Ordering Fast Food: Service Encounters in Real-Life Interaction and in Textbook Dialogs

Hanh thi Nguyen
Hawaii Pacific University

Noriko Ishitobi
Nagoya Municipal Ueda Junior High School

In this paper we compare authentic fast-food ordering transactions with EFL textbook dialogs in order to assist teachers and materials writers in the development of students' communication skills. Using conversation analysis (CA) and drawing on the concepts of communicative competence and interactional competence, we first provide a detailed description of a small sample of real-life transactions and then compare these with the dialogs in textbooks used in Japan, including some successive editions. We demonstrate that the textbook dialogs differ from the recorded real-life interactions in the sequencing of actions and completeness of actions. In the context of the findings, we suggest implications for language teaching and materials development.

　本論は、学習者のコミュニケーション能力の育成を目指す教師や教科書執筆者に助力するため、ファストフード店での注文のやりとりについて、オーセンティックな対話とEFL教科書にある対話文とを比較する。会話分析（CA）の手法を用い、コミュニケーション能力やインタラクション能力の概念に基づいて、まず現実のやりとりのデータサンプルを詳細に記述し、その後日本で使われている教科書の対話文と比較する。ここで検証された教科書の対話文が、録音された現実のやりとりとは一連の行為進行や行為の完了の面において異なっているということを論証する。この研究結果に照らして、言語教育や教材開発への提案を行う。

Over the past 20 years, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) has revised the English language curriculum several times in order to put more emphasis on developing Japanese learners' communicative abilities. The current curriculum states the overall objectives of foreign language education in junior high school as "to develop students' basic *communication abilities* such as listening, speaking, reading and writing, deepening their understanding of language and culture and fostering a positive attitude toward communication through foreign languages" (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, & Technology, 2011, emphasis added). This paper analyzes fast-food ordering transactions in authentic encounters in order to inform dialogs in textbooks currently used in Japan. Our goal is to assist textbook writers, publishers, MEXT, and teachers in the creation and use of language materials to develop students' communicative competence.

Communicative competence involves the integrated use of grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence—in other words, the ability to understand and utilize linguistic forms, the sequential organization of language, the appropriateness of language use in context, and the strategies to handle communication breakdowns (Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). Elaborating on this concept, Hall (1993), He and Young (1998), H. Nguyen (2012), and Young (2009) proposed that an individual's ability to participate in social interaction is comprised of the capability of managing several aspects of a given *interactional practice*, which include its sequential organization, topic management, turn-taking mechanism, linguistic forms, and participation frameworks, all being reflective of the social, cultural, historical, and political context of the interactional practice itself. To develop these abilities, it is important that learners engage in actual social interaction. This may not always be feasible in an EFL context, yet as a first step toward familiarizing students with social interaction, textbook writers and language teachers can at least provide students with authentic discourse samples and create authentic tasks in which students can practice the various components of communicative competence. To accomplish this goal, textbook writers and teachers need to first understand how real-life conversations are organized (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). This paper aims to assist textbook writers and teachers in this effort.

Language in Textbooks and in Naturally Occurring Interaction

Despite the fact that textbooks are the primary source of language input and language practice in most EFL classrooms (Richards, 2002),[1] research-

ers have found that textbook language differs overwhelmingly from language used in real-life interaction (Gilmore, 2004, 2007). Textbooks do not always provide the type of language that matches naturally occurring language with respect to language forms such as modal lexical items (Altman, 1990; Holmes, 1988), idioms (McCarthy & Carter, 1994; Wray, 2000), or comparative and superlative structures (Shortall, 2003), to name a few. As for pragmatic features, textbooks have also been shown repeatedly to differ from authentic realizations of several speech acts, such as agreeing and disagreeing (Pearson, 1986), complaining (Boxer & Pickering, 1995), and inviting (Bouton, 1996).[2] Finally and most relevant to this paper, researchers have identified important differences between textbooks and natural language use regarding discourse phenomena. For example, Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988) compared directions-giving in textbooks and in authentic exchanges and found that whereas textbook dialogs present a three-step model (request for directions – giving directions – thanking), authentic encounters contain a richer array of interactional elements such as orientation checks, confirmation checks, parenthetical comments, non-fluencies (e.g., pauses, hesitation markers, cut-off talk),[3] and notably, a post-question sequence in which the directions-giver may produce a filler, a pause, a repetition of the question, or a comment about the target location. Similarly, other researchers (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, & Reynolds, 1991; Wong, 2002, 2007) have demonstrated that the sequential organization of natural conversation openings and closings in textbooks is much less dynamic and elaborate than what is found in natural interaction. Gilmore (2004) further observed that service encounters presented in textbooks (including a car rental transaction, a hotel reservation, asking for directions, asking for help at an information desk, and telephone inquiries about a rental apartment, a flight, and train schedules) lack interactional phenomena such as pauses, false starts, repetitions, terminal overlaps, latching, hesitation devices, and back-channeling.

The question, of course, is whether textbook dialogs need to be the same as authentic interaction. Richards (2006) argued that general English dialogs in textbooks do not necessarily have to contain the type of interactional phenomena found in real-life conversations, as long as they are not "contrived or unnatural" (p. 20). He further asserted that the findings from research in discourse analysis and conversation analysis are not relevant to language teaching materials. This position, in our view, is problematic in at least two respects. First, it does not provide guidance on how materials developers and teachers can come up with language that is not "contrived or

unnatural." In contrast to Richards, we believe that the only way to avoid creating "contrived or unnatural" language samples is to reach out to research in discourse analysis or to perform discourse analysis with empirical data. Discourse analysis is important because intuition alone "cannot be expected to encompass the rich details and patterning of natural talk" (McCarthy, 1991, p. 145; see also Boxer & Pickering, 1995). Second, the fact that the language examples in textbooks lack the kind of interactional phenomena found in naturally occurring language may deprive learners of opportunities to comprehend meaning negotiation exchanges (Meyers-Scotton & Bernstein, 1988), handle and manipulate interactional practices to fit their agendas (see Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 1981), and select essential information from interactional disturbances (Meyers-Scotton & Bernstein, 1988)—all these are part of the ability to communicate successfully in a second language. We believe that although introducing authentic dialog samples to EFL learners may not always be possible, dialogs presented to students should at least have authentic sequential organization, typical expressions, and interactional phenomena frequently associated with the given situation as well as reflect the cultural context of the interaction (see also Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991). At a minimum, students should have the impression that they are "being taught authentic and naturally occurring structures and vocabulary to use in simulation of real-life talk" (McCarthy, 1991, p. 145). In fact, even Richards agrees that when it comes to using English for specific purposes, authentic materials are vital (Richards, 2006). In our view, the use of authentic materials should be extended to all language learning. Language use is always contextualized in specific situations and language exists nowhere but in discursive practices (Young, 2009) or speech events (Hymes, 1964) (see also Wittgenstein [1958] on the notion of "language games").

In this paper, we provide a discourse analysis of a small sample of authentic conversations concerning a specific situation, ordering food at a fast-food restaurant, to help materials developers and teachers be better informed about the same type of dialogs presented in textbooks. We chose this specific situation because it is a basic and common situation that students may encounter when they travel in an English-speaking country, and because it is found in government-approved textbooks in Japan. Our study extends the body of research on textbook authenticity reviewed above in that we examine the sequential organization of the fast-food service encounter as an entire *speech event* rather than focusing on single language forms or speech acts across various situations. To date, the only study that has compared the sequential organization of a speech event in textbooks versus that in

naturally occurring discourse is Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein's 1988 work on directions-giving encounters. The authenticity of service encounters presented in textbooks has not been fully examined as an interactional practice and we hope to fill this gap in the literature. In the next section, we briefly describe what has been written about the service encounter under study, ordering food at a fast-food restaurant.

Fast-Food Service Encounters

Fast-food restaurants such as McDonald's have intentionally worked to make ordering food a highly routinized activity. Counter workers are trained to follow specific steps in transactions with customers (Leidner, 1993). They are, however, encouraged to add variations in greeting and thanking phrases in order to "minimize the customers' sense of depersonalization" (p. 68). Empirical research on exchanges at fast-food restaurants has provided some glimpses into this speech event. In an observational study of directives used by customers at two fast-food restaurants, McDonald's and Burger King, Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988) noted that customers in the Midwestern US frequently used an elliptical bald imperative (e.g., "A Big Mac."), an imperative followed by please (e.g., "A Big Mac, please."), and a need directive (e.g., "I want . . ."). Less frequent are permission directives (e.g., "Can I . . .?"), while even less frequent are permission directives followed by please (e.g., "Can I + please?"), bald imperative (e.g., "Give me . . ."), or no words (p. 381). The brevity of these language forms is perhaps due to the fast-paced nature of a fast-food restaurant and the impersonal nature of the worker-customer relationship.

Our present study aims to contribute to the existing literature an understanding about how participants use interactional practices (including verbal expressions) to construct the overall sequential structure of a service encounter and how this structure is similar to or different from those presented in textbook dialogs. Our focus on this aspect of this speech event is informed by the notion of interactional competence (Hall, 1993; He & Young, 1998; H. Nguyen, 2012; Young, 2009) and Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of communicative competence mentioned above. After examining the recorded fast-food transactions, we turn to four government-approved textbooks in Japan[4] as examples and analyze their fast-food ordering dialogs, focusing on their sequential structures and how these structures are expressed in interactional practices. We will also survey past editions of some of the textbooks to enrich our analysis.

Methodology

The naturally occurring data analyzed in this paper consist of six transactions recorded at two fast-food restaurants in 2010 in Honolulu, Hawaii.[5] A voice recorder was placed on the counter of the restaurants.[6] The customers as well as the counter workers were a mix of native and nonnative speakers, as is typical at most fast-food restaurants in Honolulu. Since our goal was to gather naturally occurring data, we did not attempt to select only native speakers for analysis.

The textbooks with which the authentic transactions were compared are three textbooks approved by MEXT for junior high school students, *New Horizon English Course 1* (2006), *Total English* (2006, 2012), and *Sunshine English Course 2* (2006, 2012), and one for senior high school students, *Mainstream Oral Communication I* (2010). These textbooks were chosen for analysis because they contain purported dialogs in fast-food restaurants.

To describe the organization of the service encounters, we used conversation analysis (CA). A central concern in CA is the description of how social interactions are sequentially organized. CA examines how each turn at talk is constructed and how turn taking is managed in order to uncover the action(s) being performed and the trajectory of the next relevant actions that are projected (Schegloff, 2007). As such, CA is particularly helpful in the description of the overall structural organization of a speech event, or speech-exchange system (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), in which actions are sequenced in a certain expected order. It is important to note that CA arrives at a description of action sequencing by basing the analysis on observable interactional practices—practices that participants themselves orient to in order to interpret each other's actions. These interactional practices include, for example, turn-entry devices, intonation, periods of silence, hesitation markers, overlaps, volume shifts, and verbal expressions. CA's data-driven approach and its focus on the unfolding of interaction are well suited to our interest in describing the sequencing of actions in the recorded transactions and the dialogs in the textbooks. Using CA's fine-grained qualitative analysis, we start with a small data sample in order to explore patterns of sequential organization.

The recorded transactions were transcribed based on Jefferson's (2004) notation system (see Appendix). For the dialogs from the textbooks, we obtained accompanying audio recordings whenever possible and transcribed these dialogs, also using Jefferson's notation system. We then analyzed the sequential organization in both types of data and noted differences between the textbook dialogs and the actual service encounters.

Analysis

Naturally Occurring Service Encounters

The overall structure of the food ordering transaction in the authentic transactions in our data can be described by the following template:

OPENING:

(a) worker summonses—customer responses

FOOD ORDERING:

(b) customer makes request—worker acknowledges

(c) worker offers choices—customer responds / makes request—worker acknowledges

(d) worker requests confirmation of order completeness—customer confirms / makes new requests—worker acknowledges (steps b-c may be repeated)

(e) worker states order summary—customer acknowledges / reminds worker—worker acknowledges

(f) worker offers choices of food presentation—customer responds / makes request—worker acknowledges

PAYMENT:

(g) worker requests payment—customer responds by paying—worker acknowledges amount

CLOSING:

(h) worker thanks customer—customer thanks worker

(i) customer leaves counter to wait for food in another area of restaurant[7]

As a template, this structure captures the actions that take place in the transactions recorded, but each individual episode may vary slightly from this comprehensive outline. We will describe the organization of each sequence in detail below.

a. Opening

Excerpts 1 and 2 present examples of opening sequences. (In our transcripts, C stands for "customer" and W for "worker.")

Excerpt 1 [Iced Coffee]

```
1    W: aloha::,
2       (1.2)
3    W: >aloha,<
4    C: hi.
5       (0.9)
```

Excerpt 2 [Happy Meal]

```
1    W: aloha:,
2       (4.0)
3    W: aloha:,
4       (.)
5    W: next please:,
6       (3.5)
7    C: ↑can I ha:ve ↓uh (0.5) happy meal?
```

In line 1 of both excerpts, the worker's greeting functions to select and sum-mon a particular customer (the first one in line) to the interaction (cf. Sacks et al., 1974, Schegloff, 1968). Simultaneously, this turn opens up the interac-tion by initiating a state of ratified mutual participation (Goffman, 1963). The importance of the establishment of ratified mutual participation is evident in the fact that after a pause when the customer does not respond (line 2 in both excerpts), the worker repeats the greeting (line 3 in both excerpts). In Excerpt 2, the worker even changes to a request to summon the customer again (line 5). Ratified mutual participation is established when the customer responds in line 7. In Excerpt 1, the customer responds to the worker's greeting with a greeting (line 4), but in Excerpt 2, the customer responds right away with a request, which functions as an order for food. Of note, the workers' greetings may reflect and renew the physical and cultural context of the interaction: The use of the Hawaiian greeting invokes the location as being in Hawaii and orients to the cultural image of Hawaii being sold to tourists as the welcoming Aloha State. This feature may be a strategy on the part of the fast-food chain to personalize a standardized service (Leidner, 1993).

b. Food Ordering

Food ordering involves several sequences and although they are often

intertwined, for the purpose of analysis we will analyze them one at a time. The first sequence is *request—acknowledgment*, as can be seen in Excerpts 3-5.

Excerpt 3 [Happy Meal]
```
7   C:  ↑can I ha:ve ↓uh (0.5) happy meal?
8   W:  pardon?
9   C:  happy meal,
10  W:  happy meal.
```

The customer makes the request in line 7. The repair that follows (lines 8-10) shows that both participants treat the food name as the most important piece of information in this part of the interaction: When the worker indicates trouble understanding (line 8), the customer repeats only the name of the meal being ordered, and in the next turn, the worker receipts only that information (line 10).

Most customers in our data used the question format in their requests for food ("Can I have X?"), which is in line with the findings of Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988). Excerpt 4 below shows a different format of the request, the statement "I want X."

Excerpt 4 [Cranberry Pork]
```
3   C: I want a:
4      (4.0)
5   C: I want a: pork cranberry with cheese,
6   W: mhm,
```

We found that the worker produces the acknowledgement verbally in 14 (or 82%) of the 17 requests in our data. The next excerpt shows the multimodal format of the worker's acknowledgement in the context of a fast-food chain restaurant.[8] In this excerpt, the worker had trouble finding the right key for the food being ordered, and her acknowledgement is not complete until the right key is pressed.

Excerpt 5 [Spam Platter]
```
2   C: ah (.) may I have (.) number (.)
```

```
3        seven: (0.2) meal?
4         (0.5)
5    W:  <spam platter,> ((W presses key on register))
6    C:  ↓ya:s. spam platter.
7         (.)
8    C:  and ah
9    W:  spa::m:: ((looks for the key for spam platter))
10        (1.0)
11   C:  n kay:,
12        (3.5)
13   W:  °sorry°.
14   C:  breakfast bowl?
15        (.)
16   W:  okay.
17   C:  yeah.
18   W:  spam platter?
19        (0.5) ((W finally finds key for spam platter
20              and presses it))
```

In this excerpt, the customer makes the request in lines 2-3, using a ques-
tion format ("May I have X?"). While the customer refers to the meal by a
number, the worker reformulates it by the food content with a slightly rising
intonation (line 5). As such, the worker's turn does not function as an ac-
knowledgement but as a confirmation request. The customer confirms the
food order in line 6. With the brief pause in line 7, this sequence could close
down. Indeed, in line 8, the customer initiates a new turn which, with the
use of the turn-preface *and* (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994), is hearable as an-
other request. The worker, however, has not produced an acknowledgement
of the food order yet. In line 9, she repeats the name of the food but it is pro-
nounced as a stretched syllable with a leveled intonation (neither rising nor
falling) as she is looking for a key to press on the register. Produced in this
manner, this turn is marked as a non-acknowledgement (an acknowledge-
ment typically has a definite falling or rising intonation) and it displays the
worker's orientation to a delay in the closing of the sequence. The customer
seems to recognize this delay and does not take a full turn in line 11 nor

during the long pause in line 12. The fact that this delay is out of the ordinary is then shown in the worker's apology in a quiet voice in line 13. In line 14, however, the customer continues his previously abandoned request for another food item, and the worker utters a receipt (line 16), but in line 18, the worker returns to the first food order. She repeats the name of the food item with a clearly rising intonation and presses the key on the register (lines 19-20). Only after line 20 does this sequence close down and the worker initiates a new sequence (not shown in Excerpt 5). This excerpt shows that the worker's receipt serves an important function in a food ordering sequence and when it is not produced, the sequence cannot close.[9] In fact, the second food request made by the customer in such a delayed sequence may not be entered into the system at all (in the transaction recorded, the customer later reinitiates his second food item order). A reasonable implication for someone learning to interact in this type of transaction is to withhold a next request until the worker has pressed the key for the current order.

An interesting aspect of the format of the request for food we noticed in our data is that the full question form is usually used for the first food item, and subsequent requests tend to be produced as added items in the form of noun phrases (Excerpt 6, see also Excerpt 9 below).[10]

Excerpt 6 [Mac Snack Wrap]
```
1   C: can I have the uh <Mac snack wr- wrap>?
2   W: Mac wrap?
3   C: ↓yep.
4      (.)
5   C: a:nd uh (0.3) ice tea?
```

The first request (line 1) takes a full question form, but the second request, made after the first order sequence has closed (line 3), takes an abbreviated form, and the requested food item is mentioned as an added item to the first request (line 5). Thus, like Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988), we find that bare noun phrases are used frequently in requests, but, in our sample, we also find that their context is different from the context of requests in full question format: bare noun phrases tend to occur not in initial requests but in subsequent ones.

After the customer has made a food order, it is often the case that the worker follows up with food and drink choices. Excerpts 7 and 8 are examples of the next sequence: *offer of choices—response / request—acknowledgement*.

Excerpt 7 [Happy Meal]

```
10  W: happy meal. cheeseburger, hamburger,
11     or nuggets?
12  C: ↓nug°gets°.
13  W: ↓nuggets.
```

In Excerpt 7, after the worker receipts the food order by repeating it, she immediately offers choices to the customer, in this case, it is the choice of the meat (lines 10-11). The customer responds with a selection, which simultaneously functions as a request for that selection (line 12). The worker then acknowledges the selection by repeating it (line 13). Of note, the food choices are presented elliptically as a list with rising intonation (the full form would be "Would you like a cheeseburger, hamburger, or nuggets in your Happy Meal?"). Someone who is not familiar with this speech event may have a difficult time understanding this elliptical question.

Another common item that often involves choices is the drink that goes with the meal. Excerpt 8 exemplifies this.

Excerpt 8 [Spam Platter]

```
21  W: what kind of drink?
22     (.)
23  W: soda:
24  C: u:[h:
25  W:   [coffee:
26  C: coffee.
27  W: coffee.
28     (.)
29  W: how many cream and sugar?
30     ((presses key on register))
31  C: no. no need.
32     (0.8) ((W presses key on register))
```

In line 21, the worker offers the customer the choice of drink in the form of a question. After a brief pause after the question, which indicates the customer's delay in the answer, the worker provides a "candidate answer"

(Pomerantz, 1988) (i.e., a model for the customer's answer, in this case, specific types of drinks) (lines 23, 25). The customer's hesitation marker in line 24 indicates his recognition of the delay in his answer and at the same time claims the floor while an answer is not forthcoming yet. Finally, after the worker's candidate answer, the customer is able to state his selection (line 26). Right after this, the worker acknowledges the customer's selection (line 27).

After a brief gap (line 28), the same sequential structure recurs, with the worker asking another question about the choice of condiments to go with the drink (line 29). This time, the customer declines (line 31). The worker receipts this information by pressing a key on the register (line 32) and the sequence closes down.

While the above excerpts present the more common scenario, in some cases, such as in Excerpt 9 below, the customer includes enough details about the order that the sequence about choices is preempted and bypassed.

Excerpt 9 [Iced Coffee]
```
6   C: can I have a: large ice coffee >sugar
7      free vanilla<?
8      (1.0) ((W presses key on register))
9   C: and a: (.) medium fries?
10     (1.5) ((W presses key on register))
```

In lines 6-7, the customer makes a drink request. This request not only mentions the drink name ("ice[d] coffee") but also the size ("large") and his selections of drink ("sugar free") and flavor ("vanilla"). Consequently, the worker receipts the information nonverbally by pressing the key without following up with a sequence about choices (line 8). Similarly, in line 9, the customer's request mentions both the name of the food ("fries") and a size ("medium"). As before, the worker only receipts the information without initiating a new sequence about choices. The customer's inclusion of the order selections in the request may indicate his familiarity with the menu and the interactional routine of the restaurant.

After the details about the order are communicated, the worker sometimes requests the customer's *confirmation of the completeness of the order*. If the customer provides the confirmation, the ordering sequence can be brought to a close. This pattern can be seen in Excerpt 10.

Excerpt 10 [Spam Platter]
```
36  W: >anything ↑else?<
37     (.)
38  C: no that's it,=
39  W: =nine forty.
```

Alternatively, if the customer does not provide confirmation or issues another order, the interaction is back to the order – receipt token sequences (Excerpt 11).

Excerpt 11 [Happy Meal]¹¹
```
17     (2.0)
18  W: ↑that's it?
19  C: and UM (1.0) yeah cud- (.) well uh (0.2)
20     w- one McChicken,
21  W: one McChicken,
22  C: mhm,
23     (0.3)
24  C: and: (0.2) two large frie:s.
25  W: two large fries.
```

In line 18, the worker requests the customer's confirmation of the completeness of the order in the form of a question. In the next turn, the customer rejects the confirmation by producing a request for another item (lines 19-20). The customer's request in lines 19-20 is worth further examination. Her turn begins with "and," thus indicating that the upcoming turn is a continuation of the previous sequence (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994), in this case, ordering food and drinks. Second, the customer's use of several hesitation markers ("UM," "yeah," and "well") functions to hold the floor before she can name the food to be requested. These floor-holding devices may seem messy as disturbances on the surface but in fact they are crucial in this moment of the interaction (see Goodwin, 1979) because they indicate to the worker the customer's intention to continue her turn and place an additional order even when she is not yet ready to utter her desired item.

As Excerpt 11 shows, if the customer does not confirm the completeness of the order, further food ordering sequences can occur (lines 24-25). It is

important to note that in line 20, the customer ends her turn with a slightly rising intonation, but in line 24, her turn ends with falling intonation. These intonation contours seem to function as her implicit indication of when the order will still continue (line 20) and when it is complete (line 24). It seems that the worker orients to these cues from the customer, and in the next turn, she moves on to summarize the order (Excerpt 12 below).

The *order summary* sequence occurs in two of the six recorded transactions.[12] This summary sequence serves to confirm both the completeness and the accuracy of the order (Excerpt 12).

Excerpt 12 [Happy Meal]
```
24     (5.5)
26  W: so- (.) for a chicken nugget happy meal:
27     with a Sprite, (.) one McChicken
28     and two large fries.
29  C: mhm.
```

After a significant pause during which the worker enters the order information to the machine (line 24), in line 26, she takes a turn that begins with "so," a turn-initial discourse marker to indicate the upshot of the preceding interaction (Schiffrin, 1987). Subsequently, she lists all the items that have been ordered (lines 26-28). The customer's acknowledgement in line 29 confirms the accuracy of and her agreement to the order.

The final sequence in the food ordering phase involves the *choice of food presentation*, namely, whether the customer would like to have the food prepared for consumption in the restaurant or elsewhere. The fixed phrase used in the worker's request is an elliptic "for here, or to go," meaning "Do you want to eat the food here or take the food elsewhere with you?" This question, unique to fast-food and take-out restaurants, is an important one because based on the customer's answer, the worker will package and serve the food differently. This sequence is usually quite brief and indicates the completion of the food-ordering phase (Excerpt 13).

Excerpt 13 [Happy Meal]
```
30  W:  for here, or to go ma'am.
31  C:  uh- (.) ↑to ↓go.
32     (0.7)
```

We found that the sequence about food presentation choice occurs *after* the confirmation of order completeness in all of the six real-life transactions recorded. This is perhaps because while both the confirmation of the order completeness and food presentation choices are pre-closing, the former signals the potential closing of the customer's preceding requests while the latter orients to the upcoming food delivery phase. The closing-implicative nature of the sequence involving choice of food presentation can be seen in Excerpt 14, where the customer actually requests confirmation of certain items on the order when the worker introduces the choice of food presentation *before* the entire order has been repeated. Prior to Excerpt 14, the customer has placed an order for a filet-o-fish meal (the choices were either a meal or a sandwich), two nachos, and two chillies. At that point, the worker checks if the order is for only one meal (line 35) and the customer subsequently adds another order, a filet-o-fish sandwich (starting from line 36).[13]

Excerpt 14 [Filet of Fish]

```
34      (2.0)
35   W: uh: just wa- one meal:, right?
36   C: mhm, and (actually) can I have an
37      extra: plate please?
38   W: yeah.
39   C: for a sandwich.
40   W: for a sandwich.
41   C: uh huh,
42      (3.0)
43   C: same way, no sauce?
44   W: sandwich also no sauce?
45   C: yeah.
46   W: okay.
47      (3.0)
48→  W: so one filet of fish meal:,
49      (.)
50   W: uh: what kind of drink do you want?
51      (0.2)
52   C: u:::h maybe a coke,
```

```
53   W: coke
54   C: mhm,
55      (4.7)
56   W: for here or to go sir.
57   C: to go,
58      (0.2)
59   W: to go?
60      (.)
61→  C: you get the sandwich too?
62   W: yeah.
63   C: mhm. good,
64   W: one meal one sandwich.
65      (0.2)
66   C: thanks,
67      (.)
68→  C: you get um the sauce?
69      (0.2)
70→  C: two [ranches
71   W:       [yep,
72→  C: two- two chili sauce?
73   W: okay.
74   C: thank you.
```

In line 48, the worker produces the order summary but before the entire order is mentioned, she offers the customer the choice of drink for the food she just mentioned (line 50). After this sequence closes, she moves on to ask for the customer's choice of food presentation (line 56). When this sequence ends, the customer issues a question in line 61 to confirm an item he has previously ordered but that the worker did not mention in her summary in line 48. The fact that he asks this question after the sequence about the food presentation choice illustrates that this sequence implies the completion of the food-ordering phase; thus, any corrections need to be made right away.

It is worth noting that after the worker provides an affirmative answer (line 62) and the customer gives a positive assessment (line 63), the worker

verbalizes a summary of the order (line 64). It seems that by saying the order summary, the worker is orienting to her institutional role: It is the worker and not the customer who should produce the summary. The customer aligns with this participation framework and acknowledges the worker's summary in line 66.

Interestingly, the worker's summary in line 64 does not mention all of the items that have been ordered. This seems to prompt the customer to ask a question to confirm the order for the other food items. There is no immediate response from the worker, resulting in a pause in line 69. The customer then reformulates his question to be more specific and names the food item in line 70. With the worker's positive response (line 71) in slight overlap with his turn, the customer asks another question to confirm the other food item (line 72). With all the items ordered being confirmed, the customer thanks the worker, thus closing the sequence.

This particular example thus shows how the sequence about the choice of food presentation implies the closing of the food ordering sequence and how customers may participate in the summarizing of the order when the worker fails to list all the items being ordered.

c. Payment

When the order summary sequence closes, the interactions typically move to the payment sequence, in which the worker initiates a *request for payment* by announcing the amount due and the customer *responds* by handing over cash or a credit card. If it is cash, the worker *acknowledges* the amount received, and if change is due, the worker gives back the change to the customer while also announcing the change amount. Excerpt 15 is an example.

Excerpt 15 [Happy Meal]
```
32      (0.7)
33  W:  nine thirty-nine plea:se,
34      (4.0) ((C takes out ten dollar bill and hands to
        worker))
35  W:  ten.
36      (5.0) ((W counts change from register))
37  W:  <sixty one>. ((W hands change to C))
38      (.)
```

The request for payment is made in line 33, with the politeness marker "please." It is interesting to note that the customer's response is nonverbal (line 34) but the worker announces verbally the amount received (line 35). In line 37, the worker hands the change over to the customer while also announcing the amount. Throughout this sequence, neither party mentions the currency units (dollars and cents), displaying their familiarity with this transaction.

d. Closing

Finally, after the payment, the food-ordering transaction typically closes with the customer and worker thanking each other (Excerpt 16).

Excerpt 16 [Happy Meal]
```
38     (.)
39  W: thank you:,
40  C: thank you. ((C leaves counter))
```

The use of thanks by both parties indicates their mutual orientation to the closing of the conversation. In all the cases we examined, the worker seems to assume the customer's familiarity with the setting of fast-food restaurants and provides no explanation concerning where to wait for the food. When the food-ordering phase ends, the customer typically waits in another area of the restaurant away from the counter to pick up the food when it is ready.[14]

Now that we have examined in detail the sequential organization of the food-ordering transactions at fast-food restaurants, we turn our attention to some dialogs about ordering food at a fast-food restaurant in three junior and one senior high school textbooks used in Japan.

Textbook Dialogs

The first textbook we examined, *New Horizon English Course 1*, contains the following fast-food ordering dialog.[15]

Textbook Dialog 1: *New Horizon English Course 1* (2006, pp. 42-43)
```
((2.2 seconds of background music and soft background
noise))
```

```
1    Mike: two hamburgers and two colas. please?
2          (0.4)
3  Worker: large, (.) or small.
4          (0.2)
5    Mike: large, please?
6          (0.4)
7  Worker: for here, or to go.
8          (0.3)
9    Mike: to go.
10         (3.5) ((rustling sound))
11 Worker: here you are:.
12         (0.4)
13 Worker: that's five hundred and forty yen. please?
14         (2.8) ((clicking sound))
15 Worker: ↑thank ↓you.
```

There are several striking differences between this dialog and the authentic conversations analyzed above. First, there are no actions to establish a state of ratified mutual participation (see Goffman, 1963). The lack of openings in textbook dialogs has also been noted by Wong (2002) in a study comparing telephone openings in textbooks and ordinary conversations. Further, while we find in our data a full question format for the first request in authentic transactions, the customer in the textbook dialog uses noun phrases, which we find in subsequent requests but not in a first request in our data. In addition, "cola" is not an actual drink item on the menu of most fast-food restaurants and is not a common expression in English to refer to a type of soft drink.[16] The unnaturalness of the textbook dialog can be seen further in line 3, when the worker offers the choice of size. Since the customer in line 1 mentioned two kinds of item (food, drink), it is unclear for which of them a size is to be selected. Also, the two options of food/drink size mentioned (large or small) can be misleading, as most fast-food restaurants offer three options: regular/small, medium, and large. A third difference is the lack of a confirmation of the order's completeness and an order summary. A fourth difference is the inclusion of food delivery ("here you are," line 11) during the food-ordering phase—delivery normally occurs minutes after the food-ordering dialog has ended. Including this expression in the dialog is thus not realistic and could be misleading about how fast-food

restaurants operate (in contrast to food/snack bars for example). Another difference is the noninteractive nature of lines 11-15, in which the worker delivers the food, requests payment, and thanks the customer, all without any turns from the customer. Of note, the use of a full sentence to announce the price is not found in our data, where workers typically uttered only the amount due without mentioning even the currency units. More importantly, actions in the textbook dialog are sequenced without signs of negotiation, often done in a natural dialog via interactional phenomena such as receipt tokens, discourse markers, hesitation tokens, restarts, and overlaps (cf. Gilmore, 2004). Although these details may seem minute, they are important interactional practices that participants in conversations use to negotiate turns, actions, and the organization of the whole interaction (Sacks et al., 1974). If the goal of language teaching is to enable students to communicate in the target language, introducing students to these interactional practices in context is of paramount importance (Wong & Waring, 2010).

The second textbook we examined is *Total English*, and we will consider the fast-food ordering dialogs in its 2006 and 2012 editions.

Textbook Dialog 2: *Total English 1* (2006, pp. 98-99)

```
1  ((1.2 seconds of silence, heading in written version:
   "Order"))
2  Worker: ↓next, plea:se
3          (1.0)
4     Jun: I want a hamburger.
5          (0.5)
6     Jun: French fries, and tea, plea:se,
7          (1.0)
8  Worker: for he:re, or to go:,
9          (1.0)
10    Jun: here, plea:se,
11         (2.0) ((heading in written version: "Size?
                                        What kind?"))
12 Worker: lar:ge, or small French frie:s.
13         (1.0)
14    Jun: lar:ge, plea:se,
```

```
15          (1.0)
16  Worker: hot, or iced tea.
17          (1.0)
18     Jun: hot, please,
19          (2.0) ((heading in written version: "How
            much?"))
20  Worker: here you are:,
21          (1.0)
22     Jun: ↑thank ↓you:.
23          (0.5)
24     Jun: how much is it.
25          (1.0)
26  Worker: two dollars and sixty cents, please.
27          (.)
28  Worker: ↑thank ↓you:.
```

   This dialog contains opening and closing sequences and uses a full question form for the customer's first request (lines 4-6), quite similar to what we found in the naturally occurring transactions. However, there are important differences. Notably, the sequence on food presentation choices, a pre-closing sequence, is placed in line 8, immediately after the customer's first request and before the food and drink choices. Another difference is in line 24. In our data, the workers often announced the amount due as a way to close up the transaction (five out of six transactions). Given this interactional function of the price announcement, having the customer asking for the price implies a delay in the worker's announcement of the price, while in fact there is nothing in the dialog that indicates such delay. This misuse of the question about price thus makes the dialog unnatural. Finally, as also found in the dialog from *New Horizon English Course 1,* other differences from the real-life interactions analyzed above include the limited format of the choices of size (line 12), the inclusion of the food delivery sequence (line 20), the mentioning of the currency units (line 26), the lack of a confirmation of the order completeness, and the absence of interactional practices to negotiate actions and action sequencing throughout the dialog. For example, in line 4, the customer's turn ends with a falling intonation, followed by a pause (line 5), which may indicate the completion of the request. However,

in line 6, the request continues. One would expect the customer to lengthen the final syllable of her turn in line 4 and use some turn-holding devices such as hesitation markers during the silence in line 5.

The 2012 edition of this textbook presents a slightly more authentic dialog, although it still contains some noticeable differences compared to the real-life transactions.

```
Textbook Dialog 3: Total English New Edition 1 (2012, p.
101)
1    ((1.0 second of silence, heading in written version:
     "Order"))
2  Worker: ↓next please?
3        (1.0)
4     Meg: <can I have a hamburger?>
5        (0.3)
6     Meg: French frie:s, (.) and an iced tea?
7        (0.7)
8  Worker: large, or small French fries.
9        (0.7)
10    Meg: large, plea:se,
11       (0.7)
12 Worker: fo:r here, ↓or to go
13       (0.7)
14    Meg: for he:re,
15       (1.2) ((heading in written version: "How much?"))
16 Worker: here ↓you are,
17       (0.7)
18    Meg: ↑thank ↓you.
19       (0.4)
20    Meg: <how much is it.>
21       (0.7)
22 Worker: two dollars and: seventy five cents. please,
23       (0.3)
24 Worker: thank you.
```

The differences include the format of the choices of size (line 8), the inclusion of the food delivery sequence (line 14), the price request by the customer (line 20), the inclusion of the currency units in the payment sequence (line 22), the lack of a confirmation of the order completeness, and the absence of interactional practices to negotiate action sequencing.

Next, we examined the fast-food ordering dialogs in *Sunshine English Course 2,* in its 2006 and 2012 editions.

Textbook dialog 4: *Sunshine English Course 2* (2006, p. 22)

```
1     ((1.2 seconds of silence))
2    Worker: can I help you?
3           (0.4)
4  Customer: yes:, a: hamburger. please,
5           (.)
6    Worker: okay? is that all?
7           (.)
8  Customer: one large orange juice, please.
9           (.)
10   Worker: okay?
11          (0.2)
12 Customer: how much is it.
13   Worker: four ninety.
```

This dialog does contain an opening sequence (lines 1-3) and a confirmation of the order completeness (line 5), as found in the authentic transactions analyzed above. It also presents the food request separately from the drink request (lines 3, 7), and has the worker announcing the price in elliptical form, making it more natural. However, it still differs in important ways from the authentic transactions we analyzed. First, the worker receipts the order request by saying "okay" (lines 5 and 9) while in our data, the workers tended to acknowledge the request by repeating the name of the item being ordered (see Excerpt 3 for example). Second, the sequence on food presentation choices, a unique and important sequence in fast-food ordering transactions, is absent. Third, this dialog contains the unnatural question for the price from the customer, as also found in *Total English*. Finally, similarly to the dialogs from the other two textbooks, this dialog also misses the interactional phenomena that participants use as basic practices to negotiate turns

and sequences. For example, in line 7, since the customer's request for the drink occurs *after* the worker's confirmation of the order's completeness (line 5), one would expect the customer to begin the turn with some non-alignment with the projection of the worker's turn, such as by using "and" to indicate the continuation of the ordering action (see our analysis of Excerpt 11 above, cf. Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994).

The 2012 edition of *Sunshine English Course 2* contains a dialog that appears to be much more similar to the authentic transactions we found in our data. This dialog is broken up into four parts, each introduced by an announcer who says the number of that part (lines 1, 9, 14, 21).

Textbook Dialog 5: *Sunshine English Course 2* (2012, p. 52)

```
1    ((Announcer: number one))
2    ((1.0 seconds of background noise))
3    Worker: ↓hello.
4            (.)
5    Worker: may I help you?
6            (0.5)
7      Maki: yes. (.) I'll have a hamburger, (.) a small
8            French fries, (.) and a cola. please,
9    ((Announcer: number two))
10   Worker: which size cola would you like.
11           (.)
12   Worker: small, (.) medium (.) or large.
13     Maki: medium please.
14   ((Announcer: number three))
15   Worker: for here, or to go:,
16           (0.4)
17     Maki: for here please.
18           (0.4)
19   Worker: would you like anything else?
20     Maki: no. (.) that's all. (.) thanks.
21   ((Announcer: number four))
22   Worker: ↓okay. that'll be three eighty plea:se,
```

```
23        (0.5)
24    Maki: here you are.
25        (0.5)
26  Worker: ↓thank you.
27        (0.3)
28  Worker: here's your change.
```

This dialog contains all the key components that we found in the overall structure of the naturally occurring transactions, including an opening sequence (lines 3-5), a sequence about choices (lines 10-13), a sequence about food presentation (lines 15-17), a sequence to confirm the completeness of the order (lines 19-20), and a payment sequence (lines 22-28). One difference between this dialog and the real-life transactions we analyzed, however, is the relative positioning of the confirmation of order completeness and the food presentation choices. As shown above (Excerpts 12, 13), confirmation of order completeness occurs before food presentation choices in the real-life transactions, but that order is reversed in this dialog. As we also noted above, while these are both pre-closing actions, they have different orientations that match their sequential order. Because the textbook dialog groups actions into four parts, it would make more sense to place the confirmation of order completeness in part two, which involves food ordering. A second difference is the absence of the worker's verbal acknowledgment in response to the customer's request, which occurs regularly in our data (see Excerpts 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 for examples). Including the verbal acknowledgment, normally a repetition of the customer's request, could facilitate listening comprehension while also increasing authenticity.

Finally, we turn our attention to a MEXT-approved senior high school textbook that includes a fast-food ordering dialog, *Mainstream Oral Communication I* (2010).[17] Constructed for students of a higher proficiency level, the dialog still contains several features that are not authentic.

Textbook Dialog 6: *Mainstream Oral Communication I* (2010, p. 39)

```
1      A: What would you like, sir?
2  Shota: Well, I'd like to have a ham sandwich.
3      A: Large or small?
4  Shota: Small, please.
5      A: Two hundred yen, sir. Anything else?
```

```
6  Shota: I'll take a chocolate shake and a medium French fries.
7     A: To eat here or to go?
8  Shota: To go, please.
9     A: That will be five hundred yen, sir. Enjoy your meal.
```
Note. Line numbers are added for reference.

Noticeably, unlike the real-life transactions analyzed above, the payment sequence is initiated in line 5, right after the first request and before a confirmation of the order completeness. There is an absence of acknowledgement by the worker after each request by the customer throughout the transaction. In addition, the routine question in fast-food restaurants, "for here or to go?" is not presented idiomatically in line 7. In line 9, the worker announces the price and produces a closing wish without any responses from the customer. Finally, at this point in the transaction, the food has not been delivered and thus the expression "enjoy your meal" does not seem to be sequentially appropriate.

In sum, our examination of the fast-food ordering dialogs in four government-approved textbooks in Japan shows that while there are some positive changes in the recent publications (a trend also found in international textbooks) (Gilmore, 2004), there is still much room for improvement in order to increase the authenticity of these textbooks.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings above should be taken as preliminary only, in view of the small data sample size for both the real-life transactions and the textbook dialogs. In addition, the lack of video data for the real-life transactions meant that valuable information on nonverbal actions (such as eye gaze, gesture, facial expression) was not available except for the actions recorded in our limited field notes.

As an initial analysis, however, we have identified the overall sequential structure and how actions are constructed and sequenced in a few real-life food ordering transactions. For example, a customer may utilize the full question form rather than the elliptic form to re-initiate the food ordering sequence and hesitation markers to hold the floor, thus sustaining the current sequence and withholding the transition to a new sequence. When we compared these transactions with textbook dialogs, we found that the textbooks deviate from authentic conversations in material ways, namely,

the sequencing of actions, the completeness of actions, and the interactional practices used to perform actions.

We are aware that textbook writers have to operate within certain constraints; for example, they may have felt the need to make the dialogs fit the linguistic focus of the lesson or the students' proficiency level, and in so doing, they omitted important aspects of social interaction such as openings, closings, receipt tokens, order summaries, and means to negotiate turns in talk.[18] However, there is a danger in acceding to such constraints. First of all, as our analysis of the authentic transactions show, choices of language expressions and other interactional practices at each moment of talk are indexical of the context and the unfolding sequential organization of the interaction. Altering the language and other interactional features may also create misleading cues about the context of the target linguistic forms as well as the structure of the interaction itself (as in the inclusion of the phrase "here you are" in a fast-food ordering transaction). Second, since it is often difficult for EFL teachers and learners to experience authentic English conversations, they need to rely on the textbook dialogs as model language samples, and if textbook dialogs are so deprived of authentic features, teachers and students may be led to believe that these dialogs are the norm and find themselves unprepared to handle real-life situations when the opportunity arises (see also Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Wong, 2002). For these reasons, in our view, simplifying conversations for textbooks can potentially make it *more* difficult for students to develop the communicative competence needed for real-life communication. In fact, introducing authentic language can only benefit students. Gilmore (2011) demonstrated that students exposed to authentic input developed higher communicative competence compared to those exposed to only textbook materials.

Where exposure to authentic input is not possible outside of the classroom, we would like to encourage textbook writers to analyze samples of authentic conversations and introduce them to students as transcripts, audio samples, or video clips (see, for examples, Barraja-Rohan & Pritchard, 1997; Reber, 2011).[19] Teachers should be encouraged to provide students with exposure to authentic interactions and opportunities to practice them. We believe that presenting speech events with authentic sequential organization and interactional practices can help students become more familiar with how language is used in the target context. Further, interactional phenomena such as pauses, overlaps, and restarts—while seemingly messy—are inherent to social interaction. Since students deal with these phenomena in their first language as well, learning how to utilize them in

the target language should be a part of language acquisition. We hope that our study, albeit performed on a small scale, can inform textbook writers and teachers with both its findings and methodology, so that they can be more effective in developing students' communicative competence.

Notes

1. It should be noted, however, that textbooks should not be considered as the sole determiner of the learning outcomes in the language classroom.

2. See also Williams (1988) for a survey of differences in speech act realizations in business meetings as given in textbooks versus naturally occurring discourse and M. Nguyen (2011) for a critical evaluation of several speech acts in textbooks used in Vietnam.

3. We do not suggest that textbooks should include CA transcripts in their written dialogs, but including interactional practices, such as these non-fluencies, in the audio version of the dialogs might increase textbook authenticity.

4. Future research on a wider range of textbooks in various countries would be desirable.

5. Permission to record the conversations was obtained from the restaurant workers and customers either beforehand or as they were waiting in line.

6. While video data would have been ideal, we decided to use audio recording to minimize the intrusiveness of the recording device.

7. The pick-up phase is separate from the ordering phase. It may occur a few minutes after the ordering phase and may be handled by the same worker or a different worker.

8. A multimodal action involves multiple meaning-making modals, such as verbal expressions, embodied actions, and manipulation of objects. The nonverbal details in the transcripts were noted by the researcher who observed the transactions while recording them.

9. The importance of the register key in this type of interaction can also be illustrated by Excerpt 9 (lines 8 and 10), where it is sufficient for the worker to receipt an order by pressing the register key without any verbal production.

10. A customer may employ this feature of the full question format to reinitiate the food-ordering phase (Excerpt 14, lines 36-37).

11. The talk between Excerpt 7 and Excerpt 11 is:

    [Happy Meal]
    ```
    14  W:  ↑what kind of drink?
    15  C:  uh: (.) Sprite.
    16  W:  Sprite.
    ```

12. Whether the summary sequence occurs or not seems to depend on the size of the order. In both cases where it occurs, the order involves several food items. In contrast, the other cases involve only one or two items. This is a pattern worth exploring in further research.

13. It is worth noting that the customer in lines 36-37 uses the full question form, which is often found in the initial request. By using the full question form right after what may sound like a summary by the worker (line 35), he seems to imply a reinitiation of the food-ordering sequence.

14. Examples of the pick-up phase are:

    Example 1
    ```
    1  W: here you go Big Mac,
    2  C: thank you.
    ```
    Example 2
    ```
    1  W: FILET OF FISH FOR YOU:, I HAVE A FILET OF FISH?
    2     (3.0)
    3  W: FILET OF FISH FOR YOU:, I HAVE A FILET OF FISH?
    4     (2.0)
    5  W: FILET OF FISH FOR YOU:,
    6     (5.0)
    7  W: thank you:,
    ```

15. The *New Horizon English Course 1* textbook contains the fast-food ordering dialog in the 1987, 1990, 1997, and 2006 editions but discontinues it in the 2012 edition. The dialog is now presented in *New Horizon English Course 2* (2012), but only as supplementary text. In contrast to the 2006 version, the 2012 version has a confirmation of the order's completeness.

16. The textbook's choice to use *cola* here is perhaps due to the fact that government authorized textbooks need to avoid using a trade name (e.g., "Coke"). If that is the case, then this is an example of how authenticity is compromised by political policies.

17. We were not able to obtain the audio recording of this dialog from the publisher.

18. These constraints should not prevent textbook writers from presenting speech events with natural sequential organization, however.

19. Another worthwhile strategy is to incorporate commercial video materials such as films and TV shows, which, although not the same as naturally occurring interaction, have been demonstrated to have high authenticity (Tatsuki, 2006; Tatsuki & Nishizawa, 2005).

Hanh thi Nguyen is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics in the TESOL Programs, Department of Languages & Applied Linguistics, at Hawaii Pacific University. She has published works on the development of interactional competence in a second language and at the workplace, classroom interaction, learners' identity transformation, and Vietnamese applied linguistics.

Noriko Ishitobi is an English teacher at Nagoya Municipal Ueda Junior High School. She holds a master's degree from Nagoya University of Foreign Studies.

References

Altman, R. (1990). Giving and taking advice without offense. In R. C. Scarcella, E. J. Anderson, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 95-99). New York: Newbury House.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B. S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D. W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal*, *45*, 4-15.

Barraja-Rohan, A. M., & Pritchard, C. R. (1997). *Beyond talk: A course in communication and conversation for intermediate adult learners*. Melbourne, Australia: Western Melbourne Institute of TAFE, Victoria University.

Bouton, L. F. (1996). Pragmatics and language learning. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (Vol. 7, pp. 1-20). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Division of English as an International Language.

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, *49*, 44-58.

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

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gilmore, A. (2004). A comparison of textbook and authentic interactions. *ELT Journal*, *58*, 363-374.

Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, *40*, 97-118.

Gilmore, A. (2011). "I prefer not text": Developing Japanese learners' communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning*, *61*, 786-819.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places*. New York: Free Press.

Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97-121). New York: Irvington.

Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of a state of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry*, *50*, 272-302.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, *14*, 145-167.

He, A. W., & Young, R. F. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. F. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*, Studies in bilingualism (Vol. 14, pp. 1-24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: *And*-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, *23*, 1-29.

Holmes, J. (1988). Doubt and certainty in ESL textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, *9*, 21-44.

Hymes, D. (1964). Toward ethnographies of communication: The analysis of communicative events. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and Social Context: Selected Readings* (pp. 21-44). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leidner, R. (1993). *Fast food, fast talk: Service work and the routinization of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mainstream oral communication I (2nd ed.). (2010). Osaka: Zoshindo.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as discourse*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Meyers-Scotten, C., & Bernstein, J. (1988). Natural conversations as a model for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics*, *9*, 372-384.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, & Technology. (2011). Lower secondary education: The course of study for foreign languages. Tokyo: Author. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/04/11/1298356_10.pdf

Nguyen, H. t. (2012). *Developing interactional competence: A conversation analytic study of patient consultations in pharmacy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Nguyen, M. T. T. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? *RELC Journal*, *42*, 17-30.

New horizon English course 1. (2006). Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.

New horizon English course 2. (2012). Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.

Pearson, E. (1986). Agreement/disagreement: An example of results of discourse analysis applied to the oral English classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *74*, 47-61.

Pomerantz, A. (1988). Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy. *Communication Monographs*, *55*, 360-373.

Reber, E. (2011). Interjections in the EFL classroom: Teaching sounds and sequences. *ELT Journal*, *65*, 365-375.

Richards, J. (2002). The role of textbooks in a language program. Retrieved from http://www.professorjackrichards.com

Richards, J. (2006). Materials development and research: Making the connection. *RELC Journal*, *37*, 5-26.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, *70*, 1075-95.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shortall, T. (2003). Corpus-driven grammar and the ELT syllabus. *The Language Teacher*, *27*, 27-29.

Sunshine English course 2. (2006). Tokyo: Kairyudo.

Sunshine English course 2. (2012). Tokyo: Kairyudo.

Tatsuki, D. (2006). What is authenticity? In *Authentic communication: Proceedings of the 5th Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference* (pp. 1-15). Shizuoka, Japan: Tokai University College of Marine Science.

Tatsuki, D., & Nishizawa, M. (2005). A comparison of compliments and compliment responses in television interviews, film, and naturally occurring data. In D. Tatsuki (Ed.), *Pragmatics in language learning, theory and practice* (pp. 87-98). Tokyo: Japan Association for Language Teaching, Pragmatics Special Interest Group.

Total English 1. (2006). Tokyo: Gakko Tosho.

Total English new edition 1. (2012). Tokyo: Gakko Tosho.

Williams, M. (1988). Language taught for meetings and language used in meetings: Is there anything in common? *Applied Linguistics*, *9*, 45-58.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical investigations* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Wong, J. (2002). "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *40*, 37-60.

Wong, J. (2007). Answering my call: A look at telephone closings. *Linguistic Insights-Studies in Language and Communication*, *63*, 271-304.

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

Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic sequences in second language teaching: Principle and practice. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 463-489.

Young, R. F. (2009). *Discursive practice in language learning and teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

(Based on Jefferson, 2004, with additional attention to nonverbal details)

`.`	: falling intonation
?	: rising intonation
`,`	: slightly rising intonation
↑	: rising pitch in the following segment
↓	: falling pitch in the following segment
↑↓	: pitch rises and falls within the next word
:	: lengthened speech
=	: latched speech
–	: cut off word
<u>underline</u>	: stressed syllable
`CAPITALS`	: louder volume
`superscript zero °`	: beginning and end of quieter speech
(( ))	: vocal effect accompanying speech or transcriber's notes
[	: beginning of overlap of speech or nonverbal actions
> <	: speech faster that surrounding speech
< >	: slowed down speech
(number)	: duration of silence in seconds
(.)	: a pause of roughly one-tenth of a second
→	: line of interest to analysis