excerpt.

(3) → Traveler: Excuse me. <u>How can I get to the museum from here</u>?
Bora: That's easy. Go straight two blocks and turn right.
Traveler: That's what it says on the map.
But I couldn't find any museum there. (F3, p.115)

The main communicative function of this dialogue is direction-giving. When the traveler asks for directions to the museum at the beginning of the conversation, he/she uses the definite article 'the', as in 'the museum'. The definite article 'the' is a cohesive device which is used to specify a noun that has been already been introduced, instructing the hearer to locate the referent in the same shared mental set of objects (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). However, in the above example, no noun has been introduced before, nor is there shared knowledge of the museum between the speaker and the hearer because 'the museum' is being said at the beginning of the conversation. This problem may lead to a confusing semantic consequence, making the listener wonder which museum the speaker is talking about, unless there is only one museum in town. In order to make the identity of the museum clearer, it seems feasible to specify the name of the museum, for example, 'the Art Museum'. This example is not in line with Enkvist's (1990) claim that interpretability is dependent upon the knowledge shared by the producer and the receptor of discourse.

Another area of clarity problems lies in semantic confusion resulting from the use of negative sentences. In the following dialogue, the interlocutors are talking about the differences between American and Korean cultures in sharing food with others.

(4) Jenny: What do you think about eating by yourself?
Minjun: Do you mean eating alone?
→ Jenny: No. I mean not sharing food when you're with your friends.
→ Minjun: Well, Koreans usually don't do that.
Jenny: In the US, people usually don't share food. (B2, p. 160)

Minjun's last utterance ("Koreans usually don't do that.") in response to Jenny's preceding comment ("I mean not sharing food when you're with your friends.") is semantically very ambiguous since it is unclear whether Minjun intends to say that Koreans share food with others or to say the opposite. A native speaker of English may have difficulty interpreting Minjun's intended message. This semantic ambiguity results from the use of the negative form ('not') in both Jenny's and Minjun's utterances. One option to make it unambiguous is to convert the negative forms into the positive ones, as revealed in the following modified version:

(4') Jenny: What do you think about eating by yourself?
Minjun: Do you mean eating alone?
Jenny: No. I mean sharing food when you eat with your friends.
Minjun: Koreans usually do that.

The use of positive statements facilitates interpretability, fully conveying the interlocutors' communicative intents, that is, "Koreans usually share food with others." This indicates that coherence is influenced by the types of linguistic structures employed. This is in keeping with Enkvist's (1990) claim that coherent interpretation is controlled by many factors such as the interlocutors' knowledge of syntax.

2. Violation of Logicality

As noted earlier, the principle of logicality states that the content of dialogues should be semantically and sequentially logical, relevant, or consistent from the beginning to the end. Indeed, the logic of ideas is a core element of coherence (K.-O. Kim, 1995; I. Lee, 1998). To make texts logical, the message the speaker intends to convey should be relevant to and consistent with what is already being talked about in the preceding context. One major problem in this regard is illogical connections between utterances, as explicated in the following excerpt:

(5) A: What do you want to make?
→ B: Many things, but I want to make a music box first.

→ A: Great! Do you want to be a scientist?
B: Yes, I do. (D1, p. 65)

The crux of a problem here is that 'a music box' in speaker B's first turn has little to do with 'a scientist' in speaker A's last turn. According to general world knowledge, 'making a music box' is not so much connected with 'a scientist' as with 'an artist' or 'an inventor'. In this respect, this dialogue fails to achieve unity in speech behaviors. This may be due to speaker A's lack of background knowledge about music box and scientist. This problem leads us to recognize the importance of Johns' (1986) claim that the degree to which a reader/listener grasps the intended meaning and underlying structure from text depends, to a large extent, upon whether the reader/listener-selected schemata are consistent with the text.

In a similar vein, some dialogues manifest semantically inconsistent relations between the speaker's comment and the hearer's reaction, as evident in the following excerpts:

(6) Brian: Did you finish your homework?
Nuri: Yes, I've just finished it. I spent more than four hours typing it.
→ Brian: I guess you've written a long paper.
→ Nuri: Not really. I wrote it by hand first and then typed it up on the computer.
I'm a slow typer. (F3, p. 35)

(7) Brian: Thanks for inviting me to dinner, Subin.
Subin: You're welcome. I made some Korean dishes for you.
→ Brian: This is incredible! How did you make all this food?
→ Subin: I followed a cookbook and my mom helped. (B3, p. 104)

In example (6), the connection between Brian's last turn and Nuri's last turn is neither consistent nor relevant because Brian's comment ("I guess you've written a long paper.") and Nuri's response ("I wrote it by hand first and then typed it up on the computer.") do not hang together: Brian is talking about the length of the content, but Nuri is talking about whether it was written or typed. They are talking at cross purposes. A very similar tendency is repeated at the end of example (7). Subin gives an irrelevant response ("I followed a cookbook.") to Brian's question ("How did you make all this food?"). When Brian is referring to 'the length of time' implying, "Looks like it took a lot of time to make all this food," Subin is giving a response referring to 'method' by saying, "I followed a cook book." These two contiguous chunks exhibit no textual coherence, failing to create meaningful text (Coates, 1995). It would be much better to give a time-related question followed by a time-related response or to give a method-related question followed by a

method-related response. For example, Brian's question can be rephrased like this: "How did you know how to make all this food?", which is logically incompatible with Subin's response.

On occasion, some textbooks manifest discontinuity of temporal frames, which results not from the misuse of tense, but from the wrong choice of an expression.

(8) → A: Thanks for taking me to the baseball game.
B: My pleasure, Cathy. It will be nice to watch the game with you.
C: Is baseball really popular in your country?
A: Sure, people really love it. (D3, p. 47)

Speaker A's thanking behavior ("Thanks for taking me to the baseball game.") in his/her initial turn sounds like they already went to the baseball game, but it is contradictory to the following context where they have not gone to the game yet, judging from speaker B's utterance, "It will be nice to watch the game with you." This violates Hellman's (1995) principle of continuity that adjacent utterances in a text tend to involve reference to events and situations that are close in time and space. If nothing is stated to the contrary, assume that everything is as before or that things are as they used to be (Hellman, 1995). In such a context, a native speaker might have made an utterance which is temporally consistent with surrounding utterances: "Thanks for inviting me to the baseball game."

Very often a logical contradiction is detected in the interaction between the speaker and the addressee, but sometimes self-contradiction is also observed, when the speaker really is contradicting himself/herself, as revealed in the following example.

(9) A: How are your classmates?
→ B: I don't know many of them yet. But everyone is so nice. (B1, p. 24)

Speaker B's initial utterance ("I don't know many of them yet.") stands in direct contradiction to his/her subsequent utterance ("everyone is so nice.") because it is carried too far to affirm that everyone is so nice in the situation where the speaker does not know many of the classmates yet. Speaker B's initial utterance leads us to assume that it is not known whether everyone is really nice, so the use of 'seems' is preferred over the use of 'is', as in the following modified version: "Everyone seems very nice." This modified utterance signaling probability is logically consistent with speaker B's preceding utterance.

Another facet of logicality problems is total illogic or a total absurdity, as demonstrated in the following conversation where speaker B wants to get advice on how to concentrate on studying. Consider speaker B's question in his/her last turn.

(10) A: What's the matter? You look worried.
B: I can't focus on studying. That really makes me stressed.
A: Oh, I know how you feel.
→B: Can you tell me the reason why I can't focus?
A: I have no idea. (D3, p. 137)

Judging from speaker B's initial turn ("I can't focus on studying."), his/her question ("Can you tell me the reason why I can't focus?") in his/her next turn sounds ridiculous and unreasonable for the reason that he/she is asking speaker A the reason which only he/she knows. This question is a clear violation of normal, cooperative, conversational behavior (Coates, 1995), thereby leading to a communication breakdown. The dialogues discussed in this section fail to conform to the principle of coherence, which holds that the components of a discourse should be related with each other through meaningful, interpreted relations (Sanford, Barton, Moxey, & Paterson, 1995).

3. Violation of Informativeness

As pointed out earlier, informativeness is a principle of coherence which states that dialogues should be as informative as is needed (Grice, 1975; K.-O. Kim, 1995). Thus, a violation of this principle occurs when the speaker provides too little information (under-informativeness) or too much information (over-informativeness) in a given context. First, let us consider the case of under-informativeness in the following example:

(11) Jenny: Tomorrow is Subin's birthday. Let's have a party.
Minjun: Sounds good. I'll bring a cake.
Jenny: Then, I'll make a pinata.
Minjun: What did you say? Make a what?
Jenny: A pinata.
Minjun: What's that?
Jenny: It's like a toy horse. It has candies in it.
Minjun: What do you do with it?
→Jenny: You hang it from a tree. Then you hit it with a long stick. (B1, p. 82)

The interlocutors are talking about how to play a pinata game, but Jenny's descriptions of the pinata at the end of the conversation do not fully account for the pinata game since hitting it with a long stick is not the main purpose of the game, nor does it fully meet the ultimate intent of Minju's question. In this context, coherence can be achieved by an elaboration of the pinata game: "You take turns hitting until it breaks and the candy falls

out." This modified version conveys full meanings of the pinata, considering the fact that breaking the pinata to release candy is the ultimate purpose of the game.

The proposed principle of informativeness is also violated in the form of abrupt connections between utterances which occur owing to a paucity of what may seem necessary background information. The following excerpt is a good example of this point.

(12) A: Look. There are many events this month.
→ B: That's right. You know what? I'm interested in sculptures.
A: Then how about going to Meet Sculptures?
B: Good idea. (C2, p. 151)

Speaker B's first turn reveals insufficient information on the grounds that his/her two utterances ("That's right." and "You know what?") sounds disconnected and disjoined without additional comments on many events going on this month. In this context, his/her better approach would be to say something like this: "That's right. It's hard to decide what to do. You know what? I'm interested in sculptures." Such an additional comment serves to bridge gaps between the two disconnected utterances, preventing abrupt flow of discourse.

Under-informativeness is also observed in the conversation where the interlocutors are talking about 'read-a-thon', a contest where competitors read books without stopping in a certain amount of time.

(13) Brian: Can you do me a favor?
Mrs. Kim: Sure. What is it?
→Brian: Can you sponsor me for the read-a-thon?
Mrs. Kim: Of course. (B1, p. 146)

Brian's favor-asking strategy, "Can you sponsor me for the read-a-thon?", is too abrupt without further background information about the read-a-thon. This utterance can be improved if it is prefaced with specific details like this: "I'm participating in the school read-a-thon. Can you sponsor me for that?"

On the other hand, some dialogues reveal not only under-informativeness but also over-informativeness. This is delineated in the following conversation.

(14) A: Why don't we go hiking tomorrow?
B: That sounds good, but I prefer to go swimming.
→ A: O.K. Let's meet at ten in the morning. (D3, p. 98)

Speaker A's speech act of making an appointment in his/her last turn does not present an adequate amount of information, nor does it reflect native speakers' actual pattern of appointment-making, as speaker A does not say where to meet, which is an important element of appointment-making. For successful appointment-making, the persons concerned should agree not only on the date and time but also on the place, according to our world knowledge. Further complication evolves with speaker A's speech behavior in that the addition of 'in the morning' to 'at ten' is too emphatic and redundant. American people are highly unlikely to make an appointment for swimming at ten at night. Moreover, it is a shared knowledge between American people that 'at ten' refers to 'in the morning' rather than 'at night' for swimming. The absence of a place of promise violates the principle that texts should not be less informative than is required, whereas the addition of 'in the morning' violates the principle that texts should not be more informative than is needed. A more authentic version of the dialogue is provided below:

(14') A: Why don't we go hiking tomorrow?
B: That sounds good, but I prefer to go swimming.
A: O.K. How about we go to the beach?
B: Sounds good. Is Santa Monica Beach okay?
A: That's good. Is 10 o'clock okay with you?
B: Sure.

The case of under-informativeness coupled with that of over-informativeness ensues in the following segment of news report where a reporter is interviewing a few people:

(15) Anchor: Good afternoon, everyone. A big fire started in the Hansin building at five o'clock this afternoon. Reporter Bak Jina is at the scene right now.
Reporter: The fire is still burning strongly. Firefighters are working hard to put out the fire, but it seems to be out of control. Let's interview a few people.
→Police Officer: <u>We haven't found the cause of the fire yet</u>.
Woman: I've lived here all my life, but I've never seen such a big fire like this. It's terrible!
→Reporter: I'll keep you up to date <u>with what's going on</u>. (F3, p. 204)

The reporter is giving news about a big fire, but it is abrupt for the police officer to give a response without the reporter's relevant interview question such as "Do you know the cause of the fire yet?" This indicates that the dialogue provides less information than is required. Opposite to this case is the case of irrelevant details in the reporter's last utterance: The fragment, "with what's going on," is redundant, given the fact that the use

of “I’ll keep you up to date” alone is good enough to cover the meaning of “what’s going on.” The dialogue samples discussed in this section strongly suggest that the interlocutors are deemed uncooperative, as cooperative speakers are expected to provide all and only as much information as is necessary (Davies & Katsos, 2013).

4. Multiple Problems

Multiple problems refer to a sample of dialogue which includes more than one type of coherence problem. One noticeable feature here is that some dialogues include both a violation of logicality and that of informativeness, as shown in the following:

(16) → A: Do you know about *Harry Potter*?
→ B: Yes, it’s about Harry Potter’s adventures.
→ A: I heard that it’s playing at the Cinema House.
Can you go see it this Saturday?
B: Thank you for asking, but I have to finish a science project. (D2, p. 29)

There is an illogical connection between speaker A’s first and second turns. Judging from his/her second turn (“I heard that it’s playing at the Cinema House.”), it can be assumed that he/she is talking about a movie, but his/her first utterance (“Do you know about *Harry Potte*r?”) just sounds like either the character or the book series rather than a movie. It would be better to ask a question like this: “Have you heard about the Harry Potter movies?” Another troublesome case in this conversation lies in speaker B’s initial response, “Yes, it’s about Harry Potter’s adventures.” in response to speaker A’s question, “Do you know about Harry Potter?” This response sounds too predictable since it is well known that the Harry Potter movies are adventure films. In order to make the conversation more effective, speaker B’s utterance should be backed up with different details about Harry Potter.

A hard nut to crack with regard to the principles of logicality and informativeness is the occurrence of illogical connections intertwined with insufficient amounts of information, as shown in the direction-giving interaction between a child, Goldilocks, and a police officer.

(17) 잘 듣고, Goldilocks와 Police Officer의 역할극을 해 봅시다.
A: I’m lost. How can I get home?
→B: Don’t worry. I can show you your way home.
→A: Oh, great! I can find my way back home.
→B: Go straight for about five minutes and turn left.

A: Thank you very much. (D1, p. 39)

Speaker A is Goldilocks, and speaker B is a police officer. In her initial turn, Goldilocks gets lost and is thus asking the police officer how she can get home. In response to it, the police officer says, "I can show you your way home." This response, however, does not make sense in that there is no adequate background information about how the police officer knows Goldilocks' home. The police officer's remark is also illogically connected to Goldilocks' subsequent response ("I can find my way back home.") because Goldilocks' use of 'can' shows her ability/possibility to find her way home, which is contrary to the preceding context where she gets lost and thus the police officer promises to help Goldilocks find her home. A further logical paradox here is that in the situation where Goldilocks is showing her ability to find her way home, the police officer is giving directions in his/her last turn. It is by no means easy to make the whole conversation flow naturally unless adequate background information is provided about how the police officer knows Goldilocks' residence. One way to improve this conversation partially is to modify Goldilocks' (speaker A) second turn like this: "If you help me, I can find my way back home." or to simply express gratitude, saying, "Thank you for your help."

The same pattern of incoherence is repeated in an advising session, as shown in the following conversation where Minjun wants to get advice on his writing from his teacher, Ms. Brown.

(18) Minjun: Would you mind reading my writing?
Ms. Brown: No problem. Let me see.
Minjun: What do you think?
Ms. Brown: Well, it has a very interesting beginning, but . . .
Minjun: Yes, go on please.
→Ms. Brown: Well, your main point isn't clear.
→Minjun: Then, how can I improve my writing?
→Ms. Brown: Here is a book titled 'Writing a Paragraph.' It'll help you. (B3, p. 72)

In this chunk of talk we run up against two major types of incoherence.. Our first attention is the interaction between Mr. Brown's third turn ("Well, your main point isn't clear.") and Minjun's interrogative utterance ("Then, how can I improve my writing?"). Given that Ms. Brown's comment ("your main point isn't clear.") is a part of Minjun's writing or a specific problem of Minjun's writing, Ms. Brown's comment is specific, whereas 'my writing' in Minjun's interrogative utterance is generic and broad. This specific to general order violates Lautamatti's (1990) principle that discourse coherence normally requires ordering of information, for example, from general to more specific

concepts or from wholes to parts. This disorganization can be improved, if Minjun makes his question ("how can I improve my writing?") more specific, as shown in the following: "What can I do to make it clear?" This sequence from general to more specific utterances promotes a logical information process. Another impediment to coherence in this dialogue lies in Ms. Brown's last turn where she is recommending a book which will help to solve Minjun's writing problems. It is highly unlikely, however, that an American teacher simply recommends a reference book without giving any advice during an advising session. To make the advising sessions more effective and authentic, the teacher should have provided more information or detailed advice before she recommends a reference book.

Another facet of multiple problems involves a combination of a logicality problem and a clarity problem. This is clearly shown in the following conversation where the interlocutors are talking about the city's plan to build apartments.

(19) Bora: Have you heard the news?
Jiho: What news?
Bora: The city planned to build apartments near the river,
but they've changed their minds.
Jiho: Really? I'm glad to hear that.
→Bora: We can ride our bikes there again.
Jiho: That's great. We can also hear birds singing in the trees.
→Bora: Right. It's important to save places like that.
Jiho: I agree. We must protect nature. (F2, p. 95)

In her second turn, Bora is giving the news that the city planned to build apartments near the river, but they've changed their minds. This is followed by her comment in her next turn, "We can ride our bikes there again." This utterance does not make sense, as 'planning' alone cannot prevent riding bikes. In other words, riding bikes has never been prohibited and thus the use of 'again' fails to be connected to the preceding part of the conversation in a rational manner. In the same situation, a native speaker might have rephrased Bora's utterance like this: "We can continue to ride bikes there." Another aspect of incoherence in this dialogue is lack of clarity in Bora's last utterance ("It's important to save places like that."). Though the expression, "to save places like that," appears natural at a cursory glance, it is too vague a statement from a native speaker's point of view. Thus, it should be made more specific like this: "It's important to have parks or green spaces." This inadequate use of a general or broad statement is probably due to L1 influence, seeing that Bora's utterance is fully acceptable in Korean, as pointed out earlier.

V. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The discussion thus far has demonstrated that textbook dialogues display different facets of coherence problems covering lack of clarity, violation of logicality, and inadequate amount of information. In regard to lack of clarity, a vague or general statement was chosen where a specific and clear statement is appropriate. This may be due to L1 interference inasmuch as Korean native speakers prefer general words or statements in the situation where English native speakers opt for specific ones. This was indeed borne out by other studies such as J.-H. Kim and E.-Y. Kwon's (2010) study, which showed that Korean native speakers tend to employ a generic, less specific, or vague expression in the situation where English native speakers prefer a specific one in the realization of refusals. This indicates that a propositional statement which appears logical in the native language does not necessarily make sense in the target language. As Alred, Brusaw, and Oliu (2003) argued, sentences that make use of vague and abstract words should be avoided or else immediately followed by specific clarification. In this sense, the textbook writers should be sensitized to the differences between English and Korean in the choice of general or specific statements, with due attention to American English native speakers' inclination to convey ideas specifically.

Clarity problems also resulted from the wrong choice of grammatical items. More specifically, the choice of the definite article in the situation where a specific name or a proper noun is appropriate and the choice of a negative statement in the situation where an affirmative statement is adequate can create misunderstanding, impeding natural flow of discourse. This suggests that erroneous choice of grammatical structures often leads to textual incoherence. It is, therefore, important to grasp the significance of interconnectedness between forms and meanings (Larsen-Freeman, 2003; White, 2014) to strengthen the systematic connections between ideas or propositions.

Probably the most troublesome case found in this study is the absence of logical connections between propositions or ideas. One major feature in this regard is that the content of an utterance is contradictory to what is being said in the prior discourse. Another case of logicality problems is that the interlocutors are talking at cross purposes. Such problems bring about communication breakdown, leading the interlocutors to lose the thread of the on-going conversation and also interrupting the smooth processing of information in the dialogues (Wikborg, 1990). Such being the case, the textbook writers should be aware of whether what the hearer is going to respond to is logically connected to what he/she or the speaker has just said in the preceding context. They should also take effective control of their discourse knowledge and world knowledge to adequately tackle logical connectivity between ideas in the textbook dialogues.

Another noticeable impediment to logicality lies in the illogical order of information

structures since some textbook dialogues were organized from a specific statement to general one, which is the opposite of what is normally sequenced. This sequential problem strongly suggests that some textbook dialogues fail to mirror judicious coherence features and normal information structures. In this respect, the textbook writers should pay careful heed to the discourse principle that coherent discourse constitutes the structure of hierarchically ordered information, that is, from more general to more specific concepts (Lautamatti, 1990). This suggestion is also supported by Louis and Nenkova's (2011) idea: "Use the first sentences in discourse relations as general sentences and the second as specific sentences (p. 606)"

In reference to the category of informativeness, many dialogues involved under-informativeness, that is, less information than is required, though a handful of other dialogues presented more information than is required. The under-informativeness is largely due to the poor or insufficient elaboration of the on-going topic, which was also reported in Khalil's study (1989), which revealed that Arab EFL learners lack detailed information in their writings. As found in the present study, the speaker's abrupt utterances devoid of preliminary background information about the topic inhibit the natural flow of the conversation, making the hearer wonder what the speaker's communicative intent is and why he/she is talking about the on-going topic. In order to cope adequately with this problem, the textbook writers should take into account I. Lee's (2002) suggestion about propositional development: Propositions should be made explicit by means of elaboration, illustration, exemplification, etc.

The findings suggest that the features of coherence should occupy an important position as a key component of textbook evaluation criteria. More specifically, the evaluation checklist should include the following criteria: (a) Are texts clear and specific enough?; (b) Are texts semantically and sequentially logical and relevant?; (c) Are texts as informative as is required? Curriculum developers' due attention to these criteria will ensure more coherent and authentic dialogues.

This study is limited to the analysis of eighteen English textbooks designed under the 2007 National Curriculum. In future studies, it may be worthwhile to analyze other textbooks to ascertain whether coherence problems found in this study are repeated in other textbooks and whether other types of coherence problems occur in these textbooks. It would also be interesting to explore how the textbooks of the 2007 National Curriculum differ from those of the 2009 National Curriculum with respect to coherence. Despite this limitation, the findings of the study will help textbook writers figure out what is deficient and how coherence problems can be improved in their textbooks. When adapted adequately, the textbooks will provide teachers with a rich source for grasping how to handle different features of coherence in the classroom. The revised editions will eventually serve as a guiding light of discourse-level language input for L2 learners.

REFERENCES

Alred, G. J., Brusaw, C. T., & Oliu, W. E. (2003). *Handbook of technical writing*. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Bae, Jungok. (2001). Cohesion and coherence in children's written English: Immersion and English-only classes. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 12*(1), 51-88.

Bae, Jungok. (2012). Ten cohesion markers' relative contribution to coherence: Letters and stories. *English Language Teaching, 24*(2), 1-26.

Carrell, P. L. (1982). Cohesion is not coherence. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*, 479-488.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teachers' course* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Choi, Yeon-Hee. (1991). Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspectives on textual coherence in Korean and English argumentative writing. *Linguistic Research, 10*, 35-55.

Coates, J. (1995). The negotiation of coherence in face-to-face interaction: Some examples from the extreme bounds. In M. A. Gernsbacher & T. Givon (Eds.), *Coherence in spontaneous text* (pp. 41-58). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Connor, U. (1990). Linguistic/rhetorical measures for international persuasive student writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 24*, 67-87.

Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (1990). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Davies, C., & Katsos, N. (2013). Are speakers and listeners 'only moderately Gricean?' *Journal of Pragmatics, 49*, 78-106.

Enkvist, N. E. (1990). Seven problems in the study of coherence and interpretability. In U. Connor & A. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 11-27). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Garrod, S., & Doherty, G. (1995). Special determinants of coherence in spoken dialogue. In G. Rickheit & C. Habel (Eds.), *Focus and coherence in discourse processing* (pp. 190-202). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Geluykens, R. (1999). It takes two to cohere: The collaborative dimension of topical coherence in conversation. In W. Bublitz, U. Lenz & E. Ventola (Eds.), *Coherence in spoken and written discourse* (pp. 35-54). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hellman, C. (1995). The notion of coherence in discourse. In G. Rickheit & C. Habel

(Eds.), *Focus and coherence in discourse processing* (pp. 190-202). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Johns, A. (1986). Coherence and academic writing: Some definitions and suggestions for teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(2), 247-265.

Jung, Woo-hyun. (2012). An analysis of interlocutors' role relationships in textbook dialogs. *Modern English Education, 13*(4), 1-24.

Jung, Woo-hyun. (2014). Inappropriate presentation of communicative functions in middle school English textbooks. *Foreign Languages Education, 21*(4), 1-27.

Khalil, A. (1989). A study of cohesion and coherence in Arab EFL college students' writing. *System, 17*, 359-371.

Kim, Ji Hyun., & Kwon, Eun Young. (2010). Pragmatic transfer in refusals: A comparative study of Korean and English. *English Language and Linguistics, 16*(1), 99-136.

Kim, Kun-Ok. (1995). Text processing based on coherence principles. *English Teaching, 50*(3), 105-130.

Kim, Myung-Hee. (2003). Coherence and cohesion in the narratives of Korean EFL learners. *Discourse and Cognition, 10*(3), 31-56.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lautamatti, L. (1990). Coherence in spoken and written discourse. In U. Connor & A. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 29-39). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Lee, Hikyoung., & Park, Kwang-Chul. (2008). Sociocultural appropriateness in Korean middle school English textbooks. *English Language and Linguistics, 26*, 215-240.

Lee, I. (1998). Enhancing ESL students' awareness of coherence-creating mechanisms in writing. *TESL Canada Journal, 15*(2), 36-49.

Lee, I. (2002). Teaching coherence to ESL students: A classroom inquiry. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(2), 135-159.

Leo, K. (2012). Investigating cohesion and coherence: Discourse strategies of Chinese students with varied lengths of residence in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*, 157-179.

Louis, A., & Nenkova, A. (2011). Automatic identification of general and specific sentences by leveraging discourse annotations. *Proceedings of the 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, Thailand*, 605-613.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Sanford, A. J., Barton, S. B., Moxey, L. M., & Paterson, K. (1995). Cohesion processes, coherence, and anomaly detection. In G. Rickheit & C. Habel (Eds.), *Focus and coherence in discourse processing* (pp. 203-213). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Swales, J. (1990). Nonnative speaker graduate engineering students and their introductions:

Global coherence and local management. In U. Connor & A. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 189-207). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

White, A. (2014). Discourse markers in task interaction: A comparison between Korean EFL learners and native speakers. *Modern English Education, 15*(4), 1-22.

Wikborg, E. (1990). Types of coherence breaks in Swedish student writing. In U. Connor & A. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 131-148). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

A List of Textbooks Analyzed

Chang, Younghee., Jung, Soyoung., Lee, Kyoungtae., Choi, Dongseok., & Brown, M. (2011). *Middle School English 1*. Seoul: Neunglyule Education.

Chang, Younghee., Jung, Soyoung., Lee, Kyoungtae., Lee, Jungeun., Kim, Yunkyoung., & Roszell, W. (2011). *Middle School English 2*. Seoul: Neunglyule Education.

Chang, Younghee., Choi, Dongseok., Lee, Seokyoung., Lee, Hyunsook., & Kim, Soyoung. (2011). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Neunglyule Education.

Kim, Duk-ki., Ahn, Byung-kyoo., Oh, Junil., Shin, Insook., Kim, Seoryoung., & Kim, Hyunsook. (2011). *Middle School English 1*. Seoul: Chunjae Education.

Kim, Duk-ki., Ahn, Byung-kyoo., Oh, Junil., Shin, Insook., Kim, Seoryoung., Kim, Hyunsook., & Choi, Jin H. (2010). *Middle School English 2*. Seoul: Chunjae Education.

Kim, Duk-ki., Ahn, Byung-kyoo., Oh, Junil., Shin, Insook., Kim, Seoryoung., Kim, Hyunsook., & Choi, Jin H. (2011). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Chunjae Education.

Kim, Im-Deuk., Ko, Kyoung-Seok., Lee, Byung-Choon., Kim, Kiho., Lee, Hikyoung., Lee, Kyoungman., Woo, Dongha., & Sylvestre, P. (2011). *Middle School English I*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.

Kim, Im-Deuk., Ko, Kyoung-Seok., Lee, Byung-Choon., Kim, Kiho., Lee, Heonjoo., Park, Namji., Song, Jehoon., Chang, Eun Kyoung., Kim, Hyunhwa., Kim, Youngseon., & Edward, S. (2011). *Middle School English 2*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.

Kim, Im-Deuk., Lee, Byung-Choon., Kim, Kiho., Lee, Heonjoo., Park, Namji., Song, Jehoon., Chang, Eun Kyoung., Kim, Hyunhwa., Kim, Youngseon., Kim, Jungseon., Kong, Jjaesoon., Kim, Jaeryoung., Cha, Eunsil., & Edward, S. (2011). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.

Lee, Byungmin., Park, Kihwa., Lim In Jae., Moon, Young In., Kim, Youngsook., Ahn,

Sungeun., Choi, Taewon., & Kim, Christian. (2011). *Middle School English 1*. Seoul: Doosan.

Lee, Byungmin., Park, Kihwa., Lim In Jae., Moon, Young In., Kim, Youngsook., Ahn, Sungeun., Choi, Taewon., & Kim, Chritian. (2011). *Middle School English 2*. Seoul: Doosan.

Lee, Byungmin., Park, Kihwa., Lim In Jae., Moon, Young In., Choi, Taewon., Lee, Jooyeon., & Kim, Christian. (2011). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Doosan.

Lee, Dami., Kim, Kyunghwan., Chang, Youngjun., Han, Ho., & Lee, Seonjung. (2011). *Middle School English 1*. Seoul: Jihaksa.

Lee, Dami., Kim, Kyunghwan., Chang, Youngjun., Han, Ho., Lee, Junghwa., Ko, Mira., & Lee, Sooyeol. (2011). *Middle School English 2*. Seoul: Jihaksa.

Lee, Dami., Lee, Junghwa., Chang, Youngjun., Han, Ho., Hong, Youngyei., Ko, Mira., & Choi, Moonyoung. (2011). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Jihaksa.

Park, Jun-Eon., Kim, Kyunsuk., Choi, Heekyoung., Kim, Kyong Hahn., Kim, Soojin., Ha, Joo-yeon., & Snow, G. (2009). *Middle School English 1*. Seoul: Daekyo.

Park, Jun-Eon., Kim, Kyungsuk., Choi, Heekyoung., Kim, Kyong Hahn., Kim, Soojin., Choi, Eunhye., & Snow, G. (2009). *Middle School English 2*. Seoul: Daekyo.

Park, Jun-Eon., Kim, Kyungsuk., Choi, Heekyoung., Kim, Kyong Hahn., Kim, Soojin., Choi, Eunhye., & Snow, G. (2010). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Daekyo.

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Level: Secondary

Woo-hyun Jung, Ph.D.
Dept. of English Language & Literature
Yeungnam University
280, Daehak-ro, Gyeongsan-si
Gyeongsangbuk-do, Korea
Tel: (053) 810-2132
Fax: (053) 810-4607
C.P.: 010-3060-3364
E-mail: woohjung@ynu.ac.kr

Received 13 March 2015
Revised 8 May 2015
Accepted 23 May 2015