



THE EFFECT OF TEXTBOOKS ON ELT TRAINEES' USE OF PRAGMALINGUISTIC FEATURES

Esim GÜRSOY*

Abstract: As the aims for learning foreign languages change in consequence of globalization, the need for teaching and learning native-like conventions of everyday speech gains importance. However, whether the textbooks used for language teaching provide such information is questionable. Learners' pragmatic knowledge and competence is framed mostly by the information presented in the textbooks. As future foreign language teachers, trainees' use of daily conventions is significant to foresee their tendency to use them in their future occupations. Thus, the current study aims to investigate one of the features of language competence by focusing on the politeness strategies when making requests. In the present study 68 freshmen ELT students were inquired about their politeness strategies. A questionnaire, designed as a discourse completion task, was given to 58 trainees to which they were asked to write an appropriate request to the given 12 situations. The rest of the trainees (10) completed the discourse orally on the same situations during an interview. Eight of the twelve situations were designed according to the Power (P), Social Distance (D), and Rank of Imposition (R) as described by Brown and Levinson (1987). The other four situations were designed to see the effects of contextual factors on users' linguistic preferences. The research results indicate that although the majority of the participants use language forms, appropriately, these are very limited to the information provided in the textbooks and that there are similarities between oral and written responses. Moreover, the results indicate that the participants are not aware of the ways to reduce Face Threatening Acts.

Keywords: Politeness strategies, requests, pragmatic awareness, foreign language learning

Özet: Globalleşmenin sonucu olarak değişen yabancı dil öğrenme amaçları günlük konuşma dilinin öğretilmesi ve öğrenilmesinin önemini artırmaktadır. Ancak, kullanılan ders kitaplarının ne ölçüde bu tür bilgileri içerdikleri belli değildir. Öğrencilerin edim bilgi ve yeterlikleri çoğunlukla ders kitaplarında verilen bilgilerle sınırlıdır. Geleceğin yabancı dil öğretmenleri olarak, öğretmen adaylarının günlük dili nasıl kullandıklarını öğrenmek, gelecekte bunları öğretmenlik yaparken kullanıp kullanamayacaklarını öngörebilmek açısından önem taşımaktadır. Böylelikle, bu çalışma dil yeterliklerinin özelliklerinden birini, ricada bulunurken kullanılan nezaket stratejilerine odaklanarak araştırmayı hedeflemektedir. İngilizce öğretmenliğinde okuyan 68 birinci sınıf öğretmen adayı nezaket stratejilerini kullanımları açısından araştırmaya katılmıştır. Bu adayların 58'inden söylem tamamlama olarak hazırlanan 12 duruma yazılı olarak ricada bulunmaları istenmiştir. Diğer 10 kişiden ise aynı şeyi karşılıklı görüşmeler sırasında sözlü olarak yapmaları istenmiştir. 12 durumun sekizi Brown ve Levinson (1987) tarafından tanımlanan Güç, Sosyal Mesafe ve Yükün Derecesi dikkate alınarak düzenlenmiştir. Diğer dört durum ise bağlamsal farklılıkların etkisini görebilecek şekilde hazırlanmıştır. Araştırma sonuçları katılımcıların çoğunluğunun dil formlarını uygun olarak kullanmalarına rağmen bunların ders kitaplarında verilen bilgilerle sınırlı olduğunu ve aynı zamanda sözlü ve yazılı olarak verilen yanıtlarda benzerlikler olduğunu göstermiştir. Buna ek olarak sonuçlar öğretmen adaylarının imge zedeleyici edimlerden haberdar olmadıklarını göstermiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Nezaket stratejileri, ricalar, edimsel farkındalık, yabancı dil öğrenimi

Background

Although it is important to develop pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of the L2 (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005), acquisition of these rules is considerably a hard task for learners in EFL environments due to the contextual limitations (Uso-Juan, 2007; Karatepe, 2001). Since pragmatic development is not one of the outcomes of learners' grammatical development (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999) specific emphasis needs to be given to help learners develop pragmatic awareness. However, as a primary source of input, the textbooks ability to

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey, esimgursoy@yahoo.com.

accommodate this need is skeptical (Uso-Juan, 2007; Bardovi-Harlig 2001; Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, & Reynolds, 1991; Boxer & Pickering 1995).

Pragmatic competence is one of the vital aspects of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995), which requires the ability to choose and recognize the appropriate forms of utterance in a given context (Kasper & Rose, 2002). As a constituent of pragmatic competence requests are one of the speech acts that are widely investigated (Pinto, 2005; Cook & Liddicoat, 2002; Karatepe, 2001; Le Pair, 1996) along with the politeness strategies (such as Ho, 2009). Requests are attempts on the part of a speaker to get the hearer to perform or to stop performing some kind of action (Ellis, 1994, p.167). The topic has been an interest to SLA research for several reasons:

1. “They are face-threatening and, therefore, call for considerable linguistic expertise on the part of the learner,
2. They differ cross-linguistically in interesting ways and
3. They are often realized by means of clearly identifiable formulas” (Ellis, 1994, p.168).

Politeness has been one of the important considerations for many researchers when investigating speech acts (see, Ho, (2009); Suh, (1999); Person, Kreuz, Zwaan, and Graesser (1995); Meier, (1995); Chen (1993); Tanaka & Kawade (1982)). The term is often considered formal and distancing and it is used to avoid any impositions or intrusions (Holmes, 1995). The current study uses Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory, which consists of three fundamental notions known as face, face threatening acts (FTAs), and politeness strategies. Yule (1996) defines face as “the public self-image of a person” (p.60). People expect their face-wants to be respected in social interactions. A person can have two face wants: positive and negative.

Positive face want is one’s need to be approved and accepted by others, and his need to be considered as one of the group members. On the other hand, negative face want is one’s need to have freedom of their actions and not to be impeded by others (Yule, 1996; Meier, 1995).

If an action threatens the “public self-image” it is called a “FTA”. The degree of risk or the weight of FTA to the hearer (H) is determined by three factors: The degree or the rank of imposition, social distance and power (Kasper, 1990, Meier, 1995). These are referred to as Power (P), Distance (D) and Rank (R). D is basically the degree of intimacy between the Speaker (S) and the hearer (H). P is H’s power over S. R is the weight of imposition on the H.

In this theory, politeness is described as a redressive action, that is, an action “that attempts to counteract the potential face damage” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.68) to prevent the effects of a FTA (Kasper, 1990). FTA’s can be reduced by using five different politeness strategies defined by Brown and Levinson (1987). These strategies are: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on-record, off-record and say nothing.

Positive politeness strategies are used to save positive face wants. In these strategies solidarity, informality and formality are emphasized with expressions involving hearer’s interests, wants and needs, such as exaggerating interest, avoiding disagreement, showing approval, and indicating common grounds (Meier, 1995; Chen, 1993; Garcia, 1993; Carroll & Konneker, 1981).

Conversely, negative politeness strategies are used to save negative face wants by using expressions that show restraint, formality and distancing (Garcia, 1993). By apologizing, being indirect, expressing pessimism (Chen, 1993), minimizing imposition, and giving

deference hearer's desire to not being imposed and being respected by others is satisfied (Garcia, 1993; Carroll and Konneker, 1981; Meier, 1995).

Among the other strategies bald-on-record strategies are used when the social distance between the H and S is small and when the power of S is higher than H. These include the use of directives, warnings, criticisms....etc. (Garcia, 1993). Off-record strategies require the use of indirect language. The utterance is vague, ambiguous, or incomplete. Hints are an example of such strategy (Garcia, 1993). Say-nothing strategy is simply the speakers being and remaining silent (Garcia, 1993). If we consider that sometimes keeping our silence means something, this strategy can play an important role in understanding conversations.

According to Suh (1999), requests are considered as FTAs. That is, when making a request the speaker asks the hearer to be involved in an action that is beneficial for the speaker but not for the hearer. Requests threaten the hearer's negative face wants, since s/he is imposed by the speaker. Therefore, the speaker needs to reduce the imposition by using a face saving act, and these face saving acts are the politeness strategies that the speaker uses.

The present study aims to look at politeness strategies of freshman ELT students at Uludağ University, Turkey when making requests. The study is based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) "politeness theory". The trigger for this research is the assumption that in most EFL contexts learners' pragmatic awareness is limited to textbooks. Although grammar is thought and given importance extensively, native-like conventions in everyday speech are not given emphasis both in the classrooms and in the textbooks. Moreover, Alagözlü and Büyüköztürk (2009) have pointed out the challenge of teaching pragmatic aspects in the classroom. In EFL contexts two prominent sources of input are the teacher and the textbooks. It has been emphasized by many researchers that the textbooks are inadequate in terms of providing pragmalinguistic features that are necessary for learners to develop pragmatic awareness and conventional language use (Kılıçkaya, 2010; Arıkan, 2007; Vellenga, 2004; Berry, 2000; Karatepe, 1998; Burns, 1998). Being one of the major sources of input (Kim & Hall, 2002), learner's pragmatic knowledge and competence are framed by the information presented in the textbooks. Hence, the purpose of this research is to see whether freshman ELT teacher trainees have gained the ability to use the pragmatic knowledge when making requests and whether these are restricted.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

Current research aims to investigate freshman ELT teacher trainees' use of politeness strategies when making requests to identify their pragmatic knowledge. It is argued that such pragmatic knowledge is the outcome of their previous language education. As one of the most important components of language education in EFL contexts, the textbooks provide input on the pragmatic features of the language being learned. The previous research showed that textbooks contain restricted use of pragmatic issues (Kılıçkaya, 2010; Arıkan, 2007; Vellenga, 2004; Berry, 2000; Burns, 1998; Karatepe, 1998). It is hypothesized that the under representation of such features in the textbooks would reveal itself in learners use of the language. Therefore, the learners' choice of linguistic features and the range of these features would be an indication of how much and how well the textbooks could reflect on the pragmalinguistic features of the L2.

As the participants of the research are ELT teacher trainees, their efficacy in using pragmalinguistic features of the L2 is critical, considering the fact that the teacher is one of the primary sources of input in the classroom in addition to the textbook. Therefore, their

ability to use these features are decisive when teaching them directly or indirectly to the language learners. Teacher trainees' ability to use these features are mostly determined by their former education. In an earlier study by Karatepe (1998) conducted in two Turkish EFL teacher training institutions, it was claimed that pragmalinguistic issues are underrepresented and are not systematically integrated in the teacher training syllabus. In a follow-up study by Karatepe (2001) it was claimed that there are striking differences between native speakers and non-native ELT teacher trainees in their linguistic choices due to Turkish ELT teacher trainees' restricted range of modal verb choices. Thus, the current study is significant in that it aims to emphasize the importance of teaching pragmatic features of L2 below and during tertiary level especially in teacher training programs.

The study tries to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Do ELT trainees use language forms appropriately when making requests?
2. Do ELT trainees use a wide range of language forms?
3. Are the ELT trainees limited to language forms that can be frequently found in textbooks?
4. Are the participants aware of the ways to reduce FTAs by using politeness strategies?

Limitations to the study

The participants of the study constitute only the freshman year trainees. The upper grades gain more pragmatic knowledge through the course of their study and as the aim of the study is to identify the possible effects of language education prior to university they were excluded from the study.

Methodology

Participants

In the present study 68 freshman ELT students were inquired about their politeness strategies. 58 of these subjects were given a questionnaire designed as a discourse completion task (DCT) (see appendix) and asked to write an appropriate request to each of the 12 situations. 10 of them completed the discourse orally on the same situations during an interview. The reason for choosing the freshman year trainees were to eliminate any possible effects of university education and to focus on the outcomes of their previous language education.

Instrument

Eight (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12) of the twelve situations were designed according to the Power (P), Social Distance (D), and Rank of Imposition (R) as described by Brown and Levinson (1987). These are accompanied by an additional feature named as "psychological factor" by Suh (1999). According to Tanaka and Kawade's (1982) Distance-Politeness (DP) hypothesis, politeness strategies are also determined by social (status) and psychological (like/dislike) distance. According to the DP hypothesis as the relationship between the H and S gets bigger the speaker will use more polite strategies, however, if this relationship is close (psychologically and socially) less polite strategies will be used. Finally, psychological variables are more important than the social variables (Suh, 1999).

The other four situations (3, 6, 9, and 11) were designed to see the effects of contextual factors on users' linguistic preferences. According to Yule (2004) in understanding the meaning of a speech act, the context plays a preliminary role. Similarly, the context enables the students to determine the appropriate form of a speech act. Karatepe (2001) claims that the knowledge of the politeness markers are not enough to be able to use them appropriately if the learners do not understand the relation between the forms and the context of situation. Thus,

restaurant context is chosen and varied by additional factors to see if there is such an effect. Two different restaurant settings are used. The first one is a fast-food restaurant, and the other is a medium priced restaurant where the customers give their orders to the waiter on their tables. In addition to seeing the possible differences of language use while ordering a meal in these two different restaurant contexts, it is assumed that the linguistic preferences might be different depending on the fact that the requester is alone or accompanied by some other people one of whom is older than the requester in both of the contexts.

To compare any differences in these contexts the same situation is given twice. In the first of these situations the requester is accompanied by a friend and friend's father, and in the second the requester is alone when making his order.

All 12 situations were created so that the respondents, all of whom were university students, might face a similar situation in real life. It is thought that if the situations are far from their real life or their imagination the results might be deceiving. As a result, the restaurants are either fast-food or medium-priced that the students can afford. The situations were presented in random order. To take any possible pressures off, the subjects were not given any time limit to complete the questionnaire.

Five requesters were used in the eight situations (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12). Four of these requesters were taken from Tanake and Kawade (1982). These are a distinguished professor (psychologically distant), a young sociable professor (psychologically close), a best friend (psychologically close), an old neighbor who is disliked by the requester (psychologically distant). The fifth requester, added to these four, is a neighbor whose age is close to that of the requester and have good relations with him/her (psychologically close) (see table 1 for situations).

Table 1. Situations and the weight of D, P, and R

		D	P	R
Sit.1	the requester asks for a book from a distinguished professor that s/he is going to use for one of her/his projects.	High	High	Low
Sit.2	the requester asks for money from her/his best friend.	Equal	Equal	High
Sit.3	requester is invited to a medium-priced restaurant by his friend and friend's father, where he orders her/his meal.	Restaurant		
Sit.4	the requester asks his older neighbor, that s/he doesn't like much, to keep the peace at home, since his children are making a lot of noise.	High	High	High
Sit.5	the requester asks her/his young sociable professor to buy a party ticket.	High	High	High
Sit.6	the requester, his friend and friend's father are at a fast-food restaurant, and s/he is going to order her/his meal.	Restaurant		
Sit.7	the requester asks his best friend's lesson notes a week prior to their exam.	Equal	Equal	Low
Sit.8	the requester needs to ask for the distinguished professor's handouts that s/he distributed in class when the requester was not at school.	High	High	High
Sit.9	the requester is at Burger King alone, and is going to order her/his meal.	Restaurant		
Sit.10	the requester asks for the help of a young sociable professor to write her/his paper.	High	High	High
Sit.11	the requester is in a medium-priced restaurant alone, and he is going to order her/his meal.	Restaurant		
Sit.12	the requester asks for a piece of bread from a neighbor who s/he likes and who is around the same age.	Equal	Equal	Low

Data analysis

The analyses of the results are made in two groups. The first group of analysis includes situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12. The second group of analysis concerns restaurant situations (3, 6, 9, and 11) to see the effect(s) of contextual factors. Seven categories were determined when making the analysis (see table 2).

Table 2. Categories used in the analysis

Categories	
Category 1	pronoun choice
Category 2	modal verb choice in the first group and modalised and non-modalised verb choice in restaurant contexts
Category 3	Use of hints (as this is an off-record strategy it is not used in restaurant contexts, instead an additional category named "changing the turn" appeared in the restaurant context)
Category 4	Giving reasons
Category 5	Use of "please" (to identify the possible transfer of native conventions to foreign language)
Category 6	Use of imperatives (a bald-on-record strategy)
Category 7	the use of "apology", as a "negative politeness" strategy

The restaurant contexts will be analyzed among themselves separate from the other eight situations due to their different purpose.

Results

Written and Oral Responses for Situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12

Category 1 (pronoun choice)

When the written responses to situations 1 and 8 with the distinguished professor are analyzed (table 1), an increase in the use of the pronoun “You” in the 8th situation, which might be a result of higher rank of imposition can be identified (Table 1). In this situation, P and D is high thus, higher use of the pronoun “I” might be expected to reduce the FTA, because by using the pronoun *I* the requester takes the responsibility of action and thus reduces the amount of Face Threat on the hearer.

The interview answers for the 1st situation do not show a change, but for situation 8 a decrease in the use of pronoun “I” can be seen (Table 2). This result may indicate that in spoken form respondents are less careful to the FTA and use less polite forms. This may be due to the limited time that respondents have to think and to respond. Moreover, the result might be an indication of the fact that trainees’ pragmatic knowledge is not internalized.

Table 3. Written Responses to situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12

Category		Sit. 1	Sit. 2	Sit. 4	Sit. 5	Sit. 7	Sit. 8	Sit. 10	Sit. 12
Pron. Choice	<i>I</i>	50%	10%		3%	67%	62.5%	2%	19%
	<i>You</i>	50%	90%	100%	97%	33%	37.5%	98%	81%
Modal Choice	<i>Could</i>	40%	26%	39%	7%	10%	27%	56%	22%
	<i>Would</i>	31%		11%	50%	9%	27%	16%	9%
	<i>Can</i>		59%	32%		52%		16%	36%
	<i>May</i>	12%				15%	25%		
	<i>Others</i>	5%			5%		11%		7%
	<i>Other Structures</i>	12%	15%	18%	38% ¹	14%	10%	12%	26%
Hinting		-	2%	-	14%	-	-	5%	-
Giving Reasons		36%	29%	63%	21%	16%	41%	17%	37%
Using Pls. (Total)		22%	9%	40% ²	3%	9%	16%	23%	14%
	<i>Beginning</i>	46%	2%	21%	1.5%	2%	5%	7%	2%
	<i>End</i>	54%	7%	19%	1.5%	7%	11%	16%	12%
Imperatives		-	3%	14%	2%	3%	-	-	-
Apology		10%	-	18%	2%	-	34%	5%	35%

¹ In situation 5 category 2, 28% of other structures are formed by using “do”

² In situation 4 in two instances please is used both at the beginning and at the end of the same sentence. For ex: Could you please be more silent please. The percentage of such sentences among all answers is 4%.

The results from the 2nd and 7th situations (with the best friend) are conflicting. Although R is higher in situation 2, since they are asking for some money, the majority of the respondents used the pronoun “You” and increased the FTA. Whereas, in situation 7, although R is low, since the majority used the pronoun “I”, which indicates lack of pragmatic awareness.

The interview answers (table 2) are similar to the written answers, which supports the claim that the respondents are not fully aware about the ways of reducing FTA, which signals limited pragmatic awareness.

When we look at situations 4 and 12 with the neighbors, we see that in situation 4 with the “not-liked” neighbor, all respondents preferred using the pronoun “you” and increased the FTA, though the R is high. Tanaka and Kawade’s (1982) DP hypothesis argues that if the relationship is psychologically and socially close less polite strategies are used. Yet, here the H is not liked by the S, thus s/he is psychologically distant. Moreover, s/he is older than the S, which creates a social distance. Therefore, it would be expected that the S use more polite strategies and reduce FTA. In this situation DP hypothesis is not proved. Contrastingly, in situation 12, although R is still high, S is socially and psychologically close to the H, which might be an explanation to use the pronoun “I” more than the pronoun “you”. In this situation DP hypothesis is proved. However, the conflicting results between the two situations once again indicate limited pragmatic awareness.

The interview answers are also very similar to the written responses. Thus, absence of pragmatic awareness can be observed in both data. Although R is different in situations 5 and 10 with the young sociable professor the S is psychologically close to the H. As the relationship between S and H is big one might expect to see the use of more polite strategies as the DP hypothesis suggests. Yet, psychological closeness of the S to the H might reinforce the use of less polite strategies and increase the use of pronoun “I”. Further, DP hypothesis argues that psychological variables are more important than social variables. There is a similarity between situation 10 and 5 although the R in this situation is low. DP hypothesis is proved in this situation. Due to psychological closeness respondents did not reduce the FTA. The results indicate the importance of psychological variables.

Table 4. Oral responses to situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12

Category		Sit. 1	Sit. 2	Sit. 4	Sit. 5	Sit. 7	Sit. 8	Sit. 10	Sit. 12
Pronoun	<u>I</u>	50%	30%	-		60%	30%	-	10%
Choice	<i>You</i>	50%	70%	100%	90%	40%	70%	100%	90%
	<i>We</i>				10%				
Modal V. Choice	<i>Could</i>	10%	10%		10%	10%	10%	20%	-
	<i>Would</i>	40%	20%	50%	70%	-	40%	50%	-
	<i>Can</i>	20%	70%	40%	-	60%	20%	30%	80%
	<i>May</i>	30%	-	-	-	10%	20%	-	-
	<i>Others</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Other Structures</i>	-		10%	20%	20%	10%	-	20%
Hinting		-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-
Giving Reasons		60%	70%	70%	30%	60%	70%	50%	70%
Using Pls. (Total)		-	20%	60%	-	10%	20%	30%	40%
	<i>Beginning</i>	-	-	40%	-	-	20%	30%	10%
	<i>End</i>	-	20%	20%	-	10%	-	-	30%
Imperative		-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	10%
Apology		40%	10%	20%	10%	10%	40%	10%	60%

Category 2 (modal verb choice)

When the modal verb choice in situation 1 and 8 in written responses are compared, it is seen that in the first situation, although R is lower than the eighth situation, more people used (71%) polite forms (in situation 8 it is 54%). In both situations the use of more polite forms indicates that the most of the respondents are aware of being polite when power and distance are high and the H is psychologically and socially distant. Thus, the DP hypothesis is proved in this situation.

According to the interview results the use of more polite forms decreases in both situations (50% in situation 1 and 20% in situation 8) probably due to the fact that the respondents had less time to think about. However, when we compare both situations more people used more polite forms in situation 1 where the rank is low.

In situations 2 and 7 little more than half of the respondents (59% and 52%) preferred a less formal modal “can” in their requests, because P and D are equal and the S is psychologically and socially close to the H. The interview results indicate an increase in the use of “can” (70% in situation 2 and 60% in situation 7).

In situations 4 and 12, with the neighbors, 50% used more polite forms with the “not-liked neighbor and only 31% used such forms with the liked neighbor. DP hypothesis is proved in these situations and category because as the relationship of the S and H gets bigger the tendency to use more polite strategies is increased as in the modal verb choice category. The

interview results indicate an increase in the use of “can” in situation 12, which might be due to social and psychological closeness.

As in category 1 in situation 5 fewer people (57%) used more polite forms although R is higher than situation 10. In situation 10, 72% preferred more polite forms.

In the interview, though 70% of the respondents used more polite forms in situation 5, which indicates an increase 40% chose such forms for situation 10 as well. This indicates a conflict between written and oral answers, which might be due to limited pragmatic awareness.

Category 3 (hinting)

Hinting, which is an off-record strategy is rarely used in these situations. In written responses it was seen in situation 2 (best friend money), 5 (young professor, ticket) and 10 (young professor-help for a paper). During the interview hinting is used only in situation 5 by 10% of the respondents.

Using hinting in requests indicates a high mastery of a language. As native speakers we often use hinting in our conversations and requests. Limited use of this strategy is also an indicator of limited or lack of awareness about native conventions.

Category 4 (giving reason)

In all situations more people gave reasons if R is high, except in situation 4 with the ‘not liked neighbor’. R is high in both situations (4 and 12) concerning the neighbor, yet more reasons are given in situation 4 where the S has negative feelings towards the H. When we compare the written responses with the interview results it is observed that there is an increase in giving reasons when making a request in the oral responses.

Category 5 (using “please”)

Both in written and oral groups “please” was mostly used in situation 4, when requesters asked their older neighbor to keep the peace at home. The use of “please” in all situations in both groups is very small. This might be because in requests “please” is an optional element (White, 1993). However, when it is used it is placed correctly either at the end of the sentence or just before the verb in most of the situations.

Category 6 (imperatives)

Imperative use is another least used category among both groups. This is because in none of the eight situations the requester’s P is higher than the requestee. According to Garcia (1993), imperatives are most likely to be used by those speakers whose power is higher than the hearer and when the social distance between the speaker and the hearer is small. Although the distance between the speaker and the hearer varied in these eight situations, speaker’s power was never higher than the hearer.

Category 7 (apology)

In both groups the highest percentage of apology use is seen in situation 12, when the requester asked for a piece of bread at 10.00 p.m. from their neighbor, who they like and who is close to their age. Second, they used it in situation 8, when they asked for the handouts from a distant professor. This result is contrary to our expectations that apology is used when P, D and R are high. However, in situation 12, D and P are equal, but R is high, because the request is made at 10.00 p.m. It can be suggested that time is an important factor to use apology when making requests.

Written and Oral Responses for Situations 3, 6, 9, and 11(The restaurant contexts)

In both groups, in all situations (3, 6, 9, and 11) “I” was the most preferred pronoun (Table 3 written group, Table 4 oral group). “You” and “We” came afterwards; “We” being the least used one. The appearance of “We” is due to the fact that some respondents did not use the interrogative form and preferred saying: “We’d like ...”.

Table 5. Written responses to situations 3, 6, 9, and 11 (the restaurant contexts)

Category		Situation 3	Situation 6	Situation 9	Situation 11
Pronoun	<i>I</i>	74%	77%	84%	90%
	<i>You</i>	24%	15%	13%	10%
	<i>We</i>	2%	8%	3%	-
	<i>'d like</i>	21%	13%	17%	13%
	<i>Want</i>	15%	11%	30%	44%
	<i>Bring</i>		8%		
	<i>Can</i>	29%	44%	17%	23%
	<i>Could</i>	10%	8%	10%	
	<i>May</i>	10%	8%	13%	
	<i>Other</i>	2%	-	-	12%
	Modals	<i>Other verbs</i>	13%	13%	13%
Give Reasons		2%	-	-	-
Using please		37%	52%	61%	43%
Total	<i>Beginning</i>	2%	4%	1%	-
	<i>End</i>	35%	48%	60%	43%
Imperative		19%	23%	51%	34%
Apology		-	-	-	2%
Changing the turn		9%	-	-	-

In the oral group in three out of four situations (6, 9, and 11) respondents used the verb *want* more than the others. The written group used “*want*” most in situations 9 and 11. “*'d like*” was the second most used form (3, 6, and 9) among the written group, whereas, “*Can*” was the second most preferred modal (6, 9, and 11) in the oral group. When the modal verb choice of the respondents are compared, it is seen that there is a tendency to use more polite forms such as “*'d like, could, can and may*” instead of giving directives such as “*Bring me a, or I want a*” in situations with a friend and friend’s father. This indicates that being alone or being with somebody, especially someone who is older than you, plays a role in being more polite in one’s requests.

Nobody in the oral group gave a reason when they ordered their meal. Similarly, in the written group only 2% gave a reason in situation 3. This is because when ordering a meal people usually do not discuss or explain why they preferred what they are going to eat with the waiter.

Table 6. Oral responses to situations 3, 6, 9, and 11

Category		Situation 3	Situation 6 ³	Situation 9 ⁴	Situation 11
Pronoun	<i>I</i>	60%	89%	90%	90%
	<i>You</i>	20%	-	-	10%
	<i>We</i>	20%	11% ⁵	-	-
Modalised/ Non- Modalised Verbs	<i>'d like</i>	30%	11%	22%	20%
	<i>Want</i>	10%	33%	33%	50%
	<i>Bring</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>Can</i>	30%	22%	22%	20%
	<i>Could</i>	-	11%	11%	-
	<i>May</i>	20%	-	-	-
	<i>Other</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>Modals</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>Other verbs</i>	10%	22%	11%	10%
Give Reasons Using please Total		-	-	-	-
		20%	20%	40%	30%
Imperative	<i>Beginning</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>End</i>	20%	20%	40%	30%
Apology		-	10%	10%	-
Changing the turn		-	-	-	-

“Please” was mostly used in situation 9 by the written (61%) and oral (40%) groups. They were used after meal names, such as “A hamburger and a coke, please”. It was least used in situation 3, by both groups, where they were in a medium-priced restaurant with their friend and friend’s father. This is because unlike situation 9 they used sentences.

Imperatives are mostly used by the written group specifically in situation 9, where the S is at a fast food restaurant alone. Only 10% of the oral group used imperatives and each time at the fast food context.

Apology is almost never used at the restaurant contexts, except in situation 11 (2%). This is an expected result since apologizing is not something common when ordering a meal.

Turn changing is only seen in situation 3 in the written group. Only 9% of the participants gave their turn to the person accompanying them. This behavior seems pretty cultural, because, when one is invited to a dinner, it is considered a polite behavior if s/he orders after

³ In this situation 9 out of 10 respondents used either a modalised or a non-modalised verb. One person did not use a verb (a hamburger and a coke please).

⁴ As in situation 6 one of the respondents ordered the meal without using a pronoun or a verb.

⁵ One of the respondents did not use any pronoun and preferred saying a hamburger and a coke please.

the host or asks the host to advise or choose the meal for him/her. Therefore, this category is seen only in situation 3. Nobody in the oral group used this strategy.

Discussion

In this part it is aimed to discuss the research results within the scope of the research questions. The results in general indicate that the majority of the trainees used certain modals such as would, could, can, and may in their requests and written and oral answers show similarities. This is because most of them learned such structures from the textbooks to use in various situations that range from more polite to less polite. However, although these forms were used appropriately (research question 1) (more polite forms are used with people who are socially and psychologically distant and whose power is higher than the speaker), they are very restricted and are not always what native speakers choose to use when making their requests (research questions 2 and 3). Often a variety is seen in native speaker conversations. The small use of the hinting strategy is a good example to this. Native speakers of all languages use hinting often in their requests. Although the aim is not to blame any teacher or textbook, it is clear that, in order to raise pragmatic awareness, native conventions need to be taught and exemplified in the classroom. Considering the fact that the participants of the current research are trained to become English Language teachers, a part of their education needs to involve a wide variety of native speaker conventions. Moreover, such information should be presented in a way that students can use it meaningfully and automatically in communicative contexts. The results of the research indicate that the participants are mostly bound to the textbook language and they are mostly rule oriented.

Early in the paper, Tanaka and Kawade's (1982) DP hypothesis was mentioned. The current study does not aim to test this hypothesis. However, the results reveal that except for situation 4 (with the "not-liked neighbor"), when the relationship between H and S is socially and psychologically distant the S will use more polite strategies. In that specific situation negative attitude and feelings towards the hearer did not cause the S to use more polite strategies. All of the respondents increased the FTA by using the pronoun "You" and only half of the respondents (50%) preferred using would or could in their requests. The rest used less polite forms and a few even used directives. This might be due to a limited pragmatic knowledge or it might be because negative feelings have a stronger effect on politeness strategies for this specific group.

Moreover, "*please*" was rarely used in the requests which might be because it is considered as an optional element. It was mostly used in restaurant contexts. Although it was not used frequently, the majority of the participants used "*please*" in an appropriate location; either at the end of the sentence or before the verb. Except from a few instances, transfer from the native language is not seen in the use of "*please*". We can say that these subjects are aware of the correct use of this word.

In addition, the results indicate that the majority of the participants are not aware of the FTA of using the pronoun "*You*" instead of "*I*". In most of the situations "*You*" is used more often than "*I*". Hence, trainees need to be made aware about the FTA of pronouns (research question 3).

When we look at the restaurant contexts, we see that, as expected, when the context is less formal, like a fast-food restaurant, and when the requester is alone in that context, less polite forms are used by the participants. In such contexts "can", "would like" and "want" are the

most used forms when talking to the waiter to order a meal. “Bring, have, and take” were rarely used.

In the restaurant contexts, turn changing category is worth mentioning. This category is seen only in situation 3, where the requester is invited to a dinner at a medium-priced restaurant by her/his friend and friend’s father. A small percentage of the respondents (9 %) gave their turn to their host.

For example:

“I’ll have what my friend orders”,

Turning to her/his friend and asking “What would you like to eat?”

It is thought that this is a cultural behavior. It is considered polite when guests order after the host in the Turkish culture. The present research did not aim at investigating and L1 or native language culture transfer. However, the results indicated that a small number of these respondents transferred their native language behavior to foreign language use. Thus, further research is necessary to identify any L1 and cultural behavior transfer when investigating the use of pragmatic features.

The results of the study showed that the pragmatic awareness, or lack of it, is very much affected by the textbooks used and by the classroom practices. As the need for communication increased with the mobility of the people, effective language teaching and appropriate use of the foreign languages gain importance to develop linguistic competence. The limited pragmatic awareness of the ELT teacher trainees indicates the necessity of explicit teaching of the native-like conventions.

Conclusion

With the growing demand to communicate in a foreign language, both the teacher education and language teaching processes require specific attention not only to form and meaning but also to the pragmatic features of a language as pragmatic competence is one of the most important components of communicative competence. In an EFL context such pragmatic awareness and knowledge could be developed by the help of the teacher and the textbook. However, it is argued by Vellenga (2004) that the presentation of speech acts in textbooks are pragmatically unsatisfactory, they are not supported well with contextual information, nor they are given explicit metapragmatic discussion. Similarly, Kasper (1990) blames textbooks as one of the factors for learners’ ineffective pragmatic strategy use.

By looking at the results it can be said that it is necessary to help language learners in general, and language teachers and trainees, in specific, develop pragmatic awareness with the explicit but contextual and meaningful teaching of daily speech conventions. In addition, it is vital that the textbooks and the teachers involve such type of input in the classroom. Grammar-based teaching needs to be replaced with communicative approaches to meet the needs of the learners for learning a foreign language. During the teacher training process, trainees’ should be provided with extensive pragmatic knowledge and be guided to develop theirs.

The results of the study emphasize the need for explicit teaching of pragmatic features. Language learners should be given opportunities to be exposed to native-like conventions through the use of authentic materials, audio-visual aids, teacher talk and the textbook. To increase such exposure, teacher training needs to involve explicit teaching of pragmatics to increase awareness. In addition, textbooks need to carry out pragmatic features and classroom methodologies to provide realistic, purposeful, and meaningful language practices.

References

- Alagözlü, N. and Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2009). Aural pragmatic comprehension. *Novitas-Royal*, 3(2), 83-92.
- Arıkan, A. (2007). Pragmatic problems in elementary level ELT coursebooks: Focus on dialogues. Proceedings from the 11th IADA Conference on 'Dialogue Analysis and Rhetoric'. University of Münster, March 26-30, 2007.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B.S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan M.J., & Reynolds D.W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversations. *ELT Journal*, 45, 4-15.
- Bardovi-Harlig (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49, 677-714.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K.R. Rose, G. Kasper, (Eds) *Pragmatic in Language Teaching* (13-32). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Berry, R. (2000). "You-ser" friendly metalanguage: What effect does it have on learners of English? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 38, 195-211.
- Boxer, D., Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49, 44-58.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. (1998). Teaching speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 102-123.
- Carrell, P. L. and Konneker, B. H. (1981). Politeness: Comparing native and nonnative judgments. *Language Learning*, 31, 17-30.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., and Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 5-35.
- Chen, R. (1993). Responding to compliments: A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20, 49-75.
- Cook, M. & Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). The development of comprehension in interlanguage pragmatics: The case of request strategies in English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25(1), 19-40.
- Ellis, R. (1994). Pragmatic aspects of learner language. In, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59, 199-208.
- Garcia, C. (1993). Making a request and responding to it: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 127-152.
- Ho, D. G. E. (2009). Exponents of politeness in Brunei English. *World Englishes*, 28, 35-51.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.
- Karatepe, Ç. (2001). Pragmalinguistic awareness in EFL teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 2&3, 178-188.
- Karatepe, Ç. (1998). Teaching pragmalinguistics in teacher training programs. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 193-218.

- Kasper, G. and Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Mahwah, NJ: Blackwell.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2010). The pragmatic knowledge of Turkish EFL students in using certain request strategies. *Gaziantep sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9, 185-201.
- 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.
- Le Pair, R. (1996). Spanish request strategies: A cross-cultural analysis from an intercultural perspective. *Language Sciences*, 18, 3-4, 651-670.
- Meier, A. J. (1995). Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24, 381-392
- Pinto, D. (2005). The acquisition of requests by second language learners of Spanish. *Spanish in Context*, 2, 1-27.
- Suh, J. S. (1999). Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 37, 195-213.
- Tanaka, S. and Kawade, S. (1982). Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 52-63.
- Uso-Juan, E. (2007). *The presentation and practice of the communicative act of requesting in textbooks: Focusing on modifiers*. In Soler, E. A. and Jorda, M. P. S. (Eds.) *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Netherlands: Springer.
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8(2). Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org>
- White, R. (1993). Saying please: Pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction. *ELT Journal*, 47(3), 193-202.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2004). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Situation 1:

One of your teachers at school assigned you a research project from which you are going to receive a grade. To prepare the project you need a book and you have seen that particular book in the office of a distinguished professor. You want to borrow that book from that professor. How would you request it?

.....

.

Situation 2:

You have a new girlfriend/boyfriend. Tomorrow you are going on a date for the first time, however, you do not have enough money. You want to borrow some money from your best friend. How would you request it?

.....

.

Situation 3:

Your friend's father is in town to visit his son/daughter. He invited his son/daughter and you for a dinner. You are having dinner at 'Çiçek Izgara'. The waiter came and you are going to order your meal. How would you order?

.....

.

Situation 4:

You have an exam tomorrow morning. You are studying, but your neighbor's children are making a lot of noise upstairs. You want to ask your neighbor, who is older than you and whom you don't like much, to keep the peace at home. How would you ask him to be more silent?

.....

.

Situation 5:

You have an 'end of the year party'. You want to sell tickets to a young sociable professor. How would you ask him/her to buy some tickets?

.....

.

Situation 6:

You are at Burger King with your friend and his/her father. How would you order a whopper and a coke?

.....

.

Situation 7:

You have an exam next week. You want to start studying and you know that your best friend takes very good notes during classes. You are going to ask for her/his notes to photocopy. How would you request her/his notes?

.....
.
Situation 8:

You couldn't attend one of your distinguished professor's lessons yesterday, however, you want to go to his/her office and ask for the handouts that s/he distributed in class. How would you request them?

.....
.

Situation 9:

You are at Burger King. How would you order a whopper and a coke?

.....
.

Situation 10:

You are writing a paper for one of your lessons. However, you are stuck and you need some help. You want to ask for the help of a young sociable professor. How would you request his/her help?

.....
.

Situation 11:

You are at 'Çiçek Izgara', but this time you are alone. How would you order your meal?

.....
.

Situation 12:

You are studying, it's 10.00 p.m. and you are hungry. You have a neighbor next door who is close to your age and that you like. You know that s/he is still awake. You want to ask for a piece of bread. How would you request it?

.....