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ABSTRACT

Although English coursebooks sometimes constitute the only source of knowledge for language learners, they have been fiercely criticised for not presenting authentic language, mainly due to the fact that materials developers rely on their intuition and casual observations to create EFL/ESL texts. This dissertation presents and critically evaluates the series of coursebooks used in Greek public education, which are published under the supervision of the Greek Pedagogical Institute. It focuses on the speech act of thanking from a pragmalinguistic point of view by comparing the similarities and differences between a corpus of 32 coursebooks and a Discourse Completion Task. By examining the two sources of data, this paper attempts to show whether the materials under investigation provide accurate linguistic representations of the speech act in question, in a variety of social contexts, accompanied by native-like optional elements (e.g. intensification particles, compliments to the interlocutor). The results suggest that relying merely on anecdotal evidence to design instructional materials misinforms learners, who are prompted to produce language which differs significantly from reallife discourse.
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4. ANALYSIS OF THANKING SITUATIONS AND THANKING STRATEGIES
### LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNC</td>
<td>British National Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANCODE</td>
<td>Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEFR</td>
<td>Common European Framework of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCT</td>
<td>Discourse Completion Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Native Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICASE</td>
<td>Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Non Native Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Native Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Speech Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSC</td>
<td>Wellington Corpus of Spoken New Zealand English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Alphabetically ordered list of thanking situations found in the coursebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Thanking situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Acceptance of an offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal</td>
<td>Thanking somebody for calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Closing the conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Closing an email/letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Ending a speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Receiving a compliment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Expressing gratitude being due to someone or something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>Thanking in greeting rituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Receiving help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Thanking for invitations ex ante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InAn</td>
<td>Anticipatory thanking for invitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inf</td>
<td>Receiving information previously requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfCC</td>
<td>Thanking for receiving information previously requested and closing the conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Thanking used jokingly or ironically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Expressing thankfulness to no one in particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/P</td>
<td>Receiving objects/presents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Thanking as an opening line in emails/letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Reaction or answer to the performance of an action (ex post or ex ante)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Thanking for promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Thanking as a response to an expression of gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Rejection of an offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Reaction or answer to a service rendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Receiving good wishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Receiving a warm welcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Alphabetically ordered list of thanking strategies found in the coursebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Thanking strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AdAct</td>
<td>Admiration of the beneficial act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdAdd</td>
<td>Admiration of the benefactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdSta</td>
<td>Admiration of the beneficiary’s state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apl</td>
<td>Making an apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>Signaling comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Using a discourse marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc</td>
<td>Indirect refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Stating the need for the favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faw</td>
<td>Bidding farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>Stating reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gra</td>
<td>Use of expression of gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grt</td>
<td>Greeting the interlocutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Use of expression of indebtedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Providing other strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Use of performative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Stating intent to reciprocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Direct refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Repeating the gratitude expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>Expressing surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un</td>
<td>Stating interlocutor’s non-existent obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis</td>
<td>Expressing wishes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Alphabetically ordered list of explicit thanks found in the coursebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Thanking expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Cheers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt</strong></td>
<td>Many thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ia</strong></td>
<td>Subject + appreciate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ig</strong></td>
<td>Subject + copula + grateful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ow</strong></td>
<td>Subject + owe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wlt</strong></td>
<td>Subject + would like to thank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>Thank (as in thank God)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ty</strong></td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tysm</strong></td>
<td>Thank you so much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tyvm</strong></td>
<td>Thank you very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ts</strong></td>
<td>Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tal</strong></td>
<td>Thanks a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tam</strong></td>
<td>Thanks a million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yt</strong></td>
<td>Yours thankfully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Statement of the problem

As children we are constantly reminded to say thank you when appropriate, since society places a high value on being polite and considers expressing gratitude an indispensable part of children’s paideia, which aims to foster their social interactions and relationships that can be severely damaged by rude behavior. As Kasper (1990, pp. 208-209) puts it, “unmotivated rudeness” emanates from unawareness and violation of proper standards of behaviour and should be distinguished from “motivated rudeness”, which refers to the speaker’s intention to appear impolite. Having taken the above matters into consideration, it is clear that expressing gratitude, although a seemingly simple concept, can present considerable challenges to speakers, given its pragmatic nature (Thomas, 1983; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986, 1993; Kasper, 1990; Aston, 1995; Cheng, 2010).

The significant role of pragmatics has long been acknowledged, as “it covers…the conventions governing what is appropriate in particular situations” (Brown & Miller, 2013, no pagination) “from the point of view of the users” (Crystal, 1980, p. 379). Backman (1990, p. 87) was actually the first to propose that language is divided into “grammar” and “pragmatics”. Traditionally though, scholars have subscribed to the belief that grammatical knowledge alone cannot equip learners for felicitous interactions. They maintain that the development of grammatical competence should not result in the negligence of communicative competence, which is an ‘umbrella competence’ encompassing a speaker’s grammatic knowledge too (Cambell & Wales, 1970; Hymes, 1972, both cited in Canale & Merrill, 1980). In the same vein, Leech (1983, p. 10) proposes a distinction between “organisational competence” and “pragmatic competence”, establishing the importance of the acquisition of multiple competences in order for learners to successfully communicate either in their native language or a foreign one. Thomas (1983, p. 91) employs the term “cross-cultural” in order to account for the fact that pragmatic failure, i.e. inability to converge to the norms of a language community, is not exclusively confined to social interactions.
between members of different language groups but refers to “any communication between two people who, in any particular domain, do not share a common linguistic and cultural background”.

Evrin-Tripp (1987, cited in Kasper, 1990) discusses the challenges that pragmatic norms pose interculturally by drawing on the concept of the development of children’s pragmatic competence who, under the age of five, ignorantly utter unconventionally direct linguistic formulae when producing requests. As far as expressing gratitude is concerned, commenting on Goffman’s ‘free goods’, Thomas (1983, p. 105) mentions that what is considered as such “varies according to relationships and situations” even within the same language. Dialectal variation can also provide important insights into differences, though less profound, that may exist within the same language. Hymes (1971, cited in Coulmas, 1981) maintains that American thank you expresses sincere gratitude, in contrast with British thank you, which is mostly used as a discourse organisation marker “with only residual attachment to thanking in some cases” (Hymes, 1971, cited in Coulmas, 1981). A broader perspective has been adopted by Apte (1974, p. 85) who argues that, in the American speech community, thank you is also used in a “mechanical” way due to the high frequency of use of expressions of gratitude.

On the other hand, regarding intercultural variation, the differences between language communities are particularly noticeable, as which situations call for thanking and which thanking expression can best achieve the purpose of the speaker varies according to the cultural values and linguistic routines of the target community (Schmidt & Richards, 1980; Coulmas, 1981; Ferguson, 1981; Intachakra, 2004). To make matters worse, Geis and Harlow (1996, p. 129) write that even when two different cultures make the same sociopragmatic distinctions, semantic and syntactic variation may occur depending on context due to the remarkable variety of “stylistic, politeness and register variation” that a speaker has available to him/her. Thus, the widely held belief that thanking is a universal phenomenon has been fatally weakened, since, although thanking can, to some extent, be considered a universal phenomenon, the use of thanking formulae varies dramatically from one society to another.

A number of examples are reported in the literature accounting for the intercultural variation that thanking expressions exhibit across languages. The Japanese expression sumimasen constitutes a classic example, as it straightforwardly reveals the disparities
that may exist between languages. The aforementioned conventional expression is employed by speakers when the latter wish to offer an apology or verbalise their gratitude, two semantically distinct concepts in English (Kumatoridani, 1999). Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 247) mention that Indian speakers actually utter “I am humiliated, so awful in my debt” when they express gratitude to acquaintances, since it is considered necessary to return the favour immediately. At the other end of the spectrum, Marathi and Hindi speakers consciously neglect to express their gratitude to close acquaintances when they receive goods or help, given that it is regarded as inappropriate (Apte, 1974). In the same vein, verbalising your thanks to family members “has negative connotations” in Turkish households and is considered inappropriate (Zeyrek, 2001, p. 46). Such examples demonstrate that gratitude expressions are much more extensively used in American and European communities than in South Asian cultures (Apte, 1974). The fact remains, however, that even in Western communities, verbalisation of gratitude appears to be remarkably dissimilar. In Greek society, for instance, expressing gratitude is deemed to be unnecessary if the object of thanking is “conceive[d]…as being…beyond the normal duties of the performer of the action” (Sifianou, 1992, cited in Bella, 2011, p. 1734), since, in the Greek community, formulae are automatically equated with formality (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2008, cited in Bardovi-Harlig, 2012). Consequently, the aforementioned cross-cultural disparities demonstrate that even employing the terms ‘polite’ and ‘politeness’, which is a lay concept in one language, i.e. English, as a universal scientific concept for all language cultures is problematic and extremely inappropriate (Watts, 2003).

Failure to conform to the pragmatic norms of the target community might lead to serious misunderstandings. Interestingly, though NSs are surprisingly tolerant of grammatical errors made by NNSs in the TL, the opposite is true for errors stemming from pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983). Numerous researchers have pointed out the unintended consequences of the latter: inappropriate pragmatic behaviour may have the detrimental effect of the speaker appearing rude or socially inferior (Thomas, 1983; Bardovi-Harling, et al., 1991; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1993; Aston, 1995; Koester, 2002; Jiang, 2006; Nguyen, 2011). According to Thomas (1983), pragmatic failure may arise due to pragmalinguistic or/and sociopragmatic mismatches between languages. While the former frequently derives from negative transferene of linguistic forms and
strategies from a speaker’s L1 to the TL, which is common place among foreign language learners (Koike, 1996), the latter refers to the social conditions of the speech event and occurs due to transference of cultural expectations and perceptions, which are, however, nothing but universal. Hence, speakers’ ability to use thanks felicitously rests on their capability to make accurate pragmalinguistic as well as sociopragmatic predictions, and pragmatically adjust in various situations and language contexts (Cohen, 1996; Koike, 1996).

So far, it has been clearly explained that cross-cultural variation influences the performance of any SA including the SA of thanking. As described in the previous paragraph, such variation may originate both from pragmalinguistic and from sociopragmatic causes. In order for learners to gain full command of a TL and avoid either kind of failure, acquiring pragmatic competence is a prerequisite, since any unfortunate instance of pragmatic failure may disrupt the conversational flow, with negative repercussions for the relationship between the interlocutors. A plethora of scholars, such as Gatbonton and Segalowitz (1988) and Wray (2000), have arrived at the conclusion that in order for L2 speakers to interact in a native-like manner, utilising less marked linguistic forms and SA strategies that will assist them towards achieving their communicative purposes, language instructors should do a hundred and eighty degree turn and provide learners with idiomatic language, exposing them to formulaic sequences, i.e. prefabricated sequences of words, which are highly likely to be uttered by NSs given that “the commonest patterns in English occur again and again” (Wray, 2000). Wray (ibid, p. 463) provides an in-depth analysis of formulaic language and identifies that in order for a learner to fluently communicate in the TL, he/she should “become sensitive to the NSs’ preferences for certain sequences of words over others that might appear just as possible”. Other researchers have discussed the necessity of providing learners with formulaic language by focusing on the SA of thanking. For instance, Eisenstein and Bodman (1986, p. 172) suggest that NSs’ expressions of gratitude are so consistent that it is as if they are provided by a “mutually-shared script”, highlighting the significance of formulaicity in L2 language instruction.

These findings have significant implications for L2 pedagogy: given that speakers’ linguistic choices are so remarkably undeviating, English instructional materials, which
constitute a principal source of knowledge for L2 learners, should present language which enables them to experience and analyse formulaic sequences for the sake of “efficient comprehension” (Wray, 2000, p. 477). This suggestion is further reinforced by the following observation: learners who immerse in the TL society have greater chances of achieving pragmatic competence as they are exposed to authentic input which enables them to acquire and use L2 pragmatic norms in the environment where they naturally occur (Liu, 1995; Yuan, 1996). In general, therefore, it seems that the language of didactic materials should reflect that of naturally occurring speech, bringing about apparent side effects for coursebook developers (see discussion in Section 2.3).

This section has discussed the broad differences that expressions of gratitude exhibit cross-culturally as a means to prove that knowing how and when to say thank you in an L2 can be problematic for learners. It went on to suggest that allowing them to access authentic pragmatic input containing formulaic language is of paramount importance, given the ritualistic selections that NSs make linguistically. The next section justifies why the analysis above has been given by presenting the purpose of this paper.

1.2. Purpose of study

Apart from Schauer and Adolphs (2006), there is a general lack of research in the presentation of expressions of gratitude in English instructional materials. The SA of thanking has, however, been extensively investigated. The aim of the study at hand, therefore, is to explore the SA of thanking as it appears in the coursebooks used in Greek public education. Given my Greek origin and my intention to work in the Greek public sector as an EFL teacher, it would be useful and interesting to assess the use of expressions of gratitude in the Greek EFL coursebooks, which I myself might be asked to use in the future. As demonstrated in Section 1.1, the SA of thanking can pose formidable challenges to learners which can be surmounted if they are exposed to input resembling the linguistic reality of the target community. To that end, the following research questions guided the present study.

RQ1. Do the coursebooks under investigation provide a considerable variety of thanking situations and thanking expressions across all language levels and school grades examined? Is their distribution patterned and justifiable?
RQ2. Are there significant differences between the expressions of gratitude presented in the coursebooks in question and those which are most likely to be uttered by NSs of English?

RQ3. Are there significant differences in the intensification of thanking formulae between the coursebooks under investigation and NSs’ preferences?

RQ4. Do the coursebooks in question accurately present the relationship between the choice of thanking strategies and the social context in which a thanking situation occurs?

1.3. Overview of chapters

In the following chapter I introduce the theoretical framework for this study by reviewing the literature on the SA of thanking and present an overview of studies, all of which recognise the discrepancies between coursebooks and TL use, suggesting that misrepresentations of SAs in didactic materials may result in learners’ fruitless attempts to competently perform when interacting in the target community. Chapter Three describes the methodology of the study and goes into detail concerning the data collection and analysis methods. Chapter Four discusses the findings which emerged from the statistical analysis, while Chapter Five presents the final points that need to be mentioned regarding the interpretation of the results obtained in the previous chapter, before discussing the most important weaknesses of the study at hand which may have affected its measurements and results, and making recommendations for further research work.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature on the pragmatics of thanking and begins by laying out an overview of the SA in question, politeness, and the notion of face. The second section moves on to present a plethora of studies, the common denominator of which is expressing gratitude. The final section is concerned with the findings of research papers which investigated the presentation of SAs in instructional materials and concluded that they fail to reflect the language that NSs actually use in
the target community as a means of accounting for a key aspect of this study, which is the analysis of the EFL coursebooks.

2.1. The SA of thanking: Theoretical background

SAs are among the variety of topics that the field of pragmatics accounts for. Austin (1962, p. 160) was the first to suggest that speaking is equivalent to performing acts and classified the SA of thanking as a “behabitve”, since it “include[s] the notion of reaction to other people’s behaviour and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions to someone else’s past conduct or imminent conduct”. Defining the propositional content of the SA in question, Searle (1969, p. 67) explains that thanking is an illocutionary act performed by a speaker who is benefited by the performance of a past act A and denotes one’s feelings of “gratitude or appreciation” for that particular act, pointing out that the sincerity rule coincides with the essential rule (see Table 1, Appendix A). Deviating from Austin, Searle (1976, p. 12) claims that thank is an “expressive”, given that “the truth of the expressed proposition is presupposed”, and argues that the syntax of English reflects its expressive nature, since thank is not followed by a that clause in its performative occurrence but takes a gerundive nominal instead. Together, Austin and Searle are considered to be the early pioneers in the field of SAs, inspiring and influencing numerous linguists to come.

The literature has long emphasised the importance of the SA of thanking, since a copious amount of work has been published on it. Unlike Norrick (1978) and Leech (1983), who report that thanking may be used anticipatorily too, i.e. for actions that will be performed in the future, Fraser (1983, p. 40) proposes that thanks verbalises speakers’ gratitude only for acts that have already been carried out, classifying it as an “evaluative”. Commenting on the social value of thanking, Goffman (1971, p. 141) asserts that not only can thanks be given to express that the speaker is satisfied by the beneficial act, but it also provides proof that one possesses socially desirable traits, characteristic of a worthy person, “alive to the norms and practices” of a society. Such observation have been made by a large number of scholars, who also identified the SA of thanking as a prime example of polite language (Laver, 1981; Leech, 1983; Watts, 2003).
Presenting a dual notion of face in their politeness model, Brown and Levinson (1987) consider thanking as a face threatening act, given that the beneficiary acknowledges a favour received by the benefactor to whom he/she now owes a debt. Contrarily, Edmondson (1981) offers an explanation for the hearer-supportive nature of thanking, arguing that the explicitness and directness which are associated with offering thanks reflect its hearer-supportive nature, underlining its substantial contribution to social interaction. In his scale of politeness, Leech (1983, pp. 104-106) lists thanking as a “convivial” which as he maintains, is “intrinsically polite”. Regarding convivials, Leech (ibid, pp. 104-105) also asserts that their illocutionary and social goal coincide, rendering such illocutions “intrinsically courteous”, prompting individuals to seize any “opportunity for comity” in cases such as “offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, [and] congratulating”. Such phatic or –to use Watt’s (2003, p. 19) term, “politic” uses of thanking expressions have been identified by Norrick too, who concludes that the SA in question is “the most formulaic and least heartfelt of expressive illocutionary acts” (Norrick, 1978, p. 285).

Turning now to other functional characteristics of the SA of thanking, apart from signaling politeness, speakers frequently employ thanking formulae after accepting/refusing favours, gifts, or offers (Jautz, 2013). Less genuine expressions of gratitude include thank you as a discourse marker, signaling the end of the conversation (Rubin, 1983, cited in Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986), or as a “social interactional markers” (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. 60). Thanking formulae may also be used to respond to questions about the speaker’s wellbeing, after receiving wishes, or “as a summons to speak” (Jautz, 2013, p. 12). Numerous functions of thanking have been reported in the literature, while several linguists have attempted to create taxonomies, listing all the possible or most frequent functions of thanking, with Coulmas’ (1981) taxonomy being the most influential (see Table 2, Appendix A).

2.2. Linguistic research on thanking

The purpose of this section is to review the research studies on the SA of thanking. However, linguistic research on the given SA exhibits large variation due to the different aspects with which researchers have traditionally dealt. Therefore, the aim of this section is to present a selection of studies which have investigated the relationship between thanking and some other SA within the same language, before moving on to
present the results obtained from investigations which examined the use of expressions of gratitude in English in comparison with some other language. A review of the literature on studies which have documented the differences between NSs and NNSs when the latter verbalise their gratitude will be discussed at the end of this section.

2.2.1. Comparison of the SA of thanking vs. other SAs

Previous research comparing the SA of thanking and some other SA within the same language has yielded interesting results. Coulmas (1981) investigated thanks and apologies in Japanese and found out that many, but not all, gratitude expressions can be replaced by apologies, a pattern which can be explained by the fact that Japanese speakers associate gratitude with guilt. A later study by Kumatoridani (1999, p. 641) examined Japanese *arigatoo* ‘thank you’ and *sumimasen* ‘I’m sorry’ and found that the motivation that governs the alternation and co-occurrence of the aforementioned formulae can be “inter-personal” and “discourse-organisational”. Similarly, Jung (1999, cited in BardoviHarlig, et al., 2008) found out that expressions of gratitude can be replaced by apologies in Korean. However, although prior research has suggested that apologies and thanks frequently overlap in Southeast Asian communities, Nakai and Watanabe (2000, cited in ibid.) demonstrated that speakers rarely make use of an apology expression in a thanking situation.

2.2.2. Comparison of expressions of gratitude in English vs. in other languages

Existing research has recognised the critical role played by cross-cultural variation in expressing gratitude by discussing the different realisations of thanking across language communities. Aston (1995) investigated the use of thanking expressions in conversational closings in English and Italian by examining service encounters which involved a request between assistants and customers in bookshops. It was shown that encounters with thanks are almost twice as frequent in Italian than in English and that the proportion of thanking produced by assistants and customers was greater in Italian encounters than in English ones. Giannoni (2002) investigated research article acknowledgments in English and Italian and found a preference for *I*-avoidance in Move 2 in the Italian texts, while overt thanking expressions were observed in a wider
variety and slightly higher numbers in English acknowledgements. The authors of the latter also appeared to “credit help received in terms of utility,” unlike their Italian counterparts who emphasised on the value of the act (ibid, p. 24).

Examining NSs of Chinese and English, Cheng (2005, p. 109) reported that informants utilised different strategies in their expressions of gratitude in terms of length of SA sets and variety of strategies, affected by “contextual variables, social status, familiarity, and imposition”. Intachakra (2004, p. 59) compared the linguistic realisations and contexts of apologies and thanks in English and Thai. The author revealed that Thai speakers utter less explicit thanking expressions than their British counterparts and highlighted the “repetitive and predictable nature” of conversational routines. A comparison between American English and Korean email advertising messages was drawn by Park and Lee (2012) who demonstrated that American subjects had a greater willingness to include gratitude statements in their advertising messages. They also showed greater enthusiasm to respond to messages which contained a gratitude statement unlike their Korean counterparts, to whom the inclusion of a gratitude statement in email advertising messages had the opposite of the intended effect.

Although studies of different languages have traditionally been a primary concern of pragmatic research, recently there has been renewed interest in contrastive studies of one language, aiming to investigate the realisation of certain forms and their various functions across different dialects of the same language. Regarding the SA in question, Jautz (2013) compared the formal realisations of expressions of gratitude and their functional characteristics across different genres (i.e. radio phone-ins and broadcast interviews) and different varieties of English (i.e. British and New Zealand English) by analysing the spoken part of the BNC and the WSC. The investigation demonstrated that the use of thanking in British English slightly, but clearly, differs from the use of thanking in New Zealand English. It was reported that in general, British speakers express gratitude more frequently than their counterparts and make more extensive use of optional elements (e.g. stating the reason for thanking). The most surprising finding however concerns the different functions that thanking formulae serve in the varieties studied. According to the author, while New Zealanders express gratitude so as to enhance their interpersonal relations, the most common function of thanking formulae in British English was that of discourse organisation marker.
2.2.3. Native vs. non-native use of expressions of gratitude

Other studies examined the use of expressions of gratitude by NSs and NNSs of English. These studies agree that the SA of thanking poses great challenges to NNSs due to the paucity of the linguistic means available to them because of their inaccurate sociocultural perceptions (Özdemir & Rezvani, 2010; Pishghadam & Zarei, 2011). Particularly, Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) examined 67 advanced L2 speakers of English who had been in the US for an average of two years and belonged to 15 different nationality groups, reporting that their failure to express gratitude in a native-like manner stemmed from both pragmalinguistic inadequacies in their repertoire and sociopragmatic mismatches between L1 and L2.

In a similar experiment, Eisenstein and Bodman (1993) also studied the prosodic characteristics of expressions of gratitude uttered by NNSs of English and reported that the latter lacked warmth and sincerity in comparison with NSs’ intonation features. Cui (2012, p. 759) investigated the employment of expressions of gratitude by NSs and advanced-level NNSs of English (Chinese, Korean, and Indonesian) and concluded that, to some extent, ESL learners cannot express gratitude appropriately due to “the misuse of convention and syntactic errors”, proposing that negative transfer as well as cultural differences with regard to social norms are responsible for depriving learners of achieving native-likeness in expressing gratitude.

2.3. Problems in the presentation of SAs in EFL teaching materials

The infelicitous production of SAs by language learners, as demonstrated in the previous section, has prompted researchers to investigate their presentation in L2 didactic materials, given that coursebook developers rely on their intuitions, leading them to form wrong or inadequate judgements about language, which are however delivered to learners too (Cohen, 1996; Biber, et al., 2002; Aksoyalp & Toprk, 2015). The following is a detailed report on the studies which substantiate the allegation above.

Scotton and Bernsten (1988) analysed direction giving in teaching materials and compared their language with that of real-life discourse. The authors reported that, while coursebook writers clearly favoured a certain directive type, i.e. the bald imperative, audio-taped natural conversations suggested that speakers employ a
combination of directive types, such as types beginning with you and indirect types too. Boxer and Pickering (1995) investigated the SA of complaining as it appeared in seven coursebooks, pointing out that the latter fail to present indirect complaining strategies, which are frequently employed by NSs. The authors argued that even when indirect complaints were found in the coursebooks, they were inadequately presented, since coursebook writers aim to teach learners how to be polite and politic rather than how to foster “social solidarity through commiserative responses” (Boxer & Pickering, 1995, p. 47).

Bouton (1996) offered substantial evidence that the SA of inviting, as it appeared in Wall’s and Wolfson’s data, significantly deviated from its realisation in ESL texts, since the latter fail to present all three types of invitations (i.e. ambiguous, unambiguous, and non-negotiable), and even if they do, their distribution does not approximate real-life occurrence. Aksoyalp and Toprak (2015, p. 131) reviewed 17 EFL coursebooks to assess the presentation of complaints, apologies, and suggestions, drawing our attention to the fact that pragmatics occupies a “marginal” position in L2 instruction. Although it was evident that relatively little attention was devoted to the SAs in question, the researchers reported that there was a pattern behind their distribution, since the range and frequency of linguistic strategies used to perform them increased as the level of language proficiency increased.

Despite the fact that the SA of thanking constitutes a thoroughly investigated area of study, little research has focused on its presentation in EFL/ESL materials. In 2006, Schauer and Adolphs published a paper in which they evaluated the pragmatic content of four beginner and intermediate level coursebooks with regards to gratitude expressions, reporting that the materials in question provided a rather limited amount of thanking formulae, while important strategies, such as thanking + stating reason, were unjustifiably not contained in the beginner level coursebooks. Due to the growing recognition of the role of corpora as a point of reference for coursebook writers, the aforementioned authors also sought to determine the basic and more elaborate formulaic sequences consistently used to express gratitude in the CANCODE corpus, showing that thank you was the most frequently employed lexical item to convey gratitude, while thanking + refusing was the most common strategy utilised by speakers.
In the same vein, Cheng (2010) investigated the MICASE and BNC spoken corpora, identifying a plethora of linguistic realisations and formulaic sequences with respect to thanking situations, highlighting the potential difficulties that learners may encounter when interacting in the TL. The fact that only one-out-of-10 coursebooks that Cheng briefly surveyed contained the SA of thanking may account for L2 learners’ arduousness of successfully recognising the situations which call for thanking in order to issue a felicitous thanking formula. Similarly, de Pablos-Ortega (2011, p. 2424), who investigated the use of thanking expressions in 64 coursebooks for teaching Spanish as a foreign language, revealed that the thanking situations which appeared in the given coursebooks fail to “widely, or accurately reflect the sociocultural reality of the Spanish language and culture”. While the aforementioned survey was conducted in Spanish L2 coursebooks, it however seems to underscore that the misrepresentation of the pragmatics of thanking is a universal phenomenon.

Taken together, these results suggest that great disparities exist between authentic data and language presented in coursebooks, leading researchers, such as Williams (1988), Carter and McCarthy (1995), and Cullen and Kuo (2007) to overtly criticise them for not providing learners with authentic input on many levels, apart from the pragmatic one, depriving them of valuable opportunities to develop real-world communicative skills. Given that the language in the coursebooks surveyed in the studies mentioned above scarcely matched language of real-life discourse, it is expected that the Greek instructional materials will prove to contain language that has little in common with naturally occurring English.

3. METHODOLOGY

This case study investigates teaching materials used in primary education and the first part of secondary education in Greek public schools. It aims to explore whether or not these teaching materials equip learners with an extensive repertoire of expressions of gratitude, occurring in various social situations, enabling them to communicate in the TL in a native-like manner from an early learning stage. This thesis also intends to determine whether the presentation of intensifying particles in the materials coincides with actual language use. The final objective of the study is to discover whether the coursebooks in question provide learners with accurate knowledge concerning the
additional elements which might accommodate a thanking formula with regards to the situation in which it occurs.

In order to shed light on the aforementioned queries, the research design was decided to be correlational and its instrument consists of two parts: data collected from Greek EFL coursebooks and a DCT. The purpose of the design was to investigate the occurrence of thanking expressions in the given teaching materials first and then correlate the results with the results on responses to the DCT which would elicit NSs’ thanking formulae. This chapter discusses thoroughly the methods used in the study. The first section provides an overview of the didactic materials analysed for this investigation, while in the second part an account of how the list of search items was determined is given. The third and final section of this chapter moves on to describe the second part of the instrument, i.e. the DCT, providing details of the sampling design, the research tool, the steps taken in order for the data to be gathered, and the tool used in order for the quantitative analyses to be carried out.

3.1. Presentation of the teaching materials

A total of 32 EFL books used in primary and junior high school in Greece were analysed for the purpose of this study (see Table 3, Appendix B). Its specific objective was to investigate the English teaching materials designed by the Greek Pedagogical Institute, which assumes a considerable amount of responsibility for the preparation of Greek coursebooks. Hence, high school didactic materials were intentionally excluded from analysis, given that, unlike the other levels of education, language instructors in high school get to decide which coursebooks to utilise in their teaching, choosing from a list which contains instructional materials distributed by international, well respected publishing companies.

Regarding grades 1 and 2 of primary school, the introduction of a foreign language at such a young age is part of an innovative project, called English for Young Learners (EYL), also known through its Greek acronym – PEAP, aimed at enriching the school curriculum. PEAP has been implemented in only 40% of Greek schools, as it is still operating on an experimental basis (Dendrinos, 2013). The PEAP portal contains all the resource materials, activities, and guidelines for the EFL teacher, and it was decided that the whole of the educational material for each of the aforementioned grades would
be considered as one single coursebook for the purposes of the present study. Grade 3 features two versions of the same series of coursebooks, depending on the pupils’ language proficiency: *Magic Book 1*, which addresses to pupils who are complete beginners, and *Magic Book 2*, which was prepared for learners who have completed the PEAP course. The remaining grades in primary school do not adhere to the aforementioned division, that being, there is a single coursebook taught to the entire class regardless of the learners’ level of proficiency, while the levels for which the materials have been designed accord with CEFR Levels A1 and A2.

Turning now to junior high school, *Think Teen* is the official series utilised by language teachers and consists of 5 coursebooks. Each of them is accompanied by a workbook and a teacher’s manual. While for the 1st and 2nd grade English “is taught at two different levels per grade based on the pupils’ language proficiency”, this dichotomy does not apply to the 3rd grade (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2010). The coursebooks also include descriptions regarding the language level for which they have been designed that ranges from CEFR Level A1 to B1.

3.2. Determining search items in the teaching materials

Thanking expressions occurring in conversational exchanges and written discourse in the student’s books and workbooks were collected for analysis. The teacher’s manuals were solely used in order for the tapescripts to be retrieved, since they contain a significant amount of input to which learners are exposed through the listening tasks. As far as the conversational exchanges are concerned, in order for a thanking expression to be selected for analysis, it had to at least appear as the responding utterance of an adjacency pair (e.g. offer-thanks), if not as part of a larger stretch of speech. The degree of familiarity between the speakers, as well as their status, should be easily deduced from the context. Example (1) illustrates an adjacency pair in which the thanking expression was decided not to be analysed, since it appears as the first-pair part and it is relatively unclear why the speaker expresses his/her gratitude towards his/her interlocutor. Moreover, the relationship between the two is also unclear. What is more, the purpose of this paper is not to explore the appreciative reactions (i.e. my pleasure) which expressions of gratitude might trigger, therefore the following expression of gratitude appeared rather incongruous.
(1) – I really appreciate your help.
– My pleasure.

(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Student’s book for advanced level students, p. 137)

For practical reasons, a lexical approach was adopted in order to determine which lexical items to look for when examining the EFL coursebooks. Previous studies on the SA of thanking, such as Intachakra (2004), Schauer and Adolphs (2006), and Jautz (2013), have shed light on the most common linguistic realisations of gratitude, and their findings were used in order for a list of search items to be compiled, as illustrated in Table 4. It is important to point out that Table 4 presents individual words which were expected to occur in the teaching materials either on their own (e.g. thanks) or as part of a larger linguistic construction (e.g. many thanks). However, given that this investigation sought to also determine the SA sets used in each thanking situation, functions which preceded or followed the thanking expression were also analysed (e.g. use of expression of gratitude + stating reason in thank you for...). These functions are discussed at greater length in section 4.2, and the term ‘thanking strategies’ is used to refer to them throughout this paper. The data collected from the coursebooks was coded in accordance with the coding scheme proposed in the aforementioned section. The same scheme was used in order to code the responses to the DCT, fully discussed in the following section, since the purpose of this study was to collate gratitude expressions obtained from EFL instructional materials and NSs of English.

| Table 4: List of search items |
3.3. The DCT

3.3.1. The questionnaire

In order to investigate whether the language of thanking, as found in the coursebooks, coincides with naturally occurring speech, a DCT was designed, taking into account the most frequent situations occurring in the coursebooks. Regarding the latter, only the conversational exchanges were taken into consideration for designing the situational prompts of the DCT, in accordance with prior studies, such as Eisenstein and Bodman (1986), Cheng (2005), and Özdemir and Rezvani (2010), which investigated expressions of gratitude in scenarios which involved interlocutors solely in conversational settings. Furthermore, the scenarios were constructed with regard to some of the components which may influence the linguistic realisations of thanking, i.e. the relationship between the individual who performs the SA of thanking and the one who receives the benefit of the act (see Table 5, Appendix C). This is similar to the process model followed by de Pablos-Ortega (2011), as suggested by Coulmas (Coulmas, 1981, p. 75), according to whom “the quality of the interpersonal relation between the participants…determine[s] the degree of gratefulness that should be expressed”, and thus the choice of gratitude expressions. While more factors intervene in the performance of the SA of thanking, such as the object of gratitude, the size of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grateful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thankful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thankfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many authors have traditionally used DCTs to elicit thanking formulae (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; Schauer & Adolphs, 2006; Özdemir & Rezvani, 2010; Pishghadam & Zarei, 2011), as they constitute “an effective means of gathering a large amount of data quickly” (Cohen, 1996, p. 25). Even though DCTs have drawn fierce criticism, since it is maintained that the information they elicit is “intuitional” instead of “data on language use and behaviour” (Kasper, 2008, p. 294), their excessive use in the pragmatics literature, along with its characterisation as “a highly effective research tool”, can be explained by the fact that they are believed to provide the “canonical shape of SAs” (Beebe & Cummings, 1996, p. 80). This deems the adopted method practical and useful.

The present DCT (see Appendix C) comprises 10 scenarios in which participants were asked to provide a written response of the verbal action they would perform in a given situation. Informants were also given the option of not having to respond to a scenario at all. This ensures that the avoidance strategy, which is usually not included in data obtained from DCTs but is present when using other methods (e.g. role-plays, natural observations), would not be left out (Cheng, 2005). Following Eisenstein and Bodman’s (1986) call for describing the setting of the event and the relationships of the interlocutors, a brief description is provided for each of the scenarios. The latter were items retrieved from previous DCTs (example scenario, scenarios 5 and 10) that were used in similar studies, or situations I had observed but were adapted accordingly in order to elicit expressions of gratitude. The first part of the questionnaire, which aimed at collecting the informants’ autobiographical data, was adapted from de Pablos-Ortega’s (2011) questionnaire. Prior to data collection, a trial of the DCT was carried out in five L1 speakers of English in order to uphold its content validity and revise it, based on the informants’ relevant feedback.

3.3.2. Participants in the DCT investigation

The total number of subjects that completed the DCT consisted of 39 individuals. However, 36 questionnaires were analysed, since the primary inclusion criterion for the
informants was English to be their L1. As the minimum number of participants for statistical analysis is 15 (Field, 2000), the given sample size was estimated to produce accurate predictions. The 36 English NSs who completed the DCT selected themselves to participate in the investigation. Nine of them were male and 27 female. The substantial majority of them were British, while only 16.7% of the total population were brought up in the USA. Their average age was 26 years old. In addition, over half of the participants (53%) said that they were fluent or competent users of a foreign language (French, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish), while 13 participants indicated that they couldn’t speak any other language apart from English.

3.3.3. Procedure

The process of the data collection through the online distributed DCT lasted one month. A software provided by Smart Survey was used to create the questionnaire, which also appeared on the aforementioned webpage. Research participants were asked to give written consent before filling out the questionnaire, which was estimated to take no more than five minutes to answer. The DCT asked the participants to picture themselves in particular situations that required the provision of a gratitude expression as a response to a given verbal prompt. Once all responses were received, they were coded using the coding scheme presented in section 4.2, which is the same scheme used to code the thanking situations obtained from the EFL instructional materials, in order for the correlation between the two sources of data to be feasible. Finally, the coded thanking sequences acquired from both parts of the instrument were entered onto the R software programme in order to perform both qualitative and quantitative analyses.

This chapter has described the methods used in this investigation and has provided an illuminating insight into the procedural steps that were followed in order for this study to be conducted. However, questions have been raised in connection with the thanking situations and strategies identified in the data collected. The next chapter describes the thanking situations found in the coursebooks, which formed the basis for designing the DCT, before moving on to the presentation of the thanking strategies as they were proposed by both the authors of the EFL coursebooks and the NSs of English.
4. ANALYSIS OF THANKING SITUATIONS AND THANKING STRATEGIES

4.1. Classification of thanking situations

Inspecting the occurrence of thanking formulae in the coursebooks, 12 thanking situations were identified and are presented in Table 6. These primarily express the illocutionary force of expressing gratitude, but it was decided to also analyse situations which “draw on the concept of gratitude in a broader sense” (Jautz, 2013, p. 63), for example thanking as a social amenity, and even thanking instances in which the illocutionary force was an expression of sarcasm or accepting/rejecting an offer. This approach was adopted by other researchers too, such as Eisenstein and Bodman (1986), de Pablos-Ortega (2011), and Jautz (2013). What follows is a description of the functions of the thanking routines found in the Greek EFL coursebooks. Graph 1 illustrates their distribution, separating the thanking situations which occurred as part of a conversational exchange from those identified in non-spontaneous speech (i.e. thanking expressions found in written discourse, such as emails and notes, as well as recorded messages and oral announcements, which were not taken into consideration for preparing the DCT for reasons already discussed in section 3.3.1). As shown by Graph 1, the 10 most frequently occurring thanking situations formed the basis for designing the questionnaire (see Appendix C, Table 5). Due to the rich variety of thanking categories, the latter had to be coded. The coding of each category is provided in Table 6, which is considered to be exceptionally useful, given that in this paper the information in the figures is provided in coded form for practical reasons (see List of abbreviations 2 for alphabetically ordered coding scheme). An example of each situations is also available in Appendix D.

4.1.1. Thanking for receiving goods. In these situations, the interlocutor thanks as a consequence of having received goods, either physical ones, such as objects and presents, or non-physical ones, such as information after having asked for directions.

4.1.1.1. Receiving objects/presents. In the coursebooks, expressions of thanks occur when the beneficiary gets a present on his/her birthday, or an object, usually money received (Example 1, Appendix D) or change given during a
commercial transaction. This thanking situation, occurring 12 times in the teaching materials as Graph 1 reveals, which makes it the fourth most

Table 6: Classification of thanking situations found in the coursebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanking situation</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thanking for receiving goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Material goods:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving objects/presents</td>
<td>O/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Non material goods:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1. Receiving good wishes</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Receiving a warm welcome</td>
<td>Wel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3. Receiving a compliment</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4. Receiving help</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5. Receiving information previously requested</td>
<td>Inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thanking for offers, invitations, or promises:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Thanking for offers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1. Acceptance of an offer</td>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2. Rejection of an offer</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Thanking for invitations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1. Anticipatory thanking for invitations</td>
<td>InAn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2. Thanking for invitations ex ante</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Thanking for promises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thanking for services rendered and performance of actions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Reaction or answer to a service rendered</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Reaction or answer to the performance of an action (ex post or ex ante)</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expressing gratitude being due to someone or something</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expressing thankfulness to no one in particular</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thanking in greeting rituals</td>
<td>Gr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thanking as a response to an expression of gratitude</td>
<td>Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thanking as a closing signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1. Closing the conversation</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2. Closing an email/letter</td>
<td>CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3. Ending a speech</td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thanking for receiving information previously requested and closing the conversation</td>
<td>InfCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Thanking somebody for calling</td>
<td>Cal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Thanking as an opening line in emails/letters</td>
<td>OE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thanking used jokingly or ironically</td>
<td>Ir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 1: Thanking situations in the coursebooks**
common category, coincides with Coulmas’ (1981, p. 74) category of “thanks for material goods (gift, services)”.
4.1.1.2. Thanking for receiving non-material goods: As opposed to the previous category, here the object of gratitude refers to thanking for receiving nonmaterial objects, i.e. wishes, welcomes, compliments, help, and information, thus comprising five subcategories. This category is also proposed by Coulmas (1981) in his taxonomy of thanking.

4.1.1.2.1. Receiving good wishes. In the given coursebooks, different wishes (e.g. good luck and enjoy your evening) are offered to the addressee before they travel by plane (Example 2, Appendix D), have dinner, protests against the council’s decision, celebrate their birthday, and as a farewell wish. Situations in which wishes are expressed occur seven times in the coursebooks, classifying the present category as the sixth most common category in the teaching materials.

4.1.1.2.2. Receiving a warm welcome. According to Norrick (1978, p. 289), welcoming is a “special case of thanking”. Therefore, it was decided to be included as a separate category. In his analysis, Norrick allows a deeper insight into welcoming, pointing out that it is similar to thanking, since in both cases the speaker is the beneficiary while the addressee is the benefactor, or – to use Norrick’s (ibid) terms – the “patient” and the “agent” respectively. However, while a welcoming expression is appropriately used when someone has arrived in a specific place, thanking may occur much more broadly, including in the aforementioned situation. In the coursebooks, welcoming, which was found to be among the 10 most common categories, is linked to expressing pleasure at someone’s arrival at an interview (Example 3, Appendix D) and indicates that the addressee’s presence is a source of pride and honour for the speaker.

4.1.1.2.3. Receiving a compliment. Thanking expressions occur in the coursebooks as a response to a compliment which is made either to reinforce or, in the case of strangers, to create “solidarity” (Manes & Wolfson, 1981, p. 124). The identified compliment formulae are connected to one’s physical appearance and culinary achievements (Example 4, Appendix D).

4.1.1.2.4. Receiving help. This category, which is among the five most frequently occurring categories in the teaching materials, is present in the taxonomy of
thanking created by de Pablos-Ortega (2011) but not in Coulmas’ (1981) one.

However, its insertion in the present classification was deemed to be imperative, since, in the coursebooks, there are situations in which the interlocutor thanks his/her teacher, pupil(s), parents, or friend (Example 5, Appendix D) as a consequence of having received help.

4.1.1.2.5. Receiving information previously requested. Interactions in which exchange of information between interlocutors occurs were spotted in the coursebooks relatively more frequently compared to the other thanking instances. This information usually refers to directions (Example 6, Appendix D) or telephone numbers and is provided to the addressee in the street or during a telephone conversation.

4.1.2. Thanking for offers, invitations, or promises. This category resembles Coulmas’ (1981) category I of his taxonomy and includes three subcategories: offers, invitations, and promises.

4.1.2.1. Acceptance or rejection of an offer. An individual might express gratitude after receiving an offer, which he/she either accepts or politely declines. These offers are frequently related to an invitation to have some food (Example 7, Appendix D) or a meal and happen in people’s homes. Although the frequency of the present category in the teaching materials is relatively low, five thanking instances after refusing an offer were found, rendering the present category the seventh most common category in the coursebooks.

4.1.2.2. Thanking for invitations: Merely two thanking situations occur in the coursebooks with regards to the SA of invitation, interestingly extracted from written discourse only, referring to sojourns and voluntary work (Example 8, Appendix D). These fall into two fundamentally different categories – anticipatory thanking for invitations and thanking for invitations ex ante. In the former, the sender of the invitation is the one who also expresses gratitude, referring to the potential act of the receiver accepting it, and has to anticipate for “the future space of action...in order to find out whether the action is feasible or not” (Rehbein, 1981, p. 220). On that account, “thanking someone in advance...is defective as an expressive illocutionary act”, since the truthvalue of the proposition cannot be
presupposed (Norrick, 1978, p. 285). Contrastingly, in the latter, the receiver of the invitation is the one who expresses his/her gratitude before the invitation.

4.1.2.3. Thanking for promises. In the coursebooks, only a single conversation occurs in which the receiver of the object of thanking, i.e. a promise, expresses his/her ex ante gratitude to the benefactor (Example 9, Appendix D).

4.1.3. Thanking for services rendered and performance of actions. This category is inspired by de Pablos-Ortega’s taxonomy (2010; 2011) and refers to situations in which the services provided are either part of the interlocutor’s obligations or, contrastingly, they are not part of his/her job. In the former cases identified in the coursebooks, the SA of thanking takes place at a store (Example 10, Appendix D), during some teacher’s office hours, and upon completion of a task assigned. The latter occur during police interrogations, a speech in which thanks are expressed to people who have done voluntary work, and during a teacher-student impromptu meeting. Graph 1 shows both thanking instances to occur equal number of times. However, it was decided to include only one of them in the DCT due to practical limitations.

4.1.4. Expressing gratitude being due to someone or something. Here, the beneficiary may thank a person for what the latter has done to the former, i.e. the thankable. The person thanked is usually a friend, a classmate, a guardian, or a teacher – there is even one example in which the benefactor is not a person but an ancient civilisation – who receives thankfulness after offering hospitality (Example 11, Appendix D), information, help, or money. Interestingly, the majority of the examples occur in different types of written discourse (e.g. articles, emails, journals, and biographies), which can be considered more formal compared to the other thanking situations in the coursebooks, the most part of which appears in conversational routines.

4.1.5. Expressing thankfulness to no one in particular. Only two examples representing expressing thankfulness to no one in particular (Example 12, Appendix D) were extracted from the coursebooks but neither of them were part of conversational exchanges. Such thanking formulae, which express “relief or dismay…are not addressed to the current interlocutor and the propositional content condition is not met either” (Jautz, 2013, p. 7). Hence, Cheng (2010) aptly classifies such
conventional expressions of relief as non-gratitude ones. However, given the scope of the present study and for reasons already mentioned in section 4.1, this category could not have been omitted from the present classification.

4.1.6. Thanking in greeting rituals. Classified as a non-gratitude strategy by Cheng (2010), this category is the second most frequent thanking situation found in the coursebook dialogues. Greetings have received considerable attention, as, although they constitute “highly salient conversational functions” (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999, p. 685), uttering a phatic thank you as a greeting response appears to pass unnoticed by both the speaker and the hearer (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986). This is perhaps due to the fact that greeting routines are considered to be a commonly agreed social ritual, slavishly followed by the members of a given community (Firth, 1957, cited in Hassanain, 1994). In the situations found in the coursebooks, thanking formulae are provided as a response to questions used as a greeting amongst interlocutors who are either friends (Example 13, Appendix D) or meet each other for the first time but neither individual is socially superior to the other.

4.1.7. Thanking as a response to an expression of gratitude. Expressions of thanks may occur as a response to expressions of gratitude (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006; Cheng, 2010). Although only one example representing the aforementioned category was found in the coursebooks, its presence is interesting and even trailblazing, since this function of thanking formulae is rarely mentioned in ELT materials (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006). In the given coursebooks, the context for the given situation is an interview on a radio programme (Example 14, Appendix D).

4.1.8. Thanking as a closing signal. By far the most recurring situation of thanking in the materials surveyed is that of indicating closing, and includes three subcategories, depending on whether the speaker closes a conversation, an email/letter, or ends a speech. The given thanking situation is mentioned by Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992, p. 60), who point out the “conversational purpose” of thanking expressions, as well as Jautz (2013), who highlights the contribution of thanking routines to the organisation of discourse. Other authors also mention that the use of thanking formulae may signal the conclusion of a conversation (Goffman, 1971; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, cited in Coulmas, 1981; Rubin, 1983, cited in Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986), while the significance
of properly terminating an interaction is manifested by the fact that it is considered part of a speaker’s discourse knowledge, which in turn constitutes part of his/her declarative knowledge, linked to “an individual’s knowledge of the rules and and elements” of a given language (Færch & Kasper, 1984, p. 215). Therefore, although thanking as a conversation-ending strategy has been classified as a nongratitude one (Cheng, 2010), it would be interesting to assess its occurrence in the the coursebooks in questions, since, on a discourse organisation level, thanking formulae also serve the macro-function of closing conversations, as suggested by Jautz (2013). As far as conversational exchanges are concerned, the contexts for the given thanking situation are interviews (Example 15, Appendix D) or police interrogations, which are the most frequent cases in which thanking as a closing signal was observed.

4.1.9. **Thanking for receiving information previously requested and closing the conversation.** Several examples in which the purpose of the provision of a thanking expression was ambiguous were found in the coursebooks. In fact, the present category constitutes the second most commonly occurring one (along with thanking in greeting rituals). In these situations, a thanking formula was provided by the speaker after receiving information previously requested, usually referring to directions (Example 16, Appendix D), but coincided with the termination of the conversational exchange. The aforementioned ambiguity might exist due to the fact that there is an essential difference between naturally occurring dialogues and coursebook ones: while coursebook direction-giving dialogues contain three parts (i.e. requesting directions, direction-giving, and uttering a thanking expression in response to the directions provided), real direction-giving contains more parts (e.g. openers and pre-closings) (Scotton & Bernsten, 1988). However, the formation of this entirely new category was calculated to be mandatory, since the given thanking situation was among the most common ones in the didactic materials under investigation.

4.1.10. **Thanking somebody for calling.** In these situations, thanking takes place when the speaker who performs the given SA expresses his/her gratitude to a person who has made a phone call to a museum (Example 17, Appendix D) or a zoo in

---

1 Terkourafi (2011) also found that in informal spoken Cypriot Greek, a truncated version of thank you, i.e. fxaristo, is utilised to express gratitude for an object obtained as well as locally manage discourse in transactional encounters, demonstrating the ambiguous nature that thanking formulae may conceal.
order to ask for further information. However, the vast majority of the given thanking situation was not found in conversational exchanges but in recorded messages which included a gratitude statement in order to “generate a more positive evaluation” on behalf of the caller (Park & Lee, 2012, p. 138).

4.1.11. *Thanking as an opening line in emails/letters.* While thanking as a closing signal was frequently encountered in the coursebooks, only one thanking situation was extracted from the opening sentence of an email (Example 18, Appendix D).

4.1.12. *Thanking used jokingly or ironically.* One derived use of thanking formulae signaling irony (Example 19, Appendix D) was found in the coursebooks. Such uses of thanking formulae are “non-literal” and insincere, since the beneficiary has not actually been benefited from the thankable (Jautz, 2013, p. 7).

This section has presented a critical, in-depth overview of the thanking situations identified in the teaching materials surveyed for this study. In the following section, the thanking sequences or ‘thanking strategies’, as they are referred to throughout this paper, are focused on.

4.2. Analysis of thanking sequences

This section begins by presenting the thanking strategies found in the EFL coursebooks, since they constitute a major topic under investigation in the present study. While the overwhelming majority of them (nine out of 10) were also present in the NSs’ responses, the latter exhibited a larger variety of thanking strategies. Therefore, the second part of this sections discusses the additional thanking strategies that were retrieved from the responses to the DCT (see Appendix E for examples of sequence categories, see List of abbreviations 3 for alphabetically ordered coding scheme). Although this encourages us to discuss a considerable implication of this study, this cannot be realised until the next chapter of this paper.

4.2.1. Analysis of thanking sequences found in the teaching materials

In this section, a brief report on the major thanking strategies which were identified in the coursebooks is presented. Table 7 illustrates their distribution and coding scheme.
The categories were formed in accordance with prior studies, such as Eisenstein & Bodman (1986), Schauer and Adolphs (2006), and Intachakra (2004).

### Table 7: Distribution of thanking strategies found in the coursebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanking strategy</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Number of examples</th>
<th>Percentage of examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit expression of gratitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Use of performative</td>
<td><em>Per</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Use of expression of gratitude</td>
<td><em>Gra</em></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Use of expression of indebtedness</td>
<td><em>Ind</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expression of admiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Admiration of the beneficial act</td>
<td><em>AdAct</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Admiration of the benefactor</td>
<td><em>AdAdd</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Admiration of the beneficiary’s state</td>
<td><em>AdSta</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refusal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Direct refusal</td>
<td><em>Ref</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Indirect refusal</td>
<td><em>Exc</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stating reason</td>
<td><em>For</em></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expressing surprise</td>
<td><em>Sur</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Expressing wishes</td>
<td><em>Wis</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bidding farewell</td>
<td><em>Faw</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Signaling comprehension</td>
<td><em>Com</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Using a discourse marker</td>
<td><em>DM</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.1. Explicit expression of gratitude. Category 1 constitutes an indispensable part of every gratitude move, since its subcategories “are obligatory units that make use of repetitive syntactic as well as semantic formulae” (Intachakra, 2004, p. 51). The first subcategory, i.e. *use of performative*, requires the speaker to use a
performative verb, as its name indicates, preceding the subject of the clause. Examples from the coursebooks include SA verbs such as appreciate and owe. The second subcategory concerns offering gratitude using an elliptic construction such as thank you, thanks, or cheers. Remarkably, it was interesting to find the expression cheers in the coursebooks, since other researchers have reported that coursebook writers frequently fail to incorporate casual expressions in their texts (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006). Yet, it erroneously appeared only in small numbers despite the fact that research has shown that cheers is commonplace in British English NSs’ interactions (Intachakra, 2004; Schauer & Adolphs, 2006). On several occasions, thanking was intensified (as in thank you very much).

However, intensification was not always linked to the benefactor’s efforts to please the beneficiary (Jautz, 2013). For instance, in two almost identical situations of direction-giving, the thankable makes use of the common elliptical expression thank you in one case but an intensified version of thanks in the other. Finally, expressing indebtedness requires a subject followed by the copula and an adjective (as in I am grateful), which was by far among the most infrequent strategies found in the coursebooks.

4.2.1.2. Expression of admiration. Many times, an expression of gratitude was either preceded or proceeded by a compliment addressed to the beneficial act or to the benefactor, or a comment referring to the current emotional state of the beneficiary. Consequently, the second strategy comprises three subcategories. The former involves phrases which explicitly and positively refer to the act or the object of appreciation and contain an expression that has a deictic usage, such as that in that’s a good idea. In the second subcategory, the speaker positively refers to the hearer, expressing his/her admiration for the interlocutor (as in you are a good friend), while the last strategy is employed when the person who utters the thanking expression also verbalises his pleasure by utilising an adjective to describe his positive emotional state (as in It’s good to be here).

4.2.1.3. Refusal. This strategy was observed only in examples in which the sender of the thanking expression had to politely reject an offer and comprises two subcategories. The thanking expression was sometimes preceded by an explicit no, rendering the refusal direct. Direct refusals occur only three times in the
coursebooks, a finding that is consistent with previous research which demonstrated that such refusals are not a common strategy for speakers (Tanck, 2002), since they increase the risk of offending the hearer’s face (Beebe et al., 1990, cited in Morkus, 2014). In other cases the refusal was realised through more indirect strategies, which include offering an excuse/reason about declining the offer. The combination of a thanking strategy and a refusing one is very delicate and even considered a skill that needs to be taught to learners of a foreign language (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006). However, despite its significance, its occurrence in the coursebooks was infrequent.

4.2.1.4. Stating reason. The examples extracted from the coursebooks showed that the thanking formula was sometimes followed by an intensifier before the verbalisation of the reason for thanking in the form of a prepositional phrase beginning with for. The latter was either followed by a NP (as in thanks for your help) or a VP-ing (as in thank you for calling), successfully exposing learners to both structures which are equally likely to be employed by NSs (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006). The occurrence of the present category in the coursebooks was quite satisfying (22.7%), given that it is among the most frequent strategies used by NSs to express gratitude (ibid).

4.2.1.5. Expressing surprise. In a limited number of thanking situations, expressing delight (as oh in oh, thanks) was found among the functions which can precede the function of thanking. However, only a single linguistic formula of expressing surprise (i.e. oh) was found in the coursebooks, while data retrieved from Eisenstein and Bodman’s (1986) sample of NSs’ responses exhibited greater variation (e.g. gee, wow, what a surprise).

4.2.1.6. Expressing wishes. Only in a single situation was a thanking expression followed by well-wishing (i.e. Thank you X. Happy Easter) as opposed to the data obtained from the coursebooks in which the present strategy appeared more frequently. It was further decided that expressions such as I look forward to seeing you again, which appeared in the NSs’ responses, would be included in this category, since they verbalise the speaker’s anticipation to see, at least in the example given above, his/her interlocutor in the future too.

4.2.1.7. Other functions. More functions appeared along with expressions of gratitude, which can be observed in Table 7, but due to practical limitations they cannot be
analysed in depth. It should also be noted that *naming a benefactor* was a commonly occurring category in the coursebooks’ data. However, since the present study does not adhere to the framework proposed by Jautz (2013), where the aforementioned category is taken into consideration, it was decided not to be included in the present classification of thanking strategies either. Apart from *thank you*, in which the addressee is explicitly mentioned by means of the personal pronoun *you*, all the other instances of naming a benefactor are not addressed individually. Even in the case of *thank you* though, the personal pronoun is “an integral part of the thanking formula” (Jautz, 2013, p. 86), and therefore *thank you* was classified as simply a formula expressing gratitude.

This section has dealt with providing a comprehensive account of the thanking strategies found in the instructional materials. The following section will closely examine the strategies which were solely observed in the NSs’ responses.

4.2.2. Analysis of additional thanking strategies found in the DCT

One anticipated finding was that NSs would provide lengthier SA sets and more complex responses than those identified in the materials. Hence, this section provides a brief report on the thanking strategies which were employed only by the speakers in their responses to the DCT scenarios. These strategies and their coding are illustrated in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanking strategy</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stating intent to reciprocate</td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stating interlocutor’s nonexistent obligation</td>
<td>Un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Making an apology</td>
<td>Apl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stating the need for the favour</td>
<td>Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Repeating the gratitude expression</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greeting the interlocutor</td>
<td>Grt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Providing other strategies</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.1. Stating intent to reciprocate. Cheng (2005) uses the term ‘repayment strategy’ to refer to the speaker’s intent to reciprocate for service, money, or goods received by his/her interlocutor. It can be characterised as a controversial strategy, since the results it has yielded in prior investigations exhibit great inconsistency. For instance, while Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) observed its use in their DCT, Schauer and Adolphs (2006, p. 129) pointed out that, although it was present in their questionnaire too, it was unexpectedly absent from the CANCODE corpus, which was utilised for their investigation, perhaps due to the fact that “naturally occurring discourse...tends to require faster processing of information”, and as a consequence, utilisation of a relatively limited number of thanking formulae and a fixed set of strategies instead of a combination of various politeness strategies. In the data obtained for this study, the given strategy always follows an explicit expression of gratitude, while the speakers’ formulae that were used to state their intent to reciprocate were less standardised than expected.

4.2.2.2. Stating interlocutor’s non-existent obligation. In her investigation, Cheng (2005, p. 46) states that “this strategy can be accompanied by other strategies, such as thanking” and expresses the speaker’s desire to diminish the favour received by implying its unnecessity. This category was also identified by Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) and Schauer and Adolphs (2006). However, similar to the previously examined category, there were no instances of this category in the CANCODE corpus either, for reasons to do with the way the authors searched for the particular strategy in the corpus, as it is explained in their paper. In this study, the participants provided the following formulaic sequences after having expressed their gratitude first: you shouldn’t have to/ didn’t have to/ didn’t need to do sth. This limited selection of structures demonstrates that NSs of a language tend to repeatedly use certain formulae despite the fact that their answers are picked out of a pool which, in theory, contains endless linguistic options.

4.2.2.3. Making an apology. The apologetic strategy has already been proposed by Cheng (2005) and used by other researchers in recent studies in the use of expressions of gratitude, such as Özdemir and Rezvani (2010) and Pishghadam and Zarei (2011). In the present DCT, the participants either used an apologetic formula to express their regret ( I’m sorry), or the apologising words were
followed by a statement of the fact (*Sorry to bother you*). Given that only two variants were identified in this strategy, reminding us of previous strategies which also exhibited significant uniformity, it can be observed that the utterances used in conversations “recur, are predictable, and are associated with…particular types of interactions” (Richards & Sukwiwat, 1983, p. 114). Another interesting finding of this study is that the apologetic strategy was not always accompanied by an explicit thanking expression, but when it did, the gratitude statement always preceded the apology.

4.2.2.4. Stating the need for the favour. Previous studies evaluating this category observed that it was among the least frequently employed strategies (Özdemir & Rezvani, 2010). This result is consistent with the data obtained in the DCT, since the given category was observed only once. The structure that was found in the DCT is: *I wouldn’t ask if it wasn’t important*.

4.2.2.5. Providing other strategies. Due to practical limitations, a category was included which would incorporate any formulae that would not belong to any of the existing categories. These formulae were primarily identified in the second scenario of the DCT and include statements of the speaker’s well-being and questions concerning the interlocutor’s state of health. When the coding of the NSs’ responses had to be realised, it was decided to employ this category only in cases where none of the fundamental thanking strategies (see Table 7, superstrategies 1 and 2) had been used in order to observe more directly cases in which a gratitude statement was completely absent from a response.

This chapter began by describing the thanking situations that were identified in the teaching materials. It went on to consider the strategies that were observed in the data, initially presenting the ones found in both the EFL coursebooks and the questionnaires. This section has thoroughly reviewed the thanking strategies that were observed in the NSs’ data but not in the teaching materials. Strategies 5 and 6 (see Table 8) were excluded from the analysis due to their apparent simplicity and because of practical limitations. In the next chapter results are presented and answers to the research questions as posed in Section 1.2 are provided.
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part of the thesis presents and discusses the findings which emerged from the analysis of the data gathered for this study. While the two first sections deal with the exploration of the data obtained solely from the coursebooks, the subsequent sections discuss the findings which emerged from the correlation between thanking in the didactic materials and the responses to the DCT scenarios. Section 5.1 describes and discusses the distribution of the total number of thanking situations found in the coursebooks taking into account the school grade in which the situations occur. The second part moves on to describe the distribution of explicit thanks across the language levels of the coursebooks. The purpose of the third section is to contrast the gratitude expressions used by NSs of English in each thanking situation in the DCT with those found in the coursebooks. The use of intensifiers in the teaching materials in comparison with the questionnaires will be discussed in the forthcoming section. The final section of this chapter presents the results relating to the repertoire of thanking strategies utilised by NSs with regards to the type of thanking situation and compares them with those obtained from the analysis of the teaching materials.

5.1. The pragmatic dimension of thanking in the coursebooks

As already discussed, sociopragmatic mismatches between languages and cultures and “cross-culturally different perceptions of when and for what goods or services it is appropriate to thank” (Thomas, 1983, p. 109) may lead to sociopragmatic failure due to cultural and social miscalculations. For instance, expressions of gratitude are used, among other functions, as markers of intimacy and closeness in Greek society (Antonopoulou, 2001), as opposed to English speaking cultures where, according to Jautz (2013), the aforementioned case of using a thanking formula is not observed. Therefore, it is of paramount importance to expose EFL learners to a variety of thanking situations in order to make them familiar with those which call for thanking, so as to gradually develop social competence in the TL.

Graph 2 shows the distribution of thanking situations according to the proposed classification presented in Section 4.1. Different combinations of school grades have been taken into account, since, as explained in section 3.1, not all pupils are offered equal opportunities with regard to English in primary school, while in junior high
Graph 2: Distribution of the SA of thanking by combination of school grades
Learners are taught at two different levels, depending on their overall language proficiency.
From Graph 2, it is apparent that although in primary school (Graphs 2.A and 2.B) learners are exposed to approximately the same variety of situations, the opposite is the case for junior high school, where weaker learners (Graph 2.C.) become familiar with merely 10 thanking situations, while their advanced counterparts (Graph 2.D) are presented with seven additional ones. For primary school, there is a close link between language proficiency and variety of situations, as the richest variety of them occurs in 5th and 6th grade. These results are in agreement with other research which found that there is a developmental trend between language proficiency and pragmatic competence (Rose, 2000). However, such an association between variety of situations and school grade is not observed in junior high school, where strikingly, for the weaker students the variety of situations decreases as the level of proficiency increases (Graph 2.C). Regarding the advanced group (Graph 2.D), the variety of thanking situations rises moving from 1st to 2nd grade before it plummets in the 3rd grade to merely three types of thanking situations. Nevertheless, this is quite reasonable, as thanking someone and responding to thanks is part of the 2nd grade advanced level syllabus.

In summary, these results show that the distribution of thanking situations across the school grades is not patterned in the case of junior high school, since underachieving pupils are exposed to significantly fewer thanking situations compared to higher achieving ones, while in primary school, whether pupils start learning the TL in 1st or 3rd grade is not expected to make much of a difference.

5.2. Distribution of explicit thanks with regards to the language level

The analysis of the direct acts of thanking in relation to the language level of the teaching materials showed that their distribution was neither patterned nor explainable.

Graph 3 provides an overview of the distribution of the direct acts of thanking identified across the four language levels of the EFL coursebooks. Due to practical limitations, the variants in Graph 3 had to be coded (see List of abbreviations 4). Thank you, thanks, and thanks a lot were the most frequent elements in the teaching materials, while the rest of the variants appeared less frequently. Not surprisingly, thank you was aright the most Graph 3: Distribution of explicit thanks in the coursebooks by language level
usual formula across all levels. This result is consistent with the results of Intachakra (2004) and Schauer and Adolphs (2006). In other words, the corpora assembled or
examined for the realisation of the aforementioned studies reveal that *thank you* is indeed the most frequent variant employed by NSs of English. Yet, while the aforementioned studies revealed that *cheers* was among the most frequently occurring thanking expressions, this finding is not in agreement with the results of the present study in which *cheers* occurs extremely rarely, depriving learners of valuable opportunities to be exposed to “clearly colloquial” thanking expressions (Jautz, 2013, p. 13). A possible explanation for this might be that, although the aforementioned studies investigated expressions of gratitude solely in British English, nowhere in the teaching materials is the variety of English taught clearly articulated.

At the lowest level (i.e. EYL), *thank you* and *thanks* were detected to be the most common thanking expressions, a result which may be explained by the young age of the learners and their low level of proficiency. At the remaining levels, the same variants occur on their own or with other components, such as intensifiers. Coursebook writers might have aimed at learners acquiring the routine formula expressing gratitude initially at the lowest level before proceeding to introducing more semantically complex formulaic expressions as the level of proficiency increased, although there was no increase of the level of complexity of the gratitude expressions associated with higher levels of language proficiency. Hence, the rare occurrence of more elaborate thanking expressions across all levels raises concerns about their acquisition by language learners.

As Gass (Gass, 1994, p. 212) puts it, the process of learning a word is “recursive…and does not occur instantaneously”, that is it takes more than a single encounter for a learner to acquire an item of vocabulary along with its semantic and syntactic information.

Overall, these results indicate that while learners are likely to acquire some of the most frequent thanking expressions used in the TL, more linguistically complex or casual realisations of thanking will probably be ignored. However, the practicality of elaborate thanking is challenged, given that the literature on the SA of thanking recognises that NSs tend to utilise a limited number of expressions to verbalise their gratitude towards their interlocutor.
5.3. Type of explicit thanking with regards to the type of thanking situation

This study sought to assess the thanking expressions found in the Greek EFL coursebooks. In order to achieve this, a comparison needed to be drawn between the results obtained from the analysis of the teaching materials and those acquired from the questionnaires.

Graph 4 compares the results obtained from both data sources. Apparently, the variety of thanking responses found in the questionnaires (Graph 4.B) was notably higher than that in the coursebooks (Graph 4.A), suggesting that the latter do not accurately reflect the English linguistic reality. A possible explanation for this result may be the language level of the teaching materials, which ranged from complete beginners to CEFR B1, perhaps limiting coursebook writers to certain linguistic realisations of thanking. Nonetheless, it can be seen that thank you occurs in every situation in the coursebooks, making it the most frequent variant in most situations. However, such a uniformity was not observed in the thanking responses given by the NSs, in which thank you was found in just four of the scenarios.

For the conversational closings, the input provided in the coursebooks seems to accord with the NSs’ intuitions, since the most frequent variants in the teaching materials (thanks, thank you, thank you very much) coincide with those in the questionnaires. However, the same conclusion cannot be reached for the second, sixth, eighth, and tenth situations, in which there is absolutely no correlation between the results obtained from the two data sources. In the same vein, the comparison of the figures showed that, for some of the situations, the disparities between the coursebooks and the NSs’ responses were so significant that the two data sources had only one element in common (thank you so much in the fifth situation, thanks in situations seven and nine).

Regarding the third situation, although some of the variants were observed in both the teaching materials and the DCT (thank you, thanks a lot, thanks a million), thanks was found to be the most frequently used thanking expression in the coursebooks, a variant which was completely absent from the thanking responses given by the NSs. From the fourth situation, a mixed picture emerged, since all the thanking formulae found in the coursebooks were also observed in the DCT. However, thanks, which was the most commonly occurring element in the DCT for the given thanking situation, was not found in the EFL coursebooks, not even in small figures.
Graph 4: Thanking formulae in the coursebooks and the DCT by type of thanking situation
Viewing the data as a whole, it can be generalised that the the Greek didactic materials do not accurately present those linguistic realisations of thanking which are most likely to be employed by NSs in a particular situations. The responses to the DCT revealed that certain structures are similar across speakers. This is apparent by the fact that in the majority of the scenarios in the questionnaires, one, two, or three of the thanking variants occurred more frequently than the rest of the thanking expressions, confirming that there is a preference for utilising particular expressions of gratitude, depending on the situation. However, the fact that there was little or no correlation between the two data sources predicts that the Greek materials expose learners to inaccurate input as to which thanking expression to utter with regards to the thanking situation.

5.4. Intensification of gratitude expressions

Intensifiers or – to use Holmes’ (1984, passim) terms – “boosters” are particles which modify a thanking routine by increasing its illocutionary force. Holmes (1984, p. 363) points out that they are used to express “the speaker’s positive feelings towards the hearer…or to increase the solidarity of the relationship” between the interlocutors. Jautz (2013) demonstrated that intensifiers are employed quite regularly by NSs of English when uttering a gratitude expression. Hence, an objective of this study was to investigate how the thanking formulae are boosted in the teaching materials compared to the DCT. This section firstly presents the intensifiers found in both data sources, contrasting the results obtained from the present study with those from prior investigations, before proceeding to examine in detail the use of intensifying particles in relation with the thanking situation in which they were utilised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensifier</th>
<th>Coursebooks</th>
<th>DCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no intensifier</td>
<td>very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no intensifier</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much indeed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so much</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a million</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 presents the intensifiers identified in both sources of data gathered for this investigation, making comparisons between the two. It can be deduced that intensification is found in the EFL coursebooks (18%) almost as often as in the DCT (21.3%). While four of the categories are found in both sources of data (very much, a lot, so much, a million), the rest of them can be seen either in the coursebooks or in the DCT, though in miniscule numbers. While in the coursebooks very much appears to be the most frequent particle (6%), in accordance with previous research which demonstrated that the aforementioned booster appears more frequently than any other particle in British and New Zealand English (Jautz, 2013), the DCT revealed that very much is the second most frequently used intensifier (9.2%) , following so much which was the first choice for the NSs (10.3%). Nevertheless, for the DCT, the difference between the two most frequent variables is rather insignificant (1.1%).

A lot, which as Jautz (ibid) argues is among the most commonly used intensifiers, aptly appears to be the second and third most frequently used booster in the teaching materials (5%) and the DCT (0.6%) respectively. However, the observed difference between the occurrence of a lot in the two sources is quite significant, and the fact that it appears eight times more often in the coursebooks than in the DCT was an unexpected finding. This inconsistency between the literature and the data obtained from the questionnaires could be attributed to the fact that, in the latter, some of the informants spoke American English, a language variety which was not examined in Jautz’ (ibid) investigation.

Another unanticipated finding was that very much indeed, which Jautz (2013, p. 91) describes as “typical of British English,” is found among the variants identified in the coursebooks but not in the questionnaires, although 83.3% of its respondents were British. There are several possible explanations for this result. It might be related to the considerable variation that the analysis of different genres might produce (i.e. Jautz’ study investigated radio phone-ins and broadcast interviews only) or to the formality with which very much indeed is associated (Jautz, 2013).

Together, these results indicate that while the Greek EFL coursebooks do expose learners to some typical intensifiers, they fail to present a larger variety of particles, rendering some of them completely absent from the learners’ provided input (so, really, many).
Turning now to the use of intensifiers in relation with the thanking situation, Graph 5 provides the results obtained from the analysis of the teaching materials (Graph 5.A) and

**Graph 5: Intensification in the coursebooks and the DCT by type of thanking situation**
the DCT (Graph 5.B). Not surprisingly, in neither source are intensifying particles used in greetings, which have a highly phatic function and “communicate[s] attitudes rather than bare facts” (Bowen, et al., 1985, p. 102). In other words, as Searle (1969) puts it, greetings lack propositional content and sincerity. Therefore, since the thanking formula provided by the speaker does not genuinely express gratefulness, it would be too much of an imposition to provide an intensified gratitude expression. Thus, in the following analysis, greetings have not been taken into consideration.

The graph is quite revealing in several ways. While NSs chose *so much* in every scenario to increase the illocutionary force of their thanking expression, the aforementioned particle appears in only three thanking situations in the teaching materials (receiving information previously requested, rejection of an offer, thanking for receiving information previously requested and closing the conversation). Regarding the three final scenarios, NSs showed that they might utter an intensified thanking expression, even in an insignificant number of cases (in the last scenario only one participant employed a boosting device). However, the thanking expressions which occur in the same situations in the coursebooks are not accompanied by any intensifier at all. Especially in the case of thanking someone for a service rendered, we would justifiably expect that the teaching materials would have provided learners with some intensified thanking expressions, since “the degree of imposition may be related to the modification” carried out by some boosting device (Jautz, 2013, p. 152).

As for the conversational closings, Graph 5 illustrates that, in both data sources, *very much* is the most frequent variant, rendering the teaching materials a key source of knowledge in that respect, unlike the third scenario, in which the boosting devices employed by the NSs are entirely different to those found in the coursebooks. However, concerning the situation in which a thanking formula is uttered after receiving information previously requested and simultaneously as a discourse organisation marker for closing the conversation (coded as *InfCC*), the very same intensifiers were found, though in different proportions, in both data sources.

Together these results provide important insights into the distribution of intensified thanking formulae in relation with the situation in the Greek EFL coursebooks. From the latter, a rather mixed picture emerged, characterised by a number of reliable as well as inaccurate predictions concerning the use of intensifying particles in the TL.
5.5. Distribution of thanking strategies with regards to the type of thanking situation

The final purpose of this investigation was to explore the relationship between the linguistic strategies adopted by speakers when facing a thanking situation and the social contexts in which each strategy occurs. The research to date has tended to focus on the thanking strategies adopted by speakers in general (Intachakra, 2004; Schauer & Adolphs, 2006), rather than by situation, where much less is known (Cheng, 2010). Given that interlocutors tend to perform remarkably identical verbal routines, depending on the type of interaction in which they take part, it is worth investigating whether the writers of the Greek EFL materials have provided learners with accurate information concerning the strategies which are most frequently employed by NSs.

Graph 6 illustrates the thanking strategies found in the coursebooks (Graph 6.A) and the DCT (Graph 6.B) in relation to the social context in which they occur. Evidently, the most frequently employed strategy in both sources of data is the provision of an expression of gratitude, which appears to be an obligatory unit of every thanking sequence in the overwhelming majority of thanking situations. While the use of a performative verb can replace the aforementioned strategy, since, together with expressing indebtedness, they constitute the most vital element of every thanking sequence (see section 4.2.1.1), it can be seen that utilising an expression of gratitude far outnumbers its counterparts. Expressing indebtedness is not even present in the data, as it did not appear in conversation exchanges in the coursebooks, and none of the informants employed this strategy in the DCT. This result may be explained by the fact that expressing indebtedness is associated with major favours (Intachakra, 2004). However, in none of the situations examined did the beneficiary accept a major favour bestowed on him/her by the interlocutor.

When ending a conversation, the DCT proved that stating a reason for thanking and verbalising your appreciation towards the act that has preceded (e.g. the conversation) are frequently occurring strategies, aptly presented in the coursebooks too. In greeting rituals, both data sources seem to acknowledge that uttering a phatic thanking expression

**Graph 6: Type of thanking strategy by situation found in the coursebooks and in the DCT**
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is sufficient enough, rendering the choices of the coursebook writers well-informed. When receiving help, it was observed in the questionnaires that the beneficiary usually expresses his/her admiration towards the act worthy of appreciation and/or his/her state of pleasure which is an outcome of the beneficial act, strategies which were present but not emphasised in the teaching materials. As far as thanking for a service rendered is concerned, the DCT suggested that a combination of expressing gratitude followed by the reason for thanking constitutes the most frequent elements of a thanking sequence. Similarly, the coursebooks also provide the aforementioned frequent amalgamation but fail to emphasise its prominence, as they present other less significant strategies as equally important.

As to the fourth, sixth, ninth, and tenth situations, it can be observed that while a thanking expression can be combined with a variety of thanking strategies, some of which occur more commonly than others, according to the DCT responses (e.g. stating a reason for thanking and expressing pleasure for the current state are frequently employed strategies when receiving a warm welcome), the coursebooks fail to expose learners to accurate input, since, as it can be seen in Graph 6.A, a single thanking expression is provided, which is accompanied by no or very few other thanking strategies, failing to depict the linguistic reality of the TL.

In summary, these results show that while Greek coursebook developers expose learners to some thanking strategies, NSs’ responses indicated that, in real-life interactions, speakers tend to use either longer sequences, by employing larger sets of thanking strategies, or a wider variety of strategies, which can be fairly accurately predicted based on the situation in which a speaker has found himself/herself. However, such a plethora of choices is not made available to the Greek EFL learners, which are provided with rather ‘simplified’ input, lacking “the idiomaticity and complexity of normal NSs discourse” (Waters, 2009, p. 315).

6. CONCLUSION

The present study was designed to determine whether the SA of thanking is adequately presented in the English instructional materials used in Greek public education, in order to fill a gap in existing research, as this is one of the few studies to exclusively
investigate the linguistic forms and social strategies employed to express gratitude in both ESL coursebooks and real language (Schauer & Adolphs, 2006).

The research has shown that the distribution of thanking in the coursebooks is rather unjustifiable, since no correlation was observed between the frequency of thanking situations on the one hand and school grade on the other. For instance, more thanking situations were identified in the teaching materials of primary school compared to those of junior high school, revealing that there exists no connection between the range of thanking and the language level of the instructional materials. The second major finding was that, although Greek learners are taught the unmarked expressions of gratitude, they are deprived of opportunities to acquire more marked thanking expressions frequently found in specific varieties of English. Moreover, the type of thanking situation emerged as a reliable predictor of the gratitude expression issued by the NSs. However, the aforementioned finding was proved to be unfavourable for the instructional materials. Examining the type of thanking expression provided with regards to the situation, it was observed that the thanking formulae found in the coursebooks in a specific situation did not coincide with the data obtained from the questionnaires. The research also showed that, although the coursebooks examined included a sufficient variety of intensifiers, their predictions concerning the type of thanking situation that needed to be ‘boosted’ and the particle issued were not always in accordance with the NSs’ responses.

The most interesting finding to emerge from this study though concerns the range of strategies employed by NSs when they verbalise their gratitude. Particularly, although the Greek EFL materials were proved to provide L2 learners with a large number of thanking strategies, the DCT showed that they can be combined in multiple ways, forming complex sequences which were absent from the didactic materials. Given that the latter are sometimes the main source of input for L2 learners, it is not hard to imagine the consequences that this unrealistic presentation of the SA of thanking may have upon learners’ attempts to communicate in the target community.

In general, therefore, the results of this investigation suggest that the Greek EFL coursebooks should provide learners with enough opportunities to build up their repertoire of thanking expressions and strategies more consistently. The lack of special emphasis on expressing gratitude in the TL is evident even in the coursebooks’ syllabi, as only one of them contains a special reference to thanking. This serious gap in the
curriculum might be related to a common misconception; expressing gratitude does not pose difficulties for the L2 learner, therefore it needs not to be taught (Cheng, 2005).

Though the present study was not designed to assess the opportunities given to learners to practise the SA of thanking, the paucity of activities targeting the function of thanking supports the previously mentioned allegation. The activities observed in the Greek teaching materials accounted for a limited number of thanking situations (e.g. thanking in greeting rituals and after receiving information previously requested in directiongiving encounters) in stereotypical ways (lists of phrases, ordering sentences, and gapfilling exercises). This contrasts with the principles of explicit pragmatic instruction, according to which “teaching pragmatics empowers students to experience and experiment with the language at a deeper level, and thereby to participate in the purpose of language – communication, rather than just words” (Bardovi-Harling, et al., 1991, p. 13). It can thus be concluded that the activities found in the Greek teaching materials fail to offer learners opportunities for meaningful communicative practice in life like situations and neglect to supply them with explicit metapragmatic information, which is absent from the teachers’ manuals too, leaving it entirely up to the teacher to impart this valuable knowledge.

Yet, high expectations are aroused by the coursebooks’ descriptions. For instance, Think Teen claims to offer pupils important pragmatic advantages. It is stated that authentic or semi-authentic texts and semi-scripted dialogues have been integrated into the series, in order for learners to become socioculturally competent by being exposed to various social behaviours and situations. The authors also highlight their focus on interactional aspects of the TL, which aim to develop learners’ fluency, while they manifest their sensitivity towards cross-cultural differences, making language instructors aware that learners frequently misinterpret what is said to them based on their knowledge of the pragmatic norms established in their community. Since such resonant claims are made, we would expect the connection between coursebooks and DCT to be more sufficient and obvious.

This tenuous connection between coursebooks’ findings and DCT responses manifests the urgent need to develop L2 didactic materials, whose authors do not neglect research findings relying only on their intuitions, but make informed choices, either by consulting prior studies or by making use of corpora, in order to meaningfully and
realistically expose learners to the TL and prepare them for the reality of language use in the target community. As Boxer and Pickering (1995, p. 52) put it, instructional materials should “be based on spontaneous speech in order to capture the underlying social strategies of the speech behaviour being studied”. Nonetheless, it is encouraging to see a proliferation of corpus linguistic studies (e.g. Carter & McCarthy, 1995; McCarthy & Carter, 1995; Conrad, 1999; Biber, et al., 2002) which aim to raise awareness of how language forms are used in real social contexts, although we are not aware of whether coursebook developers make use of the available information.

However, this study is not without its limitations. It is unfortunate that this investigation was limited by the composition of the sample. As participants were free to decide whether to take the survey or not, the validity of the study is in jeopardy due to the so-called “problem of participant self-selection” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 100). Responding to a questionnaire voluntarily is possible to affect the subjects’ “aptitude, motivation or some other basic characteristics”, rendering the sample non-representative (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 101). Nevertheless, it was inevitable not to select the given sample design, since subjects could not have been forced to compulsorily take part in the study.

In addition, the initial goal was to gather data from 50 participants. This was not achieved, since finding subjects was unexpectedly proved to be incredibly laborious. Given the time constraints in which data had to be collected, coded, and interpreted, it was unfeasible to leave the survey open for longer, which could have attracted a larger number of participants. Nevertheless, the generalisability of the results is not threatened by the moderate sample size (see section 3.3.2).

This study was further limited by the absence of the prosodic characteristics of expressions of gratitude. Given that not all thanking formulae in the coursebooks were extracted from audio files and because of the complexity of the framework that such measurements would require, prosody is a factor with which this investigation has not dealt. Furthermore, an issue that this study intentionally did not draw attention to was whether gender differences affect the way gratitude is expressed. Prior studies, such as Greif and Gleason (1980) and Cui (2012), have already determined that gender is a factor which influences the frequency and length of expressions of gratitude. However, a more thorough framework was needed in order for gender differences to be determined, which was not feasible due to practical limitations.
Considerable more work needs to be done in the field of pragmatics as regards to the SA of thanking. Despite the proliferation of studies, not much is known regarding intralanguage variation as a factor upon which thanking depends. To my knowledge, to date only Jautz (2013) has examined how different varieties of the same language can influence expressions of gratitude, reporting that variation may occur due to dialectal differences. Variational pragmatics is an intriguing field which is expected to be explored usefully and extensively in the future, since it constitutes a recently developed field of study. Another interesting area of future research would be to investigate the influence of other factors, such as ethnicity and gender, and their interaction upon the SA of thanking. However, such studies would require rather complex frameworks due to the multiple correlations that need to be discovered.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table 1: Propositional content of thanking (Searle, 1969, p. 67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositional content</th>
<th>Thank (for)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past act A done by H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A benefits S and S believes benefits S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S feels grateful or appreciative for A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts as an expression of gratitude or appreciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity and essential rules overlap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: A taxonomy of the SA of thanking (Coulmas, 1981, p. 74)

Thanks ex ante (for a promise, offer, invitation)
Thanks ex post (for a favour, invitation (afterwards))
Thanks for material goods (gifts, services)
Thanks for immaterial goods (wishes, compliments, congratulations, information)
Thanks for some action initiated by the benefactor
Thanks for some action resulting from a request /wish/order by the beneficiary
Thanks that imply indebtedness
Thanks that do not imply indebtedness

APPENDIX B

EFL teaching materials analysed for the study

<p>| Primary School |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student’s Book</th>
<th>Workbook</th>
<th>Teacher’s Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Online educational material, (EYL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Online educational material, (EYL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Magic Book 1 (level: complete beginners)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magic Book 2 (level: A1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>English 4th Grade (level: A1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>English 5th Grade (level: A1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>English 6th Grade (level: A2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Junior High School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student’s Book</th>
<th>Workbook</th>
<th>Teacher’s Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Think Teen 1st Grade of Junior High for beginner level students (level A1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think Teen 1st Grade of Junior High for advanced level students (level A2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Think Teen 2nd Grade of Junior High for beginner level students (level A2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think Teen 2nd Grade of Junior High for advanced level students (level B1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Think Teen 3rd Grade of Junior High School (level B1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 32 books

APPENDIX C
Table 5: Relationship between interlocutors and thanking situations in the DCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Closing the conversation</td>
<td>Thanking in greeting rituals</td>
<td>Receiving information previously requested and closing the conversation</td>
<td>Receiving objects/presents</td>
<td>Receiving help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Receiving good wishes</td>
<td>Rejecting offer</td>
<td>Receiving a warm welcome</td>
<td>Receiving information previously requested</td>
<td>Reacting to service rendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire

The following task contains 10 descriptions of situations you might find yourself in. Please read the situations and write what you would say in each one of them in the space provided. Try to respond as you would in an actual conversation. Say as much or as little as you wish- you may choose to say nothing (write x if you choose to say nothing as a response). You cannot leave any questions unanswered. Here is an example: You are on the bus, heading to town to meet your friends. Just before your stop, you press the stop button and start preparing to alight it. The bus stops, the door opens, and you say: Cheers!

**Scenario 1:** You are a TV presenter on the local TV channel, interviewing a book writer called Jo Poole. You meet him for the first time, but your profession dictates that you create an amicable atmosphere. After interviewing him for some time, you
ask him your last question, he answers it, and you now want to end the interview. You say:

Scenario 2: You bump into a not so close friend of yours who you haven’t seen for quite a long time. You greet each other and kiss before he/she asks you how you are. You say:

Scenario 3: You have just moved to a new town. You haven’t found a job yet so you decide to go to the Job Centre to get some help. As you are not familiar with the area, you stop a passerby to ask for directions on your way there. He/She willingly gives you clear and precise directions, and as soon as he/she finishes, you say:

Scenario 4: Your flatmates have organised a small birthday party for you. After they sing the happy birthday song and cut your birthday cake, one of them approaches you and gives you a present while some other friend yells “that’s from everybody”. You take the present and say:

Scenario 5: You are about to move to a new apartment but you have no car, and you don’t know how to transport your stuff to it. You ask a very close friend, who has a truck, to help you move. Your friend immediately agrees to help you. You say:

Scenario 6: You are about to leave on holiday, and you are in the town centre, doing some last-minute shopping. You bump into a not so close friend of yours and have a small talk with him/her for a few minutes. During the conversation, you let him/her know that you are about to go on vacation, your destination, how long you are going to stay there, and that you are travelling by plane. You are in a hurry though, so you tell him/her that you have to go but it was really nice talking to him/her. Your friend says goodbye and wishes you a nice flight. You say:

Scenario 7: You attend a dinner at a friend’s house. Your plate is full of food, but the hostess suggests you try some more. You are not willing to accept her offer. You say:
**Scenario 8:** You are a scientist, expert in the area of genetic engineering. You have been invited for an interview by a quite successful science YouTube channel. The interview begins with a warm welcome from the host, during which he refers to your area of expertise and your achievements as a scientist. He finally says “welcome,” and you say:

**Scenario 9:** You call a friend, whose parents you have never met, on his/her landline. His/Her parents, who are visiting, pick up the phone and inform you that he/she is still at work. As you need to get in touch with him/her immediately, you ask whether they could give you a phone number to call him/her at work. His/Her mother gives it to you. You say:

**Scenario 10:** You are at the checkout point of a supermarket, having just done your weekly shopping. The cashier asks you whether you need any assistance in bagging your groceries. You say that you do, and a bagger immediately comes to help you. He/She does this, and before you pick up your things and leave, you say to him/her:

---

**APPENDIX D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Examples of thanking situations identified in the coursebooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Example 1** | Canteen assistant: Hi Matt! What are you having today?  
Matt: Just a chicken sandwich and some orange juice, please.  
Canteen assistant. That’s 95p. Matt:  
Here you are.  
Canteen assistant: Thank you.  
*(Excerpted from English 5th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 27)* |
| **Example 2** | Steve: Right. See you, Daphne. Have a nice flight!  
Daphne: Thanks. Take care. Bye!  
*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 1st Grade of Junior High School, Teacher’s book for beginner level students, p. 101)* |
**Example 3**
Presenter: Well, pop fans, tonight we have on our show the one and only Willie Robinson. Welcome Willie, it's great to speak to you again.
Willie: Thank you Jo. It's good to be here!

*(Excerpted from* Think Teen, 3rd Grade of Junior High School, Teacher’s book, p. 17)*

**Example 4**
George: Oh, it smells nice.
Bill: Thank you.

*(Excerpted from* English 6th Grade, Workbook, p. 3)*

**Example 5**
Animal 1: Oh no, I can’t climb…
Animal 2: Don’t be sad. I can help you. Join me.
Animal 1: Thank you! You’re a good friend.

*(Excerpted from* Magic Book 2, Student’s book, p. 71)*

**Example 6**
Pierre: Excuse me…Do you think you could tell me the way to a good traditional restaurant in the area?
Passer-by: Sure. Go down the Acropolis hill, along Areopagitou Street and turn left in Adrianou Street. Go along this street and you’ll see “Dionysos’ Tavern” on your left. You can’t miss it!
Pierre: Thanks a lot.

*(Excerpted from* English 5th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 39)*

**Example 7**
Old woman: Please, have a cup of hot tea and some cakes. They are freshly baked.
Wife: Thank you! Really, I haven’t tasted cakes as delicious as these before!

*(Excerpted from* English 6th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 32)*

**Example 8**
Our Mayor will appreciate your participation in our volunteer programme!

*(Excerpted from* English 6th Grade, Student’s book, p. 129)*

**Example 9**
Client: Do you think I’ll have the car on Thursday?
Car mechanic: Ok. Don’t worry. I’ll fix your car tomorrow. Client: Oh. Thanks a lot.

*(Excerpted from* English 6th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 60)*
**Example 10** Girl: Umm...it feels so soft and I think my father likes this design. It matches his linen jacket, but the price tag says $13.99, and I know I don’t have that much money. I only have $12, 00.

Man: Well, let me see… You’re lucky. This T-shirt just went on sale. It’s only $11.90. What do you say?

Girl: Oh, thanks. I’ll take it.

*(Excerpted from English 6th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 24)*

**Example 11** I can’t believe my holiday is over! I had a great time and everything we did and saw was amazing! I can’t thank you enough!

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Workbook for advanced level students, p. 142)*

**Example 12** (…) The food is tasty but not really healthy. Thank God, there are many different salads! (…)

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 1st Grade of Junior High School, Student’s book for beginner level students, p. 182)*

**Example 13** – Hello, Jane. How are you doing?
– All right. Thanks, Brian. And you?
– I’m fine, thanks. See you later, Jane.
– See you!

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Workbook for advanced level students, p. 15)*

**Example 14** Presenter: Well, thank you very much for your interesting talk tonight David and we look forward to seeing you again on our show sometime soon.

D.G.: Thank you too, Bill.

P.: That's about all for tonight so I leave you with this music from the Amazon jungle... [fade out with tribal music]

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Student’s book for beginner level students, p. 7)*
**Example 15**

A: Back to what we discussed before, do you think that careful selection of the foods we eat can make a difference in the way we feel?

B: According to the survey, over a third of the people asked said they were very certain that the improvements they had seen to their mental health were directly linked to the changes they had made to their diet.

A: It's been a very interesting and enlightening discussion. Thank you very much Dr. Brown for being with us today.

B: My pleasure!

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 3rd Grade of Junior High School, Teacher’s book, p. 138)*

---

**Example 16**

– How do I get to your house?

– Well, go down Ermou street and then take the first turning on the left.

– And then?

– It’s a small house on your right. Just ring the bell on the gate.

– Thanks a lot. See you there!

*(Excerpted from English 5th Grade, Student’s book, p. 48)*

**Example 17**

Thank you for calling the British Museum. The British museum is open the following days and times. (…)

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 1st Grade of Junior High School, Teacher’s book for advanced level students, p. 62)*

**Example 18**

Dear Christine,

Hi! Thanks for your e-mail and the photos you sent me. (…)

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 1st Grade of Junior High School, Workbook for advanced level students, p. 21)*

**Example 19**

(…) And all this thanks to that broken window!

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 1st Grade of Junior High School, Student’s book for advanced level students, p. 49)*

---

**APPENDIX E**

**Examples of sequence categories**
Example of sequence containing the use of a performative verb

Mr. Bonano, first of all I’d like to thank you for agreeing to see me at such short notice!

(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Student’s book for advanced level students, p. 94)

Use of performative + Stating reason (coded as //Per + For//)

Example of sequence containing the use of an expression of gratitude
No, thanks. I’ve read it.

*(Excerpted from English 5th Grade, Workbook, p. 57)*

Direct refusal + Use of expression of gratitude + Indirect refusal (coded as //Ref + Gra + Exc//)

---

Example of sequence containing the use of an expression of indebtedness

We were grateful for the building and for the freedom to experiment with it.

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Student’s book for advanced level students, p. 66)*

Use of expression of indebtedness + Stating reason (coded as //Ind + For//)

---

Example of sequence containing the use of an expression of admiration of the beneficial act

Nice work, Daedalus. Thank you.

*(Excerpted from Magic Book 2, Student’s book, p. 98)*

Admiration of the beneficial act + Use of expression of gratitude (coded as //AdAct + Gra//)

---

Example of sequence containing the use of an expression of admiration of the benefactor

Thank you! You’re a good friend

*(Excerpted from Magic Book 2, Student’s book, p. 71)*

Use of expression of gratitude + Admiration of the benefactor (coded as //Gra + AdAdd//)

---

Example of sequence containing the use of an expression of admiration of the beneficiary’s state

Thank you Celia. I’m delighted to be here.

*(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Teacher’s book for advanced level students, p. 30)*

Use of expression of gratitude + Admiration of the beneficiary’s state (coded as
Example of sequence containing the use of direct refusal

No, thank you, baby bear. These sweets are so yummy.

(Excerpted from Magic Book 1, Student’s book, p. 72)

Direct refusal + Use of expression of gratitude + Indirect refusal (coded as //Ref + Gra + Exc//)

Example of sequence containing the use of indirect refusal

No, thank you. These hamburgers are so tasty

(Excerpted from Magic Book 1, Student’s book, p. 72).

Direct refusal + Use of expression of gratitude + Indirect refusal (coded as //Ref + Gra + Exc//)

Example of sequence containing the function of stating reason

Thank you for coming at such short notice, Miss Adams.

(Excerpted from English 5th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 84)

Use of expression of gratitude + Stating reason (coded as //Gra + For//)

Example of sequence containing the function of expressing surprise

Oh. Thanks a lot.

(Excerpted from English 6th Grade, Teacher’s book, p. 60)

Expressing surprise + Use of expression of gratitude (coded as //Sur + Gra//)

Example of sequence containing the function of expressing wishes

Thank you, Easter Bunny. Happy Easter!

(Excerpted from EYL, 2nd Grade, no pagination)

Use of expression of gratitude + Expressing wishes (coded as //Gra + Wis//)

Example of sequence containing the function of bidding farewell

All right, Mark. Thanks a lot. See you later!

(Excerpted from English 5th Grade, Workbook, p. 21)
Signaling comprehension + Use of expression of gratitude + Bidding farewell
(coded as //Com + Gra + Faw//)

Example of sequence containing the function of signaling comprehension

Ok, thanks.
(Excerpted from English 5th Grade, Workbook p. 21)
Signaling comprehension + Use of expression of gratitude (coded as //Com + Gra//)

Example of sequence containing the use of a discourse marker

Well, thank you very much for your interesting talk tonight David.
(Excerpted from Think Teen, 2nd Grade of Junior High School, Teacher’s book for beginner level students, p. 7)
Using a discourse marker + Use of expression of gratitude + Stating reason (coded as //DM + Gra + For//)

Example of sequence containing the function of stating intent to reciprocate

I really appreciate your help. I will pay you, I promise.
(Sample of native-English speakers’ responses)
Use of performative + Stating intent to reciprocate (coded as //Per + Rec//)

Example of sequence containing the function of stating interlocutor’s non-existent obligation

Oh, thanks guys. You didn’t have to.
(Sample of native-English speakers’ responses)
Expressing surprise + Use of expression of gratitude + Stating interlocutor’s nonexistent obligation (coded //Sur + Gra + Un//)

Example of sequence containing the function of making an apology

I’m sorry, but I’m just too full. It was delicious!
(Sample of native-English speakers’ responses)
Making an apology + Indirect refusal + Admiration of the beneficial act (coded //Apl + Exc + AdAct//)

Example of sequence containing the function of stating the need for the favour

Thank you. I wouldn't ask if it wasn't important.
(Sample of native-English speakers’ responses)
Use of expression of gratitude + Stating the need for the favour (coded as //Gra + Exp//)

Example of sequence containing repetition of the gratitude expression

Thank you! Thanks for having me.
(Sample of native-English speakers’ responses)
Repeating the gratitude expression + Stating reason (coded as //Rep + For//)

Example of sequence containing the function of greeting the interlocutor

Hi!
(Sample of native-English speakers’ responses)
Greeting the interlocutor (coded as //Grt//)