Pragmatic Features in English Course Materials
Used at a Thai University

Sirion Wichien ¹, Prachamon Aksornjarung ²

1. M.A. in Teaching English as an International Language, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University.
2. Ph.D. (English), Assistant Professor, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University

Abstract

The need of using English fluently and appropriately in international communication becomes more important in the present globalization of the world. To be in line with the necessity, facilitating learners of the English language in acquiring communicative competence is utmost essential. Course materials are considered the center of the curriculum and syllabus in most classroom and they assume an important role in English Language Teaching (ELT), especially in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. The present study investigated pragmatic features—Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, Style, and Cultural information—contained in English commercial course materials (books) used in communication courses at a Thai university. Data collection and analysis were carried through line-by-line investigation of both Student’s and Teacher’s books. Results indicated that not every pragmatic feature focused in this study was presented in each book. Differences in number of pragmatic features between Teacher’s books and Student’s books were also found. The quantity and quality of pragmatic information in the books under investigation is inadequate as a source to gain pragmatic competence for EFL students. It is recommended that non-native EFL teachers not rely solely on Teacher’s books. It is advisable that they resort to other authentic language sources to enhance their pragmatic knowledge and competence.
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Background

International communication is becoming more and more important paralleling with the present globalization of the world economy. It is, thus, rightly claimed that English has played an important role in global communication. Besides being the medium of communication among native speakers, as well as native and non-native speakers, English is accepted as an international lingua franca—used by billions non-natives to non-natives (Lin, 2008; Pakir, 2000). English, in fact, has assumed the important role in various fields, namely, diplomacy, media, business, industry, entertainment, education, science and technology and information (Krachu & Nelson, 1996). People living in this contemporary society, therefore, realize the need of using English fluently and appropriately (Zhuge & Wu, 2005).

Teaching English, thus, has an important role to play in equipping people with such efficiency. Language teaching, in fact, has shifted its focus from the traditional approach which focused on the acquisition of linguistic knowledge—vocabulary, pronunciation, and syntax—to facilitating the learners in acquiring communicative competence (Ji, 2007; Kim & Hall, 2002).

According to Saville-Troike (1982), communicative competence, the term coined by Hymes (1974), can be broadly defined as what a speaker needs to know in order to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community. Therefore, learners who are communicatively competent not only possess the knowledge of language code, but they also know how to say things to different interlocutors. In other words, they have social and cultural knowledge which enables them to use and interpret linguistic forms appropriately.

The communicative competence at that level which is considered indispensable for second language learners to successfully communicate in the target language is known as pragmatic competence (Ji, 2007; Kim & Hall, 2002). Thomas (1983) subdivided the term into two categories: pragmalinguistic competence and socio-pragmatic competence. The former refers to the ability to use grammar rules to form sentences correctly while the latter refers to the ability to communicate properly according to the social rules. Following Kasper (1997), pragmatic competence can be defined as the knowledge of communicative action and the way to carry it out, and the ability to use language appropriately according to the context. Lack of this competence may lead to cross-cultural miscommunication.

For learners of English as a Second Language (ESL), conceivably they have an advantage in acquiring this knowledge through their extended engagement with their
The immediate environment since pragmatic competence has a close relationship with the sociocultural values and beliefs of the country or the community where the target language is used (Kim & Hall, 2002; Kondo, 2002; Krachu & Nelson, 1996). The English learning conditions in the EFL context, however, are different. English is used mainly in the classroom, EFL learners, thus, have significantly fewer opportunities to engage in English-based communication outside the classroom. The English classroom, therefore, becomes the central site for their development of pragmatic competence.

Previous studies show that pragmatic competence can be taught (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Kasper, 1997; Liu, 2006). However, foreign language teachers, being foreign language learners themselves, hesitate to teach pragmatics in their classrooms. A large number of EFL teachers have learned English as a foreign language. Many may neither have any contact with native speakers, nor have they had enough opportunities to fully develop their pragmatic knowledge and skills (Cohen, 2004; Kim & Hall, 2002). For those non-native teachers, course books can be of particular use in equipping themselves with pragmatic competence. In other words, course books are the only tool non-native speaker teachers use to teach the four language skills and pragmatic knowledge (Kim & Hall, 2002).

Textbooks are also considered central to the curriculum and syllabus in most classrooms (Vellenga, 2004). Textbooks play an important role in English Language Teaching (ELT), especially in the EFL classroom. It provides the primary or perhaps the only form of linguistic input as textbooks are less expensive and more accessible than other media (Kim & Hall, 2002). However, textbooks rarely provide enough information for learners to successfully acquire pragmatic competence. In the worst case, it can be a source of pragmatic failure (Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009). Bardovi-Harlig (2001), for instance, reported that speech act realizations presented in textbooks might not reflect the manner in which native speakers commonly realize in a speech act. The target language culture may be misrepresented and the rules of speaking or politeness norms may be distorted. Moreover, textbooks have been criticized for decades for failing to provide EFL learners with adequate and appropriate pragmatic knowledge (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Ji, 2007; Takafumi, Fukusawa & Shinichi, 2007; Vellenga, 2004; Yang, 2007). Vallenga (2004), in particular, reported that metalinguistic and metapragmatic information related to ways of speaking were missing from ELT textbooks used in most university worldwide. Many studies analyzing pragmatic knowledge in English textbooks used in EFL contexts, such as Japan and China, also reported in the same direction.
In Thailand, English is taught as a foreign language. Equipping Thai learners with communicative competence in order to communicate effectively in international communication is truly essential. Although there have been a few studies about pragmatic competence in Thai university level English learners and Thai English teachers (Pinyo, Aksornjarung, & Laohawiriyanon 2010) for instance, the investigation on pragmatic information in English textbooks used in Thailand has not yet been conducted. Similarly, whether there exist any additional pragmatic features in Teacher’s book as a resource for teachers has not been questioned. Therefore, the findings of both quantity and quality of pragmatic features contained in English Student’s books and Teacher’s books used at a Thai university from the present study would serve as important information for English language course material writers and teachers.

Research Questions

1. What pragmatic features are included in English course materials (books) used at a Thai university?
2. Are Teacher’s books different in number of pragmatic features from those of Students’?

Technical Terms

Speech act information Speech act information in this study consists of 3 categories—types of speech act, numbers of linguistic form provided for each speech act, and exercises or tasks using the speech acts the students have just learned in each particular unit.

Usage refers to the explanations about the usage of any linguistic forms and of any grammatical features, expressions, phrases, or words which could enhance pragmatic knowledge of the students.

Politeness refers to the use of appropriate language considering different social factors, including social distance, age, role relationships, and so forth, between the speaker and the interlocutor in the given contexts.

Register refers to the sort of social genre of linguistic use. It comprises three dimensions—field, tenor, and mode. Field refers to the social setting and purpose of the communication. Tenor refers to the relationship between interlocutors or participants in the event. Mode refers to the medium of communication as in spoken or written.
Style refers to variations within registers representing choices along social dimensions. In this study, it refers to the degrees along formality-casualness continuum.

Cultural information in the present study refers only to the information about culture that one has to know and be aware of when communicating verbally in order to avoid pragmatic failure or breakdown in communication. Therefore, other information about cultures, for example, music or food was ignored in the present study.

Quality refers to the amount of details or explanation, the complexity or variety of examples provided in the context.

Review of related literature

Communicative competence

For two or three decades, a primary goal of the English Language Teaching has been the development of communicative competence. The classroom practices has shifted from the traditional approach which focused on the acquisition of linguistic knowledge—vocabulary, pronunciation, and syntax—to the facilitation of learners communicative competence (Ji, 2007; Kim & Hall, 2000). Communicative competence proposed by Hymes was a broader concept which encompassed linguistic competence as well as other aspects, particularly sociocultural dimensions (Nazari, 2007). According to Saville-Troike (1982), communicative competence can be broadly defined as what a speaker needs to know in order to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community. It involves knowing what to say to whom, when, and how to say it appropriately in certain situation. It also involves the social and cultural knowledge, the factor enabling the speaker to use and interpret linguistic forms (Saville-Troike, 2006).

Pragmatic competence

In addition to the language user’s ability in using the language, termed as linguistic competence, it is requisite that s/he possesses pragmatic competence, an aspect of communicative competence indispensable for communicating successfully in the target language (Ji, 2007; Kim & Hall, 2002; Saville-Troike, 2006). According to Saville-Troike (2006), it can be defined as what a speaker must know in order to interpret and convey meaning in communication. Similarly, Kasper (1997) defined pragmatic competence as the knowledge of communicative action and the way to carry it out, and the ability to use language appropriately according to the context.
Pragmatic competence is so vital that lacking it may lead to communication breakdown. It can cause misunderstandings, serious miscommunication, and even distort the communication goals when learners understand only the literal meaning of words but do not know the rules for interpreting them (Kasper, 1997; Lin, 2008). In certain cases, speakers who fail to use pragmatically appropriate language might appear rude or insulting, particularly those speakers considered as advanced learners whom are expected to have high pragmatic competence (Bardovi-Harlig et al, 1991). Such situations are believed to possibly happen to non-native speakers using English as a Second Language, and as a Foreign Language.

Many studies on pragmatic competence have shown that there is a difference between the pragmatic of native speakers and learners of the target language for certain reasons (Yuka, 2008). First, although there is considerable amount of universal pragmatic knowledge which can be transferred for free from the learners’ L1 if there is a corresponding form-function mapping between L1 and L2, learners always fail to use what they know (Kasper, 1997). Second, classroom instruction may be a cause of pragmatic failure. Finally, learners may not realize the existence of different ways or many linguistic forms to be used in conveying their intention.

**Pragmatic competence development and the role of instruction**

In order to help learners develop their pragmatic competence, instruction comes into play (Fujioka, 2003). Previous studies indicated that with explicit instruction about pragmatics of a target language, learners can develop and improve their pragmatic competence (Yuka, 2008). Pedagogical intervention enhances learners awareness and making use of their universal transferable pragmatic knowledge (Kasper, 1997). Instruction also makes available to learners for observation the language which learners might not have opportunity to observe without being directly involved in the conversation. In addition, by highlighting, instruction helps learners notice features of language and language use without which such language features might pass the learners unnoticed (Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R., 2003). A study by Crandall and Basturkmen (2004), for example, showed that after the instruction, the students’ perception of the appropriacy of various requests came closer to those of the native speakers. Therefore, the role of instructor and teaching materials is very important in learner’s pragmatic competence development.
However, a great number of EFL teachers are non-native speakers who themselves have learned English as a foreign language. They may neither have ever had any contact with a native speaker nor have they had enough opportunities to fully develop their pragmatic knowledge and skills. Consequently, many foreign language teachers hesitate to teach pragmatics in their classroom (Cohen, 2004; Kim & Hall, 2002; Krachu & Nelson, 1996). Moreover, they tend to be less serious in scoring pragmatic errors than teachers in ESL context (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998). As a result, EFL learners have limited opportunities to develop their pragmatic competence. To this end textbooks, therefore, can be particularly useful in the teaching of pragmatic competence by providing access to knowledge and skills in the target language to which the learners as well as the teachers may not be exposed (Kim & Hall, 2002).

**Related studies on pragmatic knowledge in textbook**

A number of studies have been carried out on pragmatic knowledge contained in commercial English textbooks used in different countries. These textbooks were used in both the English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) programs. However, criticism has been that L2 textbooks fail to provide learners with adequate and appropriate input (Yang, 2007; Yuka, 2008).

Vellenga (2004) conducted a qualitative and quantitative study of 8 intermediate to upper-intermediate level ESL and EFL textbooks. Selected through informal survey of major publishers, 4 integrated skills EFL texts and 4 grammar ESL texts were investigated. Information about general pragmatic information, metalanguage style, and speech act information was located through a page-by-page analysis. Furthermore, the teacher’s manual of each book was cross-referenced with the textbooks to examine the pragmatic information. Teacher interviews were also carried out in the research process. Any information related to culture, context, illocutionary force, politeness, appropriacy and/or register, even it appeared in only one phrase, was counted as one page.

The results showed that there was a lack of metalinguistic and metapragmatic information in the textbooks. In general, the amount of pragmatic information was small in all the texts. Although there were a larger percentage of pages of EFL texts with pragmatic information, the quality of pragmatic information was better in ESL texts in terms of number of speech acts and amount of pragmatic cues. However, for most types of speech acts, there was no metapragmatic discussion on politeness or appropriacy. This also applied to the
teacher’s manuals; there was no metapragmatic information or extensions beyond that are provided in the textbooks. In addition, data from teacher interviews indicated that 3 out of 4 teachers brought outside activities to supplement their designated textbooks. However, those activities rarely included pragmatic topics. Textbooks, in this case, were the majority of input for the learners.

In another study, Takafumi, S., Fukasawa, E., and Shinichi, Y. (2007) explored the introductions and practices of speech acts in “Oral Communication 1” textbooks used in Japan. Different from Vellenga’s study, 17 textbooks used in Japan with the approval from MEXT or Ministry of Education, Sports, Culture, Science and Technology were investigated. The pragmatic feature focused in the study was speech acts. The number of types of speech acts explicitly presented in the textbooks was counted to compare the degree of explicitness of the pragmatic information in each textbook. Variations of linguistic forms, explanation of linguistic forms and speech acts, and exercises for practice of speech acts were also analyzed.

The results were in line with the study of Vellenga. A small number of speech acts explicitly were presented in each textbook; students could learn only a limited number of linguistic forms for each speech act. In addition, metapragmatic information was insufficient both in terms of quantity and quality. Furthermore, students had limited opportunity to practice the speech acts and the forms they had just learned.

Another different EFL context was explored of which the result was reported in the same direction (Ji, 2007). She conducted a content analysis to explore the nature of pragmatic materials and tasks in the textbooks titled College English (New) Listening and Speaking Course (book 1-4). The books were written by a group of Chinese English professors, and published by Shanghai Foreign Education and Teaching Publishing House from 2001-2003. Pragmatic information in her study was partly adapted from the work of Vellenga. Quantitative data focused on percentage and amount of pragmatic information included in the textbooks, and amount of variety of pragmatic information. The qualitative data concentrated on the nature of pragmatic information and the level of richness of pragmatic information.

Findings showed that the variety of pragmatic information in the books was limited and most of the metapragmatic explanations were simple.

It can be concluded from the studies on pragmatic information in different ESL and EFL context reviewed above that most course materials failed to provide adequate amount of pragmatic knowledge for students to develop their pragmatic competence.
Framework of the study

This study aimed at investigating the pragmatic features—Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, Style, Cultural information—contained in commercial English Student’s books and Teacher’s books used by a Thai university. The material covered only the commercial books used in four communication courses: (1) Communicative Grammar I, (2) Communicative Grammar II, (3) English for Everyday Communication, and (4) English across Culture.

Research Methodology

Subjects

The subjects of this study were 6 books—3 Student’s books and 3 Teacher’s books—used in the required communication courses. The names of the books are shown in following table.

Table 1: The course and book titles investigated in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Grammar II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English across Culture</td>
<td>People Like Us, Too, Greenall S. (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments

In order to analyze the above mentioned books, tables of analysis adapted from the frameworks proposed by Vellenga (2004), and Takafumi, S., Fukasawa, E., and Shinichi, Y. (2007) were adapted (see table 2 and table 3 in Appendix). The pragmatic features investigated in this study were Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, Style, and Cultural information. The books were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively using the tables as instruments for the data collection process.

Data collection

The investigation was conducted as the basis of line-by-line of all the six selected books to explore the pragmatic features contained in each book. Furthermore, the Teacher’s manual of each book was cross-referenced with the Student’s books to examine whether the pragmatic features and information were explained richer in details or with additional
examples. The tape scripts of listening activities in Student’s book were considered a part of Student’s books although they appear in Teacher’s books. Any new point of information related to Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, Style, and Cultural information even if it appeared in only one phrase was counted as an aspect of information.

**Data analysis**

To answer the research questions addressed, the data collected on the line-by-line basis were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. First they were systemized to accommodate statistical analyses.

To answer research question 1, the data in the tables were examined whether all the pragmatic features were presented in all the three Student’s books and the three Teacher’s books. The details were reported.

To answer research question 2, the frequency of the aspects of pragmatic information presented for each pragmatic feature in each book was counted and compared. The results were reported in terms of the difference in number of pragmatic features between the Teacher’s books and the Student’s books. Also reported were the details of such differences.

Research question 3, asking about the quality of pragmatic features in Student’s books and Teacher’s books, was in progress at the time of preparing this report.

**Findings**

1. **Pragmatic features contained in English course materials (books) used at a Thai university**

It is found that not every pragmatic feature focused in this study presented in each book. The results are shown in table below.

**Table 4: Pragmatic features contained in each book**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Features</th>
<th>Student's Books</th>
<th>Teacher's Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touchstone 4A</td>
<td>Grammar Sense 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech act information</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 shows the inclusion and not inclusion of the pragmatic features in question. None of the books provided all the 6 pragmatic features under investigation. All of them, however, presented at least 3 features. Below is the detail of each course material.

*Touchstone 4A*, Student’s book included 5 from the 6 features. Information about Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, and Style was contained in the book. However, it did not include any Cultural information.

Similar to the Student’s book, *Touchstone 4A*, Teacher’s books included 5 features—Information about Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, and Style.

*Grammar Sense 3*, slightly different from *Touchstone 4A*, Student’s book included 4 features. Usage, Politeness, Register, and Style were contained in the book. However, no speech act information and cultural information was given.

*Grammar Sense 3*, Teacher’s book included only 3 features. Usage, Politeness, and Style were presented in the book. Information about Speech act information, Register and Cultural information was omitted. Like *Touchstone 4A*, both versions of *Grammar Sense 3* did not present any information on cultural aspect.

Like *Grammar Sense 3*, *People Like Us, Too*, Student’s book included 4 features—Speech act information, Usage, Style, and Cultural Information. However, the features left out were different.

*People Like Us, Too*, Teacher’s book included 4 features. However, the features presented were different from the Student’s book. It presented Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, and Style.

2. The difference in number of pragmatic features between Teacher’s books and Student’s books.

Besides examining the types of pragmatic features included or excluded in each of the books under investigation, the present study looked into the number of frequency of each feature included. It was found that there were differences in number of pragmatic features between Teacher’s books and Student’s books as shown in table 5 below.

**Table 5: Number of pragmatic features—Speech act information, Usage, Politeness, Register, Style, and Cultural information—included in each book.**
Among the 3 Teacher’s books, only *Touchstone 4A* appeared to contain more pragmatic information than its counterpart. Although, the frequency of Speech act information and Politeness was equal in the *Touchstone 4A* Teacher’s and the Student’s versions, greater details of Usage, Register, and Style were given in the Teacher’s book.

Different from *Touchstone 4A*, *Grammar Sense 3* presented pragmatic features mainly in the student’s books. Every pragmatic feature contained in this book was higher in number in the Student’s book than in the Teacher’s book. The biggest difference can be seen in the number of information about Usage; the Student’s book contained 64 aspects of pragmatic information whereas there were only 2 aspects presented in the Teacher’s book. Furthermore, the information appeared in the Teacher’s book was simply reminding the points already mentioned in the Student’s one.

*People Like Us, Too* showed a different result from the others. There were greater numbers of aspects of Speech act information, Usage, and Cultural information in the Student’s book while the aspects of Politeness and Style appeared more in the Teacher’s book.

**Discussion**

**The difference in number of pragmatic features included in English commercial books**

The results from the book analysis indicate that the pragmatic features focused in the study are included in the books used in required communication courses of a university in Thailand. However, the features and the pragmatic information contained vary across the books. In addition, the numbers of pragmatic features appearing in those books, as shown in table 5, need to be examined in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic Features</th>
<th>Student’s Books</th>
<th>Teacher’s Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touchstone 4A</td>
<td>Grammar Sense 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People Like Us, Too</td>
<td>People Like Us, Too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech act information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note* *Speech act information includes only number of type of speech act*
For instance, although the number of speech act in *People Like Us, Too* (Student’s book) was more than the one in *Touchstone 4A*, the former includes only small numbers of forms for each speech act while the latter contains more forms and exercises for students to practice each speech act. Furthermore, there was no information about speech act while that about the usage is considerable high in *Grammar Sense 3* compared to other books. *Grammar Sense 3* is a grammar based book which explains the use of each grammatical form to convey meaning without explicit introduction of speech act. For example, “*Present continuous sentences with adverbs of frequency that mean “all of the time” (such as always, constantly, continually, and forever) often express complaints.*” Besides, cultural information, which is an important source of avoiding cross-cultural communication, was included only in one book, *People Like Us, Too* (Student’s book) with little information. In that information, 8 out of 9 aspects were information about making compliment and responding to compliment in different cultures.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, from the data analysis, although the pragmatic features are included in those books variedly, the amount of pragmatic information in these books is far from being an adequate source for EFL students to gain pragmatic competence. Likewise non-native EFL teachers may also find it insufficient to simply rely on Teacher’s books to enhance their pragmatic knowledge.

**Recommendations**

The books investigated in this study are those used in the required communication courses. In order to examine whether EFL students receive enough pragmatic information, there needs to be a further examination of other books they use, course materials, and the actual teaching practice.
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APPENDIX

Table 2: Details of Speech act information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Speech act</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1…</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2…</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Details of Usage, Politeness, Register, Style, Cultural information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>Token</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register</td>
<td>Token</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Token</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Information</td>
<td>Token</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>