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Abstract. This qualitative study is an attempt to develop our knowledge on using the back-channels in English conversations as a second language obtaining English language textbooks for Iranian school students through the old and new educational system. The textbook of second guidance school grade has been compared with seventh junior high school grade (as the first group), and the textbook of third guidance school grade has been compared to eighth junior high school grade (as the second group). It has been a discourse analysis of these books based on Maynard’s (1997) taxonomy. The results of back-channels frequency have been 26 and 18 times in the first group, respectively; so, the proportion has been 1.44. Also; back-channeling markers have been appeared 40 and 29 times in the second group, respectively; thus, the proportion has been 1.38. It has been concluded that the back-channels frequency has had a quantity improvement in the new version to the old one.
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1. Introduction

This discourse study is concerned with the uses of back channels to show listenership involvement. Discourse analysis (DA) or discourse study is an approach to analyze written, vocal, or sign language (Budd, 2006). Specifically, the research investigated the uses of back-channelling utterances. The research focuses on the different back-channels that are identified; however, the locations (pages at which they occur) are not mentioned.

There are different views about back-channeling. Friginal and Benjamins (2009), Reinders (2014), Tottie (1991) and White (1997) believed back-channels are words or phrases which provide feedback to the speaker by indicating that the listener is still involved in the conversation but not actively participated at the moment. Kjellmer (2009) used the term “back-channels” in his study because the recipient did not interrupt the speaker. His definition of “back-channels” was the noises, sounds, and utterances made by non-speakers. White (1989) explained that the term “back-channels” referred to the main channel for the speaker and the back-channel for the listener.

Stenström (1994) considered back-channels as a means to ease the complex interaction. Also, the segments of speech followed by a back-channel can be increased with the number of cues present in the speech. Different speakers may use various combinations of back-channels. Furthermore; realization of a back-channel may differ from speaker to speaker.

Stenström (1994) explained back-channels are utterances as well as turn-takings, but the difference is that back-channels do not interrupt the speaker, and not to be interrupted by interlocutor is a common right in a conversation. Using back-channels does not mean speaker shift; whereas, the listener confirms what the speaker says, even encourages him/her to continue.

In discussing the importance of the back-channels in a conversation, Zimmermann (1991) claimed that the quality of a conversation depends
largely on what takes place in the person to whom words are directed. In
order to act as an active, supportive and polite listener, one should
in general signal an interest in what the speaker is talking about. Listener
responses were often referred to as acknowledgment tokens (Drummond
& Hopper, 1993) or back-channel (Yngve, 1970).

Teachers warn that the back-channels should not be completely re-
placed with live discussion, as it was reported such errors were iterated
by participant students. These experiences require careful structuring;
and that teachers must manage and monitor students’ performances in
a real context (Gardner, 2001). Thus, it is not the only factor. Also, the
role of listener, speaker, participation, monitoring, interlocutors’ com-
mon ground, teachers’ management are influential, as well. The impor-
tance of the listener cannot be neglected in the literature; as the listener
is both a recipient and a respondent in the conversation (Gardner, 2001).

White (1997) and Pipek (2007) claimed that back-channel cues tended
mostly to cause short pauses. Their content analyses showed these pauses
via fillers and turn-takings via naming interlocutors to show only the
form; however, the intonation of back-channels is also important. Tottie
(1991) and Shelley, and Gonzalez, (2013) specified a supportive function
of back-channels, which signaled understanding and agreement, and also
regulative function, which encouraged the speaker to continue. These
two functions could be defined as agreement and continuer.

Many other researchers and writers probed back-channellings among
interlocutors as an active, alive participation and tested their hypoth-
esis by experiments or collected data through instruments like inter-
views, questionnaires or observations, but through no book (Cazden,
2011; Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki & Tao, 1996; Clesson, 2011; Cutrone,
2000; Rosenfeld & Hancks, 1980; Tarone & Kuehn, 2000; Yazdfazeli,
Motallebzadeh, & Fatemi, 2015).

Additionally, back-channels had various definitions in different arti-
cles which were complementary as it was expounded in the background
section. The whole picture of all back-channels is in the appendix A of
the present study.
Statement of the problem
Books are said to be well-specified in which all their components like turn-takings, feedbacks, and back-channels’ type and frequency are recognizable. The specificity plays a fundamental role in the educational system, so do used textbooks in this research.

While the value of back-channeling has been broadly debated among social media enthusiasts (Ross, Terras, Warwick, & Welsh, 2011; Sutton, Palen, & Shklovski, 2008), it has not been the subject of scholarly research in conversation parts of the schools’ textbooks.

Back-channels may not be noticed unless an individual back-channeling varies from what is expected, and the conversation may be ceased consequently. This study tries to solve the problems by addressing back-channels in textbooks as a reliable source and determining their type and frequency. As discussed by Tao and Thompson (2009), back-channels frequency can be an influential indicator of the second language.

Objectives of the study
The current study is to comparatively analyze the conversation sections of aimed four books in Iran; each covering seven to ten units for students. The study is designed through the use of back-channel models to find out whether the conversation sections are rich. This will be concluded by finding different types of back-channels and their frequencies in the four books. The following research questions will ultimately be answered:

1. Which types of back-channels are used in the conversation texts?
2. How frequently are the back channels used?

The conversations of these four books are studied considering the existence and the distribution of back-channels. In other words, this study is guided by two research questions. The first focuses on which back-channelling markers are used. The second seeks to determine in which version of books back-channeling is used more.

Significance of the study
Concerning the way that both instructors and students are relying on textbooks as important materials for instructions and also key factors
for communication; thus, numerous researchers consider them for assessment. A proficient instructive system requires course books to be focused on the same instructive goals. Enough consideration must be taken in composing course books, thereof. More specifically, due to the vital role of back-channels in mutual understanding and the use of them in many aspects of language learning, back-channels in English language textbooks are analyzed here.

**Taxonomy**
This article follows Maynard’s (1997) taxonomy since it is one of the full-fleshed back-channeling taxonomies. On the contrary, rarely did researchers adopt any particular back-channelling taxonomy, the main reasons are the items overlap each other, and the researchers’ taxonomies are not complete; also other researchers have a problem with the term and its classifications (Fujimoto, 2009). Studying the articles and studies, it has been tried to find and classify the back-channeling markers, though they are more than these. Other back-channels and two conversations assigning the use of back-channels are in the appendix.

### 2. Review of Literature

Mowlaei Aghblagh’s (2017) study aimed to determine the type and frequency of back-channel responses used in the Persian language based on Maynard’s (1997) classification. The corpus of the study was 2 hours of conversation, recorded in the dormitory of a university in Tehran. The result of the study showed the most frequent words used as back-channel responses and the functional type of different forms of back-channel response.

Sharifi and Azadmanesh (2011) investigated back-channel markers in casual Persian conversations. Their study concerned lexical, grammatical, prosodic and semantic factors which are involved in a listener’s back-channeling. The results showed that the lexical item “khob” (ok) with a specific intonation (rising) at the end of an utterance and “Mage naw” elicit a back-channel response. They also argue for the elicitation of back-channel responses at the points of grammatical completion. Among 147 recorded back-channels, 112 of them had a falling pitch, 12 had a
falling pitch followed by a pause and 23 had a rising pitch. When it
came to the semantic factors, the results showed that in most of the
cases the listeners’ back-channel responses confirmed the speakers’ at-
titude depending on the context of the utterance and they cannot be
predicted. Other back-channels were for clarification and giving sugges-
tions.

Zhang (2012) in his case study documented and analyzed the sub-
ject’s use of English back-channels in interactions that are common
in Mandarin and American. He deduced that the subject transferred
American interaction rituals and English syntax to her Mandarin lan-
guage interactions with students. The corpus of data from the ethno-
graphic observation, audio, and video recording, and interviews were
collected in a Chinese language class. Tao and Thompson (2009) stud-
ied English back-channels in Mandarin conversations. Two sources of
data were included in their research. One was a conversation between a
Chinese professor who had been in the U.S. for 17 years, and the other
one was a native Mandarin speaking student. The professor had spoken
English just on the basis of informal conversations, both at home and
at work. It was a naturally-occurring conversation recorded in 1978 in
Taiwan. The second source of data was a series of eight interview-style
conversations between another Chinese professor with a very similar cul-
tural background to the first one, and a Mandarin-English bilingual stu-
dent, who had spoken Mandarin more on a daily basis. This took place
in the early 1970s, in the U.S. They concluded that knowing English
back-channels will affect Mandarin conversation.

Maltz and Borker (1982) based on Tottie (1991) found that men and
women may use back-channel markers differently, in that men tend to use
them to show understanding or agreement as the supportive function,
while women tend to use continuers as regulative function. Their findings
support the multiple meanings with different forms.

Lau, Chen, Huang, and Li (2000) compared Canadian and Chinese
back channeling markers and resulted that Chinese participants in the
role of listeners made significantly more back-channel responses than
their Canadian counterparts in performing the task. “Nod” and “okay”
had the highest frequencies in both groups. However, the Canadians
used “repeat” more frequently than Chinese and Chinese used “uhm” and “yeah” more than Canadians. Participants in both groups switched codes when making back-channel responses. Their results were in line with that of Li, Cui, and Wang, (2010). A significant negative correlation was found between the frequency of back-channel responses and participants’ level of conversation enjoyment. These results may raise the critical issue of how to balance the appropriate amount of back-channel responses in these societies.

To summarize the review of the literature, the studies are fairly relevant to the back-channel markers and the definition of this phenomenon. It should be summoned that back-channels all in all viewed as feedback, turn-taking strategy for interlocutors and sounds for conveying emotions.

3. Review of Taxonomies

Back-channels are of three types: one word (yeah, no), a sentence (oh, I see, I am with you), or in a question form (Is that so? / -by falling tone). There is a similar perspective which proposed three back-channeling categories: non-lexical back-channels, which are vocalic sounds that have little or no referential meaning, such as “mhm”; phrasal back-channels, which are typical expressions of acknowledgment and assessment, such as really; and substantive back-channels, being turns with referential content such as a repetition or a clarifying question (Iwasaki, 1997).

In linguistics, the study of language, the back-channel represents a kind of feedback whereby a listener provides verbal “code-switching, interjections, repeating, e. g. Uh huh, I see, yes” and nonverbal “eye contact, head nodding, laughing, e. g. Nod, smile, frown” markers to invite a speaker to either continue or clarify. This sense of back-channel is frequent in language and culture studies (Wolf, 2008; Miyata & Nisisawa, 2007; White, 1989).

Interjections are exclamations for expressing emotions or feelings and inserted in conversations. Laughing in the answer and repeating the answer to clarify it or correct the partner’s responses are in the acknowledgment category, and also repeating is added to the continuer category. Repeating functioned as both categories depending on the way it was used
in a conversation (Jokinen, 2009). By head nodding, we think “Do the speaker and listener make and maintain eye contact throughout a conversation? Does the speaker expect non-verbal cues such as head nodding to show attentiveness or does the speaker expect verbal responses such as ‘yes and mhmm’ to show attentiveness?” Ways of showing that a person is listening are by non-verbal back-channel signals, such as head nodding and eye contact (Donahue, 1998; Lambertz, 2011; McClave, 1999). By code-switching, partners find the proper intended response in conversations.

The complete back-channeling classification is Fujimoto’s (2009) list who collected and mixed all back-channeling categories. He categorized thirteen functions of back-channels as follows which contains Maynard’s (1997) list of six functions (1) continuer, (2) understanding, (3) support and empathy, (4) agreement, (5) emotive, and (6) minor additions and also Gardner’s (2001) five entries (1) continuers, (2) acknowledgement (3) news markers (4) change-of-activity tokens, and (5) assessments.

4.1. Continuer: Speaker is listening, and listener should continue speaking (e.g., mm-hm, uh-uh, yeah).

4.2. Understanding and acknowledgment: It means receiving information or hearing when the listener says back-channels with falling intonation or pitch (for instance, I see).

4.3. Support and empathy: Listener expresses support and empathy towards the speaker’s judgment (for example, laugh, that is good, yeah).

4.4. Agreement: The speaker did not receive new information (for instance, You are (so) right, How true, Too true, I agree, Right, and Yeah).

4.5. Emotive: This is when the listener responds emphatically in the forms of laughs and exclamation to the speaker (e. g. wow, great, fantastic, yeah, hehehe).

4.6. Minor addition: This is the listener’s request for information or clarification (the most common example is really?).

4.7. Newsmarker: It marks what the speaker has said as newsworthy in some way (all right, right, ok, oh, short questions, etc.).
4.8. **Change of activity**: It marks the transition for a new activity or topic (*ok, all right*).

4.9. **Assessment**: It evaluates the talk of the current speaker (*e.g.* *wow, great, mm*).

4.10. **Disagreement**: It shows non-support of what the speaker has said (*e.g.* *sorry, no*).

4.11. **Signal of confirmation**: It shows one has received specific information (*e.g.* *I’ve got it*).

4.12. **Interest or attentive signal**: It displays interest and engagement in what the speaker has said (*for instance, Uh-huh!*).

4.13. **Collaborative finish**: It means the listener finishes the speaker’s utterance (*for example, Ok, I know*).

Like above, there are series of backchannel markers mentioned in the appendix A which are sought in the school books. A number of them are found in the mentioned books and as it is seen some of them are more frequent than others in the textbooks.

## 4. Methodology

**Materials**

The back-channels in English conversations as a second language were studied. The textbook of the second grade of guidance school is compared with the seventh grade of junior high school, and the textbook of the third grade of guidance school is compared to the eighth grade of junior high school, and these are articles’ material.

The conversational parts of the mentioned books and related articles were studied to find back-channeling markers and useful points, respectively. The present study is different from others in which it deals with books and clarifies the specific back-channeling markers in the books, and there is a clear-cut statistic comparison in this article, thereof. In fact; back-channeling happens in communication so that the partner will be able to send and receive feedback, but the researchers poked it in dialogs of the books because they are communicative and are used in daily English native speakers’ interactions.
Data Collection Procedure
In this study, the raw data was gathered carefully, and the back channels were identified based on the scales proposed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, (1974); Duncan and Niederehe, (1974) and Goodwin, (1981). Thus; exact specifications for back-channel classification were determined. Based on the obtained data, it was investigated if there was an improvement in the amount or frequency of back-channels. Finally, the data were analyzed using a few statistical procedures.

Data Analysis Procedure
The study is mainly qualitative, so no further statistical analyses are needed. Therefore, the entire analysis of the present study is carried out by careful inspection of the conversations included in English textbooks of guidance and junior high schools from many authors’ back-channel models but not an exclusive one.

To find the types of back-channels involved in the contents of the conversations basically, the only quantitative analysis performed in this study includes some simple statistical analyses like counting the frequencies of the occurrence of a sub-category of models as well as their percentages presented in tables and shown on graphs. Moreover, the percentage and relative frequency are reported in order to illustrate the distribution levels of these back channels better.

5. Results

Because EFL materials and textbooks are key factors in many language programs, it is essential to use the results of the textbook evaluation to justify choosing a particular textbook. Nowadays, function, in reality, is focused as a means to practice in the service of conversation; e.g., students are recommended to write a letter and know how to speak with a tourist. Exposure to the environment is considered; e.g., how to show the address or direction to others and how to tell about their hobbies. We can see its manifestation in the new version of books. So, the practical view affects books.

Practical view is a striking point, and it is important to know that in this new educational system 10/20 of scores is devoted to class activity,
5/20 of scores to oral interview, role play, lecture and monologue, 2.5/20 of scores to listening, and only 2.5 out of 20 of scores to writing and reading. In contrast, in the old educational system, reading and writing were only focused; listening and speaking received no attention as they did not have any proportion in each student’s total score. This means that the rating system has been changed.

In the new educational system, teachers are facilitators and books are changed correspondingly, and also an implicit error correction or recast, communication and function are fully focused. So, it is to some extent similar to the weak version of CLT; however, teachers go beyond choosing a method and come closer to an approach; it means teaching new books is not limited to a particular method, and an eclectic method is chosen by need analysis.

In the previous educational system, the chosen method was the GTM (Grammar Translation Method); thus, grammar and vocabulary were emphasized, and even conversations were memorized like a parrot and summarized; it means that only PPP (Presentation, Practice, and Production) were used; e.g. mechanical drills (—–is a student, he, she, Ali).

The main string of the present paper is the frequency of back-channels in books as one of the main parts of communication. In tables, one can see the frequency of each of the back-channeling marker, and under each bar graph, one can see the total frequency of back-channeling range of usage and the comparison and proportion of books.

In the first bar graph (Fig 1./ in the Appendix), back-channeling markers appeared as 26 times total in the 7th grade of the junior high school book and 18 times in the second grade of a guidance school book. So, the proportion is 1.44 and ‘yes, no, ok and oh’ just applied in the old version of the book, on the contrary, twelve types of back-channels are available in the old version. Statistically ‘No’ is the mode of frequency in the old book. Otherwise, code switching is the most frequent marker in the new version.

‘Oh’ has the same frequency in both books. Merely ‘yes’ and ‘no’ in the old book are more than the new book; other markers are the other way around. The variety of back-channels in the textbook of second
guidance school grade is lower than that in a 7th junior high school textbook. Not only is the variety of back-channels in the textbook of a 7th junior high school higher than the second guidance school textbook, but also, back-channels’ total frequency in the new version is higher than the old one.

In the second bar graph (Fig 2./ in the Appendix), back-channeling markers appeared 40 times total in the 8th junior high school book and 29 times in the third guidance school book. So, the proportion is 1.38 and ‘yes, no, ok, sure, I see, all right and oh’ just applied in the old version of the book. ‘All right and ok’ were not in the new book. Otherwise, there are fourteen types of markers in the new book. ‘Yes’ is the most frequent marker in both books related to this bar graph, whereas ‘repetition’ is as frequent as ‘yes’ in the new book.

None of the markers has the same frequency while comparing books. ‘Yes, no, I see, all right, and ok’ are more frequent in the old book than the counterparts in the new book. The variety of back-channels in the textbook of the third grade guidance school is lower than that in an 8th junior high school textbook. The variety of back-channels in the textbook of the eighth grade junior of high school is higher than the third guidance school textbook, and back-channels’ total frequency in the new version is higher than the old one, as well.

In Table 1 and bar charts, variety and number of back-channeling markers have appeared in the textbook of second and third grade of the guidance school is lower than that in seventh and eighth grades of junior high school textbook. Back-channels’ total frequency in the new version is higher than the old one. Junior high school 8th-grade book of the new educational system has the highest frequency (40 out of 113 times) and the guidance school 2nd-grade middle school book of the old educational system has the lowest frequency (18 out of 113 times).

For the sake of ease, the term ‘textbook’ is written as acronym ‘B’. The third bar chart (Fig 3./in the Appendix) shows the final data draft which compares the percentage of back-channeling markers in books as you see. Pairs of old and new books contents in the shadow of back-channeling were compared here to find out which of them has a higher back-channeling frequency.
In order to classify back-channels according to their functions based on Maynard’s (1997) taxonomy, Table 2 has been drawn. The most prevalent classifier is “Support and empathy” and the least common one is “continuer”. However, the role of continuing has been carried out by all of the classifiers; there were no continuer “mm-hm, uh-uh, yeah” markers.

However, regarding Table 2, there is no vivid difference between “support and empathy” and “Agreement” markers, “yes” was taken as “support and empathy” and “sure, ok, all right” as “Agreement”, according to Maynard’s (1997) markers categorization. In his taxonomy, Code switching, misunderstanding, losing the string of words, disagreement, repetition, and rejecting were neglected.

6. Discussion

The notion of back channeling holds different meanings for different researchers. There is a popular saying among the researchers that back channeling is the role a listener plays in a conversation with both verbal and non-verbal signals. The present article opted to probe verbal markers in conversations of four books.

This feedback is a very important process in many aspects of language learning. Moreover, in Cech and Condon’s (2004) view, the back-channel is named as a minimal response indicating the speaker’s engagement in speech while being passive in the conversation. If someone wants to become more familiar with the use of back-channels in this article, he/she should know that the occurrence times of back-channeling markers in the mentioned books are studied just in the dialogs of conversations and pronunciations. Although some possible words like ‘yes’ and ‘no’ or others are in common with back-channeling markers in other parts like exercise sections, they do not convey the feedback effect of back-channeling.

In conversation, when speech is followed by back-channels, it encourages the partner to involve constantly. It might approve that a combination of cues can signal one’s interlocutor that a back-channel is appropriate (Friginal & Benjamins, 2009; Reinders, 2014; Tottie, 1991;
White, 1997). However, the problem of all texts is that no one can feel back-channels because texts cannot express personal emotions. One important point in some articles is that there are words as discourse markers viewed as back-channeling markers, e.g., Friginal and Benjamins (2009). One can find out by reviewing many articles (e.g., Friginal & Benjamins, 2009; Reinders, 2014; Tottie, 1991; White, 1997) that the discourse markers are not mentioned as back-channeling markers while they are back-channels. These two concepts will be explained here. You can behold either the back-channeling marker categories in the taxonomy section of the article or the markers themselves in the appendix. Also, discourse markers are used to monitor the flow of talk, and it signals the speaker’s intention to mark a boundary in discourse (Friginal & Benjamins, 2009). Considering all the examples of both, there is no boundary or difference between these two.

“Oh” as an “interjection” can be “emotive” and “well, you know” as “discourse markers” can be “continuers” but they didn’t allude anywhere. Another point is none of the markers can be dedicated to just one classifier, and consequently, most of the researchers’ classifications become vague (Fujimoto, 2009).

The findings suggest that the most commonly used type of back channeling is “yes” as “Support and empathy” and “ok, sure, all right” as “agreement” are in the second rank of back-channels. According to Fujimoto (2000) and Gardner (2001), “yes, no” are continuers and signals of acknowledgment, so if their taxonomies were applied, the results would differ.

Investigating the results according to Iwasaki (1997) classification, it was found out that both old and new versions revealed a high use of short-form replies, very limited use of long-form back-channels; thus it leaves the interactional burden on the first speaker in the role plays. In the new educational system, back-channeling markers are used more variously.

To clarify the first research question, you can refer to the appendix B. In answer to the second research question or hypothesis it should be said that the new books have an improvement in the amount or frequency of back-channels in comparison to the old books. The main
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hypothesis of this article was that the new books had a higher level of back-channeling than the old version of books had. And it came true.

Conclusions and Implications

Ward (2007) listed the most common back-channel responses in modern languages on his web page. Similarly, in the present article, it has been talked about the frequency and percentage of back-channeling markers. This study gave an insight into the importance of listenership and also how a listener can project effective listenership through back channels. Types and frequency of back-channels used in the conversation texts of the four school textbooks are revealed in this research through discourse analysis.

In future, it is possible to extend this analysis to the complementary turn-taking category of back-channeling in these books and explore how a spoken dialogue system may take advantage of back-channeling to improve dialogue coordination, the user experience, and better interaction.
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Backchanneling Strategy in Textbooks

The times of occurrence of backchanneling in the old book and the new book are shown in the figure below:

Fig 1. Frequency bar chart of second guidance school and seventh junior high school grades textbooks

The types of backchanneling are shown in the figure below:

Fig 2. Frequency bar chart of third guidance school and eighth junior high school grades textbooks

Table 1: Distribution of back-channeling strategies in books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Relative frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 3. Percentage bar chart of back-channels

Table 2: Distribution (f) of back-channeling strategies in books according to the taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and empathy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor additions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A: Guidance school 2nd-grade middle school B of old educational system

*B: Junior high school 7th grade B of the new educational system

*C: Guidance school 3rd-grade middle school B of the old educational system

*D: Junior high school 8th grade B of the new educational system
Appendix A: Back-channeling Markers

As you read in the discussion section below is a list of back-channeling markers. These markers are provided for a better understanding of the concept of back channeling and its authentic real-world usage.

- Really?
- Fantastic
- He he he
- Wow
- Yes- yeah
- No
- Uh- huh
- Hmm- hm- mmm- mmmm
- I see
- I know
- Ok- okay
- Uhu
- How splendid
- Right
- Hell

- Ah
- Nnn
- Hey
- I am with you
- Aha
- Very exciting
- Aww big party
- I am not sure
- Interesting
- Oooooh
- I agree
- You are (so) right.
- How true
- Goodness
- Gosh
Appendix B: Back-channels’ Exemplars in the Books

There is a copy of examples of back-channels in the named books in the following. Back-channels are underlined and italicized.

1) A: Can I help you?

   B: Yes. Can I have my library card, please?

   A: Sure. What’s your name?

   B: I’m Parisa Behparvar.

   A: Sorry, what’s your last name again?

   B: Behparvar. b-e-h-p-a-r-v-a-r.

   A: OK. Here’s your card.

2) A: Hello.

   B: Hello. Is that Ali?

   A: Yes. Who’s speaking?

   B: This is Reza.

   A: Hello, Reza. What are you doing?

   B: I’m studying.

   A: English or Persian?

   B: English.

   A: Do you study English every day?

   B: No, not every day. But I’m practicing it now.

   A: Oh, mum’s calling. Thank you, goodbye.

   B: Goodbye.