

148058

T. C.
ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI

**REQUESTS IN ENGLISH AND IN TURKISH IN THE
LANGUAGE OF TURKISH STUDENT TEACHERS:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

DANIŞMAN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çiğdem KARATEPE

Filiz KAL ÜNAL
BURSA 2004

TC.
ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

Filiz Kal Ünal'a ait "Türk öğretmen adayı öğrencilerinin Türkçe'de ve İngilizce'deki rica ifadelerinin karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi" adlı çalışma, jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı'nda 22/10/2004 tarihinde Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

İmza

Başkan

Yrd. Doç. Dr. İsmet Öztürk

İmza

Üye (Danışman)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çiğdem Karatepe

İmza

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şeref Kara

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to find out to what extent Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms in English and in Turkish by considering situational factors. In addition, it was aimed to investigate whether Turkish student teachers transfer Turkish request forms into English.

The data were gathered from 190 university students studying at Uludağ University in Bursa. They were all student teachers attending to English Language Teaching Department. 90 of them were first year and 100 of them were third year students.

The instruments used in collecting the data were discourse completion tests in both English and Turkish and interviews designed by taking into consideration the situational factors, namely power, social distance and size of imposition involved in the request.

The analysis revealed that the student teachers differ in their preferences for direct, conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect request strategies with respect to social factors. The findings showed evidence for both appropriate and inappropriate performance of requests in English and in Turkish. The data revealed that informants transferred some verb preferences, length of utterances, etc. from Turkish into English which may lead them to communicative failures.

CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION	1
---------------------------	----------

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1. Communicative Competence	4
2.1.1. Sociolinguistic Competence	5
2.1.2. Sociocultural Competence	6
2.1.3. Pragmatic Competence	9
2.2. Interlanguage and Communicative Competence	11
2.2.1. Politeness Theory	12
2.2.2. Speech Act Theory	14
2.2.3. Components of Speech Acts	17
2.2.4. Appropriateness and Learner Language	18
2.2.5. Requests	20
2.2.5.1. The Linguistic Structure of Requests	20
2.2.5.2. Level of Directness	22
2.2.5.3. Factors Affecting Indirectness	23
2.2.5.3.1. Power	23
2.2.5.3.2. Social Distance	24
2.2.5.3.3. Size of Imposition	24
2.2.6. Transfer from Turkish into English	25
2.2.7. Research Questions	27

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY	29
--------------------------	-----------

3.1. Informants	29
3.2. Materials	29
3.2.1. Discourse Completion Test (English Version)	29
3.2.2. Discourse Completion Test (Turkish Version)	31
3.2.3. The Interview Protocol	31
3.3. Piloting the Data Collection Tools	32
3.3.1. Piloting the Discourse Completion Test (English Version)	32
3.3.2. Piloting the Discourse Completion Test (Turkish Version)	32
3.3.3. Piloting the Interview	32
3.4. Procedures	32
Data Collection	32
3.5. Data Analysis	33
CHAPTER 4	
RESULTS	37
4.1. Power	37
4.1.1. Speaker Power Over Hearer (+P)	37
4.1.2. Speaker Power Equal to Hearer (=P)	41
4.1.3. Hearer Power Over the Speaker (-P)	44
4.2. Social Distance	46
4.2.1. Distant Interlocutors (+SD)	46
4.2.2. Intimate Interlocutors (-SD)	50
4.3. Size of Imposition	53
4.3.1. Big Size of Imposition (+SI)	53
4.3.2. Small Size of Imposition (-SI)	57
4.4. Interview	58
CHAPTER 5	
DISCUSSION	60
5.1. Power	60
5.2. Social Distance	66

5.3. Size of Imposition	69
5.4. Transfer	73
5.5. Interview	75
CHAPTER 6	
CONCLUSION	77
6.1. Summary and Conclusions	77
6.2. Suggestions for Further Research	79
6.3. Implications for Foreign Language Teaching	81
REFERENCES	83
APPENDICES	87
Appendix A: The English Version of the Discourse Completion Test	88
Appendix B: The Turkish Version of the Discourse Completion Test	92
Appendix C: The English Version of the Interview	95
Appendix D: The Turkish Version of the Interview	97
ÖZGEÇMİŞ	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. : Discourse Completion Test situations in relation to social factors

Table 3.2. : The distribution of situations according to social factors

Table 4.1. : The percentages for +P (Situation 4)

Table 4.2. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 4)

Table 4.3. : The percentages for =P (Situation 1)

Table 4.4. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 1)

Table 4.5. : The percentages for -P (Situation 6)

Table 4.6. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 6)

Table 4.7. : The percentages for +SD (Situation 2)

Table 4.8. : The percentages for +SD (Situation 9)

Table 4.9. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 2)

Table 4.10. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 9)

Table 4.11. : The percentages for -SD (Situation 7)

Table 4.12. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 7)

Table 4.13. : The percentages for +SI (Situation 3)

Table 4.14. : The percentages for +SI (Situation 8)

Table 4.15. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 3)

Table 4.16. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 8)

Table 4.17. : The percentages for -SI (Situation 5)

Table 4.18. : Numbers of main verbs (Situation 5)

ABBREVIATIONS

A	: Avoidance
CCSARP	: Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project
CEF	: Common European Framework
CI	: Conventionally Indirect
D	: Direct
DCT	: Discourse Completion Test
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ESL	: English as a Second Language
FL	: Foreign Language
FSA	: Face Saving Act
FTA	: Face Threatening Act
H	: Hearer
L1	: First Language
L2	: Second Language
NCI	: Non-conventionally Indirect
NNS	: Non-native Speaker
P	: Power
S	: Speaker
SD	: Social Distance
SI	: Size of Imposition

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is known that learning a language can sometimes be problematic. Even though all the forms and functions of the target language are gained by them, language learners experience the common problem of communication failure (Blum-Kulka 1991; Doğançay-Aktuna and Karımlı 1997; Harlow 1990; Thomas 1983). Similarly, in some situations, learners use their knowledge about language in interaction but may sometimes sound rude. This failure results from the lack of knowledge to evaluate several situational factors, such as the social norms of the target language, its culture, and the appropriateness of the conversational norms in the given situation all at once. Cohen (1996a) draws attention to this fact, "What adds to the complexity of selecting appropriate strategies is that (...) speech acts are conditioned by a host of social, cultural, situational, and personal factors." (p.255). Performing speech acts without taking into consideration the situational factors leads to misunderstandings and communication breakdowns which indicates the speakers' inability to produce appropriate speech.

In order to convey the intended meaning in speech act use successfully, learners need to develop 'communicative competence' in the target language. That is, language learners need to get the knowledge about the sociocultural expectations of the target language. Olshtain and Cohen (1989) reinforce this argument by saying that in order to acquire communicative competence in a second language, learners need to learn the rules of appropriateness, that is learning to 'use' the language in an acceptable manner. (p. 53). Without such awareness, there is always the possibility of being misunderstood or even causing offence to the interlocutors.

This possibility shows itself better in the production of speech acts in the English language. While performing the speech acts, even very advanced second language learners face with several difficulties which stem from their lack of knowledge in applying the appropriate linguistic forms to the appropriate contexts. Blum-Kulka

(1991) further explains several important factors to be considered such as the 'degree of imposition involved', the 'power relations' and the 'social distance' between the speaker and the hearer in the production of polite forms in L2 (Thomas 1994 cf. Brown and Levinson 1987). Each of these components plays a crucial role in conveying the intended meaning to the addressee.

In addition, the differences between the L1 culture and the target language culture may create problems in the performance of speech acts. Since the sociopragmatic norms and expectations differ from each other considerably in different cultures and the learners would probably not acquire this knowledge on their own, the teaching of these norms and expectations are said to be crucial by several writers such as Cohen (1996b), Cohen and Olshtain (1993), Blum-Kulka (1991), Koike (1989), etc. Cohen (1996b) gives an example where a student is invited to dinner by his/her professor and cannot accept it. He says that declining the invitation may be socioculturally appropriate; however, such a reply as "No way!" (p. 388) would be inappropriate. This example puts light on the importance of being aware of the expectations of the target language culture. For this reason, learners need to be aware of the differences between the social expectations and norms of the new learned language. As Ellis (1994) indicates this awareness may prevent them both from the transfer of social norms from their mother tongue and transliterate linguistic forms to express.

In this study, the terms 'sociolinguistic, sociocultural and pragmatic competences' which play important roles in the conveyance of speech acts are defined and explained.

The present study puts emphasis on the production of one particular speech act which is requests by Turkish EFL student teachers. The aim of the study is to find out whether Turkish learners of English successfully make requests considering the three factors mentioned above: the power relations, the social distance and the degree of imposition involved. Moreover, the effect of transfer, either positive or negative, from Turkish into English is aimed to be investigated. The results gained out of the study is thought to help student teachers, who were the informants of the present study, to be aware of the importance of these factors in the acquisition of English language, which will lead to better coping with the problems they encounter in their future teaching life.

The study provides useful information to the course book writers and material designers. In addition, it puts emphasis on the need of making a revision in English language teaching departments.

The study consists of six chapters. The first chapter briefly introduces the study to the reader.

In the second chapter, the relevant literature review is presented. First of all, the communicative, sociolinguistic, sociocultural and pragmatic competences are mentioned about in order to form a background information about their role in foreign/second language acquisition. In addition, such topics such as the Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson 1987), the Speech Act Theory (Austin 1962; Searle 1975) and also components of speech acts and appropriateness of learners' forms in the performance of speech acts are presented. They are followed by detailed explanations of requests which are the main focus of the study. Since three social variables that are power, social distance and size of imposition play a crucial role for the analysis of the collected data; an overview of them is presented in the same chapter. The role of transfer from one language into the newly learned one is briefly presented. This chapter is concluded with the research questions of the present study.

The third chapter involves the methodology of the study which includes information about subjects, materials, piloting, procedures for data collection and their analysis.

The following chapter includes the results of the collected data. The percentages for request strategies and main verb preferences are counted to find answers to the research questions.

Chapter five is consisted of the discussions of information gathered from the collected data. Each research question is discussed individually to find out answers according to the findings of the study.

The last chapter includes a brief summary and conclusions of the study which are followed by suggestions for further research and implications of results for foreign language teaching.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section is related to communicative competence. In the sub-sections, its components are explained such as the sociolinguistic, sociocultural and pragmatic competence. The second section is related to speech acts and the learner language. This section consists of six sub-sections. In the first sub-section, politeness theory and the face concept are explained. The second one is about the speech act theory. In the third sub-section, the components of speech acts are explained briefly. The fourth one is about the appropriateness of requests in learner language. The pragmatic failure, its possible causes and also its effects on the target language production are explained. The following sub-section deals with the specific speech act, requests. Finally, the transfer from the learner's first language (L1) to the foreign language (FL) is explained briefly.

2.1. Communicative Competence

Even though the learners may know well all the grammatical rules of the target language, they may not be successfully performing the speech acts and thus not communicating effectively. In the literature, several writers (Blum-Kulka 1991; Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Cohen 1996b; Ellis 1992; Koike 1989) put emphasis on this point. Blum-Kulka (1991) remarks that even advanced learners may produce speech acts that cannot convey the appropriate politeness degree and intended illocutionary force. This is a crucial problem for ESL (English as a second language) or EFL (English as a foreign language) learners. It may be resulting from the lack of information about the sociopragmatic or sociocultural values of the new learned language which causes the occurrence of communicative failure.

In some situations, the speakers employ conversational norms which are perfectly acceptable in their first language; however, this may not bring the same effective results as in the target language. Communicative competence is an umbrella term which covers many subcategories of competences in learning a language. Linguistic competence,

strategic competence, sociolinguistic competence, sociocultural competence, pragmatic competence, etc. are all explained under this term. Communicative competence refers to the learner's full ability to use a language.

Olshtain and Cohen explain how to acquire communicative competence as follows:

“One of the most important tasks in acquiring communicative competence in a second language is learning the rules of appropriateness or, in other words, learning to ‘use’ the language in an acceptable manner.” (Olshtain and Cohen 1989: 53).

The writers indicate that research on speech acts may provide insights to the types of second language rules which learners need to learn together with the grammatical competence so that they can ensure that they convey the meaning they intend to express. The writers also indicate that cross-cultural comparative studies have proved that rules for appropriateness can vary from one culture to another. There is not a single rule which is valid for all languages. For that reason, in order to be successful communicators in the second or foreign language, learners should develop communicative competence. Olshtain and Cohen (1989) explain communicative competence as the necessary knowledge and experience about how to use sociocultural rules of the target language. In addition, Harlow (1990) indicates that communicative competence implies that a speaker must possess several types of knowledge in order to interpret the intended meaning and communicate effectively in the target language.

2.1.1. Sociolinguistic competence

Sociolinguistic competence is an important component of communicative competence. Koester (2002) points out that sociolinguistic knowledge is needed in order to determine whether an act is appropriate in a particular situation. It requires some strategies while nonnative speakers (NNSs) of English perform speech acts. Cohen (1996a) and Trosborg (1987) indicate that lack of sociolinguistic competence may cause problems for learners of a foreign language. Cohen (1996a) explains sociolinguistic forms which are about the language forms used to perform the speech act. He says:

“The speaker's sociolinguistic ability would consist of their control over the selection of these forms, which includes their control over the register of these forms, from most intimate to most formal. The language forms are the actual words or phrases selected in order to realize the speech act in the given sociocultural situation (...)” (Cohen 1996a: 255).

Even though their utterances are appropriate in terms of grammar knowledge and vocabulary choice, the learners can still sound rude. Their awareness of rules that are suitable for social interactions is needed together with the linguistic knowledge of the language so that they can convey their implied meanings correctly. Cohen (1996b) and Trosborg (1987) emphasize the importance of sociolinguistic ability which plays a crucial role in performing speech acts. They add that learners should have control over some points like the degree of formality of their utterance, the use of language forms to perform speech acts, etc.

In addition, Koike (1989) says that sociolinguistic competence is being aware of the use of appropriate rules in accordance with politeness in order to understand and perform speech acts. Koike (1989) explains sociolinguistic competence as follows:

“Sociolinguistic competence concerns the relationship between language functions, such as those embodied in speech acts, and the appropriateness of the grammatical forms for the particular context. The ‘pragmatic competence’ (...) is part of the sociolinguistic competence.” (p.280).

Again, Harlow (1990) indicates that sociolinguistic competence is something which shows that the learner of the language knows where and when to use various speech act strategies in the communication. Since the linguistic forms and the social contexts of a language are interdependent, this knowledge is crucial for learning and teaching a foreign language.

2.1.2. Sociocultural competence

Sociocultural competence is another component of communicative competence which again plays an important role in performing speech acts successfully. Learners need to consider this knowledge in order to be able to determine which act is appropriate in a given circumstance. Koester (2002) mentions that speech acts are taught in formulas in language classrooms. This situation causes problems since every formula may not be appropriate to various different situations. Furthermore, the writer points out that there are sociocultural differences between the cultures of the native and the target language which may lead to inappropriateness in communication.

Koike (1989) indicates that language learners are between the grammars of L1 (native language) and L2 (foreign/second language) from the early stages to the

advanced levels and they must pass through this 'between the languages process' to maintain fluency in the target language. In the process of interlanguage development, learners may make both linguistic and pragmatic errors resulting from the social, cultural, situational and personal factors. Koike (1989) cited from Selinker (1971) says that language learners generally use their L1 language systems to produce utterances that are close to the L2. This interlanguage development is called 'a developmental continuum'. In addition, learners are also involved in a rather complex production of speech acts. Cohen and Olshtain (1993) mention about the complexity of selecting appropriate strategies when conveying a message through speech acts. Similarly, they explain this complexity in relation to the social, cultural, situational and personal factors. They note that learners should be made aware of the sociocultural expectations of the target language.

Harlow (1990: 328) reinforces this idea: "Linguistic, social, and pragmatic knowledge must all be activated and work together in harmony for a speech act to be successful." She indicates that the social rules of the mother tongue are acquired very early in childhood together with the linguistic knowledge. However, the second language learner is faced with a more complex and difficult task than the first language learner in learning the social norms of the new learned language. This situation results from the differences across cultures and the fact that learning a language requires learning the sociolinguistic forms of the target language appropriately.

Blum-Kulka (1991) emphasizes this competence in terms of conveying requests. She notes that "(...) (social meaning) relates to the degree to which a given request is deemed socially appropriate by members of a given culture in a specific situation." (1991: 260). She adds that "(...) appraisals of appropriateness can be motivated by cultural belief systems in regard to valued face needs in interpersonal relations." (ibid.). Cohen (1996a) explains that findings of his study suggest that language learners may perform 'multilingual mental translations' in order to produce speech acts. That is, if a learner's native language is Italian and if he uses Spanish for his daily communication, while performing a speech act in English he first thinks the utterance in his native language (Italian) in order to make adjustments to the context (the degree of politeness

considering the social status and age of the interlocutor, the expectations of the culture, etc.). Afterwards, he says that the learner translates the utterance into Spanish and finally, produces what he feels appropriate for English. During this process, transfer of norms and language forms is unavoidable.

Simpson, who shares similar ideas about intercultural differences as Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) do, argues about the role of culture as follows:

“(...) different cultures attach different weights or degrees of importance to factors such as power differentials and distance versus familiarity. The resulting directness may ultimately influence a whole communicative style so that it reflects the cultural attitudes of a speech community.” (p. 233).

Cohen (1996a) also points out the fact that foreign language learners may be good at vocabulary and grammar of the target language; however, this does not mean that they will have a control over the pragmatic use such as seen in the production of speech acts. He indicates that just learning various forms of language use is not sufficient, but deciding on when to use and choose the appropriate form is equally crucial. He puts light on this by giving an example:

“For example, the learner has just finished a large meal at the home of Japanese hosts in Tokyo. What does the guest say in Japanese upon getting up from the table? Does the event call for a hearty thank you, an apology, or some combination of the two?” (Cohen 1996a: 253-254).

In a similar situation in the Turkish language, the guest is expected to use formulaic expressions in order to thank to the hosts such as *‘Ellerinize sağlık. Ziyade olsun.’*

In addition, Cohen (1996a) presents three types of language learners based on their styles in speech production. One of them that is ‘avoiders’ explained as the “learners who systematically avoid material because they do not know how to pronounce it, because they fear possible sociocultural repercussions, or for other reasons between those two extremes.” (p.261). This explanation also draws attention to the crucial role of social aspect of L2.

Under the light of all the explanations given above, it is now clear that sociocultural competence is one of the main sources to achieve a full ability of acquiring

communicative competence. Another crucial source which is pragmatic competence will be illustrated below.

2.1.3 Pragmatic competence

In the literature, many writers put emphasis on the importance of pragmatic ability in learning a new language (Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei 1998; Blum-Kulka 1991; Butler and Channel 1989; Doğançay-Aktuna and Kamışlı 1997; Ellis 1992; Harlow 1990; Kasper and Blum-Kulka 1993a; Koike 1989; Rose 2001; Simpson 1997; Thomas 1983).

Koike (1989) defines pragmatic competence as “(...) is the speaker’s knowledge and use of rules of appropriateness and politeness which dictate the way the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts” (p. 279). She adds that:

“The pragmatics of speech acts in the second language context involves issues of usage such as the appropriateness of the learner’s utterance for the situation and the degree of politeness as perceived according to the target culture.” (p. 279).

Blum-Kulka (1991) explains that learner’s ‘general pragmatic knowledge’ involves the ability to understand the intended meaning from indirect utterances and ‘realising speech acts in non-explicit ways.’ (p. 255). In addition, pragmalinguistic proficiency is said to have a crucial role in producing and interpreting speech acts in the target language. She indicates that “non-native like forms” may result in pragmatic failure.

Thomas (1983), on the other hand, defines pragmatic competence as “(...) the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context.” (p. 92). According to the writer, pragmatic failure results from the inability of the hearer to recognize the speaker’s intended meaning when a speaker considers that the hearer should recognize it. The writer states that grammatical errors may be annoying; however, the hearer becomes aware of them. On the other hand, she says that pragmatic failure is difficult to realize. Since the speaker may be grammatically competent, the hearer thinks that the speaker is impolite or rude when there occurs pragmatic failure. She says that “While grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a *person*.” (1983: 97). Thomas also mentions about two types of pragmatic

failure in her article. The first one is *pragmalinguistic failure* which is explained to occur:

“(...) when the pragmatic force mapped by S onto a given utterance is systematically different from the force most frequently assigned to it by native speakers of the target language or when speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from L1 to L2.” (p. 99).

The second one is called *sociopragmatic failure* which is used by the writer “to refer to the social conditions placed on language in use.” (ibid.). On the other hand, Ellis (1994) makes a brief explanation and says sociopragmatic failure refers to ‘appropriateness of meaning’ and pragmalinguistic failure refers to ‘appropriateness of form’ (p.165).

Harlow (1990) explains that if a learner has the sociopragmatic competence, he/she knows how to vary the speech act strategies according to the given situation and the social expectations of L2 culture. The writer adds that there is interdependence between the linguistic forms and the sociocultural context.

Butler and Channel (1989) categorize the pragmatic errors as rising from three causes in accordance with the results they gained out of their study on the conveyance of requests. “1. interference from L1 (either linguistic or cultural), 2. faulty application of L2 rules (=intralingual error), 3. other causes, eg. faulty teaching or exposure to other erroneous input.” (Butler and Channell 1989:12).

Doğançay-Aktuna and Kamışlı (1997) examine whether pragmatic transfer occurs in the interlanguage of advanced Turkish EFL learners. According to the results, they indicate that pragmatic awareness cannot develop on its own. They suggest that it should be raised in the classroom. They add that pragmatic component should be included in the curricula. They state that:

“Such curricula should aim at helping learners to understand pragmatics relatively. Aided by consciousness-raising about differences in the norms of speaking across L1 and the TL and strategy training stemming from empirical research, learners can be given the opportunity to learn subtle nuances of the TL and thus become more effective communicators.” (Doğançay-Aktuna and Kamışlı 1997: 170).

Karatepe (1998) states that, according to the findings of her study, student teachers of English those attending to education faculty could not acquire the pragmatic

competence in these institutes. She suggests that pragmatic competence and awareness raisings should be included in the curricula of foreign language teaching departments. The writer further indicates that even in these institutes it may not be easy to find qualified teaching staff in the field.

Ellis (1994) mentions about some important factors in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. The first one is related to the 'level of learners' linguistic competence' (p.187). Learners need to have the necessary linguistic competence to produce native-like discourse. The second one is about the transfer of rules from L1 to the target language. He indicates that learners sometimes do cultural transfer. However, the writer says before transferring complex L1 strategies, learners need to develop the necessary linguistic competence of the newly learned language. In the third place, he puts the status of the learner. He says that learner is generally in a lower status than the addressee since he/she is the 'learner'. He suggests learners to make use of opportunities with more equal status interlocutors such as other learners.

2.2. Interlanguage and Communicative Competence

In this section, six sub-sections will be explained in order to put some light to the use of speech acts by EFL/ESL learners and also mention about the nature of learner language briefly.

Learners are between the native and the new learned language during their learning process. Neither using L1 nor L2 norms and structures effectively is called as 'interlanguage process'. Koike (1989:280) defines interlanguage as follows:

"Interlanguage is the term given to an interim series of stages of language learning between the first (L1) and the second language (L2) grammars through which all L2 learners must pass on their way to attaining fluency in the target language."

It is also indicated by the writer that interlanguage is a kind of developmental continuum which covers all components of communicative competence. As learners' communicative competence develops, interlanguage will move onto a new stage on the continuum. However, the traditional EFL teaching methodologies do not seem to aim to develop all components of communicative competence. For instance, sociolinguistic,

sociocultural and pragmatic competences appear to be ignored both in the curriculum of mainstream education and in the teacher education programs (cf. Karatepe 1998).

Basically, developing communicative competence is understood as developing knowledge of grammar and vocabulary and developing reading skill. However, as Turkey is getting ready for the membership of the European Union, we should be preparing our young generations to communicate at international markets. Therefore, Turkish foreign language education programs should be revised to include sociolinguistic, sociocultural and pragmatic competences. Teachers and student teachers need to be trained to help their learners to develop such competences in addition to the other competences.

The European Council has already described a framework based, on which how all components of language should taught during compulsory education and afterwards in the member states. In this Common European Framework (CEF) for Languages, issues related to sociolinguistic, sociocultural and pragmatic competences are highlighted, and member states are recommended to train teachers in accordance with the CEF. This aims to foster intercultural relationship amongst the citizens of growing European Union. Developing intercultural communication between nation states has the prime importance in order to establish a strong economy based on continuing peace and intercultural understanding (Council of Europe 2000).

The process of revision and restructuring of the foreign language education programs should be informed by the theories of sociology and sociolinguistics, such as The Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson 1987), The Speech Act Theory (Austin 1962), and supported by the intercultural studies which have been carried out on language and communication (e.g. Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Thomas 1995).

2.2.1. Politeness theory

Politeness Theory was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). They base this theory on Goffman's 'face concept'. Thomas (1995) mentions about this concept. She indicates that it refers to reputation or good name. The most commonly used terms are said to be 'losing face' and 'saving face'.

Goffman (1967:5) defines face as:

“(...) the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself.” (cited in Thomas, 1995:168).

Thomas makes an explanation on the role of face during interaction, “Within politeness theory ‘face’ is best understood as every individual’s feeling of self-worth or self-image; this image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others.” (Thomas, 1995:169).

‘Positive face’ is defined by Thomas as one’s desire to be respected and liked by others. On the other hand, ‘negative face’ is said to refer to one’s desire ‘not to be impeded or put upon, to have the freedom to act as one chooses’. (p. 169). Based on the notion of negative face, negative politeness is defined as a face saving act which will show deference, involve an apology for the imposition and interruption and thus will indicate the importance of the addressee’s time and concerns (Yule 1996). Similarly, positive politeness emphasizes participants have agreed on issues included in interaction and thus have a common goal. Garcia (1993) reinforces this explanation and says that speakers have the need to be accepted, so they will attempt to maintain a positive face during their interaction; since speakers have the need to be respected by others they will try to maintain a negative face.

While maintaining their face, one participant can threaten the other’s face (Brown and Levinson 1987). These are called face-threatening acts (FTAs). Yule (1996) explains a FTA as follows; “If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self-image, it is described as a face threatening act.” (p. 61). A FTA usually calls for Face Saving Act (FSA) as; “Alternatively, given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another’s face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat. This is called a face saving act.” (Yule 1996: 61).

Thomas (1995) points out that the speaker may select some strategies in order to save one's face. She draws attention to the fact that the choice of strategy can be made according to the speaker's assessment about the size of the FTA. This assessment is said to be calculated considering the size of the FTA in accordance with the power, distance and rating of imposition.

In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that there are some situational factors affecting the conveyance of requests. These factors are explained as the power of the speaker over the hearer, the social distance between the interlocutors, and the size of imposition involved in the act. They will be explained in details in the following parts of the present chapter since they play an important role in this study.

The explanations given above put light on the great role that politeness plays in the production of appropriate utterances in a foreign language. Because of its importance, it should be paid attention during the teaching and the conveyance of meanings in L2.

2.2.2. Speech act theory

The Speech Act Theory was proposed by Austin (1962) and researched by many others (Clark and Lucy 1975; Cohen 1996b; Cohen and Olshtain 1993; Ellis 1994; Jae-Suk 1999; Koester 2002; Thomas 1995; Yule 1996).

Thomas (1995) indicates that Austin (1962) made a three type of categorization as follows:

- Locution the actual words uttered
- Illocution the force or intention behind the words
- Perlocution the effect of the illocution on the hearer (p. 49)

According to the theory, there are three types of speech acts. The first one is the *locutionary act* which is "the conveyance of propositional meaning" (Ellis 1994:160). The second one is the *illocutionary act* which refers to "the performance of a particular language function" (p. 160). The last type is the *perlocutionary act* defined as "the achieving of some kind of effect on the addressee" (p.160). The direct and indirect speech acts are explained by Ellis. When performing an indirect speech act "the illocutionary force of the act is not derivable from the surface structure, as when an

interrogative form serves as a request (for example, ‘Can you pass me the salt?’) (p. 160).

Thomas explains this by giving the following example:

Example 1

“It’s hot in here!” (Thomas 1995: 49)

In the locution meaning, the speaker indicates the temperature of the room. She says that this sentence may also mean:

“I want some fresh air!”

This is the illocution effect of the sentence. The speaker is making an indirect request and implying if someone can open the window. The writer adds that if somebody opens the window, this will be the perlocutionary effect of the utterance since it is the effect of the sentence on the hearer.

Under the heading of speech acts, Yule (1996) mentions about direct and indirect speech acts. Yule says that a ‘direct speech act’ is produced when there is ‘a direct relationship’ between the structure and the function of an utterance. If this relationship is indirect instead of being direct, then it is an ‘indirect speech act’. He indicates that the form of interrogative is one of the most common type of indirect speech act. However, that they are not used to ask a question.

In addition, Thomas (1995) explains Searle’s (1975) theory of indirect speech acts and points that an indirect speech act is defined as ‘one performed by means of another’ (p. 93). However, indirectness can be ‘costly and risky’. “It is ‘costly’ in the sense that an indirect utterance takes longer for the speaker to produce and longer for the hearer to process (...) It is ‘risky’ in the sense that the hearer may not understand what the speaker is getting at.” (p. 120). The example below explains a situation where the speaker avoids making a direct complaint and instead prefers an indirect suggestion:

Example 2

B (a non-native speaker of English) has been studying with A for several weeks. He has a passion for West Side Story and has just played the film's sound track right through for the second time in one evening:

A: "Would you like to listen to something else now?"

B: "No." (Thomas 1995:120)

Performing speech acts may be rather problematic for learners in that according to Cohen (1996b) it involves the sociocultural knowledge about when to perform a speech act and which one of them is appropriate in the given circumstance (see also Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). In addition, the learner needs to decide which linguistic forms to be used in accordance with the sociolinguistic knowledge of L2. Language learners may convey or respond a speech act as the same way they would in their culture and native language. In this way, they would produce utterances inappropriate for the target language and its cultural context.

Richards (1983) says that age, sex, familiarity, role of the addresser and the addressee are the factors to be considered in order to choose an appropriate strategy to perform a speech act. However, learners may not have an awareness about the effects of contextual factors on the choice of linguistic forms. Even if they have the awareness to some extent, they may not have the linguistic resources to do an appropriate form choice.

"Foreign language learners typically have less choice available to them for performing speech acts appropriately. They may use what they think of as a polite or formal style, for all situations, in which case they may be judged as being overformal, or they may create novel ways of coding particular speech acts, such as the use of *please+imperative* as a way of performing requests, regardless of who the speaker is talking to." (p. 248).

Clark and Lucy (1975) state that when uttering a sentence, people generally mean something different than what they say. There are two different meanings of a sentence, 'literal' and 'implied' meaning. They also add that the intelligent listener is the one who can understand the request uttered by the speaker whether it is implied or conveyed request. They say that a wife who says to her husband the following sentence does not

ask a question to be answered either by yes or no. She utters the sentence as a request to open the window.

Example 3

“Would you mind opening the window, dear?” (Clark and Lucy 1975: 56)

The writers indicate that during the interlanguage process, learners construct the literal meaning of an utterance, check its ‘plausibility’ and if they decide it is ‘implausible’ then, they apply another rule to derive the conveyed meaning.

Cohen (1996b) says that no matter what approach is used in the classroom, it is necessary to specify the situation when teaching speech acts. The social factors such as age, sex, social class, status of the participants, etc. should be drawn attention and situations should be matched to the social factors to produce appropriate speech acts. In other words, the delicate relationship between contextual factors and socially and culturally appropriate linguistic choice should be taken into consideration.

2.2.3. Components of speech acts

There are different types of speech acts widely used in interactions. Requests, refusals, apologies, compliments, complaints, etc. are only some of them. For all of the components, the appropriate conveyance of speech acts can be complex and problematic for language learners. Cohen and Olshtain (1993) mention about the complexity of selecting appropriate strategies when conveying a message through speech acts. They explain that the complexity which is in close relation with the social, cultural, situational and personal factors should be considered when conveying the message.

Blum-Kulka (1991) points out that this can be a problem for learners and remarks that even advanced learners may produce speech acts that cannot convey the appropriate politeness degree and intended illocutionary force. This has been empirically shown in the literature (Blum-Kulka et al 1989; Cohen 1996; Karatepe 2001; Trosborg 1987).

Problems do not only occur at production level but also at the level of processing the intended illocutionary force. When it is not understood properly by the learners, he/she may not be able to respond to it in an expected form of linguistic and non-

linguistic behaviour. Consequently, there may be communication problems resulting from the pragmatic failure such as communication breakdowns and communication conflicts.

2.2.4. Appropriateness and learner language

Making the socially and culturally appropriate linguistic choices can be a handicap for language learners. This can be partly blamed on the fact that interlocutors do not share a common linguistic or cultural background.

Karatepe (2003) points out Turkish EFL learners' inappropriate use of speech acts, particularly requests. She states that, in general, speech acts and modal verbs are taught without a context which prevents learners from considering the context of situation while performing them. Karatepe explains that both the knowledge about how to perform a request and the ability to use it appropriately in the context are needed to perform an appropriate request. She indicates that the effect of context on performing an act is crucial for learners. The writer adds:

“Learners may know explicit categories of pragmalinguistic features such as politeness markers; however, they may fail to use them appropriately as they have not yet developed an understanding of the relation between these forms and the context of situation” (2003: 148).

The writer points out that the kind of teaching where the learner is left alone to notice the relation between form and the context of situation will lead students to failure. Since learners invent their forms or transfer from their native language, they may have problems in communicating successfully. Karatepe (2003) indicates that, as Selinker explains, learners' “odd forms” may become fossilised.

When looked at the problem from a different perspective, it is seen that there are differences between EFL and ESL learners in the perception of seriousness of grammatical and pragmatic errors. Under the light of results gained out of their study, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) argue that there is an imbalance between the grammatical and pragmatic competencies of learners both EFL and ESL. The following explanation supports their argument:

“The results show that whereas EFL learners and their teachers consistently identified and ranked grammatical errors as more serious than pragmatic errors, ESL learners and their teachers showed the opposite pattern, ranking pragmatic errors as more serious than grammatical errors.” (Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei 1998:233).

EFL learners may have difficulties in performing appropriate speech acts because of the importance given to the teaching of grammar at the cost of sociocultural awareness in the classroom. Karatepe (2003) draws attention to the point that “Students can be helped to become aware of the issues related to the appropriate uses of indirect requests by focusing on the circumstances that require this kind of use in Turkish” (p.153). This will help them to better consider the distance between the participants, weight of imposition and power in the target language.

Raising awareness in especially EFL classrooms may be useful for learners. Another factor which is functional may be the explicit teaching of pragmatic aspects and expectations of L2.

“Whereas before instruction the nonnative speakers’ apologies differed noticeably from those of the native speakers, after this explicit, empirically based instruction advanced learners were somewhat more likely to select apology strategies similar to those that native speakers used in the given situation.” (Cohen 1996a: 262).

Furthermore, Cohen (1996b) indicates in order to produce contextually appropriate speech in the target language, the sociocultural context of the language should be considered. He mentions about the importance of making students aware of the “insights” that a foreign language learner would need to successfully perform speech acts. He adds that the learners would probably not acquire this knowledge on their own.

The writer suggests the following steps to teach speech acts. First of all, the teacher should make an assessment to find out the student’s level of awareness about speech acts. Second, he says students’ considerations about interlocutors in the dialogues should be discussed. The third step is the evaluation of a situation which is useful to reinforce learners’ awareness. The fourth step is about role-play activities. They are found suitable to practise speech acts. Lastly, giving feedback and discussing are explained to be useful activities. Students talk about their awareness of similarities and differences, their expectations and perceptions.

Since the present study is particularly interested in requests in learner language, requests among other speech acts will be highlighted in the rest of the literature review.

2.2.5. Requests

Speech acts have been investigated in terms of its linguistic structure and levels of directness and indirectness they can express. Requests are among the one of the most frequently researched particular speech acts in both the learner language and across different languages.

In this section, the linguistic structure of requests, levels of directness and factors affecting indirectness (power, social distance and size of imposition) will be explained in details. The focus of the present study is above mentioned factors that affect indirectness in informants' preferences of performing requests. In addition, the role that each factor plays on the appropriate conveyance and strategy selection in making requests is also researched.

Blum-Kulka (1991) indicates that requests are pre-event acts which are intended to affect the hearer's behaviour. Ellis defines requests as "attempts on the part of a speaker to get the hearer to perform or to stop performing some kind of action." (1994: 167).

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) mention about the interesting side of requests since they constitute FTAs and affect the participants' face wants in different ways. Requests are really crucial because of their wide use in interaction between people. Now, the structure of requests will be defined briefly.

2.2.5.1. The linguistic structure of requests

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) define the structure of requests in their Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). They give the following example and then explain the structure of requests:

Example 4

"Judith, I missed class yesterday, do you think I could borrow your notes? I promise to return them by tomorrow." (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989 : 17)

- a) **Alerters:** They function as ‘attention-getters’ in requests. All verbal means used for this purpose serve as alerters. ‘Title+surname / Surname only’ and semantic variations such as “darling, you fool” function as alerters. The alerter in the example above is the address term “Judith”.
- b) **Supportive moves:** When making a request, people may want to provide a reason for the disturbance. Requests are preceded by supportive moves which may be ‘checks on availability’ such as ‘Are you busy?’ and ‘attempts to get a precommitment’ as ‘Will you do me a favour?’. Requests may also be preceded or followed by ‘grounders’ that provide the reason for the request. In the example above “I missed the class yesterday...” serve as supportive move. In addition, promises and threats may function as supportive moves.
- c) **Head acts:** The head act of a request is the part of it which serve to realize it independent from other elements involved. They vary in two categories: strategy types and perspective.

This study does not aim to investigate all strategy types in details. The main categories will be dealt with. The three main levels of directness is said to be valid across several languages by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). They will be explained following this sub-section.

As for perspective, there are different ways of performing requests. They can be

- speaker oriented as in “Can I have it?” (1989: 19)
- hearer oriented as in “Can you do it?” (ibid.)
- inclusive as in “Can we start cleaning now?” (ibid.)
- impersonal as in “It needs to be cleaned.” (ibid.)

- d) **Internal modifications:** They are the elements existing in the request utterance which are not necessary for the request to be understood. They can be omitted from the utterance and the hearer can still understand what is meant. The words in brackets are internal modifications in the given example:

Example 5

“{Darling}, {if you are going in town tomorrow}, would you mind {awfully} cashing this cheque for me, {please}?” (Blum-Kulka 1989: 19)

2.2.5.2. Level of directness

The level of directness of a request can vary according to the contextual factors and components of politeness such as power, social distance and size of imposition. Directness has been described by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). As it can be understood from the examples, a request may be more or less direct.

- a) **Direct:** In direct strategies, the speaker expresses the requests directly. They may be mood-derivable, performative, and hedged performative. The examples are:

Example 6

“You shut up.”

“I am telling you to shut up.” (Ellis 1994: 168)

- b) **Conventionally indirect:** They are commonly used in interactions. They involve suggestory formulae and query preparatory where modals are used. In the first example sentence, the child suggests the other to play a game. In the second one, he/she invites the hearer to an interaction or perhaps a game.

Example 7

“Let’s play a game.”

“Can you draw a horse for me?” (ibid.)

- c) **Non-conventionally indirect:** This strategy involves the implicature of the action that the speaker wants the hearer to realize. They are strong and mild hint. Besides several writers like Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), Ellis (1994) and Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993b), Weizman (1989) also mentions about requestive hints. She explains them as performing requests where the speaker not only intends to get the hearer to realize the requested act but also in a way that his/her intention does not be clear in the utterance meaning of

the hint. The writer indicates that the most indirect strategy is the strategy of hinting. The following examples throw light on the explanations:

Example 8

“This game is boring.”

“We’ve been playing this game for over an hour now.” (Ellis 1994: 168)

Both of them suggest the hearer to stop playing the game.

2.2.5.3. Factors affecting indirectness

It is stated in the early parts of the chapter that there are some factors closely affecting the choice of strategy type of requests. These factors are power, social distance, and size of imposition. They will be explained according to the categorization of Thomas (1995).

2.2.5.3.1. Power

There is a general assumption which is true for many situations that people try to use greater degree of indirectness with those interlocutors who have power or authority over them. On the contrary, they do not do so for interlocutors who do not have power over them (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987). This is clearly obvious in child-adult interaction.

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) found that “Requests from children to adults and those addressed to people in positions of greater power were found to be less direct than requests made in the reverse situation.”(p. 4).

In Turkish, the same effect is observed in the study of Açıkalm (1991). The writer says that young people use different speaking styles inside and outside their family. She explains that they produce more polite utterances for older members of the family and more direct ones for the younger members. She gives examples and adds they may say ‘Lütfen yapma(yın)!’ (p. 76) (*Please, don’t do!*) to their parents; however, they tend to produce sentences like ‘yapmasana kız!’ or ‘yapmasana ulan!’ (ibid.) (*Girl/Boy, don’t do it!*) for their younger siblings. Males generally use ‘lan’ which is the shorten form of ‘ulan’ and a frequently used slang word in Turkish. Hayasi (1998) who examines

gender differences in Turkish language says that some interjections like ‘lan/ulan’ and ‘hayda’ are also preferred by males. The use of slang is an indication of decreased social distance and size of imposition.

2.2.5.3.2. Social distance

Thomas refers social distance between the interlocutors as:

“(...) a composite of psychologically real factors (status, age, sex, degree of intimacy, etc.) which ‘together determine the overall degree of respectfulness’ within a given speech situation. In other words, if you feel close to someone, because that person is related to you, or you know him or her well or are similar in terms of age, social class, occupation, sex, ethnicity, etc., you feel less need to employ indirectness in, say, making a request than you would if you were making the same request of a complete stranger.” (1995: 128)

As understood from the explanation, it is clear that one need to be indirect when there is social distance with the addressee and direct when the social distance is minimal. Thomas gives the following example:

Example 9

The speaker wanted some change for the coffee machine. She first approached a colleague whom she knew very well, but, when he could not help, was forced to approach a complete stranger [a man considerably older than she was]:

“Got change of fifty pence, DB?”

“Excuse me, could you change fifty pence for me? I need tens or fives for the coffee machine.” (Thomas 1995: 128-129)

The choice of request differs in accordance with the social distance involved in the act. When social distance is considerably wide, the speakers tend to use conventionally indirect and elaborated forms.

2.2.5.3.3. Size of imposition

Thomas says that size of imposition refers to “how great is the request you are making?” (1995: 130). She states that one would probably use greater degree of indirectness when asking someone to borrow £10 than one would when requesting to borrow ten pence. The following example is from a real event between the writer and her mother. The difference reinforces the explanation:

Example 10

The speaker was my mother. She made the two following requests to me within the space of a few minutes:

“Shut the window, Jen.”

“Do you think you could find time to take those invitations to the printers?” (Thomas 1995: 130)

This factor again plays part in performing requests. The examples show that when the size of imposition is small, the speaker can tend to use direct forms; however, when it is big, the speaker performs indirect request forms.

2.2.6. Transfer from Turkish into English

One of the aims of this study is to find out the extent to which Turkish EFL learners transfer L1 request forms into English. For that reason, the term transfer will be briefly explained now.

Corder (1992) mentions about the role of the mother tongue in learning a second language. He states that the existence of errors in learning a language is considered to be a serious matter. The writer indicates that according to the general thought, the mother tongue is the main source of errors more frequently.

Since acquiring a language is a process, Corder says, learners interact, change and develop while discovering the nature and the correct use of target language. During this process, they develop their interlanguage competence. Language learning is stated as ‘a movement along a continuum’ and “the ideal end point of the movement being is the knowledge of the target language” (1992: 22). In this continuum, learners continually make changes, add new rules, restructure them and so on. The writer uses the term ‘borrowing’ instead of the word transfer. He adds that borrowing is a communicative strategy and when the communicative pressure gets higher, the learner uses borrowing strategy stronger. Corder adds that when the knowledge of the target language increases, the need for borrowings and the rate of error production decreases.

In language learning, the relation between the mother tongue and the target language plays an important role. If the language distance is great, Corder explains,

then, learners realize that they cannot borrow many things from their mother tongue. In addition, when there is a low rate of borrowings, there occurs low rate of errors. On the contrary, there are not many errors when the two languages are closely related. In this case, borrowing leads to successful productions.

For the definition of the term, Olshtain and Cohen indicate that "The term 'transfer' in second language acquisition refers to the learner's strategy of incorporating native language-based elements in target language production and behaviour." (1989:60). They add the common assumption that language learners will transfer their mother tongue forms when they realize that they have not mastered some L2 forms.

"The L2 speaker is in a precarious situation since he or she makes choices concerning an intended speech act in the target language on the basis of previous knowledge and experience, mostly in L1 and only in a limited way in L2. Speech acts of L2 learners might therefore result in failure or deviation." (Olshtain and Cohen 1989: 61).

Thomas (1983) states the reasons leading to pragmalinguistic failure which are explained as 'pragmalinguistic transfer' and 'teaching-induced errors'. She says:

"Pragmalinguistic failure may arise from (...) and 'pragmalinguistic transfer'- the inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies from one language to another, or the transferring from the mother tongue to the target language of utterances which are semantically/syntactically equivalent, but which, because of different 'interpretive bias', tend to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language." (Thomas 1983: 101).

In addition, Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993a) mention about positive and negative transfer. They draw attention to the literature in that the focus has been on negative transfer rather than positive transfer. They think that it is because the communicative success that positive transfer results in. On the other hand, negative transfer has a risk on the communicative success. The writers (1993a: 10) define the term 'negative transfer' as: "the influence of L1 pragmatic competence on IL pragmatic knowledge that differs from the L2 target" and 'positive transfer' as "... pragmatic behaviours or other knowledge displays consistent across L1, IL, and L2" (ibid.).

Doğançay-Aktuna and Kandaşlı (1997) found similar results in their study on pragmatic transfer in the interlanguage of advanced Turkish EFL learners. They conclude that:

“(...) lack of the pragmatic awareness of the TL norms is a cause for miscommunication for second/foreign users who tend to transfer some of their L1 norms into their new language, in a manner quite similar to the transfer of phonemes, morphemes, lexicon, even at ‘advanced’ levels of language development.” (Doğançay-Aktuna and Kamışlı 1997:172).

There is little research about the acquisition of requests in English by Turkish EFL learners. Most of the studies are cross-cultural in nature and in general they are made with ESL subjects rather than EFL learners.

The literature suggests that learners face with pragmatic failures quite often and the social factors mentioned earlier that are power, social distance, and size of imposition are not paid much attention in language classrooms. Since it is possible that Turkish EFL learners may face similar problems and fail to produce appropriate utterances in English, this study is designed to investigate the extent to which Turkish learners of English successfully make requests considering the three social factors mentioned above. In addition, the effect of transfer, either positive or negative, from the Turkish language is aimed to be investigated.

2.2.7. Research questions

The research questions that will be examined are:

- 1) To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of power relations between the speaker and the hearer in English?
- 2) To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of power relations between the speaker and the hearer in Turkish?
- 3) To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of social distance between the speaker and the hearer in English?
- 4) To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of social distance between the speaker and the hearer in Turkish?
- 5) To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the degree of imposition burdened on the hearer in English?

6) To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the degree of imposition burdened on the hearer in Turkish?

7) To what extent do Turkish student teachers transfer L1 request forms into L2 situations?



CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Informants

The data were collected from 190 university students studying at Uludağ University in Bursa. They were all student teachers attending to the English Language Teaching Department. They were all native speakers of Turkish and EFL learners. 90 of them were first year students who performed both the English and the Turkish version of the discourse completion test (DCT) and 100 students were third year learners who were asked to perform only the Turkish version of the DCT. In the literature, there were not studies for the Turkish language in relation to the appropriateness of request forms in Turkish which could be the baseline data for the present study. For that reason, the 3rd year subjects were not given the English version of the test since their data were planned to be the baseline data in the Turkish language. The informants' ages ranged between 17 and 24. In this study age and gender were not taken into consideration as variables for practical reasons.

3.2. Materials

3.2.1. Discourse completion test (English version)

The instrument used in this study to elicit data was a DCT. It consisted of nine situations designed to elicit requests in accordance with the given situations. The set of situations simulated natural contexts that learners probably face with. The reader can find both versions of the test in Appendix A and B.

The contexts of all situations in the DCT used in the present study were based on the DCT Billmyer and Varghese (2000) used who compared two versions of DCTs in their study. They compared the brief version, which involved short and clear explanations about the situation, and the enhanced version, which consisted of very detailed explanations and was too long, of DCTs. The former one is adapted to elicit responses for the present study. One example from their study is given below:

Example 1: Version 1 – Music Situation

You are trying to study in your room and you hear loud music coming from another student's room. You don't know the student, but you decide to ask them to turn the music down. What would you say? (Billmyer and Varghese 2000: 522).

One of the reasons for adapting the brief version was that the detailed situations would be overwhelming for informants. In order to encourage full responses, the response spaces were lengthened.

Billmyer and Varghese (2000) cited from Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993) who indicate that “(...) non-native speakers responded most like native speakers when hearer response was included in the DCT for speech acts requiring a reaction such as rejections.” (p. 519). However, Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993) investigate ‘rejections’ which are “reactive speech acts, which never stand alone”(p.159). In addition, they state that requests are “initiating speech acts and thus may stand alone” (p.159). For that reason, in order not to influence subjects' responses, turns after response space were not given in the DCT.

The contexts of situations in DCT required differing levels of directness; direct (D), conventionally indirect (CI) and non-conventionally indirect (NCI). The situations consisted of differing social factors which are the speaker's power (P) over the hearer, the social distance (SD) between the interlocutors and the size of imposition (SI) loaded on the hearer. The hearer hereafter will be expressed as (H) and the speaker will be (S).

When P factor mentioned, +P means that the S has power over the H. This will be represented as $S > H$. On the other hand, -P means that the H has power over the S ($S < H$). In addition, =P means that the S and the H are equal in terms of power over each other ($S = H$). For the explanation of SD, +SD refers to the existence of SD between the interlocutors. Conversely, -SD indicates that the interlocutors are not socially distant. Finally, +SI refers to a considerable size of imposition; however, -SI refers to the small size of imposition. Table 3.1 below shows the involvement of each factor in the situations of DCT.

Table 3.1. DCT situations in relation to social factors

SITUATIONS	POWER	SOCIAL DISTANCE	SIZE OF IMPOSITION
Situation 1	0 (S=H)	- SD	+ SI
Situation 2	0 (S=H)	+ SD	+ SI
Situation 3	+ (S>H)	+ SD	+ SI
Situation 4	+ (S>H)	- SD	- SI
Situation 5	0 (S=H)	+ SD	- SI
Situation 6	+ (S<H)	+ SD	- SI
Situation 7	0 (S=H)	- SD	- SI
Situation 8	0 (S=H)	- SD	+ SI
Situation 9	+ (S<H)	+ SD	- SI

3.2.2. Discourse completion test (Turkish version)

The English version of DCT was translated into Turkish in order to make a comparison between the responses given in L1 and FL by participants. Since the contexts of situations did not change, the responses were considered to be helpful for realizing the similarities and differences between informants' performance in both languages. This version was answered by both the first year and the third year student teachers. The third year participants' answers were collected as baseline data for requests in Turkish.

3.2.3. The interview protocol

The interview protocol is presented in Appendix C and D. It was carried out in Turkish. 15 questions were asked to understand learners' perceptions of requests in English together with their point of view about the ways to improve their knowledge in English in general. Some specific questions in relation to the situations in DCT are included in the interview protocol in order to understand whether participants have done the tests by taking the P, SD and the SI variables into consideration.

The subjects were ten first year students who had done the English version of DCT previously. The interview was done apart from the class hours. It was done in Turkish so that participants could express themselves better in their native language.

3.3. Piloting the data collection tools

3.3.1. Piloting the discourse completion test (English version)

Before gathering the actual data, a pilot study was conducted. The English version was piloted with 15 first year students. After the piloting, there were not any serious problems. A short interview with volunteer participants was made to find out whether the test involved any unknown words or unclear situations, whether the response space was long enough and also whether it was difficult to respond to or not. The DCT was completed within about 20-25 minutes by all subjects in the piloting group.

3.3.2. Piloting the discourse completion test (Turkish version)

The Turkish version of DCT was piloted with the students who answered the *English version of DCT*.

For the Turkish version of the DCT, the only problem was the space left for responses. Although any problem about space was not confronted with in the English version, the participants found it overwhelming in the Turkish test. After minimizing the spaces of response sections, the final version of the DCT was constructed.

3.3.3. Piloting the interview

The piloting of interview was made with 3 who were volunteer first year student teachers. After piloting, they were asked whether there were any questions unclear or any problems they faced with. There was not found any problems related to both the clarity of questions and the recording of answers.

3.4. Procedures

Data collection

The DCTs were completed in 20-25 minutes in the class hour. The first year subject group were administered the Turkish version after they had answered the English version of the test. The subjects were not handed out the English and the Turkish DCTs in the same day for fear that their responses might be affected negatively from each test. In addition, there was the possibility of boring the participants. In order to prevent these negative consequences, they were required to answer the Turkish version of the DCT in the following week. The third year subjects were asked to do the tests later.

Both versions of tests were administered to the participants during their regular class hours with the permission of instructors. The subjects were not informed about the aim of the study. Personal information such as name, class, number was collected via the test sheets. They were asked to write their names so that the English and the Turkish DCTs could be compared when needed. The subjects felt comfortable while answering since they were informed that they were only contributing to the research and the test results would not in any way affect their marks of any course.

3.5. Data analysis

The participants' responses were categorized after calculating their frequency of occurrence in percentages. The categorization was based on the level of directness whether subjects were direct, conventionally indirect or non-conventionally indirect in their choices of request types. Some informants avoided from making requests in some situations. They were grouped under the avoidance (A) heading.

In order to make the categorization clearer, some examples will be given now.

"I know you are very tired because of your term paper but I'm really in a bad position. Please help me so I will help you for your work later."

Such requests were evaluated as direct request forms since, as indicated in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), the head act involves mood derivable utterance (Please help me). This shows that the desired act is requested directly.

The following requests were analysed under the conventionally indirect forms since there are modal verb questions 'Can/Could' in the head act of the requests.

"Can you turn off the music, please? I cannot concentrate on my project."

"Since I missed the class several times before, I haven't got all the notes. Could you lend me your notes, please?"

According to the categorization of Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), CI strategy type involves the suggestory formulae and query preparatory consisting of modal verbs. The example below shows the suggestory formulae since it involves suggestion (let's).

"Friend, let's complete my paper. I will help you in the future."

As for non-conventionally indirect strategies, the utterances hint the desired act as follows:

“Bana bu ödevi bitirmemde yardım edecek yardımsever birini biliyor musun? Çünkü yardıma çok ihtiyacım var.”

In the above sentence, the speaker indirectly asks for help from the requestee. According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), hinting is categorized as a NCI strategy. In addition, Weizman (1989) says that in requestive hints the speaker intends to get the hearer to realize the requested act and also he/she does it in a way that his/her intention does not be clear in the utterance meaning of the hint. In the given example, the speaker asks for help indirectly and his/her intention is not that much clear in the uttered sentence. It is left to the hearer to realize the speaker's intention and offer help.

The English data were categorised according to Ellis' (1994) and Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) categorization of level of directness. However, the strategy types were analysed according to their level of D, CI or NCI and their choice for A. For the parallelism between the Turkish and the English data analysis, the percentages were calculated by regarding the contextual factors mentioned earlier. The power factor grouped as +P, -P and =P; the social distance was analysed in accordance with the bases of +SD and -SD and finally, the size of imposition was grouped as +SI and -SI.

However, the categorization was changed so that three situations out of nine would represent one social factor only. Thus, each factor was analysed taking into consideration the three of the situations of DCT. Since each situation was designed in a way to involve the three factors (P, SD, SI), the grouping was done randomly. It would be a very complex analysis if each of the 9 situations was analysed for P, SD and SI. For that reason, this kind of grouping was done by selecting the most representative situations in terms of the social factors for the analysis of each variable. The distribution is as follows. Situations 1, 4, and 6 revealed P; situations 2, 7, and 9 referred to SD and finally, situations 3, 5, and 8 were analysed according to SI. Table 3.2 below shows the distribution of situations according to social factors.

Table 3.2. The distribution of situations according to social factors.

SITUATIONS	POWER	SOCIAL DISTANCE	SIZE OF IMPOSITION
Situation 1	0 (S=H)	-	-
Situation 2	-	+ SD	-
Situation 3	-	-	+ SI
Situation 4	+ (S>H)	-	-
Situation 5	-	-	- SI
Situation 6	+ (S<H)	-	-
Situation 7	-	- SD	-
Situation 8	-	-	+ SI
Situation 9	-	+ SD	-

The choices of forms were each counted taking into consideration the +P, -P, =P, +SD, -SD, +SI, -SI. Their percentages were calculated and thus the most preferred forms were defined. The same calculations were done for both Turkish and English situations. According to the results, the English and the Turkish responses were compared. The high proportions for inappropriate choices from Turkish into English that occur for the same situation revealed the negative transfer where learners transfer inappropriate forms into the target language stemming from causes such as the lack of knowledge in the target language and its culture, overgeneralization, etc. On the contrary, the high proportions for appropriate choices from Turkish into English that occur for the same situation revealed the positive transfer. Here, the linguistic forms or sociocultural knowledge has positive effects on the transfer from L1 into L2 since both languages share some similar values or social norms. In addition, when there was no similar rate of proportions for same situations in English and in Turkish, that occurrence was considered revealing that there were not effects of transfer for these specific situations.

For the interview, the encouraging and parallel answers were looked for in accordance with the appropriate and in appropriate choices of request forms. That is, whether informants were aware of the limitations resulting from their proficiency level in the English language or their abilities/inabilities that reinforced/weakened their

performance of performing requests according to the social variables; power, social distance and size of imposition.



CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Results of the analysis of DCT data will be presented in this chapter. As stated in the earlier section, these situations were randomly grouped into three social factors which were power, social distance and size of imposition. Situations 1,4,6 were analysed for the investigation of P factor; 2,7,9 were for SD and finally, 3,5,8 were for SI. As explained in the previous chapter, the performances were counted and converted into percentages between the three groups of participants. Hereafter, the subjects will be mentioned as follows; 1st year group E, 1st year group T and 3rd year group T. In the preceding sentence, E refers to the English language and T refers to the Turkish language. The findings are provided in Table 4.1 below.

The results obtained from the data analyses of DCT (English), DCT (Turkish, 1st year student teachers) and DCT (Turkish, 3rd year student teachers) are presented below based on the three social variables, P, SD, SI. The results gained from the interview with 1st year learners are mentioned briefly.

4.1. Power

Power was evaluated according to the relationship between the interlocutors. +P represents the S's authority over H. On the contrary, -P refers to the H's authority over S, and =P reveals that the S and the H are equal in terms of power.

4.1.1. Speaker power over hearer (+P)

In the fourth situation the addresser has power over the addressee. The S was required to request to keep quiet from children in the given situation. To remind the reader, the situation is given below.

***SITUATION 4:** Imagine that you had a final exam today. You are back home now and very tired because of the heavy load of exams. You plan to rest for a while and then prepare for the exam you will take tomorrow. You are determined to sleep for two hours. However, you cannot since you hear the terrible noise of your neighbour's children. How would you ask them to be quiet?*

Table 4.1. The percentages for +P (Situation 4)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	40	53.4	0	6.6	100
1 st Year Group (T)	17.9	73.3	1.1	7.7	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	24	50	6	20	100

D (Direct), CI (Conventionally Indirect), NCI (Non-conventionally Indirect),
A (Avoidance)

When we consider the percentages of +P where the speaker has authority over the hearer, it is clear that the most preferred level type is CI. It is followed by D type and the least preferred one is NCI level. It is important to note that some informants used avoidance strategy in all groups. The findings suggest that there is a considerable difference between the preferences for performing requests in the Turkish language in general. This difference again occurs between Turkish and English performances of the informants.

There is 6.1% of difference in 1st year subject T answers when compared with the 3rd year group which is the baseline data for requests in Turkish. In addition, it is seen that there are meaningful differences between their answers in E and in T in terms of being direct in performing requests. They conveyed their direct requests as in the following example:

“Çocuklar, ya sessiz oynayın ya da dışarıda oynayın çünkü yarın önemli bir sınavım var. Sessiz olursanız biraz dinlenmeyi düşünüyorum öncelikle.”

Or in another example for the same situation, the informant utters the following sentence:

“Yarın sınavım var uyumaya çalışıyorum, biraz sessiz olun!!!”

These sentences involve direct requests since there are imperative main verbs such as ‘sessiz oynayın, sessiz olun’ in the head acts of performed requests. As for the requests in English the following sentence can be examined.

“Why are you making so much noise? I’m trying to study for my exam! Please be more quiet.”

Here, the verb of the head act is a mood derivable one which shows that the request is a direct one. It is also important to note that the percentage of direct requests is quite high (40%) in the English data.

On the other hand, as noted earlier, it is observed that the most preferred request form is CI. However, the baseline group of 3rd year T selected CI level forms more than the 1st year T group with 6.1% of difference. One example from the latter group is as follows:

“Merhaba, ben sizin komşunuzum, bugün sınava girdiğimden dolayı üzerimde birkaç günün yorgunluğu var. Ancak, biraz gürültü olduğundan uyuyamıyorum. Sessiz olabilir misiniz lütfen?”

In this example, after making some explanations, the speaker uses a modal verb which is the equivalent of the English modal verb ‘Can’ in ‘Sessiz olabilir misiniz...’ Thus, such examples are categorized as CI request forms. 53.4% of the 1st year group E selected this type of requests where the same group preferred it in T with 73.3% which is quite high.

To compare the groups in terms of the use of NCI strategy, it can be realized that the 1st year group made parallel preferences in E and in T with 1.1% difference. This level is the least preferred one, it is not chosen in E at all. The 3rd year group differs from the others slightly. The difference is approximately 5-6% where the preferences of the 1st year group deviates from the baseline group. This shows that 3rd year group tended to be more indirect than the 1st year group in the choices of Turkish requests when the speaker has P over the hearer.

Surprisingly, the difference between 1st year T and 3rd year T is considerable with 12.3% in terms of the selections for avoidance strategy. The baseline data group

preferred A with 20% which is meaningful. For this situation where participants needed to ask for silence from lower power interlocutors, the 3rd year group preferred asking for children's parents to talk to or did not write anything at all. However, there is a slight difference between the 1st year E and T groups. Similar tendency for A in 1st year groups was observed for NCI request strategy which is not preferred that much.

When the main verbs used in the performance of requests are analysed, the following results are found out as seen in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 4)

MAIN VERBS	Sessiz olmak	Avoidance	Hinting	Others	Total
1st Year Group (T)	84.6	7.7	-	7.7	100
3rd Year Group (T)	58	20	6	16	100

MAIN VERBS	Be quiet	Others	Total
1st Year Group (E)	87.7	12.3	100

When the tables are examined, it is seen that the most frequently selected verb in the Turkish data was 'sessiz olmak'. However, the 3rd year baseline group showed less tendency for the use of the same verb when compared to the 1st year T data. In addition, consistent results are observed in the English data with 87.7% of preference for the verb 'be quiet'. In Karatepe's (1998) study the same verb was observed as the most preferred one in similar situations.

Various address forms are frequently used in this situation in Turkish requests. Some examples are ‘canım, tatlım, güzelim, bızdık, fıstık, delikanlı, evlat, lan and çocuklar’. The following example reveals speaker’s anger.

“*Ne lan düğününüz mü var?*”

Açıkalm (1991) says that young people use different speaking styles. She adds that young people may say ‘Lütfen yapma(yın)!’ (p. 76) to their parents; however, they tend to produce sentences like ‘yapmasana kız!’ or ‘yapmasana ulan!’ (ibid.) for their younger siblings as seen in the Turkish data of the present study. The informants preferred various forms in English such as ‘stupid boy, my dear, sweetheart, honey, kids and boy’.

4.1.2. Speaker power equal to hearer (=P)

The findings of the first situation where the addresser and the addressee are equal in terms of authority will be explained now. The S who does not have notes for the exam wants to borrow one of classmate’s notes in Situation 1.

SITUATION 1: Imagine that you have a final exam next week and four days to prepare for it. Since you missed the class several times before, you do not have notes on all topics. So, you decide to borrow notes from one of your class mates whom you are good friends with. You know that he/she has already begun preparing for the same exam. How would you ask him/her to lend you his/her notes?

Table 4.3 shows the percentages of choices for each level by the three groups.

Table 4.3. The percentages for =P (Situation 1)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	6.6	93.4	0	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	3.3	96.7	0	0	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	13	84	3	0	100

According to the results of the study, the most preferred level of directness was CI with a considerable difference from D and NCI which are the least preferred levels. The subjects did not prefer A at all and this showed that they conveyed requests to their friends who were classmates and equals in terms of authority. For Situation 1, there is a parallelism between the 1st year groups; however, the 3rd year participants differ from others considerably.

The 3rd year group preferred to use D strategies with 13% in Turkish requests that is they tended to be more direct from the other two groups. The findings suggest that 1st year groups were more indirect to power equal interlocutors. When the groups are compared, they all show difference for using direct request forms. The difference between 1st year group E and T is 3.3% which is not great.

As for the CI level, the 3rd year group showed less tendency, when compared with the 1st year T group, for preferring CI forms with the percentage of 84%. On the other hand, 1st year group T preferred to be indirect with power equals with 96.7% of selection. An example is as follows:

“Gülşen, çok zor durumdayım canım, yardımına ihtiyacım var. Sınava çok az kaldı ve benim notlarım tam değil. Sana uyarırsa notlarını bir günlüğüne bana verebilir misin? Söz hemen geri getiricem.”

The head act involves an equivalent of a modal verb such as ‘Can’ in ‘verebilir misin?’ As it is clear from the results, most of the informants preferred CI request forms in Turkish. 1st year groups again show a slight difference of 3.3% which suggests that they were indirect even with their classmates. Seemingly, the 1st year group E preferred CI level (93.4%). However, there is a great difference among all groups with regard to four social variables, and this difference shows parallelism across all groups in the study.

The baseline data showed a slight difference of 3% selection from the other group performed in Turkish for NCI request forms. When it comes to the 1st year groups, there is an exact parallelism between them with respect to NCI strategy. None of them used NCI forms.

The following tables (Table 4.4) show the preferences of main verbs in the head acts of requests.

Table 4.4. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 1)

MAIN VERBS	Almak	Vermek	Ödünç Almak/ Vermek	Fotokopi Çektirmek	Getirmek	Hinting	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	37.9	35.5	15.5	-	-	-	11.1	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	27	30	-	16	11	3	13	100

MAIN VERBS	Lend	Give	Borrow	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	37.9	32.2	16.6	13.3	100

The 3rd and the 1st year groups of informants tend to use 'almak/vermek' most frequently in their Turkish requests. There does not seem to be misunderstandings in their utterances like owning the requested notes resulting from the verb choice since these verbs are commonly used in Turkish. In addition, they use softeners such as 'kısa bir süre için, bir günlüğüne, fotokopi çektirmek için, etc.' which imply that they request for notes in order to borrow/lend them. Whereas, the 1st year group has a considerable tendency in using the verb 'give' in their English request forms which may involve the meaning of possessing the notes apart from the meaning of lending them.

There is less tendency of using address terms in English when compared with Turkish terms. For Situation 1, native speakers of Turkish preferred ten different types (arkadaşım, canım, Xciğim, kanka, oğlum/olum, baba, kardeş, abi etc.). However, in English, they used only two types; friend and the name of the interlocutor.

Finally, it is observed that the 70% of the 3rd year, 67.7% of 1st year T and 63.3% of 1st year E groups preferred to use long utterances with detailed explanations when requesting something from children.

4.1.3. Hearer power over the speaker (-P)

In Situation 6, the S does not have power over the H, on the contrary, the H has authority over the S. The addresser is a student who has been staying at the dormitory for a few months. The S is disturbed by another student who has been there for four years and the S is required to ask for silence.

SITUATION 6: Imagine that you are staying at the dormitory and you have been there for a few months. You are preparing for your final exams of the first term. You are studying in your room since you could not find a free table in the library. A student, who has been living in the dormitory for four years, is listening to the music very loudly. You find this terribly disturbing. His/Her room is next to yours. How would you ask him/her to be quiet?

Table 4.5 below reveals the percentages of findings according to the categorization of social variables.

Table 4.5. The percentages for -P (Situation 6)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	10	84.5	5.5	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	6.6	93.4	0	0	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	5	82	12	1	100

The findings suggest that the most preferred strategy was CI followed by D level. One of the least selected types was A which was preceded by NCI level selections.

For the comparison of groups with respect to D level, 1st year group E was the one that made a choice of 10% and preferred to be the most direct among the all groups.

That group was followed by 1st year group T participants who made 6.6% of preference. The 3rd year T group as the baseline group used D forms at a rate of 5% which means that the 1st year and 3rd year T groups show a slight difference in terms of being direct. However, 1st year E group shows a considerable difference from the other groups.

As for the most preferred CI level, it is seen that the 1st year T group's preference was the most frequent one for 93.4% and this showed their tendency of being indirect to power unequals, namely the interlocutors with higher power. The following is an example where an equivalent of modal verb (Could/Would) is used in the head act (Kısabilir misiniz?).

“Merhaba. Sınavlara çalışıyorum ama müzik çok rahatsız ediyor. Sakıncası yoksa sesini kısabilir misiniz?”

On the other hand, the baseline group of Turkish showed a difference of 11.4% from the 1st year group and thus preferred to be less indirect in terms of using CI request types. According to the results, there is approximately a parallelism between the 1st year E and the 3rd year T groups. When their choices are compared, a slight difference of 2.5% is observed (84.5% vs. 82%).

Although the baseline data showed a 12% of high tendency for being more indirect (NCI) in Turkish, the 1st year T group did not use NCI forms at all. There is a considerable difference between the groups that preferred these forms. The 1st year group E made a choice of 5.5% and the 3rd year group T of 12%.

Avoidance strategy was observed in the baseline data with only 2% while it was not observed in other groups.

Table 4.6 below shows that informants preferred the verb ‘kısmak’ most frequently in their Turkish requests. The English equivalent of the same word is the most frequently used verb ‘turn down’ in the English data.

The preference of address terms in the Turkish language is again various such as ‘canım, abi, ağabeycim, abla, arkadaşım, güzelim and hoca’. The fact that they used only two variations of address in English appears to be meaningful.

Table 4.6. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 6)

MAIN VERBS	Kismak	Sessiz olmak	Dinlemek	Hinting	Avoidance	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	58.8	18	17.7	-	-	5.5	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	61	15	7	12	1	4	100

MAIN VERBS	Turn down	Be quiet/ silent/ careful	Listen	Turn off	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	53.5	25.5	10	7.7	3.3	100

4.2. Social Distance

In the evaluation of SD, there are two criteria. The first one is +SD which represents the social distance between the S and the II. The second one -SD meaning that the interlocutors are intimate. As stated earlier, the three situations are evaluated for one variable as seen above for P factor. Similarly, the findings of another three situations will be presented here.

4.2.1. Distant interlocutors (+SD)

According to the selection of situations, two of them (2 and 9) involved SD between the requester and the requestee. In Situation 2, the requesters made requests to borrow notes from a student whom they do not know well from another class. In the other one, namely Situation 9, participants ask for an extension from one of their instructors where again exists social distance.

***SITUATION 2:** Imagine that you have a final exam next week and four days to prepare for it. Since you missed the class several times before, you do not have notes on all topics. So, you decide to borrow notes from a student whose notes are known to be*

quite tidy and clear. You do not know him/her well since you are not sharing the same class. How would you ask him/her to lend you his/her notes?

SITUATION 9: Imagine that you are a fourth year student. You will be graduated in a few months. You have a term paper due the next day that requires much time to complete. You really did your best. However, you failed to start your work when you should have done so. You will not be able to complete your paper before the deadline. You need one more week and you are sure that you will present a very good paper if you are given longer time. You know your instructor has a heavy program for this week and will not be able to grade these papers for at least one week. You go to your instructor's office. How would you ask for a one-week extension?

The findings are represented in Tables 4.7 and 4.8 below:

Table 4.7. The percentages for +SD (Situation 2)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	0	100	0	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	2.3	97.7	0	0	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	1	87	6	6	100

Table 4.8. The percentages for +SD (Situation 9)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	6	94	0	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	13.4	82.2	2.2	2.2	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	11	86	2	1	100

It is obvious from the findings that the most preferred directness level is CI. It is followed by D forms; however, there is a significant difference in the preferences in Situation 2 and 9. The NCI forms and A were used less often.

To start with the 3rd year group T, it can be said that they showed a considerable difference with 10% between the D strategies of Situation 2 and 9 which is meaningful. Similarly, the 1st year group T followed, with consistent preferences, the baseline group by performing D forms in Turkish with a difference of 11.1% (Situation 2, 2.3% and Situation 9, 13.4%). Both groups differed in their choices between the given situations. On the other hand, the 1st year group E subjects avoided being direct to a socially distant friend; however, they selected D forms with 6% to another socially distant addressee who was an instructor.

When CI forms were compared across three participant groups, it was seen that they all selected CI requests most. The results indicate that the 3rd year group T shows parallelism in itself between both situations with a slight (1%) difference. In addition, the 1st year group T reveals a meaningful difference of 15.5% between Situations 2 (97.7%) and 9 (82.2%) for their CI strategy preferences. When the data for Situation 2 is examined, it is seen that the use of ‘Verebilir misiniz?’, which is the modalized form of the verb ‘ver’, occurs frequently. It is categorized as CI strategy in the analysis.

“Derse birkaç defa girmediğim için notlarım tam değil. Sizin çok düzenli ve anlaşılır not tuttuğumuzu düşünüyorum. Bana notlarınızı verebilir misiniz?”

In addition, the suffix –iz refers to the polite ‘you’ in Turkish which shows that the speaker considers the social distance. Finally, the 1st year group E showed a slight difference of 6% between the situations. These findings show consistence.

“As we do not know each other closely, it would be inconvenient for me to do this, yet, if that would be OK for you, could I borrow your notes for tonight on condition to bring them back tomorrow?”

This example shows the use of CI request forms by examining the head act involving the modal verb of ‘Could’.

The 1st year group T and the 3rd year group T used NCI forms at a low rate again. This finding reveals that the subjects did not prefer to perform requests in NCI forms when interacting with socially distant people. Informants did not use NCI requests in English. Except for the 1st year group E, avoiding making requests is seen less frequently in the preferences of the other groups.

The results of main verb selections are represented in the following tables (Table 4.9)

For Situation 2, the most frequently selected verbs in Turkish are again ‘almak’ and ‘vermek’. As explained before, Turkish native speakers do not attribute to the verb a meaning of possessing the notes. They make explanations or promise to give back the notes in a short time. Frequent incorrect use of the verb ‘give’ is seen in the English data. In this case, 25.5% of participants used ‘give’ to indicate ‘lend’ in English. A similar finding was also observed in Karatepe (2001).

As for the use of address terms, it is seen that the native speakers of Turkish used them in a few requests. In addition, there was not an address form in the English data.

Table 4.9. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 2)

MAIN VERBS	Almak	Vermek	Ödünç Almak/ Vermek	Fotokopi Çektirmek	Getirmek	Avoidance	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	29	42.2	15.5	-	-	-	13.3	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	36	14	3	18	12	6	11	100

MAIN VERBS	Lend	Give	Borrow	Take	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	44.4	25.5	18	7.7	4.4	100

Table 4.10 below presents main verb selections for Situation 9.

Table 4.10. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 9)

MAIN VERBS	Süre/Zaman vermek	Uzatmak	Teslim etmek	Avoidance	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	45.5	32.2	-	2.3	20	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	50	17	18	-	15	100

MAIN VERBS	Give	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	63.3	36.7	100

The most frequently used verb in Turkish for Situation 9 is ‘süre/zaman vermek’. There is consistency between the Turkish groups in their choices. For the English data group, it can be said that they used the verb ‘give’ with 63.3% which was followed by ‘more time, extension, one more week, etc.’ there seems to be consistency among the groups in main verb choice.

There was a consistent behaviour in all groups’ choices of address forms such as ‘hocam, efendim, öğretmenim’ and ‘Mr/Mrs X, teacher, sir, ma’am’.

4.2.2. Intimate interlocutors (-SD)

The findings of situation 7 will be explained in the case of intimate interlocutors, that is the S and the H are socially close. Here, the S asks for assistance from one of the close friends.

SITUATION 7: *Imagine that you are a fourth year student. You will be graduated in a few months. You have a term paper due the next day, but you have not done*

anything yet. You think you can ask for some help from one of your close friends. He/She is a second year student in your department. You go to his/her room to ask for help. How would you do this?

It can be noted that the most preferred directness level is CI according to Table 4.11 below.

Regarding the level of directness 14.5% of the 1st year group T chose D strategy when interacting with intimate addressees and 10% of the baseline Turkish group preferred D strategy. On the other hand, the 1st year E subjects showed parallelism with baseline group at 11.3%. There seems not to be a great difference among groups.

Table 4.11. The percentages for -SD (Situation 7)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1st Year Group (E)	11.3	85.4	3.3	0	100
1st Year Group (T)	14.5	82.2	3.3	0	100
3rd Year Group (T)	10	82	8	0	100

To compare the groups in terms of the most preferred form, CI, two groups revealed similar results. There is an exact parallelism between the 3rd year T and 1st year T groups following the same percentages, 82% and 82.2%. When we take the 1st year E group's findings into consideration, it can be seen that there is only a slight difference of 3.2% (85.4%), which does not seem meaningful.

Considering the findings of the use of NCI strategy, it can be noted that the 3rd year group shows difference of 4.7% from both the 1st year T and E groups. It is also seen that there is exactly the same percentage between the 1st year groups. All groups seemed to make requests taking their intimate relationship into account, therefore there was not any choice for A strategy.

Table 4.12. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 7)

MAIN VERBS	Yardım etmek	Hinting	Verb+ -sene/-sana	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	91.1	-	-	12.3	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	73	8	10	9	100

MAIN VERBS	Help	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	75.5	24.5	100

For Situation 7, the most commonly used verb was ‘yardım etmek’ as seen in Table 4.12 in the Turkish data. The English data is in the same line with the Turkish data in the use of an equivalent verb ‘help’. However, the Turkish verbs involved the suffix of ‘-sene, -sana’ with 10% of the 3rd year baseline Turkish group preferences. In addition, there was not equivalent verb choice in the English data.

In the use of address terms, the Turkish data revealed a various use as follows; ‘canım, güzelim, bitanem, kanka, dostum, koçum, abi, oğlum, hoca, Xciğim and ulan’. An example is:

“Naber lan? Abi şu ödeve bi el atıver be, yap şu garibana bi iyilik. Çok sıkışık durumdayım, hadi ağabeycim kırma beni.”

As mentioned before, Açıkalın (1991) says that the use of colloquial terms (oğlum and ulan) is frequently seen in young people’s speech. There is also a variety of such forms in the English data but not as rich as in the Turkish data.

4.3. Size of Imposition

The size of imposition involved in the requests are represented as +SI for big size and -SI for small size of imposition.

4.3.1. Big size of imposition (+SI)

In the DCT, two situations (3 and 8) are selected for investigating the big size of imposition. In situation 3, the S is required to borrow notes from the H and only four days left for the exam. In addition, the S asks for help for a project paper from a classmate who has just finished his/her own and has been looking forward to having a rest.

***SITUATION 3:** Imagine that you have the final exam of the course that you failed last year. You are a fourth year student and you have been repeating that course with a third year class. You have four days to prepare for the exam. Since you missed the class several times before, you do not have notes on all topics. So, you decide to borrow notes from a student in that class who is known to be quite hardworking. How would you ask him/her to lend you his/her notes?*

***SITUATION 8:** Imagine that you are a fourth year student. You will be graduated in a few months. You have a term paper due the next day. You need some help from one of your class mates who is about to complete his/her paper. You know he/she is very tired and has been looking forward to having a good rest right after finishing up with the work. But, you are in a difficult position. How would you ask him/her to help you so that you can complete your project?*

The below Tables 4.13 and 4.14 present the findings and the percentages. It is seen that the most preferred form is CI as seen in the other situations so far. It is followed by D, NCI and A.

To start with D forms, the findings show that there are noticeable differences regarding the use of directness levels between Situation 3 and 8. As for the 3rd year group T, another meaningful result with 26% of difference for conveying Turkish direct requests is worth noting. The 1st year group T preferred D request forms in Situation 3

less than they did in situation 8 since 2.2% of them selected D forms in Situation 3 where 18.8% of them preferred this form in the other one. The difference is 16.6% which is a meaningful one. In addition, the 1st year group T, for Situation 8, showed difference of 8.2% from the baseline group of the 3rd year T. This difference makes sense. However, the 1st year E group's choices rated for 2.2% for Situation 3 and 6.6% for the eighth one. There is a low difference.

Table 4.13. The percentages for +SI (Situation 3)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	2.2	97.8	0	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	2.2	97.8	0	0	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	1	96	3	0	100

Table 4.14. The percentages for +SI (Situation 8)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	6.6	93.4	0	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	18.8	75.7	3.3	2.2	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	27	65	6	2	100

Regarding the results for CI form selections, the 3rd year group T selected the CI type at such rates 96% and 65% leading to results which can be taken as considerable. The great difference occurs with 31% when big size of imposition on the H's shoulders is laid on. Similarly, for the 1st year group in the Turkish language, there is considerable difference of 22.1% between 3 and 8 which refers to meaningful discussions. When it comes to the 1st year E group, they made preferences with 97.8% for the third and

93.4% for the eighth situations. The difference seems to make no sense. This example was written for Situation 3 which consisted of mostly the CI request forms:

“May I take your notes please?”

The general tendency of non-native speakers to be indirect is the use of modals in their utterances as seen in the example. In addition, they sometimes make the inappropriate main verb selections such as ‘take’ instead of ‘borrow’ which may result in misunderstandings.

As for the NCI forms, there are slight differences among groups according to the situations. The differences are 3.3% and 3% between Situations 3 and 8. For A strategy, it can be said that the 1st year T and 3rd year T avoided from conveying requests in accordance with differing contexts.

When it comes to the analysis of main verbs, the following tables (Table 4.15 and Table 4.16) show their percentages in both languages.

When the main verbs used in requests are examined, it is understood that the native speaker groups use ‘almak/vermek’ most frequently. However, it is clear from the sentences that the speaker intends to borrow or wishes the hearer to lend the notes. This example puts light on the explanation.

“Şey diyecektim, notlarında eksik yoksa alabilir miyim? Hemen fotokopisini çektirip geri getiririm.”

For the English data, informants mostly preferred the verb ‘lend’ which is appropriate. On the other hand, the use of ‘give’ is considerable with 24.6% and the mentioned verb (together with ‘take’) may lead to communicative failure.

Table 4.16 shows that the same consistency in the selection of main verbs between the Turkish and the English data is observable in Situation 8. The most preferred verb was ‘yardım etmek’. The English 1st year group selected the equivalent verb most commonly which is ‘help’ in their requests.

The address terms are various in Turkish (arkadaşım, canım, dostum, güzelim, abi, koçum, etc.); however, the English terms are limited as ‘(my/dear) friend’ and ‘darling’.

Table 4.15. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 3)

MAIN VERBS	Almak	Vermek	Ödünç Almak/ Vermek	Fotokopi Çektirmek	Getirmek	Hinting	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	24.7	44.4	14.4	-	-	-	16.6	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	31	28	4	12	8	1	16	100

MAIN VERBS	Lend	Give	Borrow	Take	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	44.4	24.6	23.3	6.6	1.1	100

Table 4.16. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 8)

MAIN VERBS	Yardım etmek	Hinting	Avoidance	Verb+ -sene/-sana	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	88.8	-	2.2	-	8.9	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	72	6	2	1	19	100

MAIN VERBS	Help	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	86.6	13.4	100

4.3.2. Small size of imposition (-SI)

Situation 5 in the DCT involved the size of imposition which was small.

SITUATION 5: Imagine that you are staying at the dormitory and you have been there for three months. You have a project paper due tomorrow. You are very tired after school and you still try to finish the project. However, you cannot concentrate on it since you hear loud music coming from another student's room for half an hour. You met that student before but you did not talk to him/her much. He/She has been living there for three months just like you do. How would you ask him/her to be quiet?

Table 4.17. The percentages for -SI (Situation 5)

LEVEL TYPE	D (%)	CI (%)	NCI (%)	A	TOTAL
1 st Year Group (E)	16.6	83.4	0	0	100
1 st Year Group (T)	12.2	87.8	0	0	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	11	84	3	2	100

Table 4.17 above shows the percentages for the fifth situation. Again, the most preferred type is CI, followed by D, NCI and A strategies.

When starting with the comparison of D forms, the close percentages for the selection of forms between the 1st year group T and the 3rd year group T with a slight (1.2%) difference is realized and this showed their consistency. However, the other 1st year group shows 16.6% of percentage for direct form selection. The rise in the percentages of D request types for small size of imposition is meaningful.

To continue with CI forms, it can be stated that the 1st year T group made CI form selections of 87.8% whereas the baseline group made 84% for the same request type with approximately 3.8% of difference from the 3rd year group.

As for NCI forms and A, it is seen that the only group which preferred them with low percentage ratings was the 3rd year T group.

For this situation, the main verb preferences are represented in Table 4.18 below.

Table 4.18. Numbers of Main Verbs (Situation 5)

MAIN VERBS	Kısmak	Sessiz olmak	Hinting	Avoidance	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (T)	65.5	22.3	-	-	12.2	100
3 rd Year Group (T)	65	25	3	2	5	100

MAIN VERBS	Turn down	Be quiet	Turn off	Reduce the volume	Others	Total
1 st Year Group (E)	55.5	20	12.2	7.7	4.6	100

It is observed in the Turkish data that the most frequently preferred verbs were ‘kısmak’ and ‘sessiz olmak’ for Situation 5. The consistency between the baseline data group and the 1st year group is clear. What is more, the non-native speakers of English preferred the verb ‘turn down’ most frequently in their request forms. The consistence in the verb choice is evident between the Turkish and the English data.

For the address terms, the Turkish groups preferred nine different types such as ‘güzelim, arkadaşım, dostum, birader, hocam, baba, kardeş, canım, the name of the addressee’. For the same situation, five various terms were used which were ‘dear friends, my friend, fellow, brother and girls’.

4.4. Interview

The interview questions were designed to find out the participants’ perceptions of learning English and whether they were happy with their level of English. The questions also investigated what student teachers did in order to improve their knowledge in

English. Another point was related to the opportunities to interact with native speakers particularly for conveying requests. There were some questions in relation to the DCT situations which investigated the easiest and the most difficult ones to answer and their possible reasons. Finally, participants were asked whether they considered the differences in terms of P, SD and SI when conveying the requests in given situations.

As for the results, it was clear that most student teachers did some activities to improve their proficiency level such as reading books and magazines, listening to music in English and sending e-mails to native speakers of English. None of them had the chance of going abroad which would help them to improve their sociocultural competence.

Eight out of ten informants said that they did not prefer to speak in English with their friends inside and outside the classroom. In addition, they stated that it did not make sense to speak in English with classmates.

They indicated that all the situations given in the discourse completion test were easy to respond to except for Situation 4 and 9. They added that it was difficult for them to perform requests when their interlocutors were children and an instructor. In addition, all informants said that they paid attention the differences between the given situations when performing requests.

One of them indicated that she once requested something from an instructor who was a native speaker of English. She added that she planned what to say before conveying her request which helped her to better express herself.

Most of them indicated that they would differ in their requests if they were to speak face to face. However, they felt more comfortable when writing down requests since they had enough time to think and make corrections.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the study will be discussed regarding the three social factors that are power, social distance and size of imposition in relation with the appropriateness of requests conveyed.

There were seven research questions mentioned in the present study earlier. Two of them are related to power effect on the choice of request types, two of them are related to the social distance, two of them aim to investigate the size of imposition and the last question is related to the transfer of request forms from Turkish into English.

5.1. Power

The present study involved two research questions concerning the power relations as S power over H (+P), S power equal to H power (=P) and H power over the S (-P). The first research question aims to investigate the participants' request form choices and their appropriateness in English language regarding the P factor. The second question related to the same factor but this time in Turkish. These questions will be evaluated now.

Research Question 1: To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of power relations between the speaker and the hearer in English?

This question investigates the appropriateness of request forms in English (E) in accordance with the power relations as stated above. The findings of E data will be explained here according to +P, =P and -P variables.

The 1st year E group preferred CI forms more frequently than D forms when the S has P over the H (+P). In addition, some subjects avoided making requests at all (6.6%). The percentage for D forms was 40%; however, 53.4% of them preferred CI forms. The high frequency of occurrence of D forms was an expected result since the interlocutor had relatively less power. For this reason, the finding of 40% showed that learners appear to have had an awareness about directness in English.

On the contrary, 53.4% of them preferred CI forms, most of which consisted of requests with modals. This appears to indicate that more than half of the subjects did not intend to be direct even in +P situations. This may be due to various reasons. First of all, the participants may 'overgeneralize' CI forms which involve modals. Thomas (1983) indicates that what learners do quite often is to select one way of requesting and use it in all contexts, that is they overgeneralize the structure which may result in failure in interaction. When analysing the data, it was seen that most of the CI request forms consisted of modals such as 'can, could, would'. For that reason, it is possible for Turkish EFL learners to overgeneralize modal verb question use in requests regardless of the situational factors, namely power relations here. The results of Otcu and Tankut's (2003) study with Turkish EFL learners, where 90% of requests involved modal verb questions, support this finding. Another reason may be the materials, namely the textbooks used in EFL classrooms and teachers' perception of teaching requests. Textbooks show a tendency to represent requests by using modal verb questions and teachers, in general, do not pay much attention to the differing choices according to variables such as the interlocutor's age, gender, social status and so on. Lastly, the high preference for CI request forms may be due to the data collection instrument (DCT). Learners have a tendency of being more formal when writing requests in DCT. Rintell and Mitchell (1989) explain that subjects may produce more formal language because they may perceive writing activity more formal than speaking.

As for NCI forms, the results show that this form of requests was not chosen at all. Since the S has P over the II, this finding is not surprising.

6.6% of the 1st year E subjects avoided from conveying requests. This may be resulting from their inability to perform requests in English. Rose (2000) reinforces this by explaining the reasons of opting out as follows: "(...) intentional nonpertual factors, and inability to perform the act owing to limited proficiency in a language or limited familiarity with a particular scenario." (p. 39). Another reason may be, as Rose indicates, the unfamiliarity with the situation given in the foreign language. The informants may never have performed these requests in English in real life.

When the 1st year E group's requests in =P situations (speaker power equal to hearer power) are analysed, it was found that the most preferred form was CI forms with 93.4% of preference followed by D forms of 6.6% choice. The findings revealed that subjects did not appear to be aware of the influence of situational variations on linguistic choice since their interlocutors were power equal persons. They were expected to produce direct utterances instead of indirect requests. However, this may be stemming from the effect of another variable which is the 'size of imposition' laid on the interlocutor. This situation involved a pressure on the S since he/she had to ask for notes from a classmate just four days before the exam. Thus, learners may have been affected by this pressure and tended to convey indirect requests for the sake of minimizing the pressure.

As for the NCI request forms and A, it was seen that the participants did not preferred both at all. These findings are expected for power equal addressees.

Finally, the findings of -P situations where the H had P over the S showed that the most preferred form was CI ones. Subjects' choices were followed by 10% of D and 5.5 % of NCI forms. The selection of D forms was an unexpected one since the S does not have authority over the H. The 1st year E subjects made inappropriate choices in terms of politeness. This may be resulting from the 'instruction effect' in EFL classrooms. It was seen that in their direct requests, subjects frequently used the politeness marker 'please'. The teaching of 'please' in EFL classrooms in Turkey is generally tend to be in such a way that learners assume that they produce polite utterances by adding 'please' at the end of the sentence regardless of the appropriateness of the context of situation. White (1993) indicates that learners simply add 'please' to their requests in order to be more polite without considering the social distance between themselves and their interlocutors. Similarly, Faerch and Kasper (1989) point out that learners have difficulties in distinguishing the formal and informal forms in the target language. They say that learners overuse the politeness marker 'please' in their requests. These explanations reinforce the inappropriate use of 'please' by Turkish EFL student teachers.

When it comes to the 84.5% of preference for CI forms, it can be said that they produced appropriate requests by considering the power. In addition, 5.5% of subjects conveyed NCI requests and there is not any problem at this point too. Finally, none of the participants avoided making requests to addressees who have power over them, which reveals that they show the ability to convey requests.

When the main verb choices are analysed, it is seen that for +P, =P and -P factor situations, informants preferred these verbs: 'be quiet' (for Situation 4), 'lend' and 'give' (for Situation 1) and 'turn down' (for Situation 6). Their preferences for 'be quiet' and 'turn down' are appropriate for the given situations. However, for Situation 1, a considerable number of informants chose the verb 'give' together with 'lend' for their requests. The latter verb choice was the appropriate one. Whereas, the verb 'give' was inappropriate in English since it may result in misunderstandings. That verb involved a kind of 'owning' meaning where the verb 'lend' would be appropriate for the given situation. Thus, requests with the verb 'give' were inappropriate. The misuse of 'give' and 'take' instead of 'lend' and 'borrow' are said to be a common problem of Turkish EFL learners (see also Karatepe 2001; Otcu and Tankut 2003).

Research Question 2: To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of power relations between the speaker and the hearer in Turkish?

When it comes to the 1st year group T in their preference for +P situations where they have authority over their interlocutors, it is seen that 17.9% of requests are in D forms. They preferred CI forms of requests with 73.3% which is meaningful. On the other hand, the 3rd year group T showed 6.1% difference from the 1st year group with 24% in terms of being direct. The difference between the groups was a slight one. This means that the subjects were less direct in their native language than in the foreign language. This finding shows that there is a tendency to raise the level of politeness even with interlocutors who have less power over the S in Turkish. This may be stemming from the tendency of being formal when giving answers not orally but in writing.

As for the choices of CI forms, there was a meaningful difference of 23.3% between the results of the 1st year T and the 3rd year T groups. The 1st year group was more indirect in their preference of request forms than the 3rd year group. This finding suggests that they reveal the possible tendency of formal writing effect on DCT than the 3rd year group.

The NCI forms were not preferred that much in T requests too. The 3rd year group used this kind of requests with 6% only. These findings indicate that NCI forms of requests are not used by subjects in both E and T.

However, some learners avoided making requests from power unequals when they had power over the interlocutors. The most obvious use of avoidance strategy was observed in the 3rd year T group with 20%. 7.7% of the 1st year T subjects avoided performing requests in the Turkish language. The 1st year group's choices in T and in E showed parallelism, but the 3rd year group showed a considerable difference. They preferred to call children's parents instead of asking for silence from younger addressees. This may be resulting from their thought that talking to parents would be more effective to reach their goal.

As for the findings of =P situations, the requests conveyed in T between the 1st and the 3rd year subjects showed difference. The most preferred one is again the CI forms with 96.7% and 84% respectively. It was followed by D forms where the 3rd year subjects preferred these in a higher frequency than the 1st year subjects (13% vs. 3.3%). Only the 3rd year group chose the NCI forms at a low rate of 3%. In addition, none of the groups avoided conveying requests.

It was an expected result for subjects to use D forms considering the power relations. For this reason, they preferred appropriate forms and there was not any problem. As for the CI forms, it can be said that subjects did not appear to consider power factor at this point. The 1st year group showed a higher tendency than the other group in their preference of request forms. As explained for the 1st year E group before, T language groups may be affected from another variable which is the size of imposition burdened on the addressee. The subjects did not avoid requesting in T language which is quite normal.

The most preferred level of directness was the CI one when –P situations were analysed. Here, the H has P over the S and the 1st and the 3rd year subjects showed difference in their preferences for D and NCI forms. The use of avoidance strategy was only observed in the second group with a low percentage (1%).

For D forms, the 1st year group conveyed 6.6% of their requests and the 3rd year group 5% of them which indicated that the latter group did not prefer to be more direct for their interlocutors had authority over themselves. This finding suggests that the latter group made a more consistent choice considering the power relations in Turkish; however, the former one did not do so. This finding does not suggest that the 1st year group made inappropriate preferences when compared with the baseline data of the 3rd year students because of the slight difference of 1.6%.

When the CI forms are compared, it was seen that the third year group used them less than the 1st year group did. The 11.4% of difference is meaningful when related with the findings of NCI forms. The 3rd year group preferred to be more indirect and the rate of NCI forms was 12% when the other group did not made NCI requests at all. According to the results, the 3rd year group considered power relations of –P. These findings suggest that the 1st year group did not produce appropriate utterances in terms of NCI forms which were considered to be the most indirect type among others by Weizman (1989). The writer says that the most indirect and non-conventional request strategy is the strategy of requestive hints.

When the main verb choices in the Turkish data were analysed, it was seen that learners preferred the following verbs according to the power variable. For +P, the 3rd year group selected ‘sessiz olmak’ with 58% of preference and the 1st year group chose the same verb with 84.6%. The difference between the percentages results from the baseline group’s preference of 20% for avoidance. There is consistency between the Turkish group since both of them preferred ‘sessiz olmak’ as the most frequently verb. However, the baseline group used this verb less frequently than the 1st year group did.

For the power equal situation, namely Situation 1, the groups differed in their verb choices. The 3rd year baseline group preferred ‘vermek’ (to give) with 30% followed by ‘almak’ (to take) with 37.9% and ‘vermek’ with 35.5%. The difference shows that the

baseline group performed requests in 'hearer oriented' (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) utterances like "*Bana X dersinin notlarını fotokopi için verir misin?*" Whereas, the results show that the 1st year group's request forms were in 'speaker oriented' (ibid.) sentences with the mostly preferred verb 'almak'. As in the following example: "*Canım, notlarını bir günlüğüne alabilir miyim?*". Here the effect of the verb 'take' in Turkish is diminished by putting time limit and softened by the use of a term of endearment 'canım'.

Finally, for Situation 6, it is seen that the most frequently preferred verb was 'kısmak' (to turn down) for both groups. They showed a consistent behaviour in their performance of requests in Turkish.

5.2. Social Distance

There were two research questions in relation with the social distance between interlocutors. Interlocutors' relationship was described as +SD when they were distant and -SD when they were intimate. The third research question was designed to investigate the appropriateness of requests conveyed in the English language and the fourth in the Turkish language taking into consideration the effects of SD.

Research Question 3: To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of social distance between the speaker and the hearer in English?

Regarding the results gained out of the data for +SD, it was seen that the preferences according to the level of directness for the 1st year E group was as follows; for situations 2 and 9, the most preferred one was the CI and the D request forms. The NCI forms and avoidance were not preferred at all.

Subjects' majority of CI preferences were appropriate since there was a social distance between the requester and the requestee in the given situations. There appears to be a slight but still meaningful difference of 6% between the two situations in terms of indirect form choices. %100 of subjects used indirect forms when requesting notes from a student whom they did not know much. On the other hand, they used 94% of CI forms in another situation where they were required to ask for an extension from an

instructor. What is surprising is their 6% of D form preference where their interlocutor was a socially distant person, their instructor. This finding may result from their assumption in that using 'please' makes it indirect and polite enough when performing requests. Learners tended to overuse this politeness marker. As mentioned before, White (1993) states that learners add 'please' to their requests and they assume that their utterance is satisfactorily polite.

As for the preferences between the intimate interlocutors (-SD), it can be said that the most frequently selected forms were CI request types followed by D and NCI ones (85.4%, 11.3% and 3.3%). Since there was not SD between interlocutors, the preferences for D types would be appropriate. However, the student teachers most frequently selected indirect requests (CI and NCI). These findings may result from the tendency of being formal when writing answers in DCT as mentioned earlier. In addition, subjects may use the 'overlearned' request types since generally in monolingual language classrooms in Turkey, requests are taught without considering the context of situations but in isolated ways as formal and informal. The emphasis is put on the modal verb question forms and the effects of such teaching are observed in most of the findings of the present study (the high preferences of CI forms). Karatepe (2003) draws attention to the point that "Students can be helped to become aware of the issues related to the appropriate uses of indirect requests by focusing on the circumstances that require this kind of use in Turkish" (p.153). She adds that this will help them to better consider the distance between the participants, weight of imposition and power in the target language.

The analysis of main verbs showed that the informants preferred the following verbs for Situation 2, 9 and 7; 'lend' with 44.4% and 'give' with 25.5%, 'give' with 63.3%, 'help' with 75.5%. Their verb choices were appropriate except for the 25.5% of 'give' for Situation 2 in requesting notes from a student. The subjects were expected to use 'lend' instead of 'give' since the latter verb can easily lead to communicative failure. The verb 'give' involves the meaning of owning the requested notes not borrowing them. However, Turkish EFL learners show a considerable tendency to

misuse the verbs 'give/take' and 'lend/borrow'. Otcu and Tankut (2003) emphasize that the teaching of 'lend' and 'borrow' should be focused on in EFL classrooms in Turkey.

Research Question 4: To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the factor of social distance between the speaker and the hearer in Turkish?

It was seen that there were differences between the two situations (2 and 9) for +SD when Turkish data were analysed. For the choices of D request forms, both the 1st and the 3rd year groups showed a considerable difference between the situations. The former group used 2.3% of D requests in Situation 2 (borrowing notes from a student); however, they used 13.4% D forms in Situation 9 (asking for an extension of a deadline from an instructor). In addition, the 3rd year group selected D forms for Situation 2 and 9 as follows, 1% and 11%. These findings are quite surprising since they showed that both groups were not able to produce appropriate requests in their native language by being direct to their interlocutor who was socially distant and deserve deference according to the expectations of Turkish culture. This finding may be resulting from their assumption that longer sentences with elaboration and explanation reveal indirectness. Most of the participants lengthened their utterances in Situation 9; however, they used direct request types in the head act.

When it comes to the CI forms, it is obvious that most of the participants prefer being indirect. CI preferences are expected for socially distant interlocutors, thus both groups made appropriate choices.

As for the NCI forms which are suitable for +SD situations, it was seen that the 3rd year group showed consistence by making preferences in both situations. The 1st year T group did not make requests in NCI forms in Situation 2, but showed consistence with the baseline data of 3rd year T group in preferring NCI request types.

The groups avoided at low rates performing requests in Situation 9 where they showed consistent results. Apart from the other group, the 1st year group did not avoid asking for notes from a student whom they did not know very well in Situation 2 which

might have been stemming from the status of the interlocutor who was a student just as themselves.

For the intimate interlocutors (-SD), the findings suggest that for the both groups the high frequency of CI forms is dominant again. In addition, both groups preferred NCI requests where the 1st year group showed less preference than the 3rd year group with 3.3% vs. 8%. This was an unexpected result since the subjects were required to ask for help from a close friend. However, this can be explained with the effect of another variable, the size of imposition, where the S asks for help from a friend for the project paper to be handed in two days later. The time is limited and this may be a pressure on the S.

Both the groups were able to show the expected behaviour in terms of being D with intimate interlocutors; however, this finding was not satisfying because of the low rates of selection (14.5% of 1st year group and 10% for the 3rd year group). This finding appears to reinforce the idea that the participants fail to make appropriate preferences in Turkish.

The informants' main verb preferences in Turkish requests are also analysed. For Situation 2, there were differences between the 3rd year baseline and the 1st year groups. The former one mostly preferred the verb 'almak' (to take); however, the latter group chose the verb 'vermek' (to give) most frequently. This may be resulting from the different preferences for perspectives in their request utterances. For Situation 9, both groups made consistent, therefore appropriate choices for the verb 'süre/zaman vermek' (to give time) as most frequently used one.

Finally, in their conveyance of requests for Situation 7, both groups again preferred the verb 'yardım etmek' (to help) most frequently. Thus, it can be said that their utterances were appropriate. However, the baseline group used 'V+sene/sana' like in "*Bana ödevimde yardım etsene.*" The 1st year group did not use these verbs at all.

5.3. Size of Imposition

The SI involved in the request is considered as +SI where the size of imposition is big and -SI where it is small. There are two research questions in the present study in

relation to SI. The fifth question investigates whether Turkish student teachers chose appropriate requests by considering the SI in English and the sixth question has been designed to explore the same thing but in Turkish.

Research Question 5: To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the degree of imposition burdened on the hearer in English?

To start with the +SI where the imposition is big, it was seen that the most preferred request type was CI for the 1st year E subject group. There were two situations (3 and 8) related to the +SI where the participants were required to borrow notes from the H with the time limitation, four days for the exam and in the eighth situation they were to ask for help from a classmate who had just finished his/her project and looked forward to having a good rest.

When the D choices were counted, it was seen that they used these forms with 2.2% and 6.6% of preferences. It appears that the learners did not take into account the variable that is the big size of imposition which burdened the addressee. This may be resulting from their inability of conveying indirect requests or their lack of knowledge about the need to make adjustments according to the social variables. The isolated way of classroom teaching speech acts without considering the context may be showing its effects here.

As for the CI form selections, it was observed that the subjects preferred them with 97.8% and 93.4% which are quite high. These findings revealed that the subjects tried to minimize the risk of being rejected by using indirect forms. On the other hand, they were expected to choose to use NCI request types to be more indirect since the burden was really high in both situations. It appears that NCI form use was not fully achieved by the 1st year learners. This may be resulting from the classroom instruction where learners overuse the CI forms especially modal verb questions. This may affect learners in a way that they choose CI requests either consciously or unconsciously. Another reason may be the possibility of being misunderstood by the H. Weizman explains that a requestive hint, as "(...) an utterance which under certain circumstances, may be interpreted as an indirect request; but which, being inherently opaque, leaves the hearer

uncertain as to the speaker's intentions, and leaves the speaker the possibility to opt out." (1989:73). The writer adds that in performing requestive hints, the requester risks being misunderstood by the requestee and thus his/her request will be inefficient. The last reason may be the risky side of being indirect. Thomas (1995) indicates that "It is 'risky' in the sense that the hearer may not understand what the speaker is getting at." (p.120).

For the -SI where the size of imposition is small, it can be said that learners preferred just two types which are D and CI forms. They did not use NCI type of requests again and the reasons for this finding may be the same as the ones explained above. 16.6% of selection for D requests shows that they considered the social factor effect in this situation. It appears that they were able to realize and take into consideration the small size of imposition when performing their requests.

However, the high preference for CI forms reveals that most of them could not achieve the full ability of considering the context. Faerch and Kasper (1989) say that learners tend to choose longer forms, thus produce 'overelaborate and overcomplex' utterances. They add that in the interlanguage use, this was called as 'the more the better' strategy. The informants produce longer utterances in conveying requests. This may be stemming from their inability of expressing themselves in short but clear sentences.

It was obvious that informants mostly preferred the verb 'lend' in Situation 3 where the verb choice was appropriate. However, the use of the verb 'give' with 24.6% is again considerable. As mentioned earlier, the inappropriate choice of 'give' may be resulting from the inadequate knowledge of its connotations and use in context. In addition, the interference of the Turkish equivalent of 'give' which is 'vermek' may be confusing for Turkish EFL learners.

For Situations 8 and 5, the informants preferred appropriate verbs such as 'help' and 'turn down' in their request forms. This shows that they have the adequate knowledge for verb choices in English in general.

Research Question 6: To what extent do Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms by considering the degree of imposition burdened on the hearer in Turkish?

When the Turkish data were analysed, it was seen that the 1st year group differed in their choice of D forms between Situations 3 and 8 for +SI. The difference is 16.6% which was meaningful (2.2% vs. 18.8%). The same tendency was observed for the baseline group with 26% of difference (1% vs. 27%). Subjects were more indirect when asking for notes with time limitation than asking for help from a very tired friend. This was an unexpected preference. This may be resulting from the Turkish culture where close friends do the hardest jobs and show solidarity for each other. This perception reinforces the use of D forms.

As for the CI and NCI forms, it appears that the high preference is again for CI forms. The subjects in both groups selected NCI request types less than CI forms. Both groups are consistent here. However, the 3rd year group used less CI requests than the 1st year group. This again shows that they consider the big size of imposition but with different perceptions. This finding may be resulting from the closeness of classmates since both situations related to classmate interlocutors. The 3rd year group, undoubtedly, was closer in their friendship regarding that they shared the same class for a longer time than the other group did. The possible effect of student culture in their perception of friendship was seen here.

When it comes to -SI, the results are again surprising. The most frequent preference was for CI forms where subjects wanted to be indirect in their requests. The expected one was D forms since the size of imposition was small. The 1st year group showed 12.2% and the 3rd year group 11% of D choices. The difference is slight, thus it appears that both groups made consistent choices. While the latter group chose NCI forms (3%) and avoided giving answers (2%), it was not considered to be a meaningful finding because of the low frequencies.

The main verb selections in the Turkish data will be explained now. In Situation 3, the 3rd year group mostly preferred 'almak' (to take) followed by 'vermek' (to give) in their requests. However, the 1st year group most frequently preferred 'vermek' followed

by 'almak'. The effect of perspective was seen here again. It can be said that 1st year group used appropriate verbs in their conveyance of requests in Turkish.

When it comes to Situation 8, it appears that the 1st year group preferred appropriate verbs since they were in the same line with the baseline group in terms of their preferences for the verb 'yardım etmek' (to help).

As for Situation 5, there was a perfect consistency between the findings of 3rd year baseline and the 1st year groups. They preferred the verb 'kısmak' (to turn down) at exactly the same percentages (65%). This showed that the 1st year group used appropriate verbs in their Turkish request forms.

5.4. Transfer

The results of E and T language groups will be compared here to find an answer to the last research question which investigates whether there was transfer from Turkish into English.

Research Question 7: To what extent do Turkish student teachers transfer L1 request forms into L2 situations?

The main verb preferences, the use of address terms and the length of utterances will be mentioned here.

In general, it was observable that the informants used a variety of address terms in their Turkish requests. This is quite expected since the Turkish language has a rich source of address terms. They varied these terms by considering the context of situation together with their interlocutors. That is, the subjects used 'arkadaşım, canım, güzelim, kanka, koçum, etc.' for those who were socially close to them such as classmates or other friends in the same department. In addition, they made adjustments, particularly, when their interlocutors did not have power over them. In Situation 4, they asked for silence from children. Thus, their address terms differed such as 'canım, tatlım, güzelim, bızdık, küçük delikanlı, abicim, ablacım, evlat and alsö lan'. Açıkalın (1991) says that young people use different forms of speech inside and outside their family. She adds that they use colloquial words and slang frequently. The use of address terms 'lan/ulan, olum/oğlum' in the present study reinforces the writer's findings.

However, it can be said that learners might have transferred some address forms, most frequently the ones such as 'friend, dear, kids and teacher'. Their tendency to use these forms supports this; however, they could not use as many address terms in English as they did in Turkish. They were limited to a few choices as mentioned above. This may be resulting from their lack of sociocultural competence. That is, their inability may be stemming from their lack of knowledge about how to vary these terms in the target language in accordance with the cultural expectation of English. In addition, another possibility may be their lack of linguistic knowledge which may result in the overgeneralization of terms like friend, kids, etc. As for the use of the word 'teacher' and 'hocam', Otcu and Tankut (2003) indicate that the use of "teacher" is an attempt at expressing positive politeness as it seems to be equivalent of the Turkish term 'hocam' which indicates positive politeness in Turkish. They add that "Moreover, the term 'teacher' seems to result from not only the transfer of a linguistic form but also that of a politeness strategy showing deference." (p. 55) In Situation 9, approximately all of the informants preferred to use 'hocam' in their requests.

The findings of main verbs suggest that the Turkish student teachers have some problems in the use of 'give' and 'take' and also 'borrow' and 'lend'. It was seen that a considerable part of learners misused these verbs. To make it clearer, they use 'give/take' instead of 'lend/borrow'. They may be transferring these verbs from Turkish into English. Another reason of misusing these verbs may be their lack of knowledge about the difference of meaning between 'take/give' and 'borrow/lend'. They may be assuming that 'give and take' are equivalents of 'vermek and almak' in Turkish.

However, they can easily be misunderstood in English since 'give' and 'take' involves the meaning of possessing the requested item in the given situations. Otcu and Tankut (2003) suggest that teachers should focus on the teaching of 'borrow' and 'lend' while performing requests. They also add that Turkish EFL learners use 'take' and 'give' which results in communicative failure. In the present study, most of the subjects did not use softeners like 'for a short time, for tonight, etc.' or promises to give back the notes as they frequently preferred to use in Turkish. This finding raises the possibility of being misunderstood by native speakers.

As for the length of utterance, the effect of transfer from Turkish into English was seen. For Situation 4 and 9, most of the non-native speakers of English preferred long sentences in order to ask for silence from children and request extension from an instructor. Since their tendency in Turkish is the same with quite high percentages, it can be thought that they transferred the length of utterance from Turkish request forms into the target language requests. Their preference for long sentences in Situation 4 may be resulting from the desire of convincing the children to keep quiet for a while with detailed explanations. As for Situation 9, it may be stemming from the desire to sound more polite. Rintell and Mitchell (1989) reinforce this by indicating that "Having more and/or longer supportive moves in requests in particular can contribute to a perception of the request as more elaborate and therefore more polite." (p. 266).

To sum up, this study has evidence that Turkish EFL learners may face with communicative problems resulting from transfer and lack of knowledge. Doğançay-Aktuna and Kanişlı's (1997) findings support this by indicating that even advanced Turkish EFL learners make pragmatic errors resulting from the lack of linguistic proficiency to convey the necessary act. They add that learners also transfer 'the sociolinguistic norms of their mother tongue to the target language' (p. 153). The non-native speakers have communicative problems when conveying requests.

5.5. Interview

It was understood that the informants in general performed the discourse completion test by considering the given variables, namely, power, social distance and the size of imposition.

They showed a tendency of having difficulties in requesting extension from their teacher and requesting silence from children. Their effort is observable from the overelaborated and long utterances especially for these specific situations.

In the interview, they indicated that they did not prefer speaking in English with their friends which may be affecting their fluency in expressing their thoughts. In addition, they were aware of the fact that performing appropriate requests require the sociolinguistic and sociocultural knowledge together. As it is understood from the

responses, their chances to acquire them both is limited to classroom instructions and learners' own efforts of listening to music and watching films in English.



CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1. Summary and Conclusions

The present study aimed to find out whether Turkish student teachers choose to use appropriate request forms in the English and the Turkish language. In relation to this aim, the social variables described in Brown and Levinson (1987) were taken into consideration, namely power, social distance and size of imposition involved in the request.

According to the findings of the study, it was seen that there were differences in terms of appropriateness of requests in both languages. The summary will be dealt with considering the variables given in the discourse completion test.

For the power variable, it can be noted that informants sometimes considered power relations with their interlocutors as S power over H (+P), S power equal to H power (=P) and H power over S (-P). In addition, it was clear that for some situations student teachers did not take these into consideration.

In situations where the S had power over the H (+P), it was found that the informants were partially successful in choosing direct request strategies. The most preferred strategy was CI forms which showed that they did not make appropriate preferences in general. Surprisingly, the analysis of the Turkish data revealed similar findings. This may be resulting from the effect of DCT where informants might have the tendency to produce formal utterances in writing.

As for the =P situations, again the most frequently preferred strategy was CI forms. This may be resulting from the textbook and classroom instruction effects in EFL classrooms in Turkey together with the possible DCT effect as mentioned above. Requests are generally taught as formal and informal forms without taking the context of situation into consideration in classrooms. In addition, both teachers and the course books show a tendency of reinforcing the frequent use of modal verb questions in

performing requests. In the present study, the finding of an increasing preference of CI request forms is observed in almost all situations in the DCT.

However, the informants appear to have performed requests appropriately in -P situations. They used CI strategies most frequently and that was an expected finding. Being indirect to interlocutors who have power over them shows that the subjects take power relations into account and produce appropriate requests in both languages. Here, it can be noted that both in Turkish and in English NCI forms are not preferred that much. This finding may provide evidence in that informants transferred their tendency of not using NCI strategies from Turkish into English. In addition, they may be overgeneralizing modal verb question use. Thomas (1983) reinforces this idea by indicating that learners quite often select one way of requesting and use it in all contexts.

For the other variable of SD, it can be noted that both appropriate and inappropriate preferences are found. When +SD variable was focused on, it was seen that informants produced successful requests in English by considering this social factor. However, being direct to their instructor was not preferred very often. As White (1993) indicates, this may be resulting from the wrong assumption that adding the politeness marker of 'please' at the end of the request will make it sound polite. The same results were found in the Turkish data. It appears that in Turkish, speakers assume that longer sentences with explanations will be enough to sound polite. The effects of Faerch and Kasper's (1989) 'the more the better' strategy can be seen in Turkish language.

The results of the -SD situations indicate that the most preferred strategy was CI one in both languages. The informants were expected to be direct to their requestees; however, they used CI forms. This may be resulting from the effect of another variable which is the big SI seen on the same situation.

For the last variable which is SI, the findings are analysed in accordance with +SI and -SI situations. When it comes to +SI, it was found that informants mostly used CI request forms which was appropriate for the given situation. On the other hand, NCI strategies would be better in situations involving big SI. However, subjects did not use them with high preferences. Weizman (1989) states that hints as being NCI request

forms are inherently opaque and leaves the hearer uncertain about the speaker's intentions which may raise the possibility of opting out. As a result of this explanation, it can be noted that informants show a tendency to minimize the risk of the H's opting out by using NCI requests.

Finally, -SI requests show that participants were able to realize and take into consideration the small SI by preferring D request strategy. However, the high preferences for CI strategies reveals that most of them could not achieve the full ability of considering -SI. As Faerch and Kasper (1989) indicate, this may be stemming from learners' tendency of choosing longer forms and producing overelaborate and overcomplex forms.

As for the use of address terms, it was found that informants used a variety of these terms in Turkish but used in limited variety in English requests. It appears that they have lack of knowledge about using different terms. As for the use of address terms, it was found that informants used a variety of these terms in Turkish but used in limited variety in English requests. It appears that they have lack of knowledge about using different terms in accordance with the cultural expectations of L2. There is another possibility which is their lack of linguistic knowledge about address terms.

The main verb preferences suggest that the Turkish EFL student teachers have serious problems in the use of 'give/take' and 'borrow/lend'. The findings show that a considerable percentage of learners misuse these verbs in English. They may sound rude or be misunderstood by in an intercultural setting when they use 'give' and 'take' instead of 'borrow' and 'lend'. Otcu and Tankut (2003) did similar observations in their study. These verbs should be dealt with in EFL classes. Even learners at teacher education programs, as seen in the present study, may make pragmatic errors stemming from the lack of linguistic proficiency.

6.2. Suggestions for Further Research

The present study deals with the appropriateness of request forms in Turkish and in English. The three variables which are P, SD and SI were involved in the DCT to find out whether they were considered by participants. However, it was found out that from

time to time the informants were affected by other variables apart from the determined variable for some situations. In other words, they mostly preferred CI request strategies affected by the big SI where the actual variable had been the power factor. For that reason, it can be noted that the DCT may not be revealing clear cut social factor effects for each situations. Other studies involving the same variables may consider this side effect and prepare their data collection tools under the light of this explanation.

In the study, it was seen that informants' tendency of being formal may lead them to indirect strategies and inappropriate preferences. Rintell and Mitchell (1989) explain that more formal language may be produced by informants in DCTs because they may perceive writing activity more formal than speaking. It was mentioned before that the DCT showed its effect of being formal in this study. This effect should be taken into consideration when the data were being examined. In addition, this finding may be useful for other researchers who prefer to use written data collection methods in their study.

In addition, oral data together with the written data can be collected to find out the differences and the effect of writing activity. Oral data would reveal more natural or authentic data. Moreover, the length of utterance would better be revealed in the oral data.

The effects of classroom teaching have also been observed in the findings of the present study. It was also found that even learners with high proficiency levels, namely student teachers at university, performed requests which might lead to pragmatic failure. For that reason, material development studies should be carefully done by researchers so that pragmatic awareness can be raised in EFL teaching settings. This is especially crucial for Turkey who expects to become a member of the European Union. In the Common European Framework for languages (designed by the European Council in 2000), it is indicated that language policies should be revised and developments should be done to teach sociocultural, sociopragmatic and sociolinguistic proficiency. Since Turkey has been a member of the Council of Europe, these changes can be put into application before Turkey became a member of the European Union. It is seen that communicative failures may occur resulting from the lack of knowledge in intercultural

settings. More research is needed to make necessary changes to adapt principles of the Common European Framework in the Turkish foreign language education.

In addition, different research can be conducted to find out more about the intercultural differences in the performance of speech acts apart from the notion of transfer. It is evident in the literature that research on the cultural aspect of speech acts is needed.

6.3. Implications for Foreign Language Teaching

As mentioned several times earlier in the present study, the informants showed high preferences for CI request form use. It may be the effect of textbooks in EFL classrooms. In addition, the role of the teacher may be another possible effect. The textbooks and the teachers generally divide requests into two types as formal and informal. Formal requests are said to be preferred for interlocutors who have authority over the speaker, who are socially distant and when there is a big size of imposition burdened on the requestee. Informal requests are explained to be used with power equals or with hearers who do not have power over the speaker, with socially close people and when the size of imposition is small. The general tendency is teaching them without context of situations as isolated sentences. This way of learning leads learners to overgeneralizing some structures such as modal verb questions (Can, Could, Would, etc.).

In this study, the effects of overgeneralizations were seen quite often. In order to overcome this problem, learners should be made aware of the social variables and the explicit teachings should be focused on contexts involving different variables. This way of teaching may help to awareness raisings and the acquisition of pragmatic competence. In addition, the findings of present study may help textbook teachers or foreign language teachers.

The informants, who participated in the interview, stated that they did not have enough number of opportunities to use more authentic materials. Teachers can use authentic materials such as songs, documents (newspapers, magazines, books, timetables, etc.), movies, etc. to increase learners' chance to learn the target language

via authentic materials. This may add to the teaching of sociopragmatics features of the newly learned language. It may also improve the communicative competence.

However, it was seen that the future teacher could not develop the full ability to convey appropriate requests since the informants of the present study were Turkish student teachers. First of all, teacher education programs should be revised in such a way that they should include components to improve student teachers' communicative competence fully. This will enable them to teach better coming generations of young people in Turkey.

The use of computers and the internet should also become widespread. Teachers should make use of the developments in their field and be encouraged to carry out research by using these tools.



REFERENCES

- Açıklım, I. (1991). Türk Gençlerinin Yaşlıları Arasında Kullandıkları Konuşma Biçimleri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32. 233-259.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1993). Refining the DCT: Comparing open questionnaires and dialogue completion tasks. In Bouton, L. F. and Kaohru, Y. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and Language Monograph Series*, 4. University of Illinois: Urbana-Champaign.
- Billmyer, K., & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics*, 21.517-552.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of request. In Phillipson, R., Kellerman, E., Selinker, I., Sharwood Smith, M., & Swain, M. (Eds.). *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research* (pp.255-272) Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (Eds.) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests & Apologies*. Ablex: Norwood, NJ.
- Brown, G., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, C. S., & Channell, J. (1989). Researching politeness in a second language. In Butler, C.S., Cordwell, R. A., & Channell, J. (Eds.). *Language and Literature – Theory and Practice*. (pp.1-16). Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Clark, H. H., & Lucy, P. (1975). Understanding what is meant from what is said: A study in conversationally conveyed requests. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour*, 14. 56-72.
- Cohen A. D. (1996a). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18. 253-267.

- Cohen, A. D. (1996b). Speech acts. In McKay, S. L., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. (pp. 383-420). USA: CUP.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27. 33-56.
- Corder, S. P. (1992). A role for the mother tongue. In Gass, M. S. & Selinker, L. (Eds.) *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. (pp. 18-31). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Council of Europe. (2000). *A common European Framework of Reference for Languages*.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S., & Kamyşlı, S. (1997). Pragmatic transfer in interlanguage development: A case study of advanced EFL learners. *I.T.L.*, 117-118. 151-177.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14. 1-23.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: OUP. (pp.159-190).
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (Eds.). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests & Apologies*. (pp.221-247). Ablex: Norwood, NJ.
- Garcia, C. (1993). Making a request and responding to it: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19.127-152.
- Harlow, L. L. (1990). Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74.328-351.
- Hayasi, T. (1998). Gender differences in modern Turkish discourse. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 129. 117-126.
- Jae-Suk, S. (1999). Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *Iral*, 37:3. 195-213.
- Karatepe, Ç. (1998). *Teaching Pragmalinguistics in Teacher Training Programs*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Liverpool University. Liverpool, UK.
- Karatepe, Ç. (2001). Pragmalinguistic awareness in EFL teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 10. 178-188.

- Karatepe, Ç. (2003). Raising awareness about pragmalinguistic features of language. In Proceedings of the 8th International Bilkent University School of English Language ELT Conference. 147-155. Ankara: Meteksan.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993a). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. (pp. 3-17). Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993b). Speech act realization. In Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. (pp.59-63). Oxford: OUP.
- Koester, A. J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System*, 30. 167-184.
- Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage . *The Modern Language Journal*, 73. 279-289.
- Olshtain, E., Cohen, A. D. (1989). Speech act behaviour across languages. In Dechert, H. W., Raupach, M. (Eds.). *Transfer in Language Production*. (pp. 53-67). Ablex: Norwood, NJ.
- Otcu, B., & Tankut, P. (2003). What requests require: Requisites of oral production. In Proceedings of the 8th international Bilkent University School of English Language ELT conference. Ankara: Meteksan.
- Ranney, S. (1992). Learning a new script: An exploration of sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 13. 25-50.
- Richards, J. C. (1983). Communicative needs in foreign language learning. In Wolfson, N. & Judd, E. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Cambridge
- Rintell, E. M., & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: An inquiry into method. In Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (Eds.) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests & Apologies*. (pp. 248-272). Ablex: Norwood, NJ.
- Rose K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22. 27-59.
- Rose, K. R. (2001). Compliments and compliment responses in film: Implications for pragmatics research and language teaching. *IRAL*, 39. 309-326.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In Cole, P., & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.). *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

- Simpson, B. L. (1997). A study of the pragmatic perception and strategic behaviour of adult second language learners. *Language Awareness*, 6. 233-237.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4. 91-112.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/nonnatives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11.147-167.
- Weizman, E. (1989). Requestive hints. In Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (Eds.) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests & Apologies*. (pp. 71-95). Ablex: Norwood, NJ.
- White, R. (1993). Saying please: Pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction. *ELT Journal*, 47. 193-202.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Hong Kong: OUP.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A**THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST****NAME, SURNAME:****CLASS/NO:****INSTRUCTION**

Below there are nine situations. In each one, you are asked to make a request. Please complete these dialogues. Add one more turn when necessary.

SITUATION 1: Imagine that you have a final exam next week and four days to prepare for it. Since you missed the class several times before, you do not have notes on all topics. So, you decide to borrow notes from one of your class mates whom you are good friends with. You know that he/she has already begun preparing for the same exam. How would you ask him/her to lend you his/her notes?

You: Hello X.**Your Friend:** Hi!

You:

.....

.....

SITUATION 2: Imagine that you have a final exam next week and four days to prepare for it. Since you missed the class several times before, you do not have notes on all topics. So, you decide to borrow notes from a student whose notes are known to be quite tidy and clear. You do not know him/her well since you are not sharing the same class. How would you ask him/her to lend you his/her notes?

You: Hello.**He/She:** (He/She smiles.) Hello.

You:

.....

.....

SITUATION 3: Imagine that you have the final exam of the course that you failed last year. You are a fourth year student and you have been repeating that course with a third year class.

You have four days to prepare for the exam. Since you missed the class several times before, you do not have notes on all topics. So, you decide to borrow notes from a student in that class who is known to be quite hardworking. How would you ask him/her to lend you his/her notes?

You: Hello X.

He/She: Hello.

You:

.....

.....

SITUATION 4: Imagine that you had a final exam today. You are back home now and very tired because of the heavy load of exams. You plan to rest for a while and then prepare for the exam you will take tomorrow. You are determined to sleep for two hours. However, you cannot since you hear the terrible noise of your neighbour's children. How would you ask them to be quiet?

You: (Go upstairs and ring the bell.)

The child: (One of the children opens the door.)

You:

.....

.....

SITUATION 5: Imagine that you are staying at the dormitory and you have been there for three months. You have a project paper due tomorrow. You are very tired after school and you still try to finish the project. However, you cannot concentrate on it since you hear loud music coming from another student's room for half an hour. You met that student before but you did not talk to him/her much. He/She has been living there for three months just like you do. How would you ask him/her to be quiet?

You: (Knock on the door and go into the room.)

He/She: (Looks at you.)

You:

.....

.....

SITUATION 6: Imagine that you are staying at the dormitory and you have been there for a few months. You are preparing for your final exams of the first term. You are studying in your

room since you could not find a free table in the library. A student, who has been living in the dormitory for four years, is listening to the music very loudly. You find this terribly disturbing. His/Her room is next to yours. How would you ask him/her to be quiet?

You: (Knock on the door and enter into the room.)

He/She: (Looks at you.)

You:
.....
.....

SITUATION 7: Imagine that you are a fourth year student. You will be graduated in a few months. You have a term paper due the next day, but you have not done anything yet. You think you can ask for some help from one of your close friends. He/She is a second year student in your department. You go to his/her room to ask for help. How would you do this?

You: (You go near him/her and smile.)

He/She: (He/She looks at you and smiles.)

You:
.....
.....

SITUATION 8: Imagine that you are a fourth year student. You will be graduated in a few months. You have a term paper due the next day. You need some help from one of your classmates who is about to complete his/her paper. You know he/she is very tired and has been looking forward to having a good rest right after finishing up with the work. But, you are in a difficult position. How would you ask him/her to help you so that you can complete your project?

You: (You go to him/her and say you need to talk to him/her.)

He/She: (He/She is ready for listening to you.) Yes? What is the matter?

You:
.....
.....


SITUATION 9: Imagine that you are a fourth year student. You will be graduated in a few months. You have a term paper due the next day that requires much time to complete. You

really did your best. However, you failed to start your work when you should have done so. You will not be able to complete your paper before the deadline. You need one more week and you are sure that you will present a very good paper if you are given longer time. You know your instructor has a heavy program for this week and will not be able to grade these papers for at least one week. You go to your instructor's office. How would you ask for a one-week extension?

You: (Knock on the door and enter into the room.)

He/She: (Your instructor looks at you and smiles.)

You:
.....
.....



Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B**THE TURKISH VERSION OF THE DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST****AD, SOYAD:****SINIF/NO:**

Aşağıda dokuz durum verilmiştir. Her birinde sizden bir ricada bulunmanız istenmektedir. Lütfen diyalogları tamamlayınız. Eğer gerekirse yeni bir konuşma satırı ekleyebilirsiniz. Teşekkürler...

DURUM 1: Gelecek hafta final sınavınız olduğunu ve sınava hazırlanmak için dört gününüz kaldığını düşünün. Derse birkaç defa girmediğiniz için notlarınız tam değil. Samimi olduğunuz bir sınıf arkadaşınızdan notlarını istemeyi düşünüyorsunuz. Arkadaşınızın bu sınava çalışmaya başladığını biliyorsunuz. Notları arkadaşınızdan istemek için aşağıdaki diyalogda ne söylediniz?

Siz: Merhaba X.**Arkadaşınız:** Merhaba!

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 2: Gelecek hafta final sınavınız olduğunu ve sınava hazırlanmak için dört gününüz kaldığını düşünün. Derse birkaç defa girmediğiniz için notlarınız tam değil. Notları çok düzenli ve anlaşılır olan bir arkadaşınızdan notlarını istemeyi düşünüyorsunuz. Aynı sınıfta olmadığınız için bu arkadaşınızı çok iyi tanımıyorsunuz. Notları arkadaşınızdan istemek için aşağıdaki diyalogda ne söylediniz?

Siz: Merhaba.**Arkadaşınız:** (Gülümsüyor.) Merhaba.

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 3: Geçen sene başarısız olduğunuz bir dersin final sınavına gireceğinizi düşünün. Siz son sınıf öğrencisisiniz ve bu dersi alttan alıyorsunuz. Sınava hazırlanmak için dört gününüz var. Derse birkaç defa girmediğiniz için notlarınız tam değil. Dersi aldığınız sınıftaki çalışkan birinden notlarını istemeyi düşünüyorsunuz. Notları istemek için aşağıdaki diyalogda ne söylediniz?

Siz: Merhaba X.**Arkadaşınız:** Merhaba.

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 4: Bugün final sınavlarınızdan birine girdiğinizi düşünün. Şimdi evdesiniz ve sınavlar nedeniyle çok yorgunsunuz. Bir süre dinlenmeyi ve ardından yarınki sınava çalışmayı planladınız. İki saat uyumaya karar verdiniz. Ancak uyuyamıyorsunuz, çünkü komşunuzun çocuklarının yaptığı gürültüyü duyuyorsunuz. Sessiz olmalarını istemek için aşağıdaki diyalogda ne söylediniz.

Siz: (Yukarı çıkıp zili çaluyorsunuz.)

Çocuk: (Çocuklardan biri kapıyı açıyor.)

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 5: Öğrenci yurdunda olduğunuzu ve üç aydır bu yurttaki kaldığınızı düşünün. Yarın teslim edilmesi gereken bir ödeviniz var. Dersten çıktınız, çok yorgunsunuz ve projenizi bitirmeye çalışıyorsunuz. Fakat, başka bir öğrencinin odasından yarım saattir gelen yüksek sesli müzik yüzünden dikkatinizi toplayamıyorsunuz. Bu öğrenciyle daha önce karşılaşmıştınız ama onunla sadece merhabalaşmıştınız. O da sizin gibi üç aydır yurttaki kalıyor. Sessiz olmasını istemek için ona ne söylediniz?

Siz: (Odasının kapısını çalıp içeri giriyorsunuz)

Arkadaşınız: (Size bakıyor)

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 6: Öğrenci yurdunda olduğunuzu ve birkaç aydır bu yurttaki kaldığınızı düşünün. Birinci dönemin final sınavlarına hazırlanıyorsunuz. Çalışma odasında boş masa bulamadığınız için odanızda çalışıyorsunuz. Dört yıldır yurttaki kalan bir öğrenci yüksek sesle müzik dinliyor. Bu durum sizi çok rahatsız ediyor. Sessiz olmasını istemek için ona ne söylediniz?

Siz: (Odasının kapısını çalıp içeri giriyorsunuz)

Arkadaşınız: (Size bakıyor)

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 7: Son sınıf öğrencisi olduğunuzu düşünün. Birkaç ay içinde mezun olacaksınız. İki gün sonra teslim edilmesi gereken bir ödeviniz var, ama henüz yapmaya başlamadınız. Yakın arkadaşlarınızın birinden yardım isteyebileceğinizi düşünüyorsunuz. Arkadaşınız sizinle aynı bölümde okuyor ve ikinci sınıf öğrencisi. Yardım istemek için odasına gidiyorsunuz. Aşağıdaki diyalogda ona ne söylediniz?

Siz: (Arkadaşınızın yanına gidiyor ve gülümsüyorsunuz)

Arkadaşınız: (Size bakıyor ve gülümsüyor)

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 8: Son sınıf öğrencisi olduğunuzu düşünün. Birkaç ay içinde mezun olacaksınız. İki gün sonra teslim edilmesi gereken bir ödeviniz var, ama henüz yapmaya başlamadınız. Ödevini

bitirmek üzere olan bir sınıf arkadaşınızın yardımına ihtiyacınız var. Arkadaşınızın çok yorulduğunu ve ödevini tamamladıktan sonra güzel bir dinlenmeyi iple çektiğini biliyorsunuz. Ancak, çok zor durumdasınız. Aşağıdaki diyalogda arkadaşınıza ödevinizi tamamlayabilmek için ne söylediniz?

Siz: (Arkadaşınızın yanına gidiyor ve onunla konuşmanız gerektiğini söylüyorsunuz)

Arkadaşınız: (Arkadaşınız sizi dinliyor) Evet? Sorun nedir?

Siz:

.....

.....

DURUM 9: Son sınıf öğrencisi olduğunuzu düşünün. Birkaç ay içinde mezun olacaksınız. İki gün sonra teslim edilmesi gereken ve tamamlanması çok zaman alacak bir ödeviniz var. Elinizden gelenin en iyisini yaptınız. Ancak, ödevinize geç başladınız ve zamanında bitiremeyeceksiniz. Bir haftaya daha ihtiyacınız var ve bir haftalık ek süreyle çok iyi bir ödev hazırlayacağınızı biliyorsunuz. Hocanızın bu hafta çok yoğun bir programı olduğunu ve ödevleri en az bir hafta değerlendiremeyeceğini biliyorsunuz. Hocanızın ofisine gidiyorsunuz. Bir hafta uzatma istemek için ne söylediniz?

Siz: (Kapıyı çalıp içeri giriyorsunuz)

Hocanız: (Size bakıyor ve gülümsüyor)

Siz:

.....

.....

APPENDIX C

THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE INTERVIEW

Welcome. My name is Filiz Kal. I investigate requests in English and in Turkish in the language of Turkish student teachers in my MA thesis. We will have an interview in relation to my study. I am going to ask you 15 questions. Since the information that you provide will be kept confidential, please feel comfortable and give clear answers to the questions. I am going to record your answers.

QUESTIONS

1. Are you satisfied with your proficiency in English? Do you think your level of proficiency is enough for the class you attend to?
2. Are there any specific activities that you do to improve your proficiency in English? What are they? What are their advantages?
3. Have you ever been abroad?
4. What do you think can be done to improve the proficiency in English with these limited opportunities?
5. Do you speak in English with your friends inside and outside the classroom? What about with your teachers?
6. Did you experience any difficulties with your request forms when speaking in English? For example, did you use the same request forms when you needed to speak in formal language with your instructor or when you laid a considerable size of imposition on the addressee in your request?
7. Have you ever spoken to a native speaker of English instructor for such situations like asking for permission or borrowing a book? Did you plan your speech beforehand or not? Why? Why not?
8. Are there any friends that you frequently chat with or send e-mails in English on internet?
9. Do you think this kind of communication add to the improvement of the proficiency level in English? Did you request something in your e-mail messages? Did s/he request something from you?

10. What was/were the situation(s) that you had found the easiest to answer in DCT?
What is the reason? Why do you think it is easy to answer?
11. What was/were the situation(s) that you had found the most difficult to answer in DCT? What is the reason? Why do you think it is difficult to answer?
12. Did you think that the answers would be the same for the three similar situations that are given in DCT? Or did you answer considering the differences among situations?
13. Have you ever experienced one of the situations involved in the DCT? Have you experienced that situation when speaking in English or in Turkish?
14. Did you use the same type of requests as you performed in the DCT? Why do you think the differences between real life experiences and DCT responses stem from?
15. If you had responded to the situations given in the DCT face to face, would you use the same requests? What are the reasons that lead you to use different responses in speaking?

APPENDIX D

THE TURKISH VERSION OF THE INTERVIEW

Hoş geldiniz. Ben Filiz Kal. Yüksek lisans tezimde Türk öğretmen adayı öğrencilerinin İngilizce'de ve Türkçe'deki rica ifadelerini karşılaştırmalı olarak inceliyorum. Çalışmamla ilgili olarak sizinle görüşme yapacağız. Size 15 soru soracağım. Verdiğiniz bilgiler gizli tutulacağından kendinizi rahat hissediniz ve sorulara açık cevaplar veriniz lütfen. Cevaplarınızı teybe kaydedeceğim.

SORULAR

1. İngilizce düzeyinizden memnun musunuz? Sizce İngilizce seviyeniz devam ettiğiniz sınıf için yeterli mi?
2. İngilizce düzeyinizi ilerletmek için özellikle yaptığınız bir çalışma ya da faaliyet var mı? Nedir? Faydaları neler oluyor?
3. Yurt dışına gitme imkanınız oldu mu?
4. Sizce kısıtlı imkanlarla dil gelişimini devam ettirmek için neler yapılabilir?
5. Derste ve ders dışında arkadaşlarınızla İngilizce konuşuyor musunuz? Hocanızla İngilizce konuşuyor musunuz?
6. Bu konuşmalar sırasında rica ifadelerinizde günlük çektiğiniz zamanlar oldu mu? Örneğin, hocanızla daha resmi konuşmak gerektiğinde ya da ricada bulunduğunuz kişiyi ricanızla sıkıntıya soktuğunuzu, zor duruma düşürdüğünüzü hissettiğiniz zamanlarda hep aynı rica ifadelerini mi kullandınız?
7. Herhangi bir konuda izin alma, bir kitabı ödünç alma gibi konularda Philip Hocanızla konuştunuz mu? Söyleyeceklerinizi önceden düşünüp tasarladınız mı yoksa o an aklınıza geldiği gibi mi konuştunuz? Neden?
8. Yabancı dilinizde düzenli olarak elektronik posta yoluyla haberleştiğiniz veya sohbet ettiğiniz arkadaşlarınız var mı?
9. Sizce bu yolla haberleşme genel olarak İngilizce'yi ilerletiyor mu? Ne tür şeyler öğrendiniz? İngilizce olarak e-maile haberleştiğiniz arkadaşınızdan bir şey rica ettiniz mi? Onlar sizden bir şey rica etti mi?

10. Size uyguladığımız ankette yanıtlanmasını en kolay bulduğunuz durum/durumlar hangisi/hangileriydi? Size kolay gelmesinin nedeni nedir?
11. Size uyguladığımız ankette yanıtlanmasını en zor bulduğunuz durum/durumlar hangisi/hangileriydi? Size zor gelmesinin nedeni nedir?
12. Arka arkaya üç benzer duruma verilecek cevapların aynı olduğunu düşündünüz mü? Bu durumları aralarındaki farklılıkları gözeterek mi yanıtladınız?
13. Ankette yer alan durumlardan herhangi biri başınızdan geçti mi? Türkçe konuştuğunuz da mı yoksa İngilizce konuştuğunuzda mı böyle bir tecrübeniz olmuştu?
14. Bu tecrübenizde ankette verdiğiniz cevaptaki ifadenin aynısını mı kullanmıştınız? Sizce gerçek hayat ile test cevabı arasındaki farklılık neden kaynaklanıyor olabilir?
15. Anketteki durumları yüz yüze konuşma ortamında yanıtlamış olsaydınız aynı ifadeleri mi kullanırdınız? Sizi sözlü olarak farklı ifadeler kullanmaya iten nedenler nelerdir?

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

1979 yılında Elazığ'da doğdum. İlk ve orta öğrenimimi burada tamamladım. 2001 yılında Uludağ Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü'nden mezun oldum. Aynı yıl Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'nde yüksek lisans programına başladım.

İznik ve Gemlik'te İngilizce öğretmeni olarak çalıştım. Halen Kömür İşletmeleri İlköğretim Okulu'nda İngilizce öğretmenliği yapmaktayım.

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çiğdem Karatepe'nin danışmanlığında "Türk öğretmen adayı öğrencilerinin İngilizce'deki ve Türkçe'deki rica ifadelerinin karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi" konulu teze başladım.

Filiz Kal Ünal