CONCEPTUAL SOCIALIZATION IN EFL CONTEXTS: A CASE STUDY ON TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' REQUEST SPEECH ACTS REALIZATION

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

MERVE ŞANAL

THE PROGRAM OF TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

SEPTEMBER 2016

CONCEPTUAL SOCIALIZATION IN EFL CONTEXTS: A CASE STUDY ON TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' REQUEST SPEECH ACTS REALIZATION

The Graduate School of Education

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

Merve Şanal

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

The Program of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

September 2016

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Conceptual Socialization in EFL Contexts: A Case Study on Turkish EFL Learners' Request Speech Acts Realization

MERVE ŞANAL

September, 2016

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe (Supervisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Aysel Sarıcaoğlu (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Margaret K. Sands (Director)

ABSTRACT

CONCEPTUAL SOCIALIZATION IN EFL CONTEXTS: A CASE STUDY ON TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' REQUEST SPEECH ACTS REALIZATION

Merve Şanal

M.A., Program of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

September 2016

This study aimed to investigate Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their speech acts realization. More specifically, the study examined if the development of conceptual socialization is possible in EFL contexts by analyzing the similarities and differences between native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English in their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness in written and oral activities. In this respect, 25 higher level Turkish learners of English studying in a preparatory school and 10 native speakers of English working as language instructors in the same school took part in the study. In this mixed-methods approach study, the qualitative data were collected through written Discourse Completion Tasks (DCT) in English and Turkish including requests, refusing and accepting requests and audio recordings of role plays as oral discourse completion tasks. Qualitative data gained from the native speakers' and Turkish EFL learners responses to DCTs and role plays were graded by using

a criterion and the results were quantified to analyze descriptively by using the native speaker responses as a baseline.

The findings revealed that although Turkish EFL learners could perform similar to native speakers in terms of realizing appropriate acceptance speech acts, the learners could not produce appropriate request and refusal speech acts in different social situations. That was mostly because their level of formality and politeness was lower than the level of formality and politeness in native speaker responses. When their responses in Turkish were analyzed, linguistic and socio-pragmatic transfer from their mother tongue was observed. Additionally, Turkish EFL learners overused similar structures in each social interaction while native speakers used various linguistic structures. These findings helped draw the conclusion that learners' development of conceptual socialization in EFL context might be affected by classroom instruction and their L1 socialization in Turkish.

Considering the results above, this study implied the importance of learner experiences in classroom teaching in EFL context, where there is no authentic interaction, and raising learners' awareness about the cultural differences reflected on the language use in different social encounters to help them develop conceptual socialization.

Key words: Conceptual socialization, speech acts, requests

ÖZET

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN KAVRAMSAL SOSYALLEŞMESİ: RİCA SÖZ EDİMLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Merve Şanal

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Deniz ORTAÇTEPE

Eylül 2016

Bu çalışma, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin İngilizce söz edimleri kullanımlarındaki kavramsal sosyalleşme gelişimini araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Daha detaylı olarak, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce bağlamlarında, kavramsal sosyalleşme gelişiminin mümkün olup olmadığını, Türk öğrenciler ve ana dili İngilizce olan kişiler arasındaki rica, kabul ve ret söz edimi kullanım benzerlik ve farklılıklarını, resmiyet, kibarlık, doğruluk ve uygunluk seviyeleri açısından yazılı ve sözlü aktiviteler aracılığıyla araştırmayı hedeflemiştir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, karma yöntem izlenen bu araştırmada bir üniversitenin hazırlık okulunda İngilizce öğrenmekte olan 25 Türk öğrenci ve yine aynı kurumda öğretmen olarak çalışan ana dili İngilizce olan 10 tane öğretmen yer almıştır. Nitel veriler 14-soruluk İngilizce ve Türkçe yazılı rica, ricaları kabul ve ret söylem tamamlama aktivitesi ve sözlü söylem tamamlama aktivitesi olarak rol canlandırma aktivitelerinin ses kaydı aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Türk öğrencilerin cevapları bir ölçüt kullanarak puanlandırılmış ve nicel sonuçlar ana dili İngilizce olan katılımcıların cevapları temel alınarak

tanımlayıcı bir şekilde açıklanmıştır.

Bu çalışmanın bulguları, İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin kabul söz edimlerini ana dili İngilizce olan katılımcılar gibi uygun bir şekilde kullanırken, rica ve ret söz edimlerini uygun bir şekilde kullanamadıklarını göstermiştir. Bunun sebeplerinden bazıları öğrencilerin söz edimleri kullanımında kibarlık ve resmiyet seviyesi açısından farklı sosyal bağlamlarda ana dili İngilizce olan katılımcılar kadar yeterli seviyede olamamaları olmuştur. Türk öğrencilerin cevapları incelendiğinde, ana dillerinden dilbilim ve toplumsal dilbilim öğelerini, İngilizce 'ye transfer yaptıkları gözlenmiştir. Buna ek olarak, Türk öğrenciler bazı yapıları her sosyal etkileşim için tekrar tekrar kullanırken, ana dili İngilizce olan katılımcılar çeşitli kelime ve gramer yapıları kullanmıştır. Bu bulgular, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenim bağlamında, öğrencilerin kavramsal sosyalleşme gelişimlerinin sınıf içi ders öğretimi ve Türkçe 'deki ana dil sosyalleşmelerinden etkilenebildiğini göstermektedir.

Yukarıdaki bulgular göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, bu çalışma gerçek dil etkileşimin bulunmadığı yabancı dil olarak İngilizce bağlamlarında, öğrencilerin sınıf içi dil öğrenim tecrübelerinin ve yabancı dil öğretirken öğrencilerin dikkatini dil kullanımına yansıyan kültürel farklılıklara çekmenin önemini vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kavramsal sosyalleşme, söz edimleri, ricalar

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis was one of the most demanding yet most fulfilling experiences of my life. Therefore, I would like to thank everyone who provided me with their guidance, encouragement and support throughout this process.

First and foremost, I would like to express my heart-felt gratitude to my thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe, who has been much more than an academic consultant for me. Without her constructive and thought-provoking feedback, constant guidance and wisdom, I could not have created such a piece of work. She has been and will be a true source of motivation and inspiration in my life. Here, once again, "Thank you for all the things you did for me!"

I would like to express my appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı and Dr. Aysel Sarıcaoğlu, for their insightful comments, guidance, suggestions and the faith they showed to the value of my study.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the directorate of Bilkent University School of English Language for providing me with the opportunity to take part in such an eligible program.

Special thanks must be given to the students and the native speakers who participated in my research and helped me collect the data. Many thanks to Fatmagül Yıldırım and Feyza Sütcü for allocating time to share their classes with me. I also would like to express my special thanks to Clare Yalçın and Robert Loomis for their time and collaboration. Thank you for making this study possible!

I am also grateful to my “colleagues” in Teaching Unit 3, my line manager, Seçil Canbaz, my “lifelong” friends; Neslihan Erbil, Sertaç Erbil, Halime Yıldız, Tuba Bostancı, Özden Öztok and Güleyse Kansu, my “classmates” in MA TEFL program; Hazal İnce, Zeynep Saka, Pelin Çoban, Şebnem Kurt and Cansu Kocatürk. Without their encouragement and trust in me, it would have been really difficult to survive in this challenging process.

My deepest gratitude goes to my beloved family; Mustafa Şanal, Zuhal Şanal and Başak Şanal for their unconditional love and trust in me to accomplish any journey in life. Thank you for being there all the time for me.

Last but not the least, my special thanks goes to Koray Biber who was there to support me through the end of my journey. Thank you for the kindness and trust you showed in me. I hope you will stay where you are forever.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Being a competent language learner requires developing not only morphological, syntactic, grammatical or lexical knowledge in that language but also pragmatic competence which is related to interacting with others appropriately in a social context. Pragmatics deals with the ways how different contexts contribute to the meaning (Crystal, 1997). Developing one's pragmatic competence in their first language (L1), including the linguistic and social knowledge, is driven by their socio-cultural environment. However, "individual will and preference" becomes more important than social environment when it comes to developing L2 pragmatic competence (Kecskes, 2015, p. 1). As the rules for using the language appropriately in a social context are not universal but vary across languages, there have been a growing number of studies in the field of teaching and learning pragmatics (e.g., Kasper, 1992; Wolfson, 1981).

Developing pragmatic competence and improving socialization skills in the second language are important to language learning and have been researched a lot. However, studies regarding *conceptual socialization*, which underlines that the "changes in pragmatic competence are primarily conceptual rather than linguistic" while learning a second language, are scarce (Kecskes, 2015, p. 8). What scholars point out as the problem is that to develop fluency and experience social practice, a language learner needs to spend some time in the target culture and be exposed to natural use of the language (Kecskes & Papp, 2000; Robert et al., 2001).

Not being aware of the fact that the cultural values and norms are different in the target language, second language learners are likely to face various problems while communicating in different situations. Additionally, having limited access to target language environment, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context makes it difficult for foreign language learners to realize the social differences and develop pragmatic competence (Ortactepe, 2012). Hence, educating teachers and including teaching pragmatics in language teaching curricula is very important to help learners socialize in the second language. In that sense, speech acts, used in real-life interactions such as offering apologies, requests, greetings or complaints, play a key role in investigating pragmatic competence. That is why the investigation of cross-cultural speech acts, which is based on the assumption that speech acts are realized in each language but in different ways, can shed light onto the way how languages differ from each other and how it affects language learners' use of language.

Turkish and English, coming from two separate language families, reflect different cultures with various historical backgrounds. Turkish EFL learners have a tendency to use speech acts, especially requests and refusals, inappropriately in some contexts as they might neglect social rules such as formality, power and distance between the speaker and interlocutor. Kecskes (2015) states that "pragmatic competence is directly tied to and develops through the use of formulaic expressions, mainly because use of formulas is group identifying" (p. 14). Similar to formulaic expressions, speech acts reflect cultural norms and values of a society especially when different power and distance relationships are involved. Requests, accepting and refusing them are not only common to everyday life but also worth analyzing as they vary in social parameters. That's why, they can give a deep insight into the

process of conceptual socialization. The aim of this study is, therefore, to investigate if the development of conceptual socialization is possible in EFL contexts. More specifically, the study aims to explore Turkish EFL learners' conceptual socialization in their realization of request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness in semi-controlled and free practice activities.

Background of the Study

The process of language socialization involves developing both socio-cultural behavior and language skills (Poole, 1994). Language socialization refers to "a process requiring children's participation in social interactions so as to internalize and gain performance competence in these socio-cultural defined contexts" (Schieffelin and Ochs, 1986, p. 2). Language socialization does not only deal with how children enter a society and develop language skills by observing the cultural values but also refers to a lifelong process that involves different social interactions. In this respect, as the process of second language learning involves learning about the target language culture, the framework of L1 socialization can be applied to second language socialization as well. Second language socialization is the "assimilation into the linguistic conventions and cultural practices of the L2 discourse communities" while learning a foreign language especially in context (Lam, 2004, p. 44). To this end, language socialization in the second language has also inspired many researchers (e.g., Matsumura, 2001, Ortactepe, 2013). However, research relating pragmatic development in the second language focused mostly on the effect of L1 on L2 (Kasper, 1992) or sociolinguistic transfer from L1 (Wolfson, 1981). However, Kecskes and Papp (2000) came up with a different perspective by defining the term, *conceptual socialization*. They stated that the transfer is not

limited to L1 influence on L2 but rather bidirectional. Also the influence is not restricted to linguistics but it also involves knowledge and skill transfer. The link between pragmatics and socialization lies in the fact that language learners can access to pragmatic and communicative conditions through being exposed to native speakers' norms, wants, beliefs and wishes (Coulmas, 1979).

Developing pragmatic ability is important for language socialization because it is difficult to attend any social interaction in daily life if without pragmatic competence (Matsumura, 2001). Crystal (1997) defines pragmatic ability as "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (p. 301). In other words, pragmatics deals with communicative action where it is uttered. Communicative action refers to use of speech acts, different kinds of discourse and engaging in speech events having different length and complexity (Rose & Kasper, 2001). Speech acts, one of the fields that pragmatics encompasses, are functional units in communication. According to Austin's theory of speech acts, (as cited in Cohen, 1996) utterances have three kinds of meaning. One of them is *propositional or locutionary* meaning which is "the literal meaning of the utterance". Another kind of meaning is *illocutionary* that is "the social function that the utterance or written text has". The last one is *perlocutionary force* which is "the result of effect that is produced by the utterance in that given context" (p. 384). Speech acts with locutionary meaning do not usually cause misunderstandings; however, as illocutionary and perlocutionary meaning is shaped through the social context, they are more likely to be misinterpreted by second language learners. Based on different functions, speech acts have also been classified into five macro-classes

by Searle (as cited in Cutting, 2002): “representatives (assertions, claims, reports), directives (suggestion, request, command), expressives (apology, complaint, thanks), commissives (promise, threat), and declaratives (decree, declaration)” (p. 16).

As performing speech acts that carry social functions is specific to a culture, foreign language learners might find it challenging to communicate appropriately in the target language. In other words, even if learners utter grammatically and phonologically accurate sentences, they may still fail in a conversation due to their lack of pragmatic competence in the target language (e.g., Li, Suleiman & Sazalie, 2015; Ortactepe, 2012; Taguchi, 2012). This is partly because pragmatics requires attending multipart mapping of form, function, meaning, force and context which are intricate, variable non-systematic (Taguchi, 2015). Therefore, the analysis of speech acts in various languages has become necessary to understand both similarities and differences between languages and to help learners gain pragmatic competence.

A large body of cross-cultural pragmatics studies has aimed at reporting the way speech acts are realized across languages (e.g., Byon, 2001; Fukushima, 1996; Hong, 1998; Lee, 2004; Lu, 2001; Ming-Fang Lin, 2014; Pinto & Raschio, 2007; Siebold & Busch, 2015). To this end, the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) focusing on request and apology speech acts was first conducted in various languages (i.e., Hebrew, Danish, and German) by using a discourse completion questionnaire (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Discourse completion tasks (DCTs) are written questionnaires where participants are asked to fill in an appropriate response by using the speech act to the given situational descriptions (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). Some comparative studies including complaint, apology and request speech acts have also been conducted with Turkish learners of English to investigate how Turkish EFL learners realize these speech acts (e.g., Bikmen &

Marti, 2013; Istifci, 2009; Kılıckaya, 2010). These empirical studies have shed light onto how language learners perform speech acts, how languages differ from each other and to what extent mother tongue influences the use of speech acts.

Requests and refusals are one of the most commonly used speech acts in daily conversations. Realization of request speech acts is also significant in terms of politeness as the way requests are realized may vary among different social variables. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), requests are face-threatening acts as making a request "impinges on the hearer's claim to freedom of action and freedom of imposition" (as cited in Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Therefore, investigating speech acts can give us valuable information regarding language learning.

Statement of the Problem

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on investigating learners' use of request and refusal speech acts across languages and acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics (e.g., Barron, 2003; Byon, 2004; Cohen & Shively, 2007; Lin, 2014; Matsumura, 2007; Siebold and Busch, 2014). However, research with Turkish learners of English is quite limited. Much of the recent research on the analysis of Turkish learners' use of request and refusal speech acts has only looked at participants' written discourse and described how the learners used these speech acts in DCTs (Kılıckaya, 2010; Martı, 2005; Mızıkacı, 1991; Moody, 2011). From the point of language socialization, a great deal of studies has been conducted on second language socialization in (e.g., Matsumura, 2001; Poole, 1994; Willett, 1995). However, there is only one study which explored the Turkish bilinguals' use of formulaic expressions in terms of conceptual socialization in the second language (Ortactepe, 2012). Therefore, there is limited research investigating Turkish EFL

learners' development of conceptual socialization through the use of speech acts. Additionally, as the other studies focused on English as a Second Language (ESL) context, there is a lack of research exploring if the development of conceptual socialization is possible in EFL contexts.

Turkish learners of English, like most EFL learners, might have difficulty in carrying out a successful conversation with native speakers even if they utter grammatically and phonologically accurate sentences due to their lack of pragmatic competence in second language. This may be because they value learning about the forms and rules of the target language a lot or because of the lack of exposure to native speakers. As a result, while conveying their messages, they have a tendency to translate sentences from their mother tongue by ignoring the cultural differences in terms of power, distance and directness, all of which affect the level of formality and politeness, and end up uttering socially inappropriate sentences. Therefore, there is a clear need to investigate the process of conceptual socialization in learners' realization of specific speech acts so as to cater for their needs better.

Research Questions

The purpose of the study is to investigate Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their speech acts realization. In this study, the term, *conceptual socialization*, is defined as the language learners' awareness of the social differences between two cultures and the ability to reflect these differences on their language production. In this respect, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. To what extent do higher level Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their *appropriate* realization of request, refusal and acceptance speech acts;
    a. written discourse completion tasks?
    b. oral discourse completion tasks?
2. How do Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their realization of English and Turkish request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in terms of the level of;
    a. formality?
    b. politeness?
    c. directness?

In this study, *requests* are used as an umbrella term. By referring to *acceptance* and *refusals,* only accepting and refusing requests are included.

Significance of the Study

This study can contribute to the field of language teaching in different aspects. Firstly, studies have only used discourse completion tasks while investigating Turkish EFL learners' knowledge of request speech acts. However, the use of different instruments to collect data, such as role-plays may reveal better insights into learners' realization of request speech acts. Secondly, investigation of Turkish learners' speech act realization patterns to understand their conceptual socialization can help better establish the similarities and differences between Turkish and English language and explore Turkish EFL learners' difficulties in the target language. In this respect, having information about the ways Turkish EFL learners' speech acts realization in the literature can shed light onto the pragmatics-specific aspects of specific languages.

In a foreign language context, most English language learners do not have enough exposure to native English speakers, that's why, the conclusions of this study may benefit learners to a great deal. When the instruction and the course books are designed by considering the learners' needs in terms of conceptual socialization, learners' difficulties can be addressed and their awareness can be raised to use the language appropriately in different social contexts. Thus, learners can be helped to attain successful communication in the target language. Additionally, when learners are made aware of the cultural differences, they can improve their socio-pragmatic competence and feel more competent to use the target language.

Conclusion

In this chapter, an overview of literature on conceptual socialization and request speech acts has been provided. Following that, the statement of the problem, research questions and the significance of the study have been represented. The next chapter provides a detailed review of literature on conceptual socialization, pragmatic competence, speech acts including direct and indirect speech acts, social and cultural dimensions of speech acts, politeness and requests.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to review the literature related to this study investigating Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness and directness in written and oral discourse completion activities. In the first section, a general introduction to conceptual socialization, pragmatics, and pragmatic competence will be provided. Next, the features of speech acts together with cultural dimensions, directness and politeness will be covered. This section will be followed by the historical background of research related to requests and refusal speech acts among various languages as well as empirical studies carried out with Turkish English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners and the methodologies of these studies will be discussed.

Conceptual Socialization

Second language acquisition studies have long been interested in social and cultural aspects of language together with its linguistic aspects. In this section, the terms *language socialization*, *second language socialization* and *conceptual socialization* will be introduced and some background studies will be provided.

Language is considered to be a socialization process which begins whenever a person has any kind of social interaction (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Language socialization is also defined as how new members "become competent members of their community by taking on the appropriate beliefs, feelings and behaviors, and

the role of language in this process" by Leung (2001, p. 2). In other words, language socialization attempts to explain "how persons become competent members of social groups and the role of language in this process" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986, p. 167). While language socialization is about the first language (L1), the same framework can be applied to the second language (L2) to explore learners' socialization in the second language.

Second language learners are viewed "as novices being socialized into not only a target language but also a target culture" (Leung, 2001, p. 1). That's why, learning a foreign language comprises learning about both linguistic features of the target language and how to use them in different social interactions. According to second language socialization, this can be achieved through being exposed to and participating in the target language interactions (Matsumura, 2001). In this respect, foreign language teachers play a crucial role to guide language learners to realize how different cultures are reflected to language use in different social contexts and how to structure social encounters appropriately in L2 (Ortactepe, 2012). Research investigating the second language socialization focused on both social aspects and the linguistic aspects of socialization process. Some of the studies focused on the development of second language socialization (e.g., Matsumura, 2001; Willet, 1995) will be exemplified here.

Willet (1995) carried out a longitudinal study where young ESL learners in an elementary school took part. She discussed that shared understanding is constructed through negotiation during language socialization. It affects both their identity and social practices. In her second language socialization study, Matsumura (2001) investigated Japanese university students' socio-cultural perceptions and pragmatic use of English while giving advice through a 12-item multiple choice questionnaire

during an 8-month period. There were two groups of participants: Japanese exchange students in Canada and Japanese students in Japan. Based on the results, it was observed that being in the target environment had positive effects on pragmatic competence when offering advice to inferiors and people of equal social status but not higher status. It was argued that transferring experience from L1 socialization to the L2 context is observed in some cases for the group in the target environment. On the other hand, both groups developed some L2 pragmatic competence in some cases most probably through school or media in Japan.

Considering the language acquisition problem stemming not only from grammatical or lexical failure but from lack of conceptualization in the social environment of the target language, Kecskes and Papp (2000) came up with a new term, *conceptual socialization,* to define the language socialization process in the second language. According to Kecskes (2002) conceptual socialization is "the transformation of the conceptual system which undergoes characteristic changes to fit the functional needs of the new language and culture" (p. 157). In other words, as an individual has already gone through first language socialization process, conceptual socialization is being aware of the differences between two cultures and developing an identity by reflecting these differences on language production. In the case of the present study, a language learner who developed conceptual socialization in the target language can be aware of the cultural differences in the speech acts use and reflect it to his own language production.

In the study where Kecskes (2015) discusses how new language impacts the *adult sequential bilinguals'* L1-related knowledge and pragmatic ability, he firstly examines how language socialization differs from conceptual socialization. To begin with, language socialization in L1 is both linguistically and socially subconscious;

however, more consciousness and deliberate choices are involved in the L2 socialization (Kecskes, 2015). Sometimes, language learners may know the norms and expected expressions to use in the target language (e.g., 'have a nice day'), but they may not wish to use them on purpose as they find them annoying in their cultures (Kecskes, 2015). Secondly, age and the attitudes of bilinguals affect their language learning as "the later the L2 is introduced the more bilinguals rely on their L1 dominated conceptual system, and the more they are resistant to any pragmatic change that is not in line with their L1-related value system, conventions and norms" (Kecskes, 2015, p. 9). Another aspect that makes conceptual socialization different from language socialization is related to access to target culture and environment (Kecskes, 2015). While social and linguistic development go hand in hand in L1 thanks to the direct access to social norms, values and beliefs, L2 learners have limited access to target culture and environment. Kecskes (2015) states that " in the second language, pragmatic socialization is more about discourse practices as related to linguistic expressions than how these practices relate to cultural patterns, norms and beliefs" (p. 10). That's why, language learners may easily reach the grammatical structures but not the sociocultural background where those structures are normally used. Kecskes (2015) concludes his discussion by stating that when a new language is added to L1-governed pragmatic ability, bilingual pragmatic development is affected more "by individual control, consciousness and willingness" to acquire specific social skills (p. 1). He (2015) adds that "individual control of pragmatic socialization in L2" is obviously displayed in the use of *formulaic expressions* because these expressions "represent cultural models and ways of thinking of members of a particular speech community" (p. 14).

Research investigating the conceptual development in language learners is quite limited (e.g., Ortactepe, 2012). In a longitudinal and mixed-methods study, Ortactepe (2012) investigated the conceptual development of international students arriving in the United States as newcomers. The study examined the linguistic (quantitative) and socio-cultures (qualitative) features of Turkish bilingual students' language socialization process in the target language environment by collecting data three times over a year. As opposed to what previous research pointed, Ortactepe (2012) concluded that conceptual socialization in L2 depends mostly on learner's *investment* in the language rather than extended social networks.

Since developing pragmatic competence is an important component of language socialization, the next section will briefly describe pragmatics and pragmatic competence.

Pragmatics and Pragmatic Competence

Bardovi-Harlig (2013) defines pragmatics as "the study of how-to-say-what-to-whom-when and that L2 pragmatics is the study of how learners come to know how-to-say-what-to-whom-when" (p. 68). According to Yule (1996), there are four domains that pragmatics is involved with. He first states that pragmatics is "the study of speaker meaning" as it deals with what people actually mean rather than what the words or utterances people use might mean by themselves (p. 3). Secondly, pragmatics is "the study of contextual meaning" because it involves an analysis of how the context influences what speakers are going to say based on who they are talking to, where and when (Yule, 1996, p. 3). As the third domain, Yule (1996) mentions that as pragmatics requires exploring how listeners make interpretations of

the speakers' intended meaning, including even what is unsaid, it also studies "how more gets communicated than is said" (p. 3). Lastly, how much needs to be said during a conversation might depend on the notion of the distance, in other words, how close or distant is the speaker to the listeners. Therefore, pragmatics is also concerned with "the expression of relative distance" (Yule, 1996, p. 3).

Foreign language learners need to be aware of the aforementioned areas in order to improve their pragmatic competence and use the target language appropriately in social contexts. Pragmatic competence is defined as the "ability to perform language functions" and "knowledge of socially appropriate language use" in the theoretical models of communicative competence (Taguchi, 2012, p. 1). Pragmatic competence is also one of the important components of *communicative competence,* which is defined as the ability to use linguistically appropriate structures for the given social contexts (Hymes, 1971). According to Bachman (1990), pragmatic competence comprises illocutionary and sociolinguistic competence, which are related to speech acts (i.e., requesting) and functional language and sensitivity to culture and context respectively. Figure 1 displays where pragmatic competence fits in Bachman's (1990) language competence model.

Language Competence	Organizational Competence	Grammatical Competence	Vocabulary
			Morphology
			Syntax
			Phonology
		Textual Competence	Cohesion
			Rhetorical and conversational organization
	Pragmatic Competence	Illocutionary Competence	Ideational functions
			Manipulative functions
			Heuristic functions
			Imaginative functions
		Sociolinguistic Competence	Sensitivity to differences in dialect or Variety
			Sensitivity to differences in register
			Sensitivity to naturalness
			Ability to interpret cultural references and figures of speech

Figure 1. Components of language competence by Bachman (1990)

As it is demonstrated on the figure, language competence cannot be defined without pragmatic ability that encompasses both *sociolinguistic* and *illocutionary competence* including the ability of appropriate use of speech acts. Under illocutionary competence, while *ideational* functions address to expressing one's ideas and experience, *manipulative* functions are attributed to getting things done by using speech acts. For instance, ideational language can be used to present ideas in an article or to share feelings with a friend with or without the intention of getting advice. Or, one can get things done by forming order, request, suggestion or command, all of which constitute manipulative language. *Heuristic* functions are related to extending world knowledge through acts, such as teaching, learning or problem solving. *Imaginative* ones are about expressing imaginary ideas as well as humor. Telling jokes, using metaphors or figurative uses of language can be

examples of imaginative functions. Finally, sociolinguistic competence involves using culturally, regionally and socially appropriate language.

Many researchers have noted that having a high level of grammatical ability may not necessarily correspond to pragmatic competence as grammatical and pragmatic abilities may follow separate paths while learning a foreign language (e.g., Li, Suleiman & Sazalie, 2015; Ortactepe, 2012; Taguchi, 2012). Taguchi (2012) states that L2 learners may fail to achieve native-like pragmalinguistic forms at times because they might lack understanding L2 norms and linguistic practices of social interaction, which are not easily observable (p. 3). Therefore, in order to avoid pragmatic failure, learning a foreign language requires developing knowledge about speech acts, politeness, formal and informal speech, discourse genres and formulaic expressions in the target language as well as the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary structures. Additionally, as social norms such as the level of directness and formality show variation among different cultures, it is also necessary for language learners to be aware of these in order to manage communication successfully in social contexts.

Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage pragmatics has been defined as "the investigation of non-native speakers' (NNS) comprehension and production of speech acts, and the acquisition of L2-related speech act knowledge" as well as the examination of "child or adult NNS speech act behavior and knowledge, to the exclusion of L1 child and adult pragmatics" (Kasper & Dahl, 1991, p. 216). As interlanguage pragmatics includes the analysis of both learners' use and acquisition of the target language, it has a strong connection with second language acquisition. It also embodies cross-cultural

pragmatics which slightly differs from interlanguage pragmatics. In order to use language socially appropriately, a speaker must be aware of the similarities and differences of language use in various cultures. That's why, the basic aim of *cross-cultural pragmatics* is to "investigate and highlight aspects of language behavior in which speakers from various cultures have differences and similarities" through comparing linguistic realization and socio-pragmatics functions of languages (Kecskes, 2014, p. 17). Kecskes (2014) further states "cross-cultural studies focuses mainly on speech acts realizations in different cultures, cultural breakdowns, and pragmatic failures, such as the way some linguistic behaviors considered polite in one language may not be polite in another language" (p. 18). In that sense, studies related to speech acts not only play an important role in defining the pragmatic competence but also address the trend in interlanguage pragmatic studies (Barron, 2003).

Speech Acts

The theory of speech acts dates back to 1962 when the book "*How to Do Things with Words"* by J. L. Austin, who was a philosopher of language, was first introduced. A speech act, such as an apology, request, refusal or a compliment is a functional unit in communication. Speech acts are categorized according to their function, not their form because of the fact that they might carry a meaning independent of the actual words and grammar structures used (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). To give an example, 'Turn on the lights' and 'It is dark in here' can be both requests but they differ from each other in the way that they express the request to turn on the lights. On the other hand, one locution (i.e., Turn on the lights), which refers to utterances used in conversations, might be used for different purposes such as command or request depending on the context. Austin's theory of speech acts

(1962) suggests that "utterances have three kinds of meaning" (p. 10). The first meaning is *propositional or locutionary meaning.* They refer to the literal meaning of the sentence. For instance, when the utterance 'It is dark in here' is used, the locutionary meaning would concern the little or no light in the room. The second meaning is *illocutionary*, which is the intent of a locution, in other words, the social function that the utterance has. Intended purpose of the illocutionary act is called *illocutionary force*. As an illocutionary act, 'It is dark in here' might function as a request to turn on the lights. When illocutions cause listeners to do things, the last meaning of utterances, *perlocutionary force*, is involved. For instance, turning the lights on after hearing 'It is dark in here' acts as a perlocution.

Austin first claimed that behind every expression there is a *performative verb,* like 'to warn', 'to order' and 'to promise' which help make the illocutionary force explicit, but soon he disregarded this *performative hypothesis* (Cutting, 2002). The reason why he abandoned it is that utterances without a performative verb sound more natural and one utterance might perform different functions in different contexts. To this end, Searle (1969) classified speech acts into five macro-classes (see Figure 2).

Term	Definition	Example
Declarations	"Words and expressions that change the world"	"I hereby pronounce you man and wife" in the right context and spoken by an appropriate figure turns two people who are single into a married couple
Representatives	"Acts in which words state what the speaker believes to be the case, such as 'describing' or 'claiming'"	"I came; I saw; I conquered" by Julius Caesar can be considered as a representative.
Commisives	"Acts in which the words commit the speaker to a future action such as 'promising', 'offering', 'threatening', 'refusing' and 'volunteering'".	"I'll be back" as a promise or even a threat can be classified in this category.
Directives	"Acts in which the words are aimed at making the hearer do something, such as 'commanding', inviting', 'forbidding' and 'requesting'"	"Could you pass me the salt, please?"
Expressives	"Acts in which the words state what the speaker feels, such as 'apologizing', 'praising', 'congratulating' and 'regretting'"	"If I'd known she was so upset, I would have called her immediately."

Figure 2. Speech acts classification by Searle (1969)

The five general functions of speech acts listed in this classification (see Figure 2) also show that utterances without performative verbs, which are implicit performatives, sound more natural (Cutting, 2002).

Cohen (1996) states that appropriate realization of speech acts depends on two aspects: *sociocultural ability,* which is related to appropriate choice of strategies to given "(1) the culture involved, (2) the age and sex of the speaker, (3) their social class and occupations, and (4) their roles and status in the interaction," and *sociolinguistic ability,* regarding the appropriate choice of linguistic forms (p. 388). For example, when you have missed a meeting with your boss, it might be appropriate for you to reschedule the meeting in American culture. However, in other cultures, it might be unquestionable as mostly the boss decides what to do next. Therefore, cultural values influence how to act in a society. Also, choosing the appropriate words, such as "sorry or excuse me" and selecting appropriate linguistic forms for the level of formality refers to sociolinguistic ability.

Indirect vs Direct Speech Acts

Another classification made for speech acts is related to their directness level. Speakers may prefer to imply the intended message rather than uttering literal meanings of the words in conversations. Searle (1969) says that when a speaker wants to communicate the literal meaning of words, s/he uses *direct speech acts* where there is a direct relationship between the form and function. On the other hand, if the speaker wants to communicate a different meaning from the surface meaning, s/he uses *indirect speech acts* where the form and function are not directly related but there is an underlying pragmatic meaning. For instance, "Give me the salt" is a direct speech act while "Could you pass me the salt?" is an indirect one where an action is expected, not an answer to the question. As Searle (1969) states "one can perform one speech act indirectly by performing another directly" (p. 151). To give an example, "It's cold outside" is a declarative and a direct speech act when

it is used as a statement. However, when it is used in order to ask someone to close the door/window, it functions as an indirect speech act.

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) also categorized directness into three groups while identifying the differences among languages in their cross-cultural speech acts project for requests which will be discussed in detail in the historical background section:

a- "the most direct, explicit level," such as imperatives or performative verbs used as requests (e.g., Move out of the way.);

b- "the conventionally indirect level, in conventionalized uses of language such as 'could/ would you do it?' as requests."

c- "nonconventional indirect level, indirect strategies (hints) that realize the act by reference to the object or element needed for the implementation of the act" (i.e., using the utterance "It's dark in here." to request switching the lights on) (p. 201).

Empirical studies with this classification have shown that requesting strategies seem to have three levels of directness universally. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) further subdivided these three levels of directness into nine categories, named as 'strategy types', being expected to be manifested in most languages.

As far as the cultural values are concerned, the norms of *directness* level may change depending on the social context. Indirect speech acts are often considered to be more polite than direct ones in English (Blum-Kulka, 1987; Yule, 1996). Politeness, which will be discussed in detail in the following sections, is associated

with indirect speech acts, so interrogatives are used more often than imperatives to express directives, especially with people with whom one is not familiar (Cutting, 2002). Instead of using a more blunt 'No smoking' sign, the use of 'Thank you for not smoking' signs in public places in Britain can be given as an example of how they try to sound polite to strangers. Furthermore, other reasons why speakers tend to use indirect language are the formality of the context and social distance such as variations in status, occupation, age, gender, or education level between the speaker and hearer (Cutting, 2002). Therefore, during a conversation those who are less dominant might use more indirectness as higher social status can give people authority and power, leading to use more direct language.

On the other hand, in some cultures, such as Polish (Wierzbicka, 1991) directness may not be considered as a barrier to politeness but rather it might be necessary for rapport-building in social interactions. Similarly, Hinkel (1997) points out the appropriateness of directness in some cultures by stating that "direct speech acts emphasize in-group membership and solidarity and stem from the value of group orientation in Iranian culture" (p. 8). Therefore, while some aspects can be generalized across cultures, some others like directness and indirectness may have different implications in different cultures. More details regarding the universality and cultural dimensions will be discussed in the following section.

Social and Cultural Dimensions of Speech Acts

Speech act realization is *culture-specific* and may show variations from culture to culture. While the phrase "How fat you are" might express 'praising' in India, where being fat is the sign of health and prosperity, it might express 'criticizing' in Britain, where being slim is appreciated more (Cutting, 2002).

Wierzbicka (1991), a Polish linguist, deals with cross-cultural pragmatics and claims that different cultures have different ways of speech acts realization. In her work, she especially compares English and Polish and puts forward that in the Anglo-Saxon culture, where authoritarian ideas are mostly avoided, individual differences and autonomy are respected. In the Polish culture, on the other hand, more authoritative judgements might be preferred by the language users by keeping the control and responsibility of the events. To give an example, while requesting something from an addressee, interrogative forms are frequently preferred by English users as in 'Why don't you be quite'. However, as Wierzbicka (1991) claims, there is no equivalent of this utterance in Polish as a request as the interrogative form is not approved in the culture so as to express a request but rather imperative forms are preferred. Therefore, it is important for a second language learner to be aware of the cultural differences of the speech community in the target language.

On the other hand, whether pragmatic phenomena are universal or culture-specific has been discussed a lot in the literature. Two main issues that have drawn attention regarding *universality* are the universality of speech acts strategies and linguistic methods of speech act realization and the universality of theoretical frameworks (Barron, 2003). Theoretical frameworks have already been represented by Brown and Levinson (1987) with their concept of face and universal speech act strategies have been depicted through a cross-cultural project by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). One of the supporters of universality view, Searle (1969), claims that there are universal felicity conditions which constitute the strategies applied in each language to perform illocutionary speech acts. Empirical studies regarding universality and culture-specificity have shown that speech acts both reflect cultural conventions and universal elements, such as directness.

Yule (1996) suggests that in order to understand what is said in a conversation, we need to analyze a variety of *factors* which are related to "social distance and closeness" (p. 59). He (1996) further notes that there are external factors like age, power and social status and internal factors such as the degree of friendliness affecting how we say things. For instance, in English speaking societies, inferiors address superiors with a title and the last name (e.g., Mr. Brown) while friends may call each other only with their first names.

Wierzbicka (1991) describes Anglo-Saxon societies as "a tradition which places special emphasis on the rights and on the autonomy of every individual, which abhors interference in other people's affairs (*It's none of my business*), which is tolerant of individual idiosyncrasies and peculiarities, which respects everyone's privacy, which approves of compromises and disapproves of dogmatism of any kind" (p. 30). Therefore, autonomous and individualistic 'I' is given more priority in Anglo-American culture than 'we' which shows solidarity in some Eastern cultures like Israel (Wierzbicka, 1991). Apart from this, some cultures emphasize *closeness* in different degrees or may not even encourage it. Utterances used in a society where closeness is essential are more likely to be informal and casual (Wierzbicka, 1991). In 'vertical' societies like Korea and Japan, for example, "the value placed on social hierarchy is closely linked with value placed on *formality*" (Wierzbicka, 1991, p. 112).

As for Turkish culture, where solidarity and closeness are important like in many Eastern cultures, the distinction between an insider and outsider of a group is important to make (Zeyrek, 2001). While great importance is attached to friends in Turkish society, "anyone outside the boundaries of a perceived region (e.g. the house, the town, the country, etc.) is simultaneously an outsider and a stranger

belonging to the wild" (Zeyrek, 2001, p. 50). Therefore, the level of formality, directness and grammatical structures of the speech acts used in daily interactions may change accordingly.

Politeness

Politeness refers to the choices of language structures and expressions which display friendly attitude to people in a social encounter (Cutting, 2002). The framework of Politeness Theory put forward by Brown and Levinson (1987) has dominated the studies on politeness in discourse (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). According to Brown and Levinson (1987) each individual has self-public image that is related to one's emotional and social sense and expects to be recognized. In relation to this, Politeness Theory basically accounts for social skills which can ensure everyone feels affirmed in social interactions. Main concepts of this approach such as face, negative and positive politeness are discussed in the following sections.

Politeness and Face

The notion of 'face' was first derived from Goffman (1967) and then developed by Brown and Levinson (1987) who define face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 61). In each social interaction, speakers display their faces to others and also speakers are bound to protect their and the addressees' faces. According to Scollon and Scollon (2001) "every communication is a risk to face; it is a risk to one's own face, at the same time it is a risk to the other person's" (p. 44). They further note that "we have to carefully project a face for ourselves and respect the face rights and claims of other participants" (p. 44). When a speaker utters something which exposes the hearer to a threat concerning the self-image, it is called as a face-threatening act (FTA). On the

other hand, if a speaker tries to lessen a possible threat during a conversation, it is described as a face saving act (Yule, 1996). In their Politeness Theory, Brown and Levinson (1987) describe positive and negative face. Positive face is the "desire to be accepted" and gain the approval of interactants whereas negative face is the demand "to be independent" and to have freedom of action (p. 61). Requests, for example, might be formed to represent both positive and negative politeness. For instance, if a student states a sentence like 'I am sure you are very busy' before requesting something from a professor, s/he may acknowledge negative face wants. On the contrary, utterances like 'Since you are an expert in this area, your advice would be invaluable' could serve as accepting the professor's positive face (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

Positive and Negative Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1987) noted that in social encounters, both positive and negative faces must be acknowledged and as a result appropriate politeness strategies, which are termed as positive and negative politeness should be applied (p. 70). Positive politeness, which aims at protecting the positive face of addresses, can be achieved by redressing FTAs. Compliments, which show appreciation, could be given as examples of positive politeness. Negative politeness provides the negative face wants of an addressee to cater to the claims of territory. Apologies could be basic examples of negative politeness (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

Attempting to mitigate face threats affects what kind of linguistic means one would use in a conversation. For instance, instead of saying 'Close the door!' preferring to say 'Do you mind closing the door?' helps a threat to the hearer's negative face to be mitigated. Sometimes, speakers in some cultures may have

difficulty in refusing an invitation directly as they would like to preserve the face of the inviter. Additionally, the level of directness is mostly shaped through social distance, making speakers use more face-threatening acts to the people whom we are more close to (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). In a conversation to someone who has a higher status, the speaker would prefer more indirect structures to be polite. However, talking to a close friend by using face-threatening acts may not constitute any threat to the relationship.

Requests

Request speech acts are directives which are targeted to make the hearer do something. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe requests as face-threatening acts because of the fact that when a request is made, the listener's demand to freedom of action is affected by the speaker. To put it differently, if a speaker wants an addressee to do something without assuming that the addressee could be forced, a request would normally be used by the speaker. According to Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984), "the variety of direct and indirect ways for making requests seemingly available to speakers in all languages is probably socially motivated by the need to minimize the imposition involved in the act itself" (p. 201). One of the ways to reduce the imposition could be the choice of using an indirect strategy while requesting, however, still there are various ways of making a request by making use of different verbal means to address the level of imposition.

Studies Conducted on Request Speech Acts Realization

The analysis of cross-cultural speech acts dates back to the project developed by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) in an attempt to examine request and apology speech acts realization patterns over various languages (i.e., "Australian English,

American English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian") (p. 197). The authors note that the universality issue is relevant with speech act research as second language learners may fail to achieve effective communication even if they have good command of grammar and vocabulary structures of the target language. In the Cross-cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) project, researchers followed the same theoretical and methodological framework in order to identify the similarities and differences between native and non-native speakers' speech act realization in terms of situational, cross-cultural and individual variabilities. The instrument used in the CCSARP was a discourse completion test (DCT), which included incomplete dialogs where the participants were expected to write down appropriate speech acts. The data collected were analyzed by using a coding scheme. In the findings, the authors noted that situational variations such as age, gender, or occupation affect the level of politeness in speakers' speech acts, making directness levels vary from culture to culture.

After the CCSARP project, many researchers tried to investigate speech acts realizations across cultures by using the same coding scheme or adapting it. For instance, Hong (1998) investigated the similarities and differences between German and Chinese speech acts in terms of cultural and social values. The data collection instrument, DCTs, was taken from the CCSARP. One of the findings was that Chinese speakers used more lexical modification while Germans preferred more syntactic modifications when high – low status was considered. In terms of equal status, Chinese were found to be more polite. Lee (2004) analyzed request speech acts realizations of Chinese learners of English in their e-mails to their teacher by adapting the coding scheme provided in the CCSARP. Chinese learners were found

to have a tendency to manipulate direct request strategies. Students' utterances also showed that there was a strong relationship between cultural background and understandings of the teacher-student relationship.

Fukushima (1996) investigated how similar Japanese compared to British English in terms of age, occupation and level of education by using the same coding scheme. One of the findings was that Japanese used more direct language while English preferred conventional forms. Additionally, Japanese were found to use more direct forms with the people who are similar age so as to enhance solidarity among in-group members as solidarity is very important in Japanese culture.

Byon (2001) examined requesting patterns of American English and Korean by using DCTs to identify inter-language features. Byon (2001) found out that Koreans use more indirect, "collectivistic and formalistic" language than Americans, who prefer more direct and individualistic language than Koreans. The studies outlined here as well as many empirical studies carried out across languages have shed light onto socio-pragmatic abilities of second language learners and inter-language pragmatics.

In terms of Turkish language, there is limited research investigating the request strategies of Turkish learners of English. Empirical ones (Kılıckaya, 2010; Mızıkacı, 1991) used DCTs to examine the request speech act patterns and analyzed the data descriptively. Kılıckaya (2010) found that although students had linguistic means to communicate, their level of politeness was not very satisfactory. Mızıkacı (1991) concluded that while making a request, conventionally indirect forms were observed in Turkish and English as well as a positive transfer from Turkish to English. Additionally, Turkish learners of English were found to use longer

explanations and apologetic language before making a request, leading them to use deviant expressions in English.

Additionally, Marti (2005) investigated indirectness and politeness concepts used by Turkish monolinguals and Turkish-German bilingual returnees through written DCTs and a politeness rating questionnaire. The researcher found out a relationship between indirectness and politeness although they were not linearly linked. Also, there was no pragmatic transfer from German but Turkish-German bilinguals used less direct forms than Turkish monolinguals, which could be influence from German language.

Refusals

Refusal, a common speech act in daily language, basically refers to turning down an offer, request, suggestion or invitation. Refusals, face-threatening acts (FTA), are complex to realize, therefore, they require a good command of pragmatic development so as not to offense the addressee and risk the interlocutor's positive face if realized inappropriately (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2011). In order to minimize the offence, it is important to use politeness markers while performing refusals. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), what determines the choice of strategies while using a face-threatening act depends on three criteria: "social distance, relative power and severity of the act" (p. 74). Although refusals are universal, their culture-specific features make it difficult for foreign language learners to perform appropriate refusals in social contexts. That's why, a great number of research across languages has been conducted on refusals to investigate the native and non-native speakers' realization of refusal speech acts.

Studies Conducted on Refusal Speech Acts Realization

Siebold and Busch (2015) investigated the realization of different types of refusals in German and Spanish languages through open role plays. They concluded that while Spanish preferred indirect refusal strategies with vague responses, German participants preferred direct and explicit answers. The authors interpreted that this difference may result from Western-Eastern divide in politeness between these two cultures.

Lin (2014) carried out a research on refusals to find out the differences between English and Chinese language and also the perception and performance of Chinese EFL learners while refusing someone. The researcher collected the data through 'Scaled Response Questionnaire and Discourse Completion Task' and analyzed in terms of perception of face-threats, strategy use and patterns. Based on the results, EFL learners were found to perceive face-threat more than the native speakers. Therefore, they used more indirect refusals. Additionally, Chinese gave their excuse first and then expressed the regret while Americans had a tendency to express the regret first and then provide the excuse while refusing. Also, EFL learners never used some of the expressions that Americans commonly used.

In their research to examine Iranian EFL learners' sociolinguistic competence, Tamimi Sa'd and Mohammadi (2014) focused on the realization of refusals by collecting data from 30 Iranian EFL learners through Discourse Completion Task. Overall, learners were found to have lack of competency while performing refusal strategies. There were also the components of both politeness and impoliteness. Although the politeness was improved by indirectness and some

specific lexical structures, impoliteness was affected by lack of politeness markers, mitigation and length of semantic formulas.

Moody (2011) conducted a study to find out how native speakers of Turkish perform refusals in comparison to English language speakers. He collected data from Turkish only speakers, native speakers of English and Turkish bilinguals (Turkish and English) through DCTs. The data suggested that in contrast to English responses, Turkish refusals lacked direct strategies. Turkish participants used more indirect refusals except for rejecting someone of a higher social status. The researcher found similarities between some Japanese and Chinese and Turkish studies in terms of preferring indirect refusals and use of regret. Another conclusion in the study was that bilinguals used more pause fillers than native speakers of English. The researcher interpreted this as bilinguals' being more aware of how to use the pause filler strategy. Additionally, the data showed that native speakers of English had a tendency to be positive even while refusing someone whereas Turkish participants displayed mostly regret while refusing. When refusing someone of a higher status, Turkish participants preferred to mitigate the imposition of refusals by showing gratitude and using nonperformatives like *I can't*. Therefore, cultural transferal from one language to another was observed in this study.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the relevant literature on conceptual socialization, request and refusal speech acts has been provided including definitions of terms and past studies. It can be concluded that speech acts show variations among different cultures, making it difficult for language learners to achieve effective communication. However, under the issue of universality, some similar or different elements can be

found to examine different languages. Thus, this study aims to give better insight into language socialization of Turkish EFL learners by analyzing their directness, formality, politeness and appropriateness with the help of various data collection tools such as DCTs and audio recordings role-plays.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of the study is to investigate Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their speech acts realization. More specifically, the study aimed to examine Turkish EFL learners' conceptual socialization by analyzing the similarities and differences between native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English in their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness in written and oral discourse completion tasks. In this respect, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent do higher level Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their *appropriate* realization of request, refusal and acceptance speech acts;
    a. written discourse completion tasks?
    b. oral discourse completion tasks?
2. How do Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their realization of English and Turkish request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in terms of the level of;
    a. formality?
    b. politeness?
    c. directness?

This chapter consists of five main sections. In the first section, setting and participants of this mixed-methods study are introduced in detail. In the second section, qualitative data collection tools, which are written and oral discourse completion tasks (DCTs), are discussed in connection with the research design as well as the translation process and piloting of the tools. In the third section, how the data were quantified and analyzed is explained. In the final section, research procedures including the recruitment of participants and data collection steps are presented and finally method of data analysis is provided.

Setting and Participants

One group of participants of this study was 25 advanced Turkish learners of English studying at a preparatory school of a university in Ankara, Turkey in the 2015-2016 Spring semester. The participants were chosen randomly from two different advanced classes. The students' age ranged between 18 and 21 and they had been studying English for about six months in this preparatory school. Once the participants pass the proficiency exam which takes place at the end of the academic year, they can start their departments in the next academic semester. See Table 1 for more detailed demographic information about the population of this study.

Table 1

Demographic Information of the Turkish Learners of English

Background Information	N	%
Age		
17-19	15	60
20-21	10	40
Gender		
Female	9	36
Male	16	64
Years of English language learning experience		
0-1	5	20
2-3	10	40
4-5	4	16
6+	6	24
Previous experience abroad		
Yes	7	28
No	18	72

Another group of participants of this study were ten native speakers of English, aged 24-43, working as English instructor in the same preparatory school in Turkey. They were included in order to have a baseline of preferred speech act responses. Another reason why native speakers were involved is that the school is a place where learners' conceptual socialization is facilitated and learners mostly interact with those native speakers. Their teaching experience ranged between 2 and 13 years and they were from different countries with various years of experience working abroad. See Table 2 for more detailed demographic information of the native speaker participants.

Table 2

Demographic Information of the Native Speakers of English

Background Information	N	%
Age		
24-30	5	50
31-37	2	20
38-43	3	30
Gender		
Female	6	60
Male	4	40
Years of English language teaching experience		
1-3	3	30
4-6	4	40
7-9	1	10
10+	2	20
Nationality		
British	4	40
Irish	1	10
American	5	50

Data Collection

The data were collected by means of two instruments: written discourse completion tasks (DCTs) both in Turkish and English including demographic information questionnaires and audio recordings of role-plays as oral discourse completion tasks.

Written Discourse Completion Task (DCT)

The first data collection instrument of this study was written Discourse Completion Tasks. DCTs were initially used to examine speech act realization by

Blum-Kulka (1982). Kasper and Dahl (1991) define DCTs as "written questionnaires including a number of brief situational descriptions, followed by a short dialogue with an empty slot for the speech act under study" (p. 221). DCTs allow researchers to compare native speakers and non-native speakers' speech acts realization patterns.

In this study, Turkish learners and native speakers were given a 14-item written DCTs where they were expected to write down an appropriate request, refusal or acceptance speech act for the given situation. The instrument was composed of two major sections: written DCT section and a demographic information section. Demographic information section consisted of five items which aimed to collect demographic information about the participants such as their age, gender and experiences with learning English. The second section included situations and a blank was provided after each situation where the participants could write down their responses (see Appendix A). The researcher developed DCTs by adapting items from various studies conducted by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), and Rose (1994) so that the given situations would be comprehensible and familiar to the participants' context. DCTs were designed in a way that sets the social context and the relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor clearly for the participants. In the following sample test item, request speech acts, such as *"Could I have a napkin?"* is aimed to be elicited.

E.g. Situation 1: You are on an airplane. It is dinner time. The flight attendant sets your food on your tray. You need a napkin. What would you say to the flight attendant?

You:_____.

The DCTs varied on the parameters of social distance and power as they determine the level of directness, politeness and formality in their use of speech acts. See Table 3 for the distribution of the DCT items in regards to different social power and distance.

Table 3

Distribution of the DCT Items

Situation	Social Status	Item #
A student asks his roommate to clean the kitchen	Equal	1
A student asks his neighbors to be more quite		2
A student refuses to share his notes		8
You accept to repair a friend's laptop		10
A student asks his professor to give extension	Speaker has a	5
A secretary asks for a permission to leave early	lower status	7
An employee refuses to work longer		3
You accept to bring your boss' car		13
A professor asks his student to give presentation earlier	Speaker has a higher status	9
A boss asks his secretary to type letters		11
A boss refuses to give pay rise		14
A student asks a school-mate to lend him money	Acquaintance	4
You ask for a napkin on the plane	Strangers	6
You ask a stranger to take your photo		12

The DCT included *9 requests* (2 requests in equal social status (DCT # 1 & 2), 2 requests from a person of lower (DCT # 5 & 7) and higher social status (DCT # 9 & 11), a context between people who are acquaintances (DCT # 4) and two contexts between strangers (DCT # 12 & 6), *3 refusals* (a refusal in equal social status (DCT # 8), refusing someone of a higher (DCT # 3) and lower (DCT # 14) social status) and

2 acceptance speech acts (accepting a person of equal (DCT # 10) and higher social status (DCT # 13).

The DCT items were first piloted with two native speakers to see if they were unambiguous and appropriate for the level of student participants. Based on the feedback given, the items were improved and given to two other native speakers. The process continued until the most appropriate items were obtained.

For the Turkish version of the DCT instrument, the same task was translated into Turkish by keeping the social factors in mind by the researcher and the task was given to two different Turkish instructors for feedback. If there was an ambiguity, the item was revised and given to other two colleagues for feedback. The translated version was backtranslated into English by two Turkish-English bilinguals to see how much it reflected the original English version. Turkish DCTs (see Appendix C) were given to the learners two weeks after the one in English so that the participants would not be affected by their previous answers.

The native speaker responses to the DCTs were used as a baseline to compare with the Turkish learners'. The DCTs measured the students' realization of speech acts in semi-controlled practice and the Turkish and English versions showed how the same group of students responded to request speech acts in both languages.

Oral Discourse Completion Tasks

Another instrument which was used in the present study was audio recordings of role plays. According to Kasper and Dahl (1991), role plays present richer data than DCTs as "they allow us to observe how speech act performance is sequentially organized (e.g., in terms of strategy choice and politeness investment), what kinds of

interlocutor responses are elicited by specific strategic choices, and how such responses in turn determine the speaker's next move" (p. 228).

In their study, Kasper and Dahl (1991) analyze different data collection tools for speech acts, such as written DCTs, and open role plays discussing the constraints associated with each tool and state that when the situations in the tools are constructed around real-life observations, they can provide quick and quality language production of both native and non-native speakers, especially when different methods are combined.

In the present study, the same group of participants were given different role-plays requiring them to make and respond to request speech acts by accepting or refusing and asked to act out in pairs (see Appendix B). Each pair were chosen randomly and given two different role-play tasks so that each participant could utter request speech acts in their roles. Role-plays were adapted from Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), Boxer and Cohen (2004) by the researcher. A sample role-play task for one pair is as follows:

Student A: You are talking to your friend after class. You missed the last class and you want to borrow your friend's notes. How would you ask for this?

Student B: You are talking to your friend after class. He/she missed the last class and wants to borrow your notes. Accept his/her request.

Similar to DCTs, role-play tasks were piloted with two native speakers to see if they were unambiguous and at the level of the students before being given to the participants. When there was a problem, the items were improved and given to other two native speakers. The cycle continued until the most appropriate items were obtained.

After all the role-play tasks were recorded, they were transcribed by the researcher to be analyzed.

Research Design

In this study, mixed-methods approach was followed. First, qualitative data from the written DCTs and audio-recordings of role plays were collected from two participant groups. Then, they were rated and quantified based on the percentages of the given answers. Finally, the results were analyzed descriptively by taking the native speaker responses as a baseline. In-depth analysis is provided in the next section.

Data Analysis

In this comparative study, descriptive analysis of the data was employed. Firstly, the native speakers' and learners' responses to DCTs in English were rated by two different native speakers in order to increase rater reliability. The raters were trained to use the criteria in a calibration session before scoring. Similarly, Turkish EFL learners' responses to Turkish DCTs were rated by two Turkish instructors by using the same criteria. The scale (see Appendix D) that the trained raters used was adapted by the researcher from Boxer and Cohen (2004), Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and Aliakbari and Gheitasi (2014). Raters were provided with a grading sheet (see Appendix E) for each participant together with the criteria. After the raters completed the rating, their inter-rater reliability was also calculated (see Appendix G). There was high inter-rater reliability for most of the items (e.g., intraclass correlation average measures: ,895), however, there was a bit low inter-rater reliability for refusals (e.g., intraclass correlation average measures: ,657).

To analyze the data, first, native speakers and Turkish EFL learners' DCT and role play ratings were compared through independent samples t-test for the appropriateness (4th category in the rating sheet) of their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in written and oral production activities.

Second, to answer the second research question, native speakers and Turkish EFL learners' DCT ratings were analyzed descriptively in terms of the level of directness, politeness and formality in the request, refusal and acceptance speech act realization by taking native speaker responses as a baseline to see the similarities and differences between the participant groups. Also, Turkish EFL learners' responses to DCTs in Turkish were analyzed and compared with their English responses descriptively to see if there was any transfer from the mother tongue in the realization of request, refusal and acceptance speech acts.

Procedure

After the instruments were prepared and the permissions from both the Ethics Committee of Bilkent University and the institution where the data were collected gained, the data collection through DCTs and role plays was carried out at the beginning of the 2015 – 2016 spring semester. Both participant groups, who are native speaker of English and higher level Turkish EFL learners, were reached by the researcher, who was also teaching in the same preparatory school, before the data collection and were asked to sign the consent forms. Firstly, DCTs in Turkish were given to the each participant group. About two weeks after the first data collection process, learners were given DCTs in Turkish. In the following week, role-plays between pairs took place. For the role-plays, pairs were chosen randomly and asked

to participate in an available quiet classroom in the allocated time during their lunch breaks and were audio-recorded.

Conclusion

In the methodology chapter, setting, participants, data collection tools and the procedure regarding the present study examining the request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization of Turkish learners of English were presented in detail and a general overview of the data analysis was described. In depth analyses of the DCTs and role-plays will be provided in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to investigate Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their speech acts realization. More specifically, the study aimed to examine Turkish EFL learners' conceptual socialization by analyzing the similarities and differences between native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English in their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness in written and oral discourse completion activities. In this respect, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent do higher level Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their *appropriate* realization of request, refusal and acceptance speech acts;
    a. written discourse completion tasks?
    b. Oral discourse completion tasks?
2. How do Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their realization of English and Turkish request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in terms of the level of;
    a. formality?
    b. politeness?
    c. directness?

In this mixed-methods study with 25 higher level Turkish learners of English studying in a preparatory school and 10 native speakers of English working as language instructors, the qualitative data were collected through 14-item written DCTs in English including request, refusal and acceptance speech acts (see Appendix A), audio recordings of role plays (see Appendix B) and the same written DCTs translated into Turkish (see Appendix C) by the researcher. Quantified analysis of the collected data was made and the results were presented descriptively.

In this chapter, findings emerging out of the analysis will be presented in reference to two research questions. In the first section, the extent to which higher level Turkish EFL learners can produce appropriate request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in their semi controlled and free practice activities will be focused. In the next section, similarities and differences between native speakers and Turkish EFL learners' request, refusal and acceptance speech act realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness and directness as well as the comparison of Turkish EFL learners' responses in English and Turkish will be discussed by keeping the native speaker responses to the DCTs as a baseline.

While discussing the results, native speakers of English will be represented as *NS*, Turkish EFL learners will be shortened as *EFL* and Turkish language will be represented as *TR* to save space.

Comparison of NS and EFL in terms of Appropriateness in Speech Acts

In the present study, native speakers and Turkish learners of English were first given a 14-item written DCT including requests, refusals and acceptance with varying social status between the speaker and the listener (see Appendix A). Then, each Turkish learner took part in a role play where they were provided with

situations to perform request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in pairs (see Appendix B). Both native speaker and Turkish learners' responses to written DCTs and role plays were graded for their appropriateness by the raters by using a scale ranging from '1' representing *very poor* to '4' representing *completely appropriate* (see Appendix D).

Appropriateness in Written Activities

Since the data were normally distributed (see Appendix F), a parametric independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the native speakers' and Turkish EFL learners' level of appropriateness while performing speech acts in the written DCTs and role plays. Their mean scores and standard deviations were also calculated (see Table 4).

Table 4

Overall DCT Results for Appropriateness in Performing Speech Acts

Category	Groups			t-test		
		$\overline{x}$	SD	Df	T	*P*
Written DCT	Turkish EFL Learners	2.66	.38	33	-8.258	.000
	Native Speakers	3.71	.18			

*** $p < .001$

The descriptive statistics showed that in written DCTs, Turkish EFL learners' level of appropriateness in performing speech acts was lower than the native speakers' with a mean difference of -1.05 ($\overline{x}$ EFL = 2.66, SD = .38, $\overline{x}$ NS = 3.71, SD = .18). Independent t-test results indicated that this difference was statistically significant (t (33) = -8.258, $p < .001$).

Independent sample t-test was also run to compare the differences between native speakers and Turkish learners' appropriateness level for each speech act explored in this study separately (see Table 5).

Table 5

Request, Refusal and Acceptance Speech Acts Appropriateness Level in DCTs

Groups			t-test		
	$\overline{X}$	SD	df	t	*p*
Requests (Turkish EFL Learners)	2.58	.39	33	-9.393	.000
Requests (Native Speakers)	3.80	.15			
Refusals (Turkish EFL Learners)	2.41	.64	33	-6.143	.000
Refusals (Native Speakers)	3.72	.26			
Acceptance (Turkish EFL Learners)	3.28	.76	33	-2.019	.052
Acceptance (Native Speakers)	3.80	.42			

As Table 5 displays, Turkish EFL learners' level of appropriateness in performing request speech acts was lower than the NS with a mean difference of -1.22 in written DCTs ($\overline{x}$ EFL requests = 2.58, SD = .39, $\overline{x}$ NS requests = 3.80, SD = .15) Independent t-test results pointed out that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners of English was statistically significant (t (33) = -9.393, $p < .001$).

Similarly, Turkish learners' appropriateness level in performing refusal speech acts was lower than the NS with a mean difference of -1.31 ($\overline{x}$ EFL refusals = 2.41, SD = .64, $\overline{x}$ NS refusals = 3.72, SD = .26). Independent t-test results indicated that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners' realization of refusal speech acts was statistically significant (t (33) = -6.143, $p < .001$).

However, in comparison of the acceptance speech acts, Turkish learners did not show much difference than native speakers with a mean difference of -.52 in their written production ($\overline{x}$ EFL acceptance = 32.28, SD = .76, $\overline{x}$ NS acceptance = 3.80, SD = .42). Independent t-test results indicated that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners' realization of acceptance speech acts was not statistically significant (t (33) = -2.019, $p \geq .05$).

Appropriateness in Spoken Activities

Similar to written DCTs, participants' transcribed speech acts use in their role plays were rated and analyzed through independent sample t-test (see Table 6).

Table 6

Overall Role Play Appropriateness Results in Performing Speech Acts

Categories	Groups			t-test		
		$\overline{x}$	SD	df	T	*P*
Role Plays	Turkish EFL Learners	3.33	.34	33	-4.170	.000
	Native Speakers	3.83	.23			

*** $p < .001$

As it is shown in Table 6, in role plays, Turkish EFL learners' level of appropriateness level performing speech acts was also lower than the native speakers' with a mean difference of -.50. ($\overline{x}$ EFL = 3.33, SD = .34, $\overline{x}$ NS = 3.83, SD = .23). Independent t-test results pointed out that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners of English was statistically significant (t (33) = -4.170, $p < .001$).

In order to compare two groups' requests, refusals and acceptance speech act realization separately in role plays, another independent sample t-test was run (see Table 7).

Table 7

Speech Acts Appropriateness Level in Role Plays

Groups			t-test		
	$\overline{X}$	SD	df	t	*p*
Requests (Turkish EFL Learners)	3.08	.90	33	-2.387	.023
Requests (Native Speakers)	3.80	.42			
Refusals (Turkish EFL Learners)	3.12	.78	33	-2.591	.014
Refusals (Native Speakers)	3.80	.42			
Acceptance (Turkish EFL Learners)	3.80	.40	33	-.694	.493
Acceptance (Native Speakers)	3.90	.31			

As Table 7 displays, in the role plays, Turkish EFL learners' level of appropriateness in performing request speech acts was lower than the NS with a mean difference of -.72 ($\overline{x}$ EFL requests = 3.08, SD = .90, $\overline{x}$ NS request = 3.80, SD = .42). Independent t-test results pointed out that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners of English was statistically significant (t (33) = -2.387, $p < .05$).

Similarly, Turkish learners' appropriateness level in performing refusal speech acts was lower than the NS with a mean difference of -.68 ($\overline{x}$ EFL refusals = 3.12, SD = .78, $\overline{x}$ NS request = 3.80, SD = .42). Independent t-test results indicated that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners' realization of refusal speech acts was statistically significant (t (33) = -2.591, $p < .05$).

However, in comparison of the acceptance speech acts, Turkish learners did not show much difference than native speakers with a mean difference of -.10 in their role plays ($\overline{x}$ EFL acceptance = 3.80, SD = .40, $\overline{x}$ NS acceptance = 3.90, SD = .31). Independent t-test results indicated that the difference between the native speakers and Turkish learners' realization of acceptance speech acts was not statistically significant (t (33) = -.694, $p \geq .05$).

In summary, when it comes to the appropriateness of speech acts use, requests and refusals were problematic for Turkish EFL learners in both DCTs and role plays while they performed similar to native speakers in acceptance speech acts. In the criteria which was used to rate speech acts, there was also a part titled *"Please briefly explain why:_____."* if the item was not found satisfactorily appropriate. There was not any negative comment about the learners' use of grammar or vocabulary but it was mostly about the politeness level stemmed from the wrong use of the language. The most common reasons provided by the raters are presented below:

Table 8

Common Reasons for the low Scoring of Appropriateness

Reasons for Low Scoring
"The speech act sounds like an order."
"Lack of 'please' makes it a bit impolite."
"Refusing without saying 'sorry' or without providing a reason sounds a bit rude".
"Requesting first and then providing the reason is a bit strange."
"Requesting without providing a reason makes it less polite."

All these reasons provided in Table x gave better idea for the factors affecting the low ratings of Turkish learners' appropriateness in the use of speech acts. To analyze the realization of speech acts further, some central aspects, such as formality, politeness and directness level in speech acts were also aimed to be explored. The next section will provide more insight into participants' level of formality, politeness and directness in their use of speech acts.

Comparison of NS and EFL Speech Acts in Terms of Formality, Politeness and Directness

In an attempt to answer the second research question, two comparisons were made. First, native speakers and Turkish EFL learners' responses to written DCTs in English were rated in terms of the level of formality, politeness and directness by using a criteria by the raters (see Appendix D). NSs' responses were used as a baseline and Turkish EFL learners' responses were analyzed descriptively for each item to see the similarities and differences between two participant groups.

Second, the same written DCTs were translated into Turkish and given to the same Turkish EFL learners (see Appendix C). The idea behind it was to gain more insight into the learners' speech act use, specifically to see if there was a transfer from learners' mother tongue. Participants' speech acts in Turkish were also graded for the level of formality, politeness and directness by using the same criteria and analyzed descriptively.

As the situations in DCTs showed variety between the speaker's and the listener's social status, findings will be shared according to social distance for requests, refusals and acceptance respectively. Results regarding the comparison of the native speakers and Turkish EFL learners and comparison of Turkish EFL

learners' speech act use in Turkish and English will be discussed in this section through presenting their ratings in tables and some sample responses received through data collection tools.

Requests in Relation to Social Distance

In written DCTs, there were two situations requiring participants to make a request from a person of equal social status (DCT # 1 & 2), a person of lower (DCT # 5 & 7) and higher social status (DCT # 9 & 11) and a context between people who are acquaintance (DCT # 4) and two contexts between strangers (DCT # 12 & 6). The analysis of the results gained through the DCTs will be presented in the tables pointing to the frequencies and calculated percentages of the two groups' ratings in the criteria.

Requests in Equal Social Status

There are two situations where requests are employed between people of equal social status. In the first situation, a student asks his/her roommate to clean the kitchen (DCT # 1) and in the second one, a student asks his/her neighbors to be more quiet (DCT # 2). Table 9 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCTs.

Table 9

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 1 and 2

DCT	Groups	Highly Form.	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality # 1	NS (10)	-	1 (10 %)	5 (50 %)	4 (40 %)	-
	EFL (25)	-	5 (20 %)	7 (28 %)	13 (52 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	1 (10 %)	11 (44 %)	13 (52 %)	-
Formality # 2	NS (10)	-	8 (80 %)	1 (10 %)	1 (10 %)	-
	EFL (25)	-	4 (16 %)	10 (40 %)	11 (44 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	3 (12 %)	14 (56 %)	8 (32 %)	-
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness # 1	NS (10)	-	8 (80 %)	2 (20 %)	-	-
	EFL (25)	-	9 (36 %)	4 (16 %)	9 (36 %)	3 (12 %)
	TR (25)	-	9 (36 %)	12 (48 %)	3 (12 %)	1 (4 %)
Politeness # 2	NS (10)	2 (20 %)	6 (60 %)	2 (20 %)	-	-
	EFL (25)	-	3 (12 %)	8 (32 %)	9 (36 %)	5 (20 %)
	TR (25)	-	12 (48 %)	9 (36 %)	4 (32 %)	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directnes s # 1	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)		-	
	EFL (25)	5 (20 %)	20 (80 %)		-	
	TR (25)	9 (36 %)	16 (64 %)		-	
Directnes s # 2	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)		-	
	EFL (25)	5 (20 %)	20 (80 %)		-	
	TR (25)	5 (20 %)	17 (68 %)		3 (12 %)	

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

As Table 9 displays, when the formality level for DCT # 1 is concerned, NSs mostly adopted *informal* and *less formal* attitude while making a request to a person of equal status. Turkish EFL students performed similarly in terms of the level of formality both in their Turkish and English responses. Neither of the groups preferred to use a highly formal way or slangs. As for the formality level for DCT # 2, NSs mostly (80 %) adopted a formal way while only 16 % of the students were at formal level. The rest of the Turkish EFL learners' preference was more 'less formal' and 'informal'. Less formal and informal levels were also preferred more by the Turkish EFL students in their Turkish responses. That is to say, Turkish EFL learners' responses showed similarity in terms of formality in English and Turkish.

In terms of the level of politeness, most NSs (80 %) used a polite way to request in both situations, while only 34 % of EFL in DCT #1 and 16 % of EFL in DCT #2 used a polite way of requesting. Instead, rest of the students employed a 'less polite' and 'impolite way'. When learners' Turkish responses were compared, while about half of the students employed less polite and impolite requests in English, more students preferred to use 'polite' and 'slightly' polite requests in Turkish, For instance, Turkish speech act for DCT # 1, *"Mutfagi temizler misin?"* meaning *"Could you clean the kitchen?"* was found to be polite in Turkish. However, when most of the students used expressions such as *"Dude can you clean the kitchen?"* was found to be less polite in English. Instead, one of the common responses that was reported as polite from native speakers was *"Would you mind cleaning up please as I have friends coming around soon?"*

As for directness, both groups (90 % of the NS, 80 % of EFL) mostly preferred to use conventionally indirect requests "where conventionalized uses of language such as 'could/ would you do it?'" are employed while requesting. Turkish

EFL learners' Turkish responses showed similarity to their English responses. However, there were a few responses more direct in Turkish for DCT # 1 (i.e., *"Eger isin yoksa, mutfaga bi el at,"* meaning "*If you don't have anything to do, start cleaning the kitchen*.").

Below are some of the less polite responses given by the learners and more polite ones by the native speakers for DCT # 2.

Table 10

Sample NS and EFL Requests in Equal Social Status

Sample Student Responses	Sample Native Speaker Responses
"I have an important exam tomorrow. Please be quiet"	*"I am sorry to bother you. I have an exam tomorrow. Could you ask the children to be quiet?"*
"Please keep your children quiet. I am trying to study here"	*"Hi, sorry. I wonder if the kids can quiet down. I have an exam tomorrow and I need to concentrate."*
"Can you keep your children quiet? I have an exam tomorrow and I need to concentrate."	*"Sorry to bother you but could you keep it down a bit? I am studying for an exam but it's difficult because of the noise coming from the children.*
"Sorry your children are making lots of noise. Could you keep them quiet?"	

In brief, for the requests between the people of equal social status, native speakers employed less formal and informal requests where Turkish learners showed similarity for DCT # 1. When request was made to a neighbor, native speakers were mostly polite and formal. However, Turkish EFL learners' formality and politeness level were lower than the native speakers. As for directness, learners performed more

similarly in the level of directness where they used conventionally indirect requests. As far as the Turkish language is concerned, Turkish EFL learners showed similarity in their Turkish and English responses in terms of the level formality and directness, however, they were stated to be more polite in their Turkish responses than English ones.

Requests by a Person of Lower Status

There are two situations where requests are employed by a person of lower social status. In the first situation, a student asks his/her professor to give extension (DCT # 5) and in the second one, a secretary asks for permission from his/her boss to leave early (DCT # 7). Table 11 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCTs.

Table 11

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 5 and 7

DCT	Groups	Highly Form.	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	9 (90 %)	1 (10 %)	-	-
# 5	EFL (25)	-	9 (36 %)	12 (48 %)	4 (16 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	13 (52%)	12 (48 %)	-	-
Formality	NS (10)	2 (20 %)	8 (80%)	-	-	-
# 7	EFL (25)	-	9 (36 %)	14 (56 %)	2 (8 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	12 (48 %)	13 (52 %)	-	-
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)	-	-	-
# 5	EFL (25)	-	9 (36 %)	12 (48 %)	4 (16 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	22 (88 %)	3 (12 %)	-	-

Table 11 (cont'd)

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 5 and 7

Politeness	NS (10)	3 (30 %)	7 (70 %)	-	-	-
# 7	EFL (25)	-	12 (48 %)	11 (44 %)	2 (8 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	18 (72 %)	5 (20 %)	2 (8 %)	-

		Direct	Conventionally Indirect	Noncon. Direct
Directnes	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)	-
s # 5	EFL (25)	1 (4 %)	24 (96 %)	-
	TR (25)	1 (4 %)	24 (96 %)	-
Directnes	NS (10)	-	10 (100 %)	-
s # 7	EFL (25)	-	25 (100 %)	-
	TR (25)	2 (8 %)	23 (92 %)	-

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

For this category, while most NSs (% 90) used formal requests, only 36 % of students were at the same level. Rest of the students was relatively less formal in their requests. As for politeness, NSs employed a polite attitude to make a request. While 36 % of the students in DCT # 5 and 48 of the students in DCT # 7 were at the same politeness level, the others failed to reach the required politeness in this requests. In terms of directness, NSs used conventionally indirect requests, and Turkish EFL learners performed similarly.

When the learners' English and Turkish responses were compared, learners showed similar levels of formality by using formal and less formal requests with few responses being informal in English. In terms of politeness, majority of Turkish responses were at the polite level, however, in English their responses were 'slightly polite'. Learners performed similarly at the level of directness in both languages. For

instance, *"Odevimi henuz tamamlayamadım. Ek sure vermeniz mumkun mu?"* meaning *"I haven't finished my assignment yet. Would it be possible to give extension?"* was found to be polite and nonconventionally direct in Turkish. On the other hand, *"Professor, could you give me extra time because I am very busy?"* was found to be less polite as it lacks 'please' and reason is provided after the request.

Some sample responses given to DCT # 7 by each group are presented below.

Table 12

Sample NS and EFL Requests with Lower Social Status

Sample Student Responses	Sample Native Speaker Responses
"Can I leave early today?" *"Could I leave early today to go to dentist?"* *"I need to leave earlier today because I have an appointment. May I?"* *"I have an appointment today. Can I leave?"* *"May I leave 2 hours early?"* *"I need to leave early. Could you give me permission?"* *"I have a terrible toothache. Please give me permission. I have to leave early today."*	*"Would it be possible for me to leave 2 hours earlier than usual? I have a dental appointment."* *"Excuse me. I had to schedule a dentist appointment this afternoon. Would it be possible for me to leave a little early today?"* *"Would I be able to leave early today please. I really need to get to the dentist."*

In conclusion, when the requests made by a person of lower social status were analyzed, although students performed similar to the native speakers in the level of directness, most of them could not reach the same level of politeness and formality while requesting from a person who has a higher social status. Turkish EFL learners were less polite and formal compared to the native speakers. Learners' Turkish and

English responses showed similarity in terms of formality and directness, however, their Turkish responses were found to be more polite than English ones.

Requests made by a Person of Higher Status

There are two situations where requests are employed by a person of higher social status. In the first situation, a professor asks his/her student to give presentation earlier than scheduled (DCT # 9) and in the second one, a boss asks his/her secretary to type letters (DCT # 11). Table 13 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCTs.

Table 13

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 9 and 11

DCT	Groups	Highly Form.	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	4 (40 %)	6 (60 %)	-	-
# 9	EFL (25)	-	6 (24 %)	9 (36 %)	10 (40 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	2 (8 %)	19 (76 %)	4 (16 %)	-
Formality	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	6 (60 %)	3 (30 %)	-	-
# 11	EFL (25)	-	6 (24 %)	11 (44 %)	7 (28 %)	1 (4 %)
	TR (25)	-	4 (16 %)	14 (56 %)	7 (28 %)	-

DCT		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	2 (20 %)	8 (80 %)	-	-	-
# 9	EFL (25)	-	10 (40 %)	9 (36 %)	4 (16 %)	2 (8 %)
	TR (25)	-	7 (28 %)	12 (48 %)	6 (24 %)	-

Table 13 (cont'd)

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 9 and 11

Politeness	NS (10)	3 (30 %)	6 (60 %)	1 (10 %)	-	-
# 11	EFL (25)	-	8 (32 %)	7 (28 %)	4 (16 %)	5 (20 %)
	TR (25)	-	9 (36 %)	7 (28 %)	5 (20 %)	1 (4 %)

DCT		Direct	Conventionally Indirect	Noncon. Direct
Directnes	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)	-
s # 9	EFL (25)	6 (24 %)	19 (76 %)	-
	TR (25)	12 (48 %)	9 (36 %)	-
Directnes	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)	-
s # 11	EFL (25)	4 (16 %)	21 (84 %)	-
	TR (25)	11 (44 %)	13 (52 %)	1 (4 %)

Note. Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

Native speakers mostly employed a 'formal' and 'less formal' way of requesting in this category. More than half of the learners (24 % formal, 36 % less formal in DCT # 9 and 24 % formal, 44 % less formal in DCT # 11) showed similarity while about 30 - 40 % of them preferred to be informal. In terms of politeness, while almost all the NSs used a polite form of request, about 60 % of the Turkish EFL learners failed to reach the same level of politeness. As for the level of directness, both groups mostly adopted conventionally indirect way to make the request with a few Turkish learners being more direct.

For the items presented in Table 13, learners preferred similar levels of formality in their Turkish and English responses by using formal, less formal and informal requests when a request is made by a person of higher social status. As for politeness, responses showed variety in both languages between polite and impolite

and their ratings were similar in English and Turkish. In terms of directness, learners (48 % in DCT # 9 and 44 % in DCT # 11) were more direct in their Turkish responses than English. For instance, for DCT # 9, in Turkish *"Hazirsan, sunumunu bir kac gun once yapmani isterim,"* meaning *"I would like you to give your presentation a few days earlier if you are ready."* was one of the common direct responses. However, in English their use of indirect ones such as *"Can you give your presentation a few days earlier?"* were more common. Some sample less polite responses by students and polite ones by native speakers to DCT # 11 are presented below.

Table 14

Sample NS and EFL Requests with High Social Status

Sample Student Responses	Sample Native Speaker Responses
"These two letters are important for us. So can you give up other tasks and type these?"	*"I know you are busy but I need a big favor. Is there any way you could finish these letters in an hour?"*
"Can you do that before other works?"	*"I know you are busy at the moment but I really need these two letters typed up as a matter of urgency. Could ask you to do these first?"*
"Can you please write these letters in an hour? It's very important for me."	
"I know you are very busy but can you do me a favor? Could you help me?"	

In conclusion, similar to other categories of social status, although Turkish EFL learners performed similar to native speakers in terms of the level of directness, they were not as polite or formal as native speakers in this category, either. As far as the learners' Turkish responses were concerned, their ratings were similar in Turkish

and English in the level of politeness and formality, however, there were more direct responses in Turkish than in English.

Requesting from Acquaintances

There is one item where a request is made to an acquaintance in the context where a student asks a school-mate whom s/he does not know very well to lend him/her money are presented below (DCT # 4). Table 15 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCT.

Table 15

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 4

DCT	Groups	Highly Formal	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	7 (70 %)	3 (30 %)	-	-
# 4	EFL (25)	-	-	14 (56 %)	9 (36 %)	2 (8 %)
	TR (25)	-	1 (4 %)	16 (64 %)	6 (24 %)	2 (8 %)
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	3 (30 %)	7 (70 %)	-	-	-
# 4	EFL (25)	-	6 (24 %)	10 (40 %)	4 (16 %)	4 (16 %)
	TR (25)	-	15 (60 %)	7 (28 %)	3 (12 %)	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directn.	NS (10)	-	10 (100 %)		-	
# 4	EFL (25)	-	25 (100 %)		-	
	TR (25)	2 (8 %)	22 (88 %)		1 (4 %)	

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

When making a request to an acquaintance, majority of the NSs (70 %) used formal with some (30 %) less formal requests. 56 % of the Turkish EFL learners

employed a less formal way of requesting but 44 % of them used informal requests. While NSs were quite polite in their requests, only 24 % of the learners were at the same level of politeness. There was not any difference in the level of directness between the two groups.

Learners showed similar levels of formality in English and Turkish by using mostly less formal and informal requests when talking to acquaintances. As for the level of politeness, they also showed similarity by preferring polite, slightly polite and less polite requests. However, there were more students' using polite requests in Turkish than English. Learners' English and Turkish responses were similar in the use of nonconventionally direct requests. For instance, the following response to DCT # 4 was polite enough in Turkish: *"Paramı evde unutmusum, bana biraz borc verebilir misin? Yarın getiririm."* meaning *"I left my wallet at home, can you lend me some money? I will bring it tomorrow."* However, the following response in English was rated as slightly polite as it lacks *please* and request comes before the reason: *"Can you give me some money? I forgot to take money from my parents but I have to go home."* One of the appropriate response from native speakers was *"Could you do me a favor, I need to get home and realized I don't have any cash. Could you lend me some until tomorrow please?"*

Briefly, native speakers mostly used polite and formal requests regardless of whom they were talking to while Turkish EFL students were less formal and polite when they requested from someone they knew.

Requesting from Strangers

There are two situations where requests are made to strangers. In the first situation, a stranger on the road is asked to take a photo (DCT # 12) and in the

second one, a napkin is requested from the flight attendant on the plane (DCT # 6). Table 16 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCTs.

Table 16

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 12 and 6

DCT	Groups	Highly Form.	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality # 12	NS (10)	-	5 (50 %)	5 (50 %)	-	-
	EFL (25)	-	11 (44 %)	8 (32 %)	6 (24 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	21 (84 %)	4 (16 %)	-	-
Formality # 6	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	7 (70 %)	2 (20 %)	-	-
	EFL (25)	-	14 (56 %)	10 (40 %)	1 (4 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	17 (68 %)	8 (32 %)	-	-
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness # 12	NS (10)	-	10 (100 %)	-	-	-
	EFL (25)	-	15 (60 %)	8 (32 %)	2 (8 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	21 (84 %)	4 (16 %)	-	-
Politeness # 6	NS (10)	2 (20 %)	8 (80 %)	-	-	-
	EFL (25)	-	13 (52 %)	10 (40 %)	1 (4 %)	1 (4 %)
	TR (25)	-	22 (88 %)	3 (12 %)	-	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directnes s # 12	NS (10)	-	10 (100 %)		-	
	EFL (25)	-	25 (100 %)		-	
	TR (25)	-	25 (100 %)		-	
Directnes s # 6	NS (10)	-	10 (100 %)		-	
	EFL (25)	1 (4 %)	24 (96 %)		-	
	TR (25)	1 (4 %)	24 (96 %)		-	

When requests from strangers were analyzed, NSs used formal and less formal requests in DCT # 12. Turkish EFL learners also used a similar level of formality with only 24 % of them being informal. In DCT # 6, most NSs used a formal language to make request with few being less formal and 56 % of the students showed a similar level of formality by using formal requests. In terms of politeness, NSs again used a polite way to make a request. About 60 % of the learners adopted a similar way while 40 % of them were less polite. Both groups used the same level of directness.

When Turkish learners requested from strangers, their level of formality and politeness were higher in Turkish than English. However, directness level was the same in both languages. For instance, the following response was polite and formal enough in Turkish: *"Pardon, fotografımızı cekebilir misiniz?"* meaning *"Sorry, could you take our photo?"* The translated version was accepted as appropriate in native speaker responses and more than half of the students could perform similarly. As Turkish is an agglutinating language, the suffix *'misiniz'*, which states second person plural pronoun, can be translated as 'can' and 'could'. Second person plural pronoun is used to address strangers and people with higher social status to show respect and make the language formal. However, when students used the following expression in English, they were found less polite: *"Can you take our photo?"*

In DCT # 6, the use of subject 'you' while requesting to have a napkin was found to be a bit unnatural by the raters. For instance, one of the most common polite and formal responses in Turkish was *"Pardon, bir peçete alabilir miyim?"* meaning *"Could I have a napkin?"* However, some students mostly used the subject 'you' in their responses in English, which was never preferred by the native speakers (i.e., *"Could you give me a napkin?"*). When the Turkish EFL learners used subject 'I',

appropriateness was affected by other things such as the verb choice (i.e., "May I take/get a napkin?"). Here, translation from Turkish is observed as take or get can be translated as one word, "almak", in Turkish. Below are listed some more sample responses to DCT # 6.

Table 17

Sample NS and EFL Requests from Strangers

Sample Student Responses	Sample Native Speaker Responses
"Please, can you give me a napkin?"	*"Excuse me. Could I have a napkin,*
"Could you give me a napkin?"	*please?*
"Could you bring me a napkin, please?	*"May I have a napkin, please?"*
"May I take a napkin?"	

In short, when talking to strangers, Turkish EFL learners used more formal and polite requests, which showed the biggest similarity to native speakers. However, learners were even more formal and polite in their mother tongue than English.

Overall, as far as making a request is concerned, Turkish EFL learners showed the most similarity to native speakers at the level of directness by mostly using nonconventionally direct strategies in different social contexts. Learners' responses to Turkish version of the DCTs were similar to their English responses in most cases, however, there were more direct responses in Turkish when request is made to someone of a lower social status and of equal social status. On the other hand, Turkish EFL learners were not as formal and polite as native speakers. The biggest difference occurred at the level of politeness between the native speakers and Turkish EFL learners' speech act use. Although native speakers used polite requests

no matter whom they were talking to, Turkish EFL learners showed the most similarity when they were talking to strangers. When the learners requested something from someone they know, more than half of the learners did not show the required level of politeness in their request speech acts in English. When the EFL learners' responses to English and Turkish DCTs were compared, although direct translation from Turkish to English was observed at times, learners' responses in English were found to be less polite than the Turkish ones. As for the level of formality, Turkish EFL learners showed the most similarity to native speakers when they were communicating to close friends and strangers. However, when the superiors, inferiors and acquaintances were involved, about half of the Turkish EFL learners lacked the level of formality that the native speakers showed. Additionally, transfer from Turkish to English was observed at the level of formality, as the learners used the same level of formality in both languages. In general, Turkish EFL learners performed similar to native speakers at the level of directness, however, learners were less polite and formal than native speakers when requesting in English. Learners' responses in Turkish were similar to English ones at the level of directness and formality, where transfer from the mother tongue is observed, however, learners' Turkish responses were more polite than their responses in English. In addition to this, one of the common issues observed in the learners' responses was the overuse of 'can' and 'could' in requests (Table 12 & 14). Overuse of 'can' and 'could' provides an advantage for EFL learners to have the same directness level with the native speakers. However, while native speakers mostly preferred to use various requests such as 'Would you mind…?', 'Would it be possible...?', 'Do you think it would be possible….?' in the items which requires being more formal and polite,

Turkish learners failed to reach that variety in their requests. Not being linguistically competent in English affected the learners' low scoring of politeness and formality.

Refusing Requests in Relation to Social Distance

There were three items where participants were expected to refuse requests in regard to three different social variables in written DCTs: refusals in equal social status (DCT # 8), refusing someone of a higher (DCT # 3) and lower (DCT # 14) social status. Results regarding the level of formality, politeness and directness in refusal speech acts by the native speakers and Turkish learners of English both in Turkish and English are analyzed in this section through the tables pointing to the frequencies and calculated percentages of the two groups' ratings in the criteria. However, unlike requests, the findings of the study regarding refusals indicated a variety in the ratings of native speakers. That is, there was not a common pattern preferred for the level of formality and politeness in the responses produced by the native speakers. This variety in the rating of responses can be related to individual differences while refusing or the scale used for rating did not lend itself to test refusals appropriately. Therefore, in this part, the statistics will be shared in Tables 18, 19 and 20 but the response types and patterns will be discussed in Chapter V.

Refusals in Equal Social Status

There is one situation for the refusals in equal social status. In the context, a student refuses to share his/her notes (DCT # 8). Table 18 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCT.

Table 18

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 8

DCT	Groups	Highly Formal	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	2 (20 %)	6 (60 %)	2 (20 %)	-
# 8	EFL (25)	-	5 (20 %)	4 (16 %)	15 (60 %)	1 (4 %)
	TR (25)	-	2 (8 %)	15 (60 %)	8 (32 %)	-
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	-	10 (100 %)	-	-	-
# 8	EFL (25)	-	10 (40 %)	2 (8 %)	7 (28 %)	6 (24 %)
	TR (25)	-	7 (28 %)	9 (36 %)	9 (36 %)	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directn.	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	3 (30 %)		6 (60 %)	
# 8	EFL (25)	11 (44 %)	9 (36 %)		4 (16 %)	
	TR (25)	11 (44 %)	3 (12 %)		11 (44 %)	

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

For the item presented above, while 60 % of the NSs used *less formal* speech acts, 60 % of the Turkish EFL learners used informal refusals. As for politeness, while all the native speakers employed a polite way to refuse, 60 % of the learners did not reach the same level of politeness. Directness level of the both participant groups were not the same in this context. More than half of the native speakers used nonconventionally direct way which requires speakers to use hints instead of directly refusing. However, 44 % of the learners were quite direct in their refusals.

In comparison of the two languages for the item presented above, learners' refusal speech acts use ranged from formal to informal. However, while more speech acts (60 %) were considered *less formal* in Turkish, majority (60 %) was found to be

informal in English. Ratings for the level of politeness and directness showed variety in the speech acts use, as well. However, this variety showed similarity for Turkish and English. To exemplify the different levels of directness, the direct ones stated *"Sorry, I can't share my notes."* both in Turkish and English. Indirect ones stated *"Sorry, I need them tonight," "I don't have my notes with me," "My handwriting is bad."*

The scoring of formality and directness while refusing someone of an equal social status was inconsistent for both participant groups. However, all native speakers showed a polite attitude while refusing, where the learners lacked the same level of politeness. While Turkish learners' ratings in both languages showed variety in the level of formality, politeness and directness, similarity was observed between Turkish and English responses to some extent.

Refusing someone of a Lower Social Status

There is one situation for refusing someone of a lower social status. In the context, a boss refuses to give pay rise (DCT # 14). Table 19 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCT.

Table 19

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 14

DCT	Groups	Highly Formal	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	5 (50 %)	5 (50 %)	-	-
# 14	EFL (25)	-	4 (16 %)	13 (52 %)	8 (32 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	2 (8 %)	18 (72 %)	5 (20 %)	-
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	-	4 (40 %)	5 (50 %)	1 (10 %)	-
# 14	EFL (25)	-	8 (32 %)	6 (24 %)	9 (36 %)	2 (8 %)
	TR (25)	-	8 (32 %)	11 (44 %)	6 (24 %)	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directn.	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)		-	
# 14	EFL (25)	5 (20 %)	20 (80 %)		-	
	TR (25)	5 (20 %)	17 (68 %)		3 (12 %)	

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

As the table 19 shows above, native speakers used formal and less formal refusals and 68 % of the Turkish EFL learners used the same level of formality. Most of the NSs (40 % polite and 50 % slightly polite) were more polite in their use of refusal speech acts than Turkish EFL learners (32 % polite and 24 % slightly polite). Therefore, 44 % of the TSs could not show the same level of politeness. As for the level of directness, two groups were mostly conventionally indirect.

When the Turkish learners' responses in English and Turkish were compared in the situation where the refusal was realized by a person of higher social status, majority of the Turkish learners' responses were at *less formal* level in both Turkish and English. Similar level of politeness was revealed in two languages with a few responses in English being less polite. Level of directness was also similar in both

languages. For instance, one of the most common responses in Turkish was *"Uzgunum bu siralar pek mumkun gronmuyor."* meaning *"Sorry, it doesn't seem possible these days."* Turkish EFL learners used the same response in English, as well. Additionally, native speaker responses were quite similar: *"I am sorry but right now it's not financially possible."*

The scoring of formality and politeness in refusals was not very consistent for both participant groups. However, Turkish learners' rating for Turkish and English speech acts showed similarity.

Refusing someone of a Higher Social Status

There is one situation for refusing someone of a higher social status. In the context, an employee refuses to work longer in the evening (DCT # 3). Table 20 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCT.

Table 20

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 3

DCT	Groups	Highly Formal	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	2 (20 %)	5 (50 %)	3 (30 %)	-
# 3	EFL (25)	-	3 (12 %)	17 (68 %)	5 (20 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	4 (16 %)	16 (64 %)	4 (16 %)	1 (4 %)
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	2 (20 %)	5 (50 %)	3 (30 %)	-	-
# 3	EFL (25)	-	5 (20 %)	14 (56 %)	5 (20 %)	1 (4 %)
	TR (25)	-	9 (36 %)	13 (52 %)	2 (8 %)	1 (4 %)

Table 20 (cont'd)

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 3

		Direct	Conventionally Indirect	Noncon. Direct
Directn.	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)	-
# 3	EFL (25)	1 (4 %)	24 (96 %)	-
	TR (25)	10 (40 %)	12 (48 %)	3 (12 %)

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

In this item, native speakers and Turkish EFL learners showed similar levels of formality, which ranged from formal to informal. In terms of politeness, 70 % of the NSs adopted a polite and slightly polite way to refuse. Majority of the learners (56 %) used slightly polite refusals. In both groups, conventionally indirect level of refusing was observed.

In the item where a refusal was made by a person of lower social status, the level of formality and politeness was similar in Turkish EFL learners' Turkish and English responses with the majority of the answers being *slightly polite* and *less formal*. However, for the level of directness, about half of the Turkish responses were more direct than English ones, and there were also few nonconventionally direct refusals in Turkish. One of the observations made in this item was that most NSs made a request to leave early instead of refusing to work longer (see Table 21). Some students also responded similarly. To exemplify, Turkish EFL learners responded in Turkish as *"Yarın devam etsek uygun olur mu?"* meaning *"Would it be possible to work on tomorrow?"* They used similar expressions in English. See more examples below.

Table 21

Sample NS and EFL Refusals

Sample Student Responses	Sample Native Speaker Responses
"I really need to go home tonight if you don't mind"	*"I am really sorry but I have to go."*
"I'm sorry I cannot stay more because I want to leave."	*"Would it be possible for me to leave before we finish up?"*
"I gotta go because my mum is waiting for me."	*"Would it be possible for me to finish tomorrow morning? I have to leave soon to…"*
"Sorry, I do not want to disrespect but my shift has already finished."	*"I was wondering if it might be possible to leave a little early. I can come in extra early to finish it off."*
"Pardon me, I have to go."	

Turkish EFL learners showed the most similarity to native speakers at the level of formality, politeness and directness while refusing someone of a higher social status. Turkish learners' rating for Turkish and English language also showed similarity except that there were more direct speech acts in Turkish.

Overall, unlike requests, ratings showed individual variance for refusal speech acts. Instead, responses ranged from formal to informal and from polite to less polite. However, two participant groups showed similar levels of formality in each context. While Turkish learners' level of politeness was similar to natives when refusing someone of a higher social status, their level of politeness was lower than the native speakers when refusing some of equal and of lower social status. As for directness, when refusals in equal social status are concerned, natives mostly preferred to be indirect than Turkish learners. In other contexts, both groups were conventionally indirect. When the learners' Turkish and English responses were

compared, they showed similarity at each level except that Turkish speech acts were more direct when refusing someone of a higher social status. In brief, similar to requests, the biggest difference was at the level of politeness between two groups with a few more direct refusals by Turkish EFL learners while the formality level was similar.

Accepting Requests in Relation to Social Distance

There were two items where participants are expected to accept requests from a person of equal (DCT # 10) and higher social status (DCT # 13). Results regarding the level of formality, politeness and directness in acceptance speech acts by the native speakers and Turkish learners of English both in Turkish and English are analyzed in this section.

Accepting someone in Equal Social Status

There is one situation for accepting someone in equal social status. In the context, a friend accepts to repair his/her friend's laptop (DCT # 10). Table 22 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCT.

Table 22

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 10

DCT	Groups	Highly Formal	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality	NS (10)	-	1 (10 %)	2 (20 %)	7 (70 %)	-
# 10	EFL (25)	-	3 (12 %)	2 (8 %)	20 (80 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	1 (4 %)	9 (36 %)	15 (60 %)	-

Table 22 (cont'd)

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 10

		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	9 (90 %)	-	-	-
# 10	EFL (25)	2 (8 %)	23 (92 %)	-	-	-
	TR (25)	-	18 (72 %)	7 (28 %)	-	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directn.	NS (10)	7 (70 %)	3 (30 %)		-	
# 10	EFL (25)	18 (72 %)	7 (28 %)		-	
	TR (25)	19 (76 %)	6 (24 %)		-	

Note. NS: Native speakers of English, EFL: Turkish EFL learners, TR: Turkish EFL learners' speech acts responses in Turkish

Both participant groups' language was mostly similar in terms of formality, politeness and directness in this item. They used informal, polite and direct way for expressing the acceptance.

Turkish EFL learners' acceptance speech act use in English and Turkish was mostly similar in terms of formality, politeness and directness in this item. They used informal, polite and direct way for expressing the acceptance both in Turkish and English. One of the most common expressions used by native speakers were *"Yes, sure."* and *"Of course."* and the most common expressions used in Turkish was *"Tabi ki."* which can be translated as 'of course'. In addition to this, Turkish EFL learners added some more details in their speech acts, which made them more direct such as *"Tabi ki yardım ederim."* meaning *"Of course, I'll help you."* both in Turkish and English.

Accepting someone of a Higher Social Status

There is one situation for accepting someone of a higher social status. In the context, it is accepted to bring the boss' car (DCT # 13). Table 23 presents the ratings of NS's responses, Turkish EFL's English responses and their Turkish responses to the Turkish version of the DCT.

Table 23

NS and EFL Ratings for DCT # 13

DCT	Groups	Highly Formal	Formal	Less F.	Informal	Slang
Formality # 13	NS (10)	-	2 (20 %)	3 (30 %)	5 (50 %)	-
	EFL (25)	-	6 (24 %)	9 (36 %)	8 (32 %)	-
	TR (25)	-	16 (64 %)	6 (24 %)	3 (12 %)	-
		Highly Polite	Polite	Slightly P.	Less P.	Impolite
Politeness # 13	NS (10)	1 (10 %)	6 (60 %)	2 (20 %)	1 (10 %)	-
	EFL (25)	-	15 (60 %)	4 (16 %)	5 (20 %)	1 (4 %)
	TR (25)	-	20 (80 %)	4 (16 %)	1 (4 %)	-
		Direct	Conventionally Indirect		Noncon. Direct	
Directn. # 13	NS (10)	3 (30 %)	7 (70 %)		-	
	EFL (25)	13 (52 %)	12 (48 %)		-	
	TR (25)	17 (68 %)	8 (32 %)		-	

In this item, both groups showed similarity in terms of formality. About 70 % of both groups used less formal and informal acceptance speech act. As for the level of politeness, around 60 % of both groups used polite speech acts, however, rest of the participants preferred to be less polite. In terms of directness, half of the learners

preferred to be direct while most of the NSs (70 %) were conventionally indirect in their use of acceptance speech act (See Table x).

There was not much difference in acceptance speech acts as the participants produced similar levels of politeness, formality and directness in their Turkish and English responses. A few responses were more formal, polite and direct in Turkish. Some of the common responses by native speakers were "*Yeah, sure," "Yes, of course," "I'll be right back."* Turkish learners used these a bit more formal and direct expressions frequently in Turkish: *"Hemen efendim (Right away sir), Hemen getiriyorum (I'll bring it now)."* Similar responses can be observed in Turkish learners' responses in English *"Of course, sir," "Of course I can." "Sure, I can do this," "I'll bring it quickly."* Below are some more sample responses (see Table 24).

Table 24

Sample NS and EFL Acceptance Speech Acts

Sample Student Responses	Sample Native Speaker Responses
"I'm going to do this quickly."	*"Sure, no problem."*
"Sure, I will bring your car fast."	*"Yes, of course."*
"Your car is on its way to here."	*"Yes, no problem."*
"Of course, I can"	*"Sure, I'll be right back."*

In conclusion, while accepting requests, Turkish EFL learners performed similarly in English and Turkish in terms of politeness, formality and directness. Some expressions transferred from their mother tongue, such as *"Tabi ki (Of course)."* helped them to have the similarity with the native speakers. However, some other expressions transferred from mother tongue, especially while talking to someone with higher social status, such as "I'll bring it right away." was not

preferred by the native speakers. “I’ll bring it right way” is the direct translation of *“Hemen getiriyorum.”* in Turkish and is commonly used. Being unaware of the conventional use of English language, Turkish EFL learners preferred to use it.

The second research question aimed to compare NS’s and Turkish EFL’s speech act use in terms of the level of the formality, politeness and directness. While there was not much difference between the two groups in terms of the realization of acceptance, the biggest difference was in the use of requests. As for acceptance, each participant groups used similar levels of politeness and formality except for some direct expressions used by Turkish EFL learners. As far as the realization of requests is concerned, while native speakers of English employed more polite and formal attitude in their speech acts regardless of the social distance, most Turkish EFL learners failed to show the same level of politeness and formality in their request speech acts especially when they communicated with someone they know. In terms of the analysis of refusals, ratings were mostly inconsistent among native speakers. Turkish EFL learners were mostly similar to native speakers at the level of formality and directness but less polite in refusals.

Conclusion

The study examined the development of conceptual socialization in Turkish EFL learners’ speech acts realization. More specifically, the study aimed to examine Turkish EFL learners’ conceptual socialization by analyzing the similarities and differences between native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English in their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization through semi-controlled and free practice activities in terms of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness. This chapter presented the findings based upon the written DCTs in

English and Turkish and role play in two main sections: comparison of NS and EFL for their speech act appropriateness level in DCTs and role plays, comparison of NS and EFL speech acts in terms of formality, politeness and directness and the comparison of learners' speech act use in English and Turkish. The next chapter will present the findings and discussions, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to investigate Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their speech acts realization. More specifically, the study aimed to examine Turkish EFL learners' conceptual socialization by analyzing the similarities and differences between native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English in their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness in written and oral discourse completion tasks. In this respect, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent do higher level Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their *appropriate* realization of request, refusal and acceptance speech acts;
    a. written discourse completion tasks?
    b. oral discourse completion tasks?
2. How do Turkish EFL learners differ from native speakers of English in their realization of English and Turkish request, refusal and acceptance speech acts in terms of the level of;
    a. formality?
    b. politeness?
    c. directness?

In this mixed-methods approach study with 25 higher level Turkish learners of English studying in a preparatory school and 10 native speakers of English working as language instructors, the qualitative data were collected through 14-item written DCTs in English including request, refusal and acceptance speech acts (see Appendix A), audio recordings of role plays (see Appendix B) and the same written DCTs translated into Turkish (see Appendix C) by the researcher. Participants' responses given to the data collection tools were rated by native speakers in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness by using criteria (see Appendix D). Both groups' responses were quantified and Turkish EFL learners' speech acts use was analyzed descriptively by keeping the responses by the native speakers of English as a baseline. Inferential statistics have been used to compare the mean scores of both groups.

This chapter consists of four main sections. First, the findings of the study in light of the relevant literature are discussed. The discussion section will follow the same order in which the findings of the study were presented in Chapter IV. Following that, the pedagogical implications of the study are presented. After that, limitations of the study are described and some suggestions are made for further research.

Findings and Discussion

In this section, the findings will be presented. First, findings in relation to two research questions will be discussed. And then, a summary of the main conclusions will be presented to address the issue of if the development of *conceptual socialization* is possible in EFL contexts.

Discussion of the Findings Related to the *Appropriate* Realization of Request, Refusal and Acceptance Speech Acts

One of the most noteworthy findings of the present study was that the difference in the *appropriate* realization of request and refusal speech acts between the native speakers of English and Turkish EFL learners was statistically significant. That is, although the Turkish participants were higher level language learners that is B2 level learners framed by CEFR, they still could not manage to perform request and refusal speech acts as appropriate as native speakers of English both in their semi-controlled, written and freer, oral production activities gained through DCTs and role plays respectively. Most researchers pointed out that although foreign language learners have the grammatical and lexical knowledge in the target language, they may still fail achieving successful communication because of lack of pragmatic competence (e.g., Li, 2015; Ortactepe, 2012; Taguchi, 2012). Additionally, lack of conceptualization in the social environment of the target language leads second language learners to fail in using appropriate expressions in social interactions (Kecskes and Papp, 2000). In this respect, Turkish EFL learners' low scoring of appropriateness in the realization of requests and refusals might be because of being unaware of cultural and linguistic differences in the target language but these will be discussed more after presenting the results related to the level of formality, politeness and directness on page 76 and 80.

On the other hand, the study revealed that the difference in the *appropriate* realization of acceptance speech acts between the native speakers of English and Turkish EFL learners was not statistically significant. That is, accepting requests were not problematic for Turkish EFL learners as they performed acceptance speech acts similar to native speakers both in DCTs and role plays. The reason why Turkish

EFL learners found acceptance easy could be related to relatively easy linguistic structures used while accepting requests and also the use of similar expressions in their both Turkish and English responses. More detailed discussion about the appropriateness level will be provided after presenting the results related to the level of formality, politeness and directness on page 83.

Discussions of the Findings Related to the Level of Formality, Politeness and Directness in Request, Refusal and Acceptance Speech Acts

Requests in Relation to Social Distance

In order to analyze the realization of speech acts closely, participants' level of formality, politeness and directness were also examined. The findings related to request speech acts revealed that, among these three features, Turkish EFL learners showed the most similarity to native speakers at the level of directness. That is Turkish EFL learners mostly used similar expressions with native speakers by especially using nonconventionally direct[1] strategies in different social contexts. This finding is verified by Mizikaci (1991) who also stated that Turkish EFL learners preferred to use nonconventionally direct strategies while requesting. Although the level of directness was similar in both participant groups, another finding concerning the linguistic structures used while requesting revealed a difference between the groups. That is, the native speaker responses showed variety in their use of grammatical structures for requests. For example, "Would you mind…" "Do you mind..." "Do you think it would be possible…" were some of the expressions used often for different social contexts by the native speakers. However, Turkish EFL

[1] "conventionalized uses of language such as 'could/ would you do it?'" as requests

learner responses failed to show the same variety. Instead, learners overused ‘can’ and ‘could’ while requesting. One of the reasons why the learners lack various structures in request speech acts can be associated with some structures’ such as ‘can’ and ‘could’ being taught in most course books commonly starting from lower levels. Additionally, in order to acquire second language socialization and be successful language learners, language learners need to be competent in both linguistic and social aspects in the target language (Kecskes, 2002). However, lack of pragmatic structures and formulas in Turkish EFL learners’ request speech acts shows that the learners are not linguistically competent in the target language

When the Turkish participants were compared in terms of the level of directness in their use of speech acts in Turkish and English, the results indicated that learners’ responses to Turkish version of the DCTs were similar to their English responses in most cases. That is, they mostly used similar expressions in both languages by using nonconventionally direct strategies. However, there were more direct responses in Turkish when request was made to someone of a lower social status and of equal social status. For instance, in DCT # 1, participants requested from their homemates to clean the kitchen. Turkish EFL learners’ use of more direct requests in Turkish once they know the person might point to their solidarity and closeness with their friends. Similar to this, Zeyrek (2001) points out the norms of being an *insider* and *outsider* of a group in Turkish culture by emphasizing the close relationships with family members and friends but classifying the people they do not know as *strangers*. What Marti (2005) also suggested in her study where she compared the level of directness and politeness between Turkish monolinguals and Turkish-German bilinguals was that Turkish monolinguals were found to use more direct requests. However, native speakers of English avoided using direct requests no

matter whom they were talking to. This might be because of their autonomous and individualistic characteristics based on the cultural norms. According to Wierzbicka's (1991) description, English-speaking societies "place special emphasis on the rights and on the autonomy of every individual, which abhors interference in other people's affairs (*It's none of my business*), which is tolerant of individual idiosyncrasies and peculiarities, which respects everyone's privacy, which approves of compromises and disapproves of dogmatism of any kind" (p. 30).

Considering the findings of the present study, it can be suggested that Turkish EFL learners differed greatly from the native speakers at the level of politeness as natives were much more polite in each situation. In his study, Kılıckaya (2010) also pointed out that Turkish learners' level of politeness was not very satisfactory. In contrast to native speakers, Turkish EFL learners employed an impolite attitude when they knew the person they were talking to. This can also be associated with Turkish learners' sense of solidarity and closeness (Zeyrek, 2001). However, when the learners requested something from strangers, they performed similar to native speakers by preferring polite requests. This can be because Turkish L1 socialization is similar to English socialization in these contexts. When strangers are concerned, Turkish people get to be more polite.

When the EFL learners' responses to English and Turkish DCTs were compared, Turkish responses were satisfactorily polite. However, learners' responses in English were found to be less polite than the Turkish ones. This situation can be interpreted as Turkish learners' could not master the conventions of how to be more polite in English. To give an example, using 'please' was quite common in native speakers' responses while requesting. However, what the raters repeatedly gave the rationale while giving low rates to the Turkish EFL learner responses was the lack of

please in requests (see Table 8 for more reasons). That is, Turkish learners' L1 socialization does not require using 'please', which is evident from their Turkish responses, and they applied the same conventions of L1 to L2. Additionally, use of second-person pronouns in Turkish, *sen / siz*, similar to *tu* and *vous* in French, are enough to make a request polite and formal when necessary. Second person singular can be used in informal contexts while the plural one can be preferred for formal interactions. As there is only one second person pronoun *(you)* in English, Turkish EFL learners did not seem to be aware of other ways of how to make requests in English more polite or formal.

The results indicate that as far as the level of formality is concerned, Turkish EFL learners were not as formal as native speakers in general. The learners showed the most similarity to native speakers when they were communicating to close friends, which requires to be informal. Also, the learners showed similarity to native speakers when they were communicating to strangers, where being formal is appreciated. However, when the superiors, inferiors and acquaintances were involved, about half of the Turkish EFL learners lacked the level of formality that the native speakers showed. This can be because of Turkish learners' closeness when they know the person they communicate with or they lack the required linguistic structures to use in different social interactions. Once Turkish learners knew the other person, they did not get to be as formal as native speakers of English. It can be because of Turkish culture's close social network with each other. Even when addressing people they do not know on the street, for example, Turkish people may call each other *aunt (teyze)* or *uncle (amca).* In Turkish culture, where respect for the elderly and superior is important, professors may also develop a friendly relationship with their students (Zeyrek, 2001). As Turkish learners used the same level of

formality in both languages, it can be said that socio-pragmatic transfer from the Turkish culture to English language is observed at the level of formality. That's why, while learners' formality level was appropriate in Turkish, they failed to produce appropriate level of formality in their English responses.

Refusing Requests in Relation to Social Distance

Unlike requests, the findings of the study regarding refusals indicated a variety in the ratings of native speakers. That is, there was not a common pattern preferred for the level of formality and politeness in the responses produced by the native speakers. This variety in the rating of responses can be related to individual differences while refusing or the scale used for rating did not lend itself to test refusals appropriately. Therefore, in this part, analysis of response types and structures used will be focused more than the level of formality, politeness and directness between two participant groups.

When the responses were analyzed to investigate the outstanding similarities and differences between two groups, it was observed that while Turkish learners' level of politeness was similar to natives when refusing someone of a higher social status, their level of politeness was lower than the native speakers when refusing someone of equal and of lower social status. Similar to requests, native speakers preferred to be polite regardless of whomever they were interacting. This finding differs from what Moody (2011) emphasized in his study. He suggested that English participants tried to mitigate the imposition of refusals while refusing someone of a higher social status but were more direct when interacting to people of equal and lower status.

As for Turkish participants, it can be said that politeness is affected by social distance which is based on two things: knowing and not knowing the person they are communicating with. When the refusals were analyzed, differences at the level of politeness were also observed while refusing superiors and inferiors. The mentioned similarity with the native speakers when refusing someone of a higher social status can be related to common respect to superiors in Turkish culture, which makes people use more polite language. The difference, on the other hand, with regards to communicating with people that Turkish learners know affected their being less polite, stemming most probably from the sense of closeness. Thus, it can be noted that Turkish learners have socio-pragmatic transfer from L1 as their language socialization in English is similar to L1.

When the types of responses to the DCTs were analyzed, some differences were found between two groups. For instance, in DCT # 3 participants were asked to refuse their boss to work longer than their shifts on a particular day. 60 % of the native speakers were a little direct but polite while refusing. One of the common utterances they made was “I’m really sorry but I already have plans for after work”. 20 % of the native speakers only asked for permission by stating “Would it be possible for me to leave now?” and 20 % of them offered a suggestion “I was wondering if it might be possible to leave a little early? I can come in extra early tomorrow to finish it off”. When the Turkish learners’ response types were analyzed, majority of them offered suggestions while refusing, by stating “May I leave now? I will finish the project tomorrow”, “Can I finish it later?” They offered the same suggestions in Turkish, as well. Thus, it can be concluded that Turkish learners experienced socio-pragmatic transfer from L1 in their responses.

As for the response types with people of equal social status in DCT # 8, participants were asked to refuse to share their notes with their classmates. Almost all the native speakers used excuses or told lies while refusing. “I’m sorry I didn’t take notes. Could you get them from someone else?” “My notes are not the best, you wouldn’t understand them sorry” “Sorry but I’ve left my notes at home.” However, most of the Turkish learners were quite direct in their responses by stating “I do not want to share my notes” or “Sorry, I can’t share.” Only a few of them came up with excuses such as forgetting the notes at home or losing them. However, in their Turkish responses, majority of them used excuses instead of refusing directly. They refused by stating that they need the notes, they have lost the notes, they haven’t taken any notes or their handwriting is not very good in Turkish. It can be said that some aspects of language use is similar when refusing someone of an equal social status in Turkish and English such as making up an excuse. However, Turkish EFL learners did not transfer the similar responses from L1 to English. Instead, they preferred to be quite direct in English, which affected their ratings for the level of politeness and appropriateness, as well. Their low grades in politeness because of being very direct can also be verified by Marti’s (2005) study where she indicated that there is a strong link between indirectness and politeness.

Response types when refusing an inferior in DCT # 14 where participants were asked to refuse an employee to give pay rise showed similar structures in native speakers’ speech acts. Native speakers mostly said “I am sorry but it doesn’t seem possible right now.” Turkish learners’ responses mostly had expressions like “Sorry, it is not possible.” or “It is impossible.” Some of the learners’ responses were a bit promising by stating “Maybe later.” or “Can you ask again a few months later?” In their Turkish responses, learners used almost the same structures as in “Uzgunum, bu

sıralar pek mumkun degil." meaning "Sorry, it is not possible these days." In short, learners L1 and L2 socialization was similar to native speakers in this item.

In brief, ratings showed individual variance for refusal speech acts. However, some patterns were observed in the response types in relation to social distance. Turkish learners showed socio-pragmatic transfer from L1 while communicating to inferiors and superiors in English. Their politeness level was similar to native speakers while refusing superiors as both groups tried to be polite. As for inferiors, almost the same structures were used by both groups. As for response types Turkish learners sounded more promising while refusing an inferior and superior compared to native speakers. As far as refusing someone of an equal status is concerned, Turkish learners preferred to be more direct and less polite in their English responses than Turkish. Types of excuses that the participants came up with were similar for native speakers and Turkish learners' responses in Turkish.

Accepting Requests in Relation to Social Distance

Another finding as to accepting requests suggests that Turkish EFL learners performed similar to native speakers in terms of politeness and formality. The findings of the first research question also verify the similarity as Turkish learners did not differ from native speakers in their *appropriate* realization of acceptance speech acts. Also, when the Turkish EFL learners were compared in terms of their responses in Turkish and English, their answers showed similarity in both languages. To exemplify, two of the most common expressions used for acceptance by native speakers were "Yeah, sure." "Yes, of course." which can be directly translated to Turkish as "Tabi ki." and used commonly in social context in Turkish. So, Turkish

EFL learners were able realize similar expressions in acceptance with native speakers easily.

There were a few more direct speech acts in Turkish and English produced by the learners, however, it did not seem to affect the level of appropriateness scores. Learners' use of direct acceptance can be associated with their use of mother tongue as they performed similarly in both languages. For instance, the expression in Turkish *"Tabi ki yardım ederim."* meaning *"Of course, I'll help you."* is quite common to use. Learners had a tendency to translate these kinds of structures to English. Use of similar expressions in English, however, was not available by the native speakers. Natives commonly used phrases were "Yes, sure." or "Yes, of course."

Overall, performing request and refusal but not acceptance speech act is problematic for Turkish EFL learners because of different reasons. While the most important reason is being unaware of the cultural differences, lack of mastery in L2 structures also plays a big role in learners' inappropriate use of speech acts.

Summary of the Major Findings in Relation to Conceptual Socialization

Findings of the present study revealed that in EFL context, Turkish EFL learners' conceptual socialization is influenced by two inter-related processes: Their experiences of classroom instruction and L1 socialization. Evidence with regards to these two aspects will be discussed in this section.

1. One of the findings showed that native speakers of English used a variety of structures while using speech acts. However, Turkish learners lacked this pragma-linguistic diversity in their speech act use. Instead, they overused 'can' and 'could' while requesting. This can be related to classroom teaching

where ‘can’ and ‘could’ for requests are presented first and emphasized more. Also, over emphasis on the grammatical form in English rather than function based teaching in the classrooms affected Turkish EFL learners’ use of appropriate speech acts negatively. Turkish learners apparently used what is taught them in the classrooms more.

2. Transferring socio-pragmatic and linguistic features from Turkish to English affected Turkish EFL learners’ use of appropriate speech acts negatively.
    a. One of the findings was related to the level of formality and politeness. Native speakers used polite speech acts regardless of whom they were talking to and kept their formality while interacting with inferiors and superiors. However, Turkish EFL learners’ level of formality and especially politeness was lower than native speakers in their speech acts. Once the students knew the person they were talking to, they used less formal and polite speech acts. It can be because of the sense of solidarity and closeness in Turkish culture that is transferred while communicating in the target language. That is, Turkish learners’ socio-pragmatic transfer of L1 socialization to English affected their level of formality and politeness in speech acts negatively.
    b. Turkish EFL learners’ speech act use in Turkish was appropriate. However, when they used similar expressions in English, they were found to be less appropriate. For instance, while requesting in Turkish, they did not use ‘please’ and it was found appropriate. Not using ‘please’ in English, on the other hand, was one of the reasons for low ratings of appropriateness. Therefore, applying the same

conventions of L1 socialization in English led learners to use less appropriate expressions.

c. Not knowing the appropriate linguistic structures to use in speech acts caused learners to receive a lower rating in appropriateness. To exemplify, ‘get, have and take’ can be translated to Turkish with one word, ‘almak’. When the learners uttered ‘May I take a napkin?’ they were found to be less appropriate linguistically. Similarly, English is an ‘I’ oriented language where using ‘Could *I* have a napkin?’ would be completely appropriate. However, when the learners used expressions like ‘Could you give me a napkin?’ or ‘Could you give me permission?’ they were found to be less appropriate. When the learners were compared in terms of their Turkish and English responses, it was observed that they used ‘I’ as well in Turkish (i.e., Bir pecete alabilir miyim? meaning Could I have a napkin?). Therefore, it can be noted that lack of pragma-linguistic structures also affected the learners’ use of appropriate speech acts.

In brief, classroom teaching and L1 socialization is influential in developing conceptual socialization in EFL contexts. In addition to these, due to the lack of social context, authentic interaction and engagement in community practice in EFL contexts, the development of conceptual socialization in EFL learners seem to be more challenging and demand external factors or learner investment as mentioned in Ortactepe’s (2012) study.

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The findings of the present study point out important pedagogical implications that can inform the future teaching practices, not only in Turkey but also other countries around the world. The present study revealed that although the participants were higher level of English learners, they still could not produce appropriate request and refusal speech acts in different social situations. More importantly, they do not know the appropriate politeness and formality level while using speech acts as they lack conceptual socialization in the target language. However, learning how to carry out social encounters with various people ranging from teachers to friends in different situations is one of the things nonnative speakers need to achieve for social competence (Kramsch, 1987). Therefore, more importance should be given in encouraging learners to realize cultural and linguistic differences in speech acts use. During class hours, instructors can focus on speech act differences in different languages along with teaching skills so that learners' awareness could be raised. Specifically, at the preparatory schools in Turkey, teaching of speech acts can be integrated into testing, course book and curriculum design so that foreign language learners could become more competent in the use of target language by being aware of the available choices for speech act realization in different social contexts.

Some further teaching ideas should also be taken into consideration while teaching speech acts to help learners develop both pragmatic ability and conceptual socialization in the target language. To begin with, instead of focusing on form only, various structures used for different social contexts including inferiors and superiors could be presented with the help of technology in the classrooms. For instance, use of videos or scenes from TV series could help learners raise their awareness about

the different structures used in various social contexts. Role play activities can also be effective tools to teach speech acts in the classrooms as they can set the social status of the participants and context easily for the learners. Additionally, social situations can be given both in Turkish and English and students can be asked to find the similarities and differences to raise their awareness. Lastly, Ortactepe (2012) points out that "teachers should convey the functional uses of any language in its social context along with its structural components because of the link between language and social context in which it is being used by native speakers" (p. 10). In this respect, as teachers act like role models in the classrooms, their being well-rounded in terms of the cultures in the countries where English is spoken also plays a major role in raising learners' awareness of the speech acts use and helping them socialize in the second language.

Limitations of the Study

This study aimed to investigate learners' conceptual socialization in EFL contexts by comparing the request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization of native speakers of English and Turkish EFL learners. The findings of this study should be treated with caution with regards to basic limitations of it. Initially, some of the items in DCTs, especially for refusals, did not produce a common pattern for the level of politeness, formality and directness preferred by the native speakers. Instead, participants' speech acts realization showed variety in the degree of formality and politeness. In addition to it, there were only three DCT items for refusals. That's why, more items in DCTs and role-plays would have presented more complete and in-depth results. Another limitation regarding the social situations in DCT is that although familiar contexts were aimed to be chosen for the participants, some of the items might have been unavailable to participants in their social lives.

For instance, for the item where the participants were asked to refuse to share their notes with their friends (DCT # 8), a few participants noted in parentheses in the DCT sheet that they would actually share their notes. Similarly, few participants noted that they would not actually borrow money from their schoolmates for DCT # 4. Therefore, having items that are purely related to participants' social lives could have better reflected what kind of speech acts they would produce in real life.

Another limitation was related to the rating process of the speech acts. Firstly, the number of the raters was limited in this study. One rater from the UK and another rater from the USA rated English responses. Two Turkish raters rated the Turkish responses. Secondly, there were some discrepancies in the rating of the English speech acts carried out by the raters. There was low inter-rater reliability in refusals. We had to come together and discuss the level of politeness and appropriateness for some of the speech acts produced by the participants at times. It was agreed that the use of some speech acts might be individual depending on the relationship with the listener. That's why, having more number of raters could have provided more reliable results in this study.

In this study, the participants were chosen randomly from two higher level classrooms. Not knowing about the participant groups in person contributed well to the objective data analysis as the raters were not affected by the personality or the background of the participants. However, observing the natural language use of the participants in classroom atmosphere for a while could have helped the researcher to make more sense of their speech act realization.

Suggestions for Further Research

On the basis of the findings and limitations of the present research, some suggestions might be provided for further studies. To begin with, data from a greater number of participants, raters and DCT items could provide a bigger picture of the speech acts use of native speakers and EFL learners. In addition, use of different data tools such as having oral DCTs or keeping track of naturally occurring data can provide in-depth exploration of the participants' speech acts use.

This study only focused on Turkish EFL learners' production of speech acts in DCTs and role plays. It is also advisable to conduct a complementary research to see whether learners' own perception of how much formality, politeness and directness is required for each DCT item corresponds to what they actually produce. To this end, after the participants have completed the DCTs, the same task where an additional scale is added after each item showing numbers from 1 to 5 to assess the level of formality, politeness and directness can be designed. Participants' can be asked to rate the required level of formality politeness and directness for each item through retrospective interviews.

This study does not have any data for classroom instruction. Future research can also focus on the data of classroom instruction which provides information about which speech acts and how speech acts are taught to learners.

The present study focused only on requests, refusing and accepting requests. Researching other dimensions of refusals such as refusing invitations can be carried out to make comparisons. Moreover, realization of other speech acts such as complaints and apologies can also be explored for their level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness. Lastly, speech act realization of lower level and

higher level learners can also be compared to explore how much they differ from each other.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to investigate Turkish EFL learners' development of conceptual socialization in terms of their speech acts realization. More specifically, the study aimed to examine Turkish EFL learners' conceptual socialization by analyzing the similarities and differences between native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English in their request, refusal and acceptance speech acts realization in terms of the level of formality, politeness, directness and appropriateness in written and oral discourse completion activities. The findings indicated that Turkish EFL learners could not produce completely appropriate request and refusal speech acts both in their written and oral productions. Also, the learners were found to be less polite and formal than native speakers in most of the contexts in English. This can be mostly because of the transferring L1 socialization to English and lack of linguistic structures stemming mostly from the conventions of classroom teaching.

REFERENCES

Aliakbari, M., & Gheitasi, M. (2014). On Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic competence and appropriate use of "request" in English context. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics 18*(1), 19-31.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 63*, 68-86. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00738.x.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Bikmen, A., & Marti, L. (2013). A study of complaint speech acts in Turkish learners of English. *Egitim ve Bilim, 38*(170), 253-265.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). 'Learning to say what you mean in a second language: a study of the speech act performance of Hebrew second language learners'. *Applied Linguistics 3*(1), 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP) *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 196-213. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byon, A.S. (2001). *The communicative act of requests: Interlanguage features of American KFL learners*. (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Hawaii at Manoa

Byon, A. (2004). Sociopragmatic analysis of Korean requests: Pedagogical settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *36*(9), 1673-1704. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.003.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383-420). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D. (2004). Assessing speech acts in a second language. In D. Boxer & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 302-327). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(2), 189-212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00540.x

Coulmas, F. (1979). On the sociolinguistic relevance of routine formulas. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *3*, 239-266.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.

Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Fukushima, S. (1996). Requests strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language Sciences*, *18*, 671–688.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behaviour*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hinkel, E. (1997). Appropriateness of advice: DCT and multiple choice data. *Applied Linguistics, 18*(1), 1-26.

Hong, W. (1998). *Request patterns in Chinese and German: A crosscultural study.* Munich: Lin-com Europa.

Hymes, D. H. (1971). On communicative competence. In J. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin, 1972. (Excerpt from the paper published 1971, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.) Johnson, K. and Morrow, K. (1981). Communication

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(2), 215-247. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100009955.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research, 8*(3), 203–231.

Kecskes, I. (2002). *Situation-bound utterances in L1 and L2*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kecskes, I. (2014) *Intercultural pragmatics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kecskes, I. (2015). How does pragmatic competence develop in bilinguals? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, doi: 10.1080/14790718.2015.1071018.

Kecskes, I. & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kılıçkaya, F. (2010). The pragmatic knowledge of Turkish EFL students in using certain request strategies. *University of Gaziantep Journal of Social Sciences*, *9*(1), 185-201.

Kramsch, C. J. (1987). Socialization and literacy in a foreign language: Learning through interaction. *Theory into Practice*, *26*(4), 243-250.

Istifci, I. (2009). The use of apologies by EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 2*(3), 15-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n3p15.

Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room: *Global and local considerations. Language Learning & Technology, 8*(3), 44-65.

Lee, C. (2004). Written requests in emails sent by adult Chinese learners of English. *Language, Cultures and Curriculum 17*(1): 58–72.

Leung, S. (2001). Language socialization: Themes and advances in research. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–18.

Li, R., Raja Suleiman, R. and Sazalie, A. (2015). An Investigation into Chinese EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 15*(2), 101-118.

Lu, D. (2001). Cultural features in speech acts: A Sino-American comparison. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 14*(3), 214-23.

Marti, L. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish–German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(11), 1836-1869.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. (2011). Research methodologies in pragmatics: Eliciting refusals to requests. *ELIA, 11*, 47-87.

Matsumura, S. (2001). Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning, 51*(4), 635-679.

Matsumura, S. (2007). Exploring the after effects of study abroad on interlanguage pragmatic development. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 4*(2), 167-192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ip.2007.010.

Ming-Fang Lin. (2014). An interlanguage pragmatic study on Chinese EFL learners' refusal: Perception and performance. *Journal of Language Teaching &*

Research, 5(3), 642-653. doi:10.4304/jltr.5.3.642-653.

Mızıkacı, F. (1991). *A sociocultural investigation of speech acts (requests and apologies) in Turkish and English.* (Unpublished master's thesis), Bilkent University, Ankara.

Moody, M. J., (2011). *A study of Turkish and English refusal speech acts with a secondary examination for bidirectional language transferral*. (Doctoral dissertation). Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Ortactepe, D. (2012). *The development of conceptual socialization in international students: A language socialization perspective on conceptual fluency and social identity* (advances in pragmatics and discourse analysis). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ortactepe, D. (2013). "This is called free-falling theory not culture shock!": A narrative inquiry on second language socialization. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 12*(4), 215-229.

Pinto, D., & Raschio, R. (2007). A comparative study of requests in heritage speaker Spanish, L1 Spanish, and L1 English. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 11*(2), 135-155.

Poole, D. (1994). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 593–616.

Roberts, C., Byram, M., Baro, A., Jordan, S. & Street, B. (2001). *Language learners as ethnographers.* Great Britain: Cromwell Press.

Rose, K. (1994). On the validity of the discourse completion task in non-western contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15*(1), 1-14.

Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siebold, K., & Busch, H. (2015). (No) need for clarity – facework in Spanish and German refusals. *Journal of Pragmatics, 75*, 53-68. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2014.10.006

Taguchi, N. (2012). *Context, individual differences and pragmatic competence*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, *48*(1), 1-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0261444814000263.

Tamimi Sa'd, S., & Mohammadi, M. (2014). A cross-sectional study of request perspective use among Iranian EFL learners. *IJRSLL*, *3*(5), 19-31.

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Willett, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 757–761.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Invitations, compliments and the competence of the native speaker. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, *8*(4), 7–22.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeyrek, D. (2001). Politeness in Turkish and its Linguistic Manifestations. In A. Bayraktaroğlu & M. Sifianou. *Linguistic politeness across boundaries.* (pp. 43-73). Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Discourse Completion Task (DCT)

Dear Participant,

The purpose of this task is to gain information about your use of speech acts (i.e. requests, refusals) in different social contexts. Your names and answers will be kept confidential and your responses will only be analyzed for research purposes. As the result will give valuable insight into the speech acts use of Turkish learners of English, your answers are of vital importance. Thanks for your participation.

Merve Şanal

Part I

Carefully read the sentences below and write down an appropriate response to the given situations in the blank.

1. You have a very close relationship with your roommate. He/she roommate had a party in your house the night before and left the kitchen in a mess. Your friends are coming over for dinner tonight and you have to start cooking soon. So you want your roommate to clean the kitchen. What would you say to him/her?

   You:_____

   _____

   _____

2. You have an exam tomorrow but you cannot concentrate because your neighbor's children are making a lot of noise upstairs. You wait for a while but finally you go upstairs to tell them to keep their children quiet. How would you say it?

   You:_____

   _____

   _____

3. You are at the office in a meeting with your boss through the end of the day. Your boss wants to work a few more hours to finish the project. But you want to leave. What would you say to him/her?

You:_____

_____

_____

4. You are at school. When you look at your wallet, you notice that you do not have any money left. But you need to borrow some money to go back home. You encounter a classmate -whom you do not know very well- and ask for some money. What would you say to him/her?

You:_____

_____

_____

5. You are a university student and you have an assignment due in two days. However, you are very busy and don't have time to write it. So you would like your professor to give you extension for the assignment. You go to his/her office and say:

You:_____

_____

_____

6. You are on an airplane. It is dinner time. The flight attendant sets your food on your tray. You need a napkin. What would you say to flight attendant?

You:_____

_____

_____

7. You are working as a secretary for a big computer company. You normally leave at 5 pm but you need to leave two hours earlier today as you have a dental appointment. You go to your manager's office in order to ask for permission. What would you say to him/her?

You:_____

_____

_____

8. You attend classes regularly and one of your friends is asking for your notes. But you do not want to share your notes. What would you say to him/her?
You:_____

_____

_____

9. You are a professor at a university. One of your students is going to give a presentation next week. But you are asking him/her to make the presentation a few days earlier than scheduled. What would you say to him/her?
You:_____

_____

_____

10. Your friend is asking for help to repair his/her laptop. You would be happy to help. What would you say to him/her?
You:_____

_____

_____

11. You are a manager of a big film company. You have two business letters to be written soon. You know your secretary is busy but you are asking him/her to type them in an hour. What would you say to him/her?
You:_____

_____

_____

12. A friend from out of town is visiting you at school, and you are showing your friend around the campus and city. You want someone to take your picture together. You see a man dressed in a suit carrying a briefcase and you want to ask him to take your picture. What would you say to him/her?

You:_____

_____

_____

13. You are working as an assistant in a hotel. Your boss wants you to bring his car in front of the building. What would you say to him/her?

You:_____

_____

_____

14. You are the owner of a book store. One of your employees is asking for pay rise. But it does not seem possible. What would you say to him/her?

You:_____

_____

_____

Part II

Please answer the questions about yourself below.

1. **Name:** _____
2. **Age:** _____
3. **Gender:** Male Female
4. **How long have you been studying English?** 0-1 year 2-3 4-5 6+ years
5. **Have you ever lived abroad?** _____
    a. **If yes, how long?** _____
    b. **Where?** _____

DCTs adapted from various studies conducted by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), Rose (1994), Cohen (2004)

Appendix B: Role Plays

1. A. You have a new girlfriend/boyfriend. Tomorrow you are going out for dinner; however, you do not have enough money. You want to borrow some money from your best friend.
   B. Your friend is going to ask for some money from you. Reject his/her request.

2. A. You are having dinner with your friend's family. You want to ask your friend's mother/father for more. What do you say?
   B. Your child's friend is having dinner with you and he/she is asking for more food. Accept his/her request.

3. A. You are talking to your friend after class. You missed the last class and you want to borrow your friend's notes. Ask for help from your friend?
   B. You are talking to your friend after class. He/she missed the last class and wants to borrow your notes. Accept his/her request.

4. A. You are studying in your room and you hear loud music coming from a room down the hall. You don't know the student who lives there, but you go and ask him/her to turn the music down.
   B. You are listening to music in your dorm room. A student comes to your room and asks you to turn the music down. Reject his/her request.

5. A. You are a university student. You are preparing homework and you need some help. You want to ask for the help of a professor. Go to your professor's office and ask for help.
   B. You are a professor and one of your students comes to your office to ask for help from you. Talk about date and time to help her later.

6. A. You apply for a new job in a small company. You are on the phone to schedule an interview in an afternoon because you currently work in the mornings. You talk to human resources manager.

B. You are a human resources manager and somebody calls to apply for a job. He/she wants to have an interview in the afternoon. Refuse his/her request.

7. A. You are a policeman. You see a car parked in a wrong place. You go and ask the driver who is sitting in the car to move his/her car.
B. You have parked your car and you are waiting for your friend in the car. A policeman is approaching you to tell you have parked in a wrong place. Accept his/her request.

8. A. You are studying at home. Your younger brother/sister opens the window and the cold wind blows right into your face and bothers you. You ask him to close it.
B. Your older brother/sister wants you to close the window. Refuse his/her request.

9. A. You have bought a shirt from a big store for your father, but he doesn't like its color. You decide to go to the clothes store and ask the salesman to allow you to exchange the shirt.
B. You are a salesman in a big store. A customer wants to change a shirt he/she has bought before. Accept his/her request if he/she has the bill.

10. A. You are going to visit your friend, who lives in the university dormitory. You are on campus, but you don't know where the room is. You are going to ask a student for the location of the dorm.
B. You are walking on the university campus. Somebody comes and asks you the direction of the dorms. Refuse the request as you are not a student there.

Role-plays adapted from Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), Boxer and Cohen (2004)

Appendix C: Turkish Version of DCT

Sevgili Öğrencimiz,

Bu test farklı sosyal bağlamlarda kullanılan rica, ret gibi söz eylemleri hakkında bilgi toplamak için hazırlanmıştır. İsimleriniz ve verdiğiniz cevaplar gizli kalacak, araştırma için genel sonuçlar değerlendirilecek ve yorumlanacaktır. Cevaplarınızda samimi olmanız ve soru atlamamanız araştırma sonuçlarının sağlıklı bir şekilde değerlendirilebilmesi için son derece önemlidir.

Katılımınız için teşekkür ederim.

Merve Şanal

- **Lütfen aşağıda verilen durumları dikkatlice okuyunuz ve duruma uygun söylenebilecekleri verilen boşluğa yazınız.**

1. Ev arkadaşınızla yakın bir arkadaşlığınız var. Dün gece evde parti verdiğinden mutfağı dağınık bıraktı. Bu akşam yemeğine de misafirleriniz geleceği için yemek yapmaya başlamanız gerekiyor. Ev arkadaşınızın mutfağı temizlemesini istiyorsunuz. Bunu ona nasıl söylersiniz?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Yarın bir sınavınız var ancak üst kat komşunun çocukları çok ses yaptığından odaklanamıyorsunuz. Bir süre bekliyorsunuz fakat sonunda dayanamayıp üst kata çıkıyorsunuz. Çocuklarının sessiz olmasını istediğinizi onlara nasıl söylersiniz?

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Günün sonuna doğru patronunuzla ofiste toplantı yapıyorsunuz. Patronunuz birkaç saat daha fazla çalışıp üzerinde çalıştığınız projeyi bitirmek istiyor. Fakat siz artık iş yerinden çıkmak istiyorsunuz. Bunu ona nasıl söylersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

4. Okuldasınız. Cüzdanınıza baktığında hiç paranın kalmadığını görüyorsunuz. Fakat eve dönmek için paraya ihtiyacınız var. Çok iyi tanımadığınız bir sınıf arkadaşınızla karşılaşıyorsunuz ve borç para istemeniz gerekiyor. Bunu ona nasıl söylersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

5. Üniversite öğrencisisiniz ve iki gün içerisinde bir ödevi teslim etmeniz gerekiyor. Fakat çok meşgul olduğunuzdan henüz ödeve başlama fırsatınız olmadı. Hocanızdan ödevi bitirmek için daha fazla süre istemeniz gerekiyor. Bu durumda hocanıza ne dersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

6. Uçaktasınız ve akşam yemeği vakti. Uçuş görevlisi yemek tepsinizi verdi. Peçeteye ihtiyacınız var. Bunu ondan nasıl istersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

7. Büyük bir bilgisayar firmasında sekreter olarak çalışıyorsunuz. Normalde saat 5'te işten çıkıyorsunuz ama bugün dişçi randevunuz olduğundan iki saat erken çıkmanız gerekiyor. Bu durumda patronunuzdan nasıl izin istersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

8. Derslere düzenli olarak katılan bir öğrencisiniz ve bir arkadaşınız sizden ders notlarını istiyor. Fakat siz paylaşmak istemiyorsunuz. Bu durumda ona ne dersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

9. Bir üniversitede hocasınız. Öğrencilerinizden biri gelecek hafta sunum yapacak. Bu öğrencinizden sunumun kararlaştırılan tarihten birkaç gün önce yapmasını istiyorsunuz. Bu durumda ona ne söylersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

10. Bir arkadaşınız sizden bilgisayarını tamir etmenizi istiyor. Siz de yardım etmek istersiniz. Bu durumda ona ne dersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

11. Büyük bir film şirketinde yöneticisiniz. Hemen yazılması gereken iki iş mektubu var. Sekreterinizin biraz yoğun olduğunu biliyorsunuz fakat bu mektupları bir saat içerisinde yazmasını istiyorsunuz. Ona ne söylersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

12. Şehir dışından bir arkadaşınız sizi ziyarete geldi ve onunla kampüsü ve şehri geziyorsunuz. Birisinden sizin resminizi çekmesini istiyorsunuz. O sırada takım elbiseli bir adam görüyorsunuz. Ondan resminizi çekmesini nasıl istersiniz?

_____

_____

13. Bir otelde asistan olarak çalışıyorsunuz. Patronunuz sizden arabasını otelin önüne getirmenizi istedi. Ona ne dersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

14. Bir kitap mağazasının sahibisiniz. İşçilerinizden biri zam istiyor. Ancak bu pek mümkün değil. Bu durumda ona ne dersiniz?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix D: Criteria for Rating Speech Acts

FORMALITY	**1** Highly formal	**2** Formal	**3** Less formal	**4** Informal	**5** Slang
POLITENESS	**1** Highly polite	**2** Polite	**3** Slightly polite	**4** Less polite	**5** Impolite

DIRECTNESS	**1** Direct *(the most direct, explicit level, like imperatives or performative verbs acting as requests (e.g., Move out of the way.)*	**2** Conventionally indirect *(conventionalized uses of language such as 'could/ would you do it?' as requests.)*	**3** Nonconventionally direct *(indirect strategies (hints) (e.g. using the utterance "It's dark in here." to request switching the lights on)*

APPROPRIATENESS	**1** Very poor	**2** Somewhat Inappropriate	**3** Adequately appropriate	**4** Completely appropriate
Briefly explain why:				

Adapted from Boxer and Cohen (2004), Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and Aliakbari and Gheitasi (2014).

Appendix E: Grading Sheet for Raters

Participant #

ITEM #	Forma.	Politen.	Directn.	Approp.	*Briefly explain why:*
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					

Appendix F: Values for Normally Distributed Data

Written DCTs

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Request	35	1,7	3,9	2,934	,6519	,126	,398	-,921	,778
Refusal	35	1,3	4,0	2,784	,8223	-,095	,398	-1,068	,778
Acceptance	35	1,5	4,0	3,429	,7189	-,932	,398	-,134	,778
Valid N (listwise)	35								

Role Plays

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Request	35	2	4	3,29	,860	-,607	,398	-1,385	,778
Refusal	35	2	4	3,31	,758	-,609	,398	-,971	,778
Acceptance	35	3	4	3,83	,382	-1,823	,398	1,399	,778
Valid N (listwise)	35								

Appendix G: Inter-rater Reliability

DCT Item #	**Intraclass Correlation – Average Measures**
DCT # 1 formality	,736
DCT # 1 politeness	,817
DCT # 1 directness	,932
DCT # 1 appropriateness	,832
DCT # 2 formality	,808
DCT # 2 politeness	,834
DCT # 2 directness	,936
DCT # 2 appropriateness	,867
DCT # 3 formality	,678
DCT # 3 politeness	,645
DCT # 3 directness	,698
DCT # 3 appropriateness	,765
DCT # 4 formality	,796
DCT # 4 politeness	,825
DCT # 4 appropriateness	,912
DCT # 5 formality	,821
DCT # 5 politeness	,832
DCT # 5 appropriateness	,758
DCT # 6 formality	,869
DCT # 6 politeness	,798
DCT # 6 appropriateness	,841
DCT # 7 formality	,862
DCT # 7 politeness	,823
DCT # 7 directness	,935
DCT # 7 appropriateness	,798
DCT # 8 formality	,714
DCT # 8 politeness	,635
DCT # 8 directness	,685

DCT # 8 appropriateness	,712
DCT # 9 formality	,849
DCT # 9 politeness	,829
DCT # 9 directness	,911
DCT # 9 appropriateness	,890
DCT # 10 formality	,874
DCT # 10 politeness	,836
DCT # 10 directness	,912
DCT # 11 formality	,879
DCT # 11 politeness	,753
DCT # 11 directness	,839
DCT # 11 appropriateness	,951
DCT # 12 formality	,873
DCT # 12 politeness	,823
DCT # 12 appropriateness	,912
DCT # 13 formality	,936
DCT # 13 politeness	,859
DCT # 13 directness	,845
DCT # 14 formality	,654
DCT # 14 politeness	,632
DCT # 14 directness	,698
DCT # 14 appropriateness	,721