



Analysis of Presupposition Triggers in English Reading Textbooks: Learners' Familiarity

Savaş Gençtürk*¹

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the presupposition usage in English reading textbooks and students' familiarity with them. Fourteen reading texts in a reading book were analyzed to see the amount of presupposition triggers used and thirty four intermediate level students were included in the study to find out to what extent they are familiar with presuppositions used in their reading textbook. The reading texts were analyzed based on Yule's (2006) categorization of presupposition triggers consisting of six different categories: existential, factive, lexical, structural, non-factive and counter-factual (pp.30). The students were given a survey consisting of randomly chosen six sentences from the readings representing each presupposition category and asked to choose 'yes' if they are familiar with the presuppositions or 'no' if they are not familiar with the presuppositions. The results clearly showed that the presuppositions are not widely used in the reading texts. Lexical and existential presupposition triggers are the most commonly used types among all the triggers. The results also indicated that students' familiarity with the content and presuppositions will help them understand the content better.

Key Words: pragmatics and presuppositions, presupposition triggers, presuppositions in reading text books

İngilizce Okuma Kitaplarındaki Önsayıtlı Tetikleyicilerinin Analizi: Öğrencilerin Aşinalığı

Öz

Bu çalışma, İngilizce okuma kitaplarındaki önsayıtlı kullanımını ve öğrencilerin aşinalığını araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Kullanılan önsayıtlı tetikleyicilerinin miktarını görebilmek için bir okuma kitabındaki 14 okuma parçası analiz edildi ve 34 orta seviye öğrenci, kitaplarda kullanılan önsayıtlı tetikleyicilerine ne derece aşina olduklarını bulmak amacıyla çalışmaya dahil edildi. Okuma parçaları Yule (2006)'ın altı kategoriden oluşan önsayıtlı tetikleyici kategorilerine göre analiz edildi. Bu kategoriler varoluşsal, olgusal, sözcüksel, yapısal, gerçek olmayan ve karşıt-olgusaldır. Öğrencilere her bir önsayıtlı kategorisini temsil eden rastgele seçilmiş altı adet cümleden oluşan bir anket verildi ve eğer önsayıtlılara aşina iseler 'evet', eğer aşina değil iseler 'hayır' seçeneğini seçmeleri istendi. Sonuçlar önsayıtlı tetikleyicilerinin okuma kitaplarında yaygın bir şekilde kullanılmadığını gösterdi. Bütün tetikleyiciler arasında sözcüksel ve varoluşsal önsayıtlı tetikleyicileri en çok kullanılan türlerdi. Sonuçlar ayrıca öğrencilerin okuma içeriğini daha iyi anlaması için önsayıtlılara olan aşinalığının fazla olması gerektiğini gösterdi.

Anahtar Kelimeler: pragmatik ve varsayımlar, önkoşul tetikleyicileri, okuma metin kitaplarındaki ön varsayımlar

*¹Corresponding Author: Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa, gencturksavas@gmail.com

Introduction

There are four main areas that pragmatics concern with according to Yule (2006, pp.3). According to him, pragmatics is the study of 1) speaker meaning, 2) contextual meaning, 3) how more gets communicated than is said, and 4) the expression of relative distance. Presuppositions fall in to the third category emphasizing how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning and exploring how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. It can be said that it is in a way investigation of invisible meaning. Potts (2015) defines presuppositions as the pieces of information that the speaker assumes in order for her utterance to be meaningful in the current context. In addition, Karttunen (1973) states that presuppositions do not convey new information, but rather consist of backgrounded information that the interlocutors take for granted. In that vein, presuppositions can be meaningful for the listeners or readers as long as the receiver is familiar with them.

Khaleel (2010) proposes that in addition to literal meaning, the sentence or utterance conveys a host of indirect information that can be pragmatically inferred. Presuppositions are one part of that information. In this respect, 'Many sentences require that certain culturally defined conditions or contexts be satisfied in order for an utterance of a sentence to be understood...these conditions are naturally called presuppositions of the utterance...An utterance of a sentence pragmatically presupposes that its context is appropriate' (Keenan, 1971, pp.384). It can be said that there is an important relation between the uttered presuppositions by the speaker or writer and the interpretation of the receiver. If this relation is achieved successfully, the structure will not be ambiguous and the interpretation will be much easier for the reader or listener.

Regarding the textbooks, they play an important role in English language teaching, particularly in the English as a foreign language classroom where it provides the primary form of linguistic input (Kim & Hall, 2002). In EFL contexts, target-like norms can be learnt through textbooks or authentic materials that the teacher brings in class. Grant and Starks (2001) states that students are frequently not given the tools in textbooks to recognize and analyze language in a variety of contexts. In that vein, students' familiarity with the contexts has a crucial role when they are exposed to textbooks. Davoudi (2005) claims that prior knowledge about the topic speeds up basic comprehension and leaves working memory free to make connections between the new material and previously learned information (pp.112). Thus, current study mainly focuses on presupposition usage in reading textbooks and students' familiarity with them.

In order to be familiar with the presuppositions, there are some linguistic elements described as presupposition triggers enabling the writers or speakers to communicate intended information without stating them. These elements trigger the intended presuppositions or signal the existence of presupposition. In that vein, it is important for listeners or readers to be aware of these triggers to realize the presuppositions. Thus, Yule (2006) categorizes presupposition triggers into six groups including existential, factive, lexical, non-factive, counter-factual and structural. He defines each category as follows:

- 1) Existential presupposition: The possessive construction in English and any definite noun phrase can be associated with existential presupposition.
E.g. the King of Sweden (There is a king in Sweden.)
- 2) Factive: The presupposed information following verbs like 'know', 'realize', 'regret', 'be aware', 'odd', and 'glad' have factive presuppositions.
E.g. She didn't realize he was ill. (He was ill.)
E.g. We regret telling him. (We told him.)
- 3) Lexical: Yule (2006) states that the use of some forms with their stated meanings is interpreted as the presentation of some non-asserted meanings.
E.g. He stopped smoking. (He used to smoke.)
- 4) Non-factive: This is the presupposition which is assumed not to be true. Verbs like 'dream', 'imagine' and 'pretend' are generally used.
E.g. I dreamed that I was rich. (I was not rich.)
- 5) Counter-factual: In this trigger, what is presupposed is the opposite of what is true or contrary to facts.
E.g. If you were my friend, you would have helped me. (You are not my friend.)
- 6) Structural: It is presupposed that part of the structure is already assumed to be true.

E.g. When did he leave? (He left.)

These presupposition triggers can be considered as potential presuppositions as they become actual in contexts. Hence, writers or speakers may not feel the need to mention about certain pieces of information as they are assumed to be known by readers or listeners. This may affect the interpretation of the information conveyed both in a positive and negative way. If the reader or listeners is familiar with the unstated information, it will be easier for him to comprehend what is actually intended. On the other hand, if the situation is vice-versa, it might be challenging for reader or listeners to understand the gist.

Khaleel (2010) conducted a research study mainly focusing on the presupposition triggers in English journal texts. It is hypothesized in the study that there are many presupposition triggers in English journalistic texts. The author explored the concept of presupposition and identified the presupposition triggers used in the journalistic texts. Six different national and regional English newspapers representing a range of political and regional differences were selected randomly for the study. According to the results, English journalistic texts rely heavily on existential presuppositions with the ratio of 57.7% of the studied sample. Lexical triggers constituted 19.7% of the studied sample.

Similar to the study above, Bonyadi and Samuel (2011) aimed to investigate whether presupposition is employed in news transcripts. They analyzed PressTV and CNN as two samples of Persian and American English news channels. 40 transcripts of news stories were taken from the channels' websites. Then, the authors enumerated the frequency and percent of the occurrence of presupposition triggers. The results of the study showed that existential presupposition triggers were the dominant one for both of the TV channels. While existential occurred 304 times in PressTV's transcripts, it occurred 219 times in CNN's transcripts. Lexical triggers followed existential occurring 55 times in CNN's transcripts and 94 times in PressTV's transcripts.

There are not many research studies in the literature focusing specifically on presupposition triggers in written discourse. For example, Vellenga (2004) analyzed textbooks from a pragmatic perspective. She tried to find out if textbooks provide enough information for learners to successfully acquire pragmatic competence. 8 ESL and EFL textbooks were analyzed to determine the amount and quality of pragmatic information included. The main focus was on the use of metalanguage, explicit treatment of speech acts, and metapragmatic information. The findings showed that textbooks include explicit metapragmatic information and teachers' manuals rarely supplement adequately. Implications suggested that textbook developers could include authentic examples of speech acts and sufficient metapragmatic explanations to facilitate acquisition of pragmatic competence.

In another study focusing not on presupposition but textbooks, Arikan (2008) analyzed the topics of reading passages in ELT courses. He analyzed 15 ELT course books to find out the content of the topics. The author found that students' preferred topics are not realized in reading textbooks. While the students preferred cinema, computers and the Internet, sports holidays and love, the leading topics in reading textbooks were housing and family. Media and cinema got a mediocre place (7.14%).

There are many studies focusing on pragmatics, textbooks, and presupposition in the literature but little attention has been paid to the presupposition usage in English reading textbooks. Presuppositions do not convey new information but rather consist of backgrounded information that the interlocutors take for granted (Karttunen, 1973) and lack of such backgrounded information or contextual support is reflected in various processing effects, e.g. regarding the choice of interpretation of a syntactically ambiguous structure and increase in reading times (Schwarz, 2007). Khaleel (2010) states that presuppositions play a significant role in the construction of meanings. Hence, to say a sentence is meaningful is to say that it is consistent with interlocutors' presupposed knowledge of the world (Tyler, 1978:33). The presupposition usages in the reading textbooks are crucial for readers as it will be much easier for reader to comprehend if the presupposition triggers address their presupposed knowledge. This study will contribute to the literature by analyzing presupposition triggers in English reading textbooks and students' familiarity with the presupposition used. Research questions that are the main focus of this study are:

1. To what extent are presupposition triggers used in the English reading textbook Select Readings?
2. To what extent are the students familiar with the presupposition used in the textbook?
3. Do presupposition triggers help students understand the context better?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the study were 34 B2 level students studying EFL at a private university. All the participants were the researcher's students. Because of the participants' convenient accessibility, convenience sampling was applied to recruit the participants.

Data Collection Instrument

In order to find out the presupposition triggers, the Select Readings (Intermediate) textbook was chosen to be analyzed. The book consists of 14 reading passages and it is claimed in the book that the readings are teacher-approved and for today's students. Each reading passage comprises 650-900 words.

In addition, a questionnaire was applied to get the learners' ideas about the presupposition triggers. It was found out that none of the reading passages had non-factive presupposition trigger. While the first and fourth sentences represented existential presupposition type, second and fifth sentences represented lexical presupposition. Third sentence represented both counterfactual and factive presuppositions. The last sentence represented structural presupposition.

Data Collection Procedure

Instead of interviewing, each student was given a questionnaire including the interview questions and asked to choose 'yes' or 'no' as an answer. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) included six randomly chosen sentences from the reading texts and each of the sentences represented one of the presupposition trigger type. Each sentence had three sub questions and the first questions asked if the students were familiar with the content before they read the sentence. Second and third questions were aimed to see if the presupposition helped students understand the content better. Second question asked 'If yes, did it help you understand the content better?' and the third question asked 'If no, would it help you understand the content better if you were familiar with it?'.

Data Analysis

Each reading passage was subjected presupposition triggers analysis based on the classification put forward by Yule (2006). The frequency and percent of occurrence were enumerated. Then, each finding was normalized. To ensure the reliability and validity of the categorization, triangulation method was applied. Triangulation is a useful technique that facilitates validation of data through cross verification from two or more sources. In that vein, independent analysis of the same randomly chosen reading text was conducted by three different language instructors. One of the instructors was American and the other two were Turks. The result of the inter-observer reliability is shown below.

Table 1. Inter-observer reliability

	Inst. 1	Inst. 2	Inst.3	TOTAL
Presuppositions found	24	21	26	71

The number of agreement simply the smaller number was divided by the total number ($21/71=0.29$) and the results was multiplied by the number of observers ($0.29 \times 3=0.88$). Mchugh (2012) proposes that 'Cohen suggested the Kappa result be interpreted as follows: values ≤ 0 as indicating no agreement and 0.01-0.20 as none to slight, 0.21-0.40 as fair, 0.41-0.60 as moderate, 0.61-0.80 as substantial, and 0.81-1.00 as almost perfect agreement.' The rate of agreement is 0.88 showing an almost perfect agreement according to Cohen's Kappa.

The data collected through the questionnaire were entered into SPSS 23. Each question was entered as one variable and there were 18 variables in total. The first three variables referred the first sentence type, the second three variables referred the second sentence type and it went on. A Chi-Square test was applied to explore the frequencies of the 'yes' and 'no' answers. With the frequency analysis, it was easy to enumerate how many students chose 'yes' for the first question representing the first presupposition type or how many students chose 'no' for the 15th question representing the fifth presupposition type. A Chi-square test was administered to see the frequencies in the categorical groups that are 'yes' and 'no' in the questionnaire given to the students.

Results

Table 2. Presupposition triggers (PT) in reading texts

	Word Count	Existential	Factive	Lexical	Structural	Non- factive	Counter Factual	Total (PT)
1 st reading	726	6	-	2	1	-	6	15
2 nd reading	663	8	2	10	1	-	1	22
3 rd reading	798	7	-	6	1	-	1	15
4 th reading	883	6	1	4	1	-	3	15
5 th reading	759	7	-	3	1	-	1	12
6 th reading	764	6	2	5	1	-	1	15
7 th reading	706	6	1	4	3	-	2	16
8 th reading	549	3	-	5	-	-	-	8
9 th reading	869	3	3	4	2	1	3	16
10 th reading	779	2	-	4	1	-	1	8
11 th reading	896	5	-	6	2	-	-	13
12 th reading	661	4	1	3	1	-	2	11
13 th reading	821	5	3	5	1	-	-	14
14 th reading	874	6	-	8	2	-	1	17
Sum	10748	74	13	69	18	1	22	197

The table above shows the presupposition distribution across the reading texts. The textbook comprises 14 readings and 10748 words in total. Presupposition triggers are used 197 times representing the 1.83% of the whole reading textbook. Existential presupposition triggers used 74 times are the mostly used type constituting 0.68% of the book. Lexical presupposition triggers are used 69 times and they form 0.64% of the whole reading texts. Third common presupposition type is counter-factual used 22 times creating 0.2% of the book. Structural presupposition triggers come in the fourth place and they are preferred 18 time throughout the book representing 0.16 of the texts. Factive presuppositions are used 13 times and they constitute 0.12% of the book. Non-factive presupposition trigger is used only one time and it the least preferred one. Randomly chosen a few examples are given below to illustrate some of the presuppositions used in the reading texts.

Examples:

- ...and the local Nepalese community built the Kopila Valley Children's Home, a home that provides young orphans... (existential)
- ... show that being able to work effectively in teams is one of the most important and valued skills in... (existential)
- With help from new technologies and research strategies, scientists are now finding that babies begin... (lexical)
- ... they had a completely different experience than they did if they watched the same speaker in real life. (counter-factual)
- Blackmore says "It took me a while to get used to the roads and the driving style here." (structural)

- The fact is that each one of us has a store of material which should be of interest to others. (factive)
- You can't imagine how much confidence that knowledge will inspire. (non-factive)
- One would not ask questions following a tribute company treasurer on his retirement, say, but a technical talk or an ... (counter-factual)

Table 3. Students' questionnaire results

	Chi-Square	Df	Asymp. Sig.
existentialA	30.118	1	.000
existentialC	30.118	1	.000
lexicalA	14.235	1	.000
counterfactualA	23.059	1	.000
factiveB	.000	1	1.000
existential2A	.471	1	.493
existential2B	5.400	1	.020
existential2C	11.842	1	.001
lexical2A	9.529	1	.002
lexical2B	.111	1	.739
lexical2C	17.640	1	.000
structuralA	14.235	1	.000
structuralC	11.571	1	.001

Chi-Square tests are used to see the frequencies in two categorical groups and to see if they are dependent or independent of each other. In other words, taking the interview questions into consideration, if the significance level of one categorical level is below .05, it means that the mentioned item is significant regarding the students' comprehension of the reading text. Based on the Chi-Square test results shown on Table 3, the first item in the questionnaire representing existential presupposition trigger is statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = 30.118$, $df = 1$, $p < .000$). Regarding the first item, 33 students out of 34 chose the option 'no' for first question indicating that they are not familiar with the presupposition mentioned in the sentence. Similarly, 33 students also chose the option 'yes' for the third question indicating that it would help students understand the context better if they were familiar with the presupposition mentioned.

Regarding the second item representing lexical presupposition trigger, 28 students chose option 'yes' for the first question claiming that they were familiar with the presupposition and the Chi-Square result is statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = 14.235$, $df = 1$, $p < .000$). The students who chose yes for the first question also chose the option 'yes' for the second question meaning that it helped them understand the content better as they were familiar with the presupposition.

The third item in the questionnaire represents both counter factual and factive presuppositions. Because of this reason, there are four sub questions in this item. The first and the second questions ask if the students are familiar with the mentioned presuppositions. The third and the fourth questions ask 'If yes, did it help you

understand the content better?’ and ‘If no, would it help you understand the content better?’. Results show that counterfactual presupposition has a statistically significant result, ($\chi^2 = 23.059$, $df = 1$, $p < .000$). 31 students chose option ‘no’ for the first question representing that they were not familiar with the content. Regarding the factive presupposition, the test result is not statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = .000$, $df = 1$, $p = 1,000$). While 17 students chose the option ‘yes’, 17 students chose the opposite.

With regard to the fourth item representing the second existential presupposition, the test results do not show a statistically significant result, ($\chi^2 = .471$, $df = 1$, $p = .493$). 15 students claimed that they were familiar with the presupposition mentioned but 19 students claimed the opposite. However, the students who chose the option ‘yes’ also chose ‘yes’ for the second question meaning that it helped them to understand the content and the test result is statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = 5.400$, $df = 1$, $p = .020$). Regarding the third question, 17 out of 19 students who chose the option ‘no’ preferred the option ‘yes’ meaning that it would help them understand the content better if they were familiar with the presupposition and the result is statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = 11.842$, $df = 1$, $p = .001$).

The fifth item represents the second lexical presupposition. 26 students chose the option ‘no’ for the first question meaning that they were not familiar with the presupposition and 23 of them chose the option ‘yes’ for the third question claiming that it would help them understand the content better if they were familiar with the presupposition. The test results are statistically significant for both questions, ($\chi^2 = 9.529$, $df = 1$, $p = .002$) and ($\chi^2 = 17.640$, $df = 1$, $p < .000$). Eight students preferred to choose ‘yes’ for the first question but four of them claimed that it would not help them understand the better even if they were familiar with the presupposition and four of them claimed the vice versa. The result is not statistically significant in that sense, ($\chi^2 = .111$, $df = 1$, $p = .739$).

The last item represents structural presupposition and the test result is statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = 14.235$, $df = 1$, $p < .000$) meaning that they were not familiar with the presupposition mentioned as 28 students chose the option ‘no’ for the first question. 23 of them chose the option ‘yes’ for the third question claiming that it would help them understand the content better if they were familiar with the presupposition and the test result is statistically significant, ($\chi^2 = 11.571$, $df = 1$, $p = .001$).

Discussion

In its attempt to identify the presupposition triggers used in English reading textbook Select Readings (Pre-Intermediate), this research has defined the six types of presupposition triggers used in the reading book. After analyzing 14 reading texts in the book, it can be said that the reading texts do not heavily rely on presuppositions. It was hypothesized that the presuppositions were widely used in the reading texts however the results showed the opposite. Presuppositions make up only 1.83% of the whole reading book.

As to the presupposition triggers used, existential presupposition trigger constitutes 37.5% of the whole presuppositions. There are 197 presuppositions mentioned and existential presupposition recurred 74 times. The ratio of lexical presuppositions is 35% of the whole triggers recurring 69 times. It can be concluded that even though the presuppositions are not commonly used in the reading texts, existential and lexical presupposition types are the commonly used types. This result also correlates with the results found in Khaleel’s (2010) and Boyandi and Samuel’s (2011) studies.

In respect to the students’ familiarity with the presuppositions mentioned in the texts, the first question of each item in the questionnaire gives us an impression. It can be concluded that the students are not familiar with the presuppositions used in the reading texts. Glanzberg (2005) states that conveying information is always done against a background of shared information. Only in the second item, 28 students chose the option ‘yes’ claiming that they were familiar with the presupposition mentioned. The item was ‘In most African countries more than 90 percent of the population lives without electricity.’ and the results were statistically significant. The item represents a lexical presupposition trigger. The results cannot be generalized so it is not possible to say that the students are generally familiar with the lexical presuppositions used in the texts. However, within the context, it is the only item that the students were familiar with. The same students also chose the option ‘yes’ for the second question meaning that their familiarity helped them understand the content better. In that vein, it can be concluded that if the topics and the presupposition types are chosen based on students’ needs, it will be much easier for students to understand the content. Arikan (2008) states in his research that students’ topic choices are ignored in reading passages. Thus, it can be said that the more the topics and presupposition are close to

students' needs, the more easily the students will understand the content. It is interesting that all the third questions have statistically significant results indicating that it would help students understand better if they were familiar with the mentioned presuppositions in the texts. This finding also supports Arikian's (2008) findings.

Conclusion

In sum, on the contrary of Khaleel's (2010) findings, the detected presupposition triggers do not constitute much of the reading texts. Within the preferred presupposition types, lexical and existential presuppositions are the most common triggers. Bonyadi and Samuel (2011) and Khaleel (2010) also say that the existential presuppositions are the mostly used presupposition triggers.

Presuppositions do not convey new information, but rather consist of backgrounded information that the interlocutors take for granted (Karttunen, 1973). Domaneschi et al. (2013) state that 'if a speaker utters a sentence p containing a presupposition trigger that activates a presupposition q, and q does not belong to the common ground of presuppositions, it is a case of presupposition failure. If this occurs, speakers are required to repair the failure to make sense of utterance.' It was clear from the results that the students are not familiar with the presuppositions mentioned and it is also concluded that students will understand the content better if they are familiar with the presuppositions.

References

- Arikan, A. (2008). Topics of reading passages in ELT course books: What do our students really read? *The Reading Matrix*, 8(2), 70-85.
- Bonyadi, A. & Samuel, M. (2011). Linguistic nature of presupposition in American and Persian newspaper editorials. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 1-16.
- Davoudi, M. (2005). Inference generation skill and text comprehension. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(1), 106-123.
- Domaneschi, F., Carrea, E., Penco, C., & Greco, A. (2013). The cognitive load of presupposition triggers: Mandatory and optional repairs in presupposition failure. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 29(1), 136-146.
- Grant, L. & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap operas. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 39, 39-50.
- Glanzberg, M. (2005). Presuppositions, truth values and expressing propositions. In M.
- Glanzberg, G. Preyer & G. Peter (eds.), *Contextualism in philosophy: Knowledge, meaning, and truth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karttunen, L. (1973). Presuppositions of compound sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4(2), 169- 193.
- Keenan, E. L. (1971). Two kinds of presupposition in natural language in Fillmore and Langendoen. *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Khaleel, L. M. (2010). An analysis of presupposition triggers in English journalistic texts. *J. of College of Education for Women*, 21(2), 523-551.
- Kim, D. & Hall, J. K. (2002). The role of an interactive book reading program in the development of second language pragmatic competence. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 332-348.
- McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*, 22(3), 276-282.
- Potts, C. (2015). Presuppositions and implicature. In Shalom, L. & Chris, F. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, 168-202. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schwarz, F. (2007). Processing presupposed content. *Journal of Semantics*, 24, 373-416.
- Tyler, S. A. (1978). *The said and the unsaid*. New York: Academic Press.
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 8(2). Retrieved from: <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume8/ej30/ej30a3/>
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

1) "The following article is from the website TakePart." EXISTENTIAL

- a) Before you read the sentence above, did you know that there was such a website called TakePart? () YES
() NO
- b) If your answer is "Yes", do you think it helped you understand the sentence better?
() YES () NO
- c) If your answer is "No", do you think it would help you understand the sentence better if a website that you know is mentioned in the sentence?
() YES () NO

2) "In most African countries more than 90 percent of the population lives without electricity." LEXICAL

- a) Before you read the sentence above, did you know that there were some people in Africa living without electricity? () YES () NO
- b) If your answer is "Yes", do you think it helped you understand the sentence better?
() YES () NO
- c) If your answer is "No", do you think it would help you understand the sentence better if a fact that you are familiar with is mentioned in the sentence?
() YES () NO

3) "If you have been to Africa, you know that almost that many people play soccer whenever they get the chance." Counter factual and factive

- a) Have you ever been to Africa? () YES () NO
- b) Before you read the sentence above, did you know that many people play soccer in Africa whenever they get the chance? () YES () NO
- c) If your answer is "Yes" for the question "b", do you think it helped you understand the sentence better?
() YES () NO
- d) If your answer is "No" for the question "b", do you think it would help you understand the sentence better if you knew that many play soccer in Africa whenever they get the chance?
() YES () NO

4) "This website gathers news, photos, and videos about today's issues and suggests actions people can take to make a difference." existential

- a) Before you read the sentence above, did you know that there were some issues in the past as well?
() YES () NO
- b) If your answer is "Yes", do you think it helped you understand the sentence better?
() YES () NO
- c) If your answer is "No", do you think it would help you understand the sentence better if issues that you are familiar with is mentioned in the sentence?
() YES () NO

5) "They no longer need to use unhealthy and expensive kerosene lamps or walk three hours to charge their cell phones." lexical

- a) Before you read the sentence above, did you know that African people used to use unhealthy and expensive kerosene lamps or walk three hours to charge their cell phones?
() YES () NO
- b) If your answer is "Yes", do you think it helped you understand the sentence better?
() YES () NO
- c) If your answer is "No", do you think it would help you understand the sentence better if you were familiar with the fact mentioned in the sentence?
() YES () NO

6) "How many would dedicate their lives to the issue? At least one." Structural

- a) Before you read the sentence above, did you know that at least one person would dedicate his/her live to the issue of endangered manatees? () YES () NO
- b) If your answer is "Yes", do you think it helped you understand the sentence better?
() YES () NO
- c) If your answer is "No", do you think it would help you understand the sentence better if you were familiar with the issue mentioned in the sentence?
() YES () NO