RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1673**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

102. Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals[1]

Şeyma KÖKCÜ[2]

Abstract

To communicate appropriately with native speakers to maintain communicative tasks like ordering food or refusing to do a favor without any misunderstandings, learners need to acquire the sociocultural features of the target language (TL) pragmatic units like speech acts. One source of input providing the learners with these TL sociocultural features is the coursebooks they use in classrooms. This study's goal was to explore the strategy types and authenticity of speech acts in second language (L2) Turkish coursebooks. To achieve this, request and refusal strategies in dialogues in three B2 level L2 Turkish coursebooks were identified and classified based on the type of strategies through content analysis. Following that, a coursebook authenticity questionnaire including these dialogues was conducted with 50 native speakers of Turkish asking them to rate how natural these dialogues sound natural. Results showed that the types of strategies in the investigated coursebooks reflect the natural use of direct and indirect strategies in Turkish depending on the politeness variables of power and social distance relationship between the interlocutors. It was indicated by the results of the questionnaire that while requests and refusals in the dialogues sound natural, they do not sound totally natural, meaning that there is still something unnatural in these utterances. Limitations and suggestions are discussed in the article.

Keywords: L2 Turkish, authenticity, speech acts, requests, refusals

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma

Öz

Yemek siparişi vermek veya bir daveti reddetmek gibi iletişimsel görevleri gerçekleştirmek için anadili konuşurlarıyla yanlış anlama olmaksızın düzgün bir şekilde iletişim kurabilmek için dil öğrenicilerinin söz edimleri gibi edimbilimsel birimlere ilişkin hedef dildeki sosyokültürel bilgiyi edinmeleri gerekmektedir. Öğrenicilere hedef dilin sosyokültürel özelliklerine erişim imkânı sağlayan dilsel girdi kaynaklarından biri ders kitaplarıdır. Bu çalışmanın amacı ikinci dil (D2) Türkçe ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğünü ve strateji çeşitlerini incelemektir. Bu doğrultuda, üç farklı B2 düzeyi D2 Türkçe ders kitabındaki diyaloglarda bulunan istek ve ret strateji tipleri içerik analizi yoluyla sınıflandırılmıştır. Daha sonra bu diyalogları içeren özgünlük anketi 50 anadili Türkçe konuşuruyla uygulanmış ve katılımcılardan diyalogların kulağa ne kadar doğal gediğini değerlendirmeleri istenmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda elde edilen bulgular incelenen kitaplardaki strateji çeşitlerinin dolaylılık yönünden konuşurlar arasındaki güç ve yakınlık değişkelerine göre

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

1674 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

Türkçedeki doğal kullanımı yansıttığı görülmüştür. Anketten elde edilen bulgular ise anadili Türkçe konuşurlarının diyalogları tamamen doğal değil doğal bulduğunu, yani bu sözcelerde yine de doğal olmayan bir şey olduğunu düşündüklerini göstermiştir. Sınırlılıklar ve öneriler makalede tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: İkinci /Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe, özgünlük, söz edimleri, istek, ret

1. Introduction

Ordering food, buying clothes, or asking somebody for help are some communicative tasks a second language (L2) learner needs to achieve while living in an L2 context. While achieving these tasks, learners need to communicate with native speakers (NSs) of the target language (TL). Therefore, it is of paramount importance for learners to acquire L2 pragmatic, which studies the meaning in context (Leech, 1983), since high proficiency of grammar is not equal to same level of proficiency in language use in interactional context (Taguchi, 2012; Zhu; 2012). One important aspect of L2 pragmatic that learners need to acquire to achieve in everyday tasks is speech acts, which are actions like refusing, ordering or requesting taking place through an utterance (Yule, 1996).

As the new members of the L2 community, learners face sociocultural norms of the TL community while performing speech acts in everyday life. Since these norms vary across languages, learners need to learn these new sociocultural norms in order to communicate appropriately with the NSs and to avoid misunderstandings by being exposed to L2 input through these interactions with the NSs. Another source of input through which learners gain access to TL sociocultural norms is coursebooks used in L2 teaching. Given that even in L2 contexts where the learners have access to input through interaction with NSs learners may not take an active role in social interaction with the L1 users if they are not willing to (Norton, 2008), coursebooks may constitute the main source of input for learners to acquire L2 pragmatic. Therefore, it is crucial for the coursebooks to present samples of natural everyday social interaction to make the learners exposed to sociocultural norms of the TL through these dialogues.

Currently, there are limited studies investigating speech acts in L2 Turkish coursebooks (Aksu Raffard, 2018; Altun Alkan, 2019; Bayat, 2017; Özdemir, 2016; Polat, 2010). However, no study explores authenticity of the speech acts in L2 Turkish coursebooks. Therefore, this study aimed to explore the strategy types and authenticity of requests and refusals in three B2 level L2 Turkish coursebooks.

2. Literature review

2.1 Pragmatics

In today's language teaching and learning approaches, making the learners get the ability to achieve communicative tasks by developing their communicative competence is becoming more and more important. According to Hymes (1972), communicative competence which is the ability to use the linguistic structures appropriately depending on the varying social contexts should be acquired by the learners to communicate in an appropriate way. In other words, to be able to use the TL correctly, learners should acquire the knowledge of the L2 culture and social norms as well in addition to the language forms. Ellis (1994) states that communicative competence "entails both linguistic competence and pragmatic competence" (p. 696). While linguistic competence refers to the knowledge of language forms, pragmatic competence refers to knowing to speak appropriately in a specific context. More specifically, pragmatics is "the study of how-to-say-what-to-whom-when and L2 pragmatics is the study

of how learners come to know how-to-say-what-to-whom-when" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, p. 68). It refers to interpreting the meaning in what a speaker says and does not say. As to the pragmatic competence, it is the ability to use the language appropriately in context. To achieve this, speakers need to have the knowledge of the correct use of the functional aspects of the language as well as the linguistic structures.

There are many studies investigating pragmatic competence in an L2 and it is proposed by many researchers that having a high proficiency of grammatical competence does not refer to the same level development of pragmatic competence (Johnson & Rosano, 1993; Kecskes, 2000; Li, Suleiman & Sazalie, 2015; Ortaçtepe, 2012; Kökcü & Ortaçtepe-Hart, 2022; Taguchi, 2012; Zhu; 2012) because L2 learners may transfer the sociocultural norms of their L1 to the TL due to their lack of awareness of the sociocultural differences between their L1 and the TL. This lack of awareness may result in pragmatic errors like misunderstanding. According to Taguchi (2012), the reason why L2 learners make this kind of pragmatic errors is their inability to have interaction in the TL and to match the language forms with the related sociocultural norms as a result of this lack of interaction. In this respect, it can be argued that interaction with the TL speakers and exposure to sociocultural norms of the TL are quite important for the development of L2 pragmatic competence.

2.2 Speech acts

One unit studied under pragmatic competence is speech acts. According to many philosophers like Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), linguistic groups of words are not the minimal units of communication, "but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving directions, apologizing, thanking and so on (Blum Kulka et al., 1989, p. 2). Speech acts are functional units of a language. As defined by Yule (1996), they allow actions like asking, ordering or requesting to be performed when the utterance including a speech act is produced. According to Austin (1962), an utterance is produced based on the realization of three acts, which are locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts refer to the literal meanings of the utterances. To give an example, when the utterance "it is too hot in here" is produced to refer to the temperature of the room, that is a locutionary act. In contrast, when the speaker wants to refer to the covert request of opening the window to the hearer, it is conventional with a force and an illocutionary act. Namely, "unless a certain effect is achieved, the illocutionary act will not have been happily, successfully performed" (Austin, 1962, p. 115). As to the perlocutionary acts, they are produced with the purpose of accomplishing an effect on the hearer by stating an utterance (Austin, 1962).

Among many classifications of speech acts, one fundamental element of distinction is based on the directness. According to this distinction, direct speech acts are the ones in which linguistic forms and the intended communicative functions are in a direct relationship (Searle, 1979) as in the direct request "Open the window". As to the indirect ones, they are realized when there is not a direct relationship between the structure and function (Searle, 1979). In other words, there is an intended purpose demanded to be satisfied in the performed utterance. For example, in conventionalized request "Can you open the window?" the speaker does not refer to the hearer's capability of opening the window, but indirectly wants him/her to open the window.

In relation to the connection between indirectness and politeness, Brown and Levinson (1978) claims that speakers can follow some strategies to mitigate the harm to the hearers' face while doing face-threatening acts. The first strategy is *bald-on record* actions in which the speaker does the FTA in "the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible" without redressing it (p. 69). Direct requests

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

1676 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

in imperative form like "open the door" can be example to these strategies. The second strategy is *positive politeness* addressing the positive face of the hearer, namely the hearer's desire to be liked by other people, with redressive action. Complimenting the hearer on something or using addressing terms like "tatlım, canım, güzelim, hey yakışıklı, aslan kardeşim" (honey, honey, beauty, hey handsome, my dear brother)" are some positive politeness strategies (Turan, 2011, p. 135). As to the third one, *negative politeness,* includes the strategies addressing the hearer's negative face, namely his/her freedom of action, with redressive action. It is about the formality in utterances as in addressing terms like "Hanımefendi/Beyefendi, Ayşe Hanım, Ahmet Bey" (Madame/Sir, Miss/Mrs Ayşe, Mr. Ahmet) in Turkish (Turan, 2011, p. 135). When it comes to the fourth strategy, it is *off-record* actions referring to the actions with more than one interpretation like metaphors or irony. For instance, "Damn, I'm out of cash, I forgot to go to the bank today." may refer to an indirect request of borrowing money from the hearer; however, the speaker "cannot be held to have committed" himself/herself to that meaning (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 69). Lastly, *don't do the FTA* strategy is about the speaker's avoidance of "offending hearer at all with this particular FTA" (p. 72). In other words, it is the most indirect strategy usually employed when there is a high risk of threat to the hearer's face.

2.2.1. Requests

Requests, defined as face-threatening acts (FTA) due to their interference in the addressee's freedom of action when the request is uttered (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), are produced to make the addressee perform something. In other words, they harm the hearer's freedom of action (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015). To reduce the imposition created by the requests on the hearer's face, the notion coming from Goffman's theory of face (1967) and referring to "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained and enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 61), indirect request strategies are applied by the speakers. Based on the level of directness, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) classify requests into three major categories as direct requests like "Open the window!", conventionalized indirect requests like "Can you open the window?" and non-conventionally indirect requests as in "It is too hot in here.". Following that, Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) created a category of nine request strategies under these three major categories depending on the level of indirectness, which will be discussed in detail in the methodology. While it is claimed in Brown and Levinson's (1978) theory of politeness that indirect strategies are used to reduce the harm to the hearer's face, according to Blum-Kulka (1989), indirectness does not always result in polite requests. It was found in the related study that the most indirect strategies are not perceived as the most polite ones in both Hebrew and English and the conventionally indirect strategies were founded to be the most polite request strategies.

To appropriately comprehend and use the speech acts,, learners of a TL need to know the social and cultural features of the TL. Without acquiring this information, learners may face problems with communicating in the TL, resulting in misunderstandings or communicative breakdowns. Therefore, there are a lot of studies on using and/or comprehending requests in a second language (Basra & Thoyyibah, 2017; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Kurdghelashvili, 2015; Li, Suleiman & Sazalie, 2015; Şanal & Ortaçtepe, 2019; Taguchi, Li & Xiao, 2016; Zhu, 2012). Among many studies conducted on requests, the Cross-cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) project by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1989) is quite important as the study investigated the use of requests across many languages and yielded a coding manual for requests guiding the following studies through categorizing the request strategies and other units of the requests. Results of the project showed that directness of the request strategies may vary across languages due to the factors like age

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

and gender affecting the politeness level. There are some studies investigating speech acts in Turkish as a foreign/second language (Aksu Raffard, 2018; Altun Alkan, 2019; Bayat, 2017; Kılınç, 2019; Özdemir, 2016; Polat, 2010);however, only a few of them are based on request strategies (Altun Alkan, 2019; Kılınç, 2019; Özdemir, 2016; Polat, 2010). Among these, results of the study by Altun Alkan (2019) showed that there are differences in use of requests between native Turkish speakers and Turkish as an L2 learners. Furthermore, it was found that age, social status and social distance between speakers has a larger effect on use of requests by native Turkish speakers.

One of the most important classification of requests in the literature is the coding manual proposed by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1989). The coding category by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1989) consists of alerters, request perspective, request strategies, namely head act, internal modifications and supportive moves (external modifications). Examples for the components of the categorization are as follows:

Alerter: It is the unit used to get the hearer's attention. Titles/Roles like "Hocam" (My teacher/professor), Ali Bey (Mr. Ali) "beyefendi/efendim" (sir), "hanımefendi/hanım" (Ms.), "oğlum" (my son), attention getters like "pardon/affedersiniz" (excuse me) "merhaba" (hello) and endearment terms such as "canım" (honey), "tatlım" (sweetie) are some example to alerters used in Turkish.

> Request perspective: A request can be realized from the viewpoint of the speaker, hearer, both or none.
>
> Speaker dominance: It refers to the use of "I" language in the request. Thus, the imposition is largely on the speaker, mitigating the harm to the hearer's face. For example, "Pardon, bir kahve alabilir **miyim?"** (Excuse me, can **I** get a coffee?) is an example to speaker dominant request in Turkish.
>
> Hearer dominance: In this perspective with "you" language, imposition is mostly on the hearer, giving more harm to his/her face. "Pardon, bir kahve getirebilir **misiniz**?" (Excuse me, can **you** get me a coffee?" is the hearer dominant version of the same request given above.
>
> Speaker and hearer dominance: This perspective is a kind of combination of the former ones. In this sense, the hearer is also drawn into the request by the speaker and thus the imposition is aimed to be shared by the hearer. Therefore, "we" language is usually used in this perspective. "Hocam beni diğer sınıfa aldırabilir **miyiz**?" (Professor, can **we** have me taken to the other classroom?)
>
> Impersonal: It is the perspective including neutral forms and terms or passivization. One of the most common impersonal perspective in Turkish is realized with the help of "... var mı?" question, referring to "is there/are there" structure in English and "mümkün mü?" referring to "is it possible to" in English. "Hocam sınıf değiştirme olasılığı var mıdır?" (Professor, is there a chance to change my class?" is an example to impersonal perspective dominant request in Turkish.

Head Acts: As the classification is based on directness, mood derivable, which is the first strategy, is the most direct one mild hint the last strategy on the list is the most indirect one. The utterances below are examples to the use of each request strategy in Turkish. The speaker's intent in these examples is to borrow the hearer's class notes.

1. Mood derivable: "Bana notlarını versene!" (Give me your notes!)
2. explicit performative: "Notlarını vermeni rica ediyorum" (I'm asking you to give me your notes)
3. hedged performative: "Notlarını vermenin mümkün olup olmadığını soracaktım." (I was going to ask you if it is possible for you to give me your notes)
4. locution derivable: "Notlarını vermek zorundasın!" (You must/have to give me your notes)
5. want statement: "Notlarını istiyorum. (I want your notes)
6. suggestory formula: "Notlarını verirsen çok mutlu olurum." (I'll be very happy if you give me your notes.)

1678 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

7. preparatory: "Notlarını verebilir misin?" (Can you give me your notes?)
8. strong hint: "Dersi kaçırdım ya notlarım yok." (I don't have the notes as I missed the class.)
9. mild hint: "Ders dolu dolu geçti herhalde." (I guess the class was quite informative.)

Internal modifications: These ones modify the head act through internal changes to mitigate the imposition caused by the request. Thy are the use of or changes in interrogatives, negations, subjunctive, conditional, aspect, tense, downgraders, upgraders and combinations of these. Below are examples to some common internal modifications:

Downgrader: "**Biraz** sessiz olur musun?" (Can you be quiet **a bit**?)

Downtoner: "Sessiz olur musun **acaba**?" (Can you be quiet by **any chance?)**

Use of past tense: "… diye soracak**tım."** (I **was** going to ask if…)

External modifications/Supportive moves: These are additional utterances, namely they are external to the Head Act used before or after it. They can be used to either mitigate or aggravate the imposition of the request. Mitigating supportive moves include preparator, getting a precommitment, grounder, disarmer, promise of reward, and imposition minimizer. Aggravating supportive moves include insult, threat and moralizing. Some common mitigating examples in Turkish are illustrated below:

Preparator: "**Bir şey soracaktım.** Sigaranız var mı?" (**I was going to ask you something.** Do you have cigarette?)

Grounder: "**Geçenki dersi kaçırdım ya ben,** notlarını alabilir miyim?" (**As I missed the last class** can I borrow your notes?)

Disarmer:"**Rahatsız ediyorum ama** sessiz olur musun?" (**I'm disturbing you but** can you be quiet?)

2.2.2. Refusals

One of the most common speech acts accompanying requests in everyday social interaction is refusals. According to Chen (1996), refusals are the opposite of what the interlocutor expects to hear. By doing so the speaker harms the face of the hearer. Therefore, refusals are defined as face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1978). To mitigate the harm on hearer's positive face caused by the refusal, speakers use some strategies, usually indirect ones. Appropriate use of these strategies depend on some variables like age, gender or social status of the hearer. Therefore, Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990) classified refusal strategies into three categories as 1) direct strategies like "No" or "I can't…", 2) indirect strategies including excuses, explanations, promises, providing alternatives or avoidances and 3) adjuncts to refusals such as thanking and statement of empathy.

There are a lot of studies investigating refusals in L2 (Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Félix-Brasdefer, 2013; Lin, 2014; Martínez-Flor, 2013; Moody, 2011; Siebold & Busch, 2015; Stavans & Webman-Shafran, 2018). In the study by Félix-Brasdefer (2013), it was found that American learners of L2 Spanish studying in Mexico for eight weeks showed significant difference from learners studying the TL in America. Stavans and Webman-Shafran (2018) investigated refusals and requests by multilingual speakers and found that L1 Arabic speakers used more indirect strategies in English as the L1 English speakers do unlike what they do in Arabic due to their exposure to English. In another study, Yazıcı and Demirel (2021) aimed to identify what type of refusal strategies were used in video resources of a teaching Turkish as a foreign language material and results of their study revealed that mostly indirect

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1679**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

strategies were used in the videos. It was seen that while direct strategies were used at beginner levels more indirect strategies were observed at higher levels.

One of the most common classification of refusals is suggested by Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990). The categories in their classification and examples from Turkish are as follows:

1. Direct refusals: Saying "reddediyorum" (I refuse); Use of "Hayır!" (No!); Negative willingness/ability: "... yapamam." (I can't), ".... yapmayacağım" (I won't)
2. Indirect refusals:
a. Statement of regret: "Üzgünüm ama ..." (I'm sorry but ...)
b. Wish: "**Keşke** yardım edebilsem**" (I wish** I could help you**)**
c. Excuse, reason, explanation: "Sınava çalışmam gerekiyor." (I need to study form the exam)
d. Statement of alternative: "Bende fazla kalem yok. **Şuradaki hanımefendiye sorun isterseniz."** (I don't have an extra pencil. **Why don't you ask that lady over there?**)
e. Set condition for future or past acceptance: "Daha önce sorsan kabul ederdim" (If you had asked me earlier I would have accepted it.)
f. Promise of future acceptance: "Şimdi gelemem ama bir dahakine umarım" (I can't come now but next time hopefully)
g. Statement of principle: "Biliyorsun asla sigara içilen kafelere gitmem." (As you know I never go to indoor smoking cafes.)
h. Statement of philosophy: "Kimse bu kadar dikkatli olamaz." (Noone can be that careful)
i. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

i.1. threat or statement of negative consequences: "şimdi sizinle gelirsem sizin de keyfiniz kaçar." (If I come with you now, your mood will be down as well)

i.2. guilt trip: To a student asking for a section/class change: "Ama şimdi senin sınıfını değiştirirsem diğer arkadaşlarına haksızlık olur." (But if I change your class now, it will not be fair on your classmates.)

i.3. statement of negative opinion, criticizing the requeste/request: To a stranger asking for borrowing a pen "Kör müsün ben kullanıyorum" (Are you blind? I'm using it!)

i.4. request for help, empathy or assistance: "sana yardım edersem ne kadar zor durumda kalacağımı anlıyorsundur umarım." (I hope you understand what an inapptopriate position I'll be at if I help you.)

i.5. Let interlocutor off the hook: "Her şey yolunda merak etme" (Everything is ok don't worry)

i.6. self-defense: "Elimden geleni yapıyorum." (I'm doing my best)

j. Acceptance that functions as a refusal: Unspecific or indefinite reply; Lack of enthusiasm

k. Avoidance: k.1. Nonverbal: Silence, hesitation, do nothing, physical departure; k.2. Verbal: Topic switch, joke, repetition of part of request, postponement, hedging,

Adjuncts to refusals: Adjuncts can be described as the units which do not propose a refusal on their own.

Statement of positive opinion, agreement: "Çok isterim. (I'd love to.)

Statement of empathy: "Buna ne kadar ihtiyacın olduğunun farkındayım." (I know how much you need this.)

Pause fillers: "Hımmm" "Şey"

Gratitude, appreciation: "Teşekkür ederim." (Thank you.)

1680 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

2.2.3. Speech acts in coursebooks

Authenticity of teaching materials has been discussed and defined by many researchers. Harmer (1991) defines authentic materials as the materials designed for NSs, not for language learners. In a similar vein, according to Carter and Nunan (2001), authentic materials contain the real language used by NSs. TV shows, podcasts, films, songs, books or newspapers produced for NSs are some examples of authentic materials. These authentic materials expose learners to the unchanged real language used in everyday life. Through input in these materials, learners can see how the language is used by NSs in various social settings depending on various variables. In addition to the sociocultural benefits, authentic materials can also create motivation in learners. As they come across authentic cultural content and natural use of language by NSs, learners feel motivated to learn the TL (Kılıçkaya, 2004).

While including authentic materials in L2 teaching has been regarded as quite important with communicative language teaching approach (Durmuş, 2013, Li & Zhou, 2018), studies investigating authenticity of speech acts in L2 coursebooks show that L2 coursebooks do not show the natural interaction taking place in real-life communication contexts(Aşık & Ekşi, 2016; Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Cohen & Ishihara, 2013; Crystal & Davy, 1975; Polat, 2010; Yıldız Ekin, 2013). Among these studies, Crystal and Davy (1975) claimed in their study that even the best coursebooks they examined were far from reflecting natural use of language. In relation to the lack of authenticity in L2 coursebooks, Aşık and Ekşi (2016) claimed that the reason why coursebooks do not reflect natural use of language is because authors develop dialogues in the books intuitively without benefiting from resources of natural language use by NSs like corpus. In a similar vein, Cohen and Ishihara (2013) asserts that authors' intuition form the main source of pragmatic units in L2 teaching materials rather than empirical information. This intuitive act of forming dialogues lead to dialogues sounding unnatural no matter how hard the authors try to provide the learners with the most common samples to the pragmatic units.

When it comes to speech acts in L2 Turkish coursebooks, there are limited studies investigating speech acts in L2 Turkish coursebooks (Aksu Raffard, 2018; Altun Alkan, 2019; Bayat, 2017; Özdemir, 2016; Polat, 2010). Polat (2010) asserts that teaching Turkish as a second/foreign language coursebooks are developed based on author intuition without considering how much they reflect the natural use of language in real L1 contexts as claimed by other researchers like Cohen and Ishihara (2013). In other words, speech acts in L2 Turkish books are not considered to be authentic although use of authentic materials have been emphasized. However, to the best knowledge of the researcher, no study has explored the authenticity of the speech acts in L2 Turkish coursebooks.

3. Methodology

The present study that was conducted as part of a doctoral research investigates the types of request and refusal strategies in dialogues in three different L2 Turkish coursebooks and their authenticity. The research questions are:

1. What type of request and refusal strategies are used in L2 Turkish coursebooks?

2. To what extent do the request and refusal strategies in L2 Turkish coursebooks reflect the natural use of language?

2.a. Does the participants' year of study play a role in their ranking of the authenticity of the speech acts?

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1681**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

3.1. Setting and participants

The participants of this study consisted of 50 L1 Turkish speakers with an age range 18-22, studying Turkish Language Teaching at a state university in Türkiye and from different years of study as year 1, year 3 and year 4. The reason why this particular group of NSs were selected because as future Turkish language teachers, it is possible for them to develop teaching materials like coursebooks as well. Therefore, they are expected to give importance to the appropriate use of language units like speech acts and the representation of these units in books.

3.2. Data collection

In this mixed-methods study, data was collected through content analysis and a coursebook authenticity questionnaire. Through the content analysis, request and refusal strategies in the dialogues were classified according to the request categories proposed by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1989) and refusal classification suggested by Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990). To assure the reliability of the categorization, coding was conducted by the researcher and another expert on speech acts. Following that, the coursebook authenticity questionnaire was developed after examining three different B2 level L2 Turkish coursebooks used at Turkish Teaching Centers in Türkiye, which are *Yedi İklim Türkçe*, *Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe* and *İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe*, through document analysis. Based on the document analysis, dialogues including either requests or refusals were identified to be used in the questionnaire ending up as four dialogues.

from *Yedi İklim Türkçe,* four from *İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe* and three from *Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe*. The number of dialogues from each book is not equal and the numbering of the dialogue in the questionnaire is not ordinal due to the reliability of the instrument. To put it more specifically, the questionnaire was first designed as five dialogues from each book and the data was collected so. However, reliability analysis via SPSS program revealed that data will be more reliable when four dialogues are randomly removed the questionnaire. Therefore, four dialogues were automatically eliminated from the questionnaire.

In the questionnaire, some dialogues include both request and refusal; however, speech acts were not separated from each other as it would spoil the interactional context of the dialogue as a whole. Instead, utterances including the request and/or refusal in the dialogues were written in bold and the participants were asked to focus on these parts while rating. Therefore, the questionnaire is based on dialogues rather than individual utterances. To ensure that the interactional context and the relationship between the interlocutors is clear to the participants, some information is presented above each dialogue. The participants were asked to rate how natural the parts in bold sound as a whole on a five point scale (1: totally not natural/real to; 5: totally natural/real. An example from the questionnaire is as follows:

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

1682 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

E.g.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:1em;">

Dialogue#7: *Teknik destek elemanı ve müşteri arasında geçen bir telefon görüşmesi (A phone talk between a technical support representative and a customer):*

Teknik Destek (Technical Support): Buyurun efendim? (Yes sir?)

Müşteri (Customer): **Eee. İlk defa mail gönderiyorum da. (Uhh. Well, I'm sending an e-mail for the first time.)**

Teknik Destek(Technical Support): Tamam. Ben size yardım edeyim. (Ok. Let me help you)

Müşteri (Customer): Adresteki "a"yı yazdım da, çevresine daireyi nasıl çizeceğim? (I've written the "a" in the address, but how am I going to draw a circle around it?)

| Totally not natural | Not natural at all | Neutral | Natural | Totally natural |

</div>

3.3. Data analysis

To analyze the request and refusal strategies used in the dialogues in the three L2 Turkish coursebooks, the researcher and the expert on speech acts separately categorized the speech acts to ensure the reliability of the coding. After the coding was completed, discrepancies between the coders were discussed and changes in the categorization were applied accordingly. Then, the formula proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) **(**Reliability = consensus /consensus+disagreement) was applied to see the reliability between the coders. The result showed that the internal consistency between the coders was 89%, meaning that categorization of the speech acts by the coders is reliable.

Data from the questionnaire was analyzed via SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for Windows 22.0 program. To test the reliability of the questionnaire in terms of internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha was used. Cronbach's alpha value ranges from 0 to 1. Alpha value that is less than 0,50 means the measured tool is not reliable, value between 0,50-0,80 refers to reasonable reliability and value higher than 0,80 means high reliability (Salvucci et al. 1997). Result of the analysis showed that Cronbach's alpha value for the authenticity questionnaire was 0,54, showing that internal consistency reliability is reasonable (see Table 1).

Table 1: Reliability of the Questionnaire

Data collection tool	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Coursebook authenticity questionnaire	11	0,54

Second, normality of the data was analyzed through the values of skewness, kurtosis and standard error (see Table 2).

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

Table 2: Normality Values of the Questionnaire

Data collection tool	N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
		Value	Std. Er.	Value	Std. Er.
Coursebook authenticity questionnaire	50	0,28	0,34	-0,66	0,66

According to the skewness and kurtosis values displayed in Table 2, the data shows normal distribution as these values have to be in ±2 range to be accepted as normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). Therefore, parametric test was used to make the necessary analyses. In this regard, an ANOVA was run to see the relationship between different years of study. Moreover, frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation values were used to analyze the data descriptively.

4. Results

4.1. Types of request and refusal strategies in the coursebooks

Types of request and refusal strategies in the dialogues were categorized according to the request and refusal coding frameworks. While categorizing, units forming the speech acts (i.e., alerters, head act/strategy, request perspective, internal modification and external modification for requests and refusal strategy and adjunct for refusals) in the utterances were separated from each other by "+" in the table. (See Table 3).

Table 3: Strategies of Request and Refusals in the Coursebooks

Coursebook	Dialogue	Request		Refusal	
İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe	#1	utterance	strategy	utterance	strategy
		"Peki nereleri gezeyim neler yapayım?+ Ondan bahset+biraz" (Tell me a little+ about where I should go what I should do)	Preparator(external modification)+Mood derivable+understater(biraz/internal modification) hearer dominant perspective	"Aslında çok güzel olur+ fakat biliyorsun iş değiştirdim ve bir yılım bitmeden izin alamıyorum." (Honestly it would be great+ but as you know I've changed my job and I can't take a day off without working for a year)	Statement of agreement (adjunct)+excuse+excuse
	#4	"Merhaba+ isminizi öğrenebilir miyiz?" (Hello+ can we learn your name?)	Alerter+Preparatory Speaker and hearer dominant perspective	x	x
	#7	"Eee. İlk defa mail gönderiyorum da." (Well, I'm sending an e-mail for the first time.)	Strong hint Impersonal perspective	x	x
	#13	"Dinleyicilerimizi daha fazla meraklandırmadan başlayalım isterseniz." (if	Suggestory formula	x	x

1684 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

		you want, we can start without making our audience more curious)	Speaker and hearer dominant perspective		
Yedi İklim Türkçe	#2	[1] "Ben de senden yardım isteyecektim.+Japonlar öğleden sonra gelecekler. Sen de yardım edersen onlar gelene kadar bitiririm." (I was going to ask for help from you. The Japanese are coming in the afternoon. If you help me too, I will finish it until they come.) [2]"Sen de ben yazıyı yazana kadar benim hazırladığım sunumu okuyuver." (Meanwhile read the presentation I've prepared.)	[1]Preparatory+suggestory formula hearer dominant perspective [2]mood derivable Hearer dominant perspective	x	x
	#8	"Gençlerde de edep diye bir şey kalmadı. Aah! Ah! Zamane gençleri ne olacak! Biz gençken böyle miydik? (There is no decency in youth. Today's youth! Were we like that when we were young?)	Mild hint Impersonal perspective	x	x
	#11	"Ahmet+sen bir şey demeyecek misin?" (Ahmet won't you say anything?)	Alerter+suggestory formula Hearer dominant perspective	"Şeyy, ben gelmeyeceğim.+Kütüphaneye gidip ders çalışmam lazım." (Well, I'm not coming. I must go to the library and study.)	Negative willingness/ability (direct)+excuse
	#14	[1]"Oğlum+hiçbir şey yemedin yine!" (Son, you haven't eaten anything again) [2]" Haydi haydi, biraz daha ye bakalım!" (Come on come on eat some more)	[1]alerter+strong hint Hearer dominant perspective [2]understater(biraz)+mood derivable Hearer dominant perspective	[1]İştahım yok anne.+Ayrıca doydum. (Mum I don't have appetite. Also I'm full) [2]Anne gerçekten yemek istemiyorum.+Kendimi yorgun hissediyorum. (Mum I really don't want to eat. I feel tired.)	[1]Excuse+excuse [2]negative willingness/ability+excuse
Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe	#6	[1]"Bu sanattan biraz bahseder misin?" (Can you talk about this art a bit?) [2]"Ben de gitmek istiyorum+ Sergi devam ediyor mu?" (I	[1]Understater(biraz)+preparatory Hearer dominant perspective		

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1685**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

		also want to go. +Is the exhibiton still on?)	²preparator+Strong hint Impersonal perspective		
	#12	¹″Kitapta ne gibi ilginç haberler var? +Birkaçını anlatır mısın?″(What kind of interesting news is there in the nook? Can you tell me some?	¹Preparator+preparatory+understater(birkaç) Hearer dominant perspective	x	x
		²″Anlattığın kadarıyla gerçekten ilginç bir kitapmış.+ Ben de bu kitabı okumak istiyorum.″	²preparator+strong hint Speaker dominant perspective		
	#9	"Peki, Uzay'a nasıl çıkmış, nereden hareket etmiş, anlatsana!" (Ok, how he went to the space, where he left, tell me!)	Mood derivable Hearer dominant perspective	x	x

As displayed in Table 3, results of the speech act categorization revealed that there were 15 request strategies and seven refusal strategies in dialogues in the questionnaire. The number of direct and indirect strategies were summarized in the table below (see Table 4).

Table 4: Number of Direct and Indirect Strategies

Directness	N		
	Request		Refusal
Direct strategy	mood derivable: 4		Negative ability: 2
Indirect strategy	11	preparatory: 4	Excuse: 5
		strong hint: 4	
		suggestory formula: 2	
		mild hint: 1	

Table 4 shows that mostly indirect strategies were used in both requests and refusals in the dialogues.

4.2. Authenticity of the dialogues based on the questionnaire

4.2.1. Descriptive statistics for each book

In the questionnaire, there were four dialogues from İstanbul coursebook. The frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation values regarding these dialogues were presented in Table 5.

1686 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Speech Acts in İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe

İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe		totally not natural	not natural at all	neutral	natural	totally natural	X	Sd
Dialogue#1	f		6	6	36	2		
	%		12,0	12,0	72,0	4,0	3,68	0,74
Dialogue#4	f		5	13	21	11		
	%		10,0	26,0	42,0	22,0	3,76	0,92
Dialogue#7	f		4	4	17	25		
	%		8,0	8,0	34,0	50,0	4,26	0,92
Dialogue#13	f		26	6	14	4		
	%		52,0	12,0	28,0	8,0	2,92	1,07

As can be seen in Table 5, most of the participants stated that dialogue#1 and dialogue#4 are "natural", dialogue#7 is totally natural, and dialogue#13 is not natural. Besides that, dialogue#7 has the highest average (X=4,26) and dialogue#13 has the lowest average (X=2,62) out of 5.

Dialogue#7*: Teknik destek elemanı ve müşteri arasında geçen bir telefon görüşmesi (A phone talk between a technical support representative and a customer):*

> Teknik Destek (Technical Support): Buyurun efendim? (Yes sir?)
>
> Müşteri (Customer): **Eee**. **İlk defa mail gönderiyorum da. (Uhh. Well, I'm sending an e-mail for the first time.)**
>
> Teknik Destek(Technical Support): Tamam. Ben size yardım edeyim. (Ok. Let me help you)
>
> Müşteri (Customer): Adresteki "a"yı yazdım da, çevresine daireyi nasıl çizeceğim? (I've written the "a" in the address, but how am I going to draw a circle around it?)

There were four dialogues from *Yedi İklim Türkçe* coursebook. The frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation values regarding these dialogues were presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Dialogues in Yedi İklim Türkçe

Yedi İklim Türkçe		totally not natural	not natural at all	neutral	natural	totally natural	X	Sd
Dialogue#2	f		8	10	20	12		
	%		16,0	20,0	40,0	24,0	3,72	1,01
Dialogue#8	f		17	2	13	18		3,64	1,29

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1687**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

	%	34,0	4,0	26,0	36,0		
	f	10	4	25	11		
Dialogue#11	%	20,0	8,0	50,0	22,0	3,74	1,03
	f	1	4	24	21		
Dialogue#14	%	2,0	8,0	48,0	42,0	4,30	0,71

According to Table 6, the participants mostly found dialogue#2, dialogue#11 and dialogue#14 "natural", and dialogue#8 "totally natural". It is seen that while dialogue#14 has the highest average (X=4,30) dialogue#8 has the lowest average (X=3,64).

Dialogue 14:

> *Anne, baba ve oğul arasında akşam yemeği sırasında gerçekleşen bir konuşma (A conversation between a boy and his parents at dinner):*
>
> Anne (Mother): **Oğlum hiçbir şey yemedin yine! (Son, you haven't eaten anything again)**
>
> Ahmet (Son): **İştahım yok anne. Ayrıca doydum. (Mum I don't have appetite. Also I'm full)**
>
> Anne (Mother): Bu nasıl doymak böyle? Doğru düzgün bir lokma yemedin. **Haydi haydi, biraz daha ye bakalım! (How can you be full? You haven't had a good bite. Come on come on eat some more)**
>
> Ahmet (Son): **Anne gerçekten yemek istemiyorum. Kendimi yorgun hissediyorum. (Mum I really don't want to eat. I feel tired.)**

As has been stated earlier, the questionnaire included three dialogues from *Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe coursebook*. The frequency, percentage, average and standard deviation values regarding the authenticity ratings of these dialogues were presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Dialogues in Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe

Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe		totally not natural	not natural at all	neutral	natural	totally natural	X	Sd
	f		1	4	30	15		
Dialogues#6	%		2,0	8,0	60,0	30,0	4,18	0,66
	f		11	6	23	10		
Dialogues#12	%		22,0	12,0	46,0	20,0	3,64	1,05
	f		10	9	29	2		
Dialogues#9	%		20,0	18,0	58,0	4,0	3,46	0,86

As displayed in Table 7, dialogue#6, dialogue#12 and dialogue#9 were regarded as "natural". As to the dialogues with the highest and lowest averages, the former is dialogue#6 (X=4,18) and the latter is dialogue#9 (X=3,36).

1688 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

Dialogue 6:

> *İki arkadaş arasında hat sanatı üzerine gerçekleşen bir konuşma:*
>
> Alen: ... Üstelik gittiğim bu sergi, arkadaşımın babasının ilk sergisiydi ve on altı yıldır yaptığı hatları ilk defa sergiliyordu. (Moreover that exhibition I visited was his/her father's first exihibition and he was showing calligrahphies which he has been making for 16 years for the first time)
>
> Azade: **Bu sanattan biraz bahseder misin? (Can you talk about this art a bit?)**
>
> Alen: Tabi. Hat sanatında yazı gelişigüzel yazılmaz ...... Mesela birçok Türk camisinde eşsiz hat örneklerini görmek mümkündür. (Of course! Calligraphy is not written randomly... For instance, it is possible to see unique calligraphy samples in many Turkish mosques.)
>
> Azade: **Ben de gitmek istiyorum. Sergi devam ediyor mu? (I** also want to go. Is the exhibiton still on?)
>
> Alen: Evet, devam ediyor. Üç gün sonra bitecek. Yarın beraber gidelim. ... (Yes, it is still on. It will end three days later. Let's go together tomorrow.)

4.2.2. Descriptive statistics for the whole questionnaire

When it comes to theresults of the descriptive statistics of the whole questionnaire, the minimum, maximum, average and standard deviation values regarding the İstanbul, Yedi İklim and Gazi coursebooks are displayed in Table 8.

Tablo 8: Descriptive Statistics for the Questionnaire

Coursebook	N	Minimum	Maximum	X	SD
İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe	50	2,50	4,50	3,66	0,53
Yedi İklim Türkçe	50	2,50	5,00	3,85	0,60
Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe	50	2,00	4,67	3,76	0,62

As can be seen in Table 8, results of the analysis showed that authenticity rating of İstanbul changes between 2,50-4,50. It is 2,50-5,00 for Yedi İklim and 2,00-4,67 for Gazi. Average of the rating for the speech acts in İstanbul it is 3,66±0,53; 3,85±0,60 for Yedi İklim and 3,76±0,62 for Gazi. Based on these results, it is seen that participants find the speech acts in the questionnaire natural/realistic, which refers to 4 point in the rating scale from 1 to 5.

4.2.3. The role of year of study

In this study, participants were from different year of studies as year 1, 3 and 4. To reveal whether this variation in the year of study has an effect on the participants' judgement in rating authenticity of the speech acts, an ANOVA was run (see Table 9).

Tablo 9: The Role of the Participants' Year of Study in Their Rating

Coursebook	Year of study	N	X	Sd	F	p	Post-Hoc
İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe	1	21	3,67	0,59			
	3	18	3,81	0,42	2,24	0,12	
	4	11	3,39	0,52			
	1	21	3,88	0,63	4,38	0,02*	year 3 > year 4

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

Yedi İklim Türkçe	3	18	4,07	0,50		
	4	11	3,43	0,55		
Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe	1	21	3,84	0,75		
	3	18	3,72	0,37	0,33	0,72
	4	11	3,67	0,71		

**p<0,01; *p<0,05

As shown in Table 9, there is no statistically significant difference between the participants' years of study in terms of their ratings of authenticity of the requests and refusals in *İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe* and *Gazi TÖMER Yabancılar için Türkçe* (p>0,05). That is, it was seen that average of the ratings by each year of study was close to each other. As to the results regarding *Yedi İklim Türkçe,* it was revealed that there is statistically significant difference between three years of study in the authenticity ratings of the speech acts (*p<0,05).

5. Discussion

5.1. Type of request and refusal strategies used in L2 Turkish coursebooks

Results of the content analysis of the speech acts in the coursebooks showed that mostly indirect strategies were used in both requests and refusals in the dialogues. The reason why mood derivables were used in four dialogues might be because of the power and distance relationship between the speaker and hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), directness in interaction changes depending on contextual elements like power and social distance between the speaker and hearer. In three of these dialogues with direct requests (dialogues#1,#2,#9), speaker and hearer are friends/coworkers, namely the power and distance relationship between them is expected to be equal (S=H). As to the other dialogue (#14), this one is between a parent and son, leading to a close, but unequal power relationship between the interlocutors (Spekaer>Hearer). Taguchi (2006) asserts that in a formal situation with somebody having more power, imposition is greater as well and this leads to use of indirect strategies. On the other hand, if the interaction is with somebody in equeal situation in terms of power and social distance, the imposition is low, leading to less need for indirect strategies. In her study about use of request strategies by Turkish monolingual and bilingual speakers, Martı (2006) found that Turkish speakers used direct strategies in situations with small amount of social distance and conventionally indirect strategies, preparatory in particular, in situations with great social distance between the interlocutors just as the strategies in this study. As this study is in accordance with the types of request strategies in the investigated books in this study, it can be claimed that coursebooks are a good representation of the request strategies preferred by NSs depending on different power and distance relationships in real life communication. Hall (1976) proposed that communication in a society changes in each culture and it can be high-context or low-context. In high-context societies, interlocutors do not convey each message directly. Instead, the message is sent indirectly and become meaningful thanks to the common background shared by the interlocutors (Hall, 1976). Therefore, social distance between the interlocutors and mutual background are crucial for a successful communication. In contrast, communication is more direct in low-context societies, leaving less importance to background knowledge. Given that Turkish society is high-context (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hall, 1979, Yemenici, 1996), the finding that indirect strategies are used more both in requests and refusals can be explained by high-context feature of Turkish society, leading interlocutors to adapt

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

1690 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

directness in interaction according to the social distance and power. Furthermore, all of the indirect refusals in the books are excuses (n:5) and they are joined with direct strategies (n:2) as well. In other words, even when refusing directly the speakers use an indirect strategy to mitigate the harm to the interlocutor's face by avoiding being too direct. Based on this finding, it can be suggested that this is also related to the indirectness arising from high-context feature of Turkish communities of speech.

5.2. How natural the requests and refusals in the dialogues sound

Based o.n these results, it is seen that participants find the speech acts in the questionnaire natural/realistic, which refers to 4 point in the rating scale from 1 to 5. This finding showing that the participants think that the requests and refusals in the dialogues sound natural to them might suggest that authors give importance to use real life like dialogues in the coursebooks as emphasized in communicative approach. On the other hand, requests and refusals in the coursebooks were not regarded as totally natural/realistic, meaning that there is still something sounding unnatural.

This finding is consistent with the other studies in the literature (Aşık & Ekşi, 2016; Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Polat, 2010; Yıldız Ekin, 2013). Crystal and Davy (1975) claim that even the best coursebooks they examined displayed a language use which do not share some features of the language emerging during natural social interaction. The unnatural use of language in the coursebooks might be caused by the resource the authors use while writing the coursebooks. To put it more clearly, the researchers assert that authors write the interactional units based on their native speaker intuition rather than making use of resources providing natural use of language such as corpus (Aşık & Ekşi, 2016; Cohen & Ishihara, 2013). Another reason of this not-totally natural language use in the coursebooks might be that they are written according to a syllabus. In relation to this, Cohen and Ishihara (2013) suggest that authors focus on the structures to be taught more than they do on the use of language in social context. Therefore, speech acts like requests and refusals might be presented in a form which do not have the features of a naturally occurring conversation in everyday social interaction.

Results regarding the role of participants' year of study showed that average of the authenticity ratings of the speech acts in Yedi İklim Türkçe by year 3 participants is higher than the average of year 4 participants. Given that there is no such difference regarding the other two books, making a general inference from the data that there is disagreement between the participants about the authenticity of the books will not be appropriate. On the contrary, these findings show that there is mostly a consensus among the participants on the authenticity of the speech acts.

Based on these findings, an implication for coursebook authors can be suggested in terms of using natural spoken data like corpus while writing pragmatic units like speech acts rather than solely depending on native speaker intuition. Since this finding might also arise from curriculum making the authors focus on forms more than functions, the syllabus to be followed should be based on the use of language in context. Thus, coursebook authors can be suggested to give more importance to designing/finding more natural pragmatic units. Since coursebooks are one of the most important input source for learners, providing them with natural samples of the TL is of paramount importance. This is because no matter whether it is L2 or FL context, one of the input sources providing the learners with speech acts is coursebooks used in classroom. Learners acquiring the TL in a foreign language context where the TL is not spoken as the L1 have limited access to sociocultural norms of the TL in natural interaction, thus they acquire this knowledge mostly through coursebooks. On the other hand, learners learning the TL in L2 context have access to natural, namely authentic interaction between the TL

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | e-mail: editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | phone: +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1691**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

speakers. However, in order for pragmatic development to be successful, being in the L2 context and exposure to the authentic input through the interaction between L1 speakers are not solely enough. Learners' desire to interact with the L1 speakers and willingness to invest in L2 play a key role in L2 pragmatic development. Unless they invest in the TL and try to participate in interaction with NSs, learners do not acquire the necessary input to develop their pragmatic skills. Thus, coursebooks might become the main source of input in L2 context as well. In other words, as the learners avoid interacting with NSs, they can learn how the language is used in context through the coursebook they use in class, making the authenticity of the input in coursebooks is of paramount importance.

This study had some limitations which can be taken into consideration for further research. First, only three coursebooks at the same level were included in the study. In another study, all levels of these coursebooks or other L2 Turkish coursebook can be examined as well. Second, the authenticity questionnaire was limited to the rating of the speech acts and did not ask any questions about why they sounded unnatural to the participants. Therefore, further research can ask the participants to say/write why they think these parts sound natural/unnatural to them or what can be changed to make them more natural. Lastly, authors of the coursebooks can be contacted and interviewed to get deeper information regarding how they wrote these dialogues.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated types of request and refusal strategies used in three L2 Turkish coursebooks and authenticity of these strategies through content analysis and an authenticity questionnaire. Findings of the study indicated that mostly indirect strategies are used in both requests and refusals in the coursebooks, which is consistent with the literature and indirectness in Turkish society arising from high-context communication. It was revealed that directness is determined by the power and social distance between the speakers, leading to less indirectness in requests and refusals when they are in equal relationship regarding these two contextual factors. In relation the literature, it can be argued that coursebooks represent the directness variable in Turkish interaction. As to the authenticity of these speech acts, the findings indicated that speech acts do not sound "totally natural" to Turkish NSs although they were described as "natural". This finding is consistent with the literature in that even the best coursebooks lack authenticity if they are not based on data obtained from natural use of language and that the participants' year of study did not play a role in their judgment.

References

Aksu Raffard, C. (2018). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi bağlamında söz edimleri başarı koşulları ve gerçekleştirme biçimlerine yönelik bir karşılaştırma. *International Journal of Language Academy, 6*(5), 46-69.

Altun Alkan, H. (2019). *Rica ediminin Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenler tarafından kullanımları* Published Master's Thesis). Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli, Türkiye.

Aşık, A., & Ekşi, G. (2016).Coursebooks and spoken discourse: The issue of authenticity with discussion over corpus and feedback from native speakers. In İ. H. Mirici, İ. H. Erten, H. Öz and I. Vodopija-Krstanović (Ed.), *Research Papers on Teaching English as an Additional Language* içinde (s.89-102). Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Rijeka: Croatia.

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *63*(1), 68–86.

Basra, S. M., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talk in an EFL class-room. International Journal of Education, 10(1), 73-81. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ije.v10i1.6848

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

1692 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

Bayat, N. (2017). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde şikâyet ve özür edimine ilişkin görünümler. *Pamukkale Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14*, 1-16.

Beebe, L., M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. R. C. Scarcelle, E. Anderson, ve S. C. Krashen (Ed.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* içinde (s. 55-73). Newbury House, New York.

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.

Blum-Kulka, S.,House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, N.J: Ablex.

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

Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A.D., & Ishihara, N. (2013). Pragmatics. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.). *Applied Linguistics and Materials Development* (pp. 113–126). London: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved May 22, 2022, from http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472541567.ch-008

Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1975). *Advanced conversational English*. Harlow: Longman..

Durmuş, M. (2013). İkinci/Yabancı dil öğretiminde özgün ve değiştirilmiş dilsel girdi üzerine. *International Journal for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 8*(1), 1291-1306.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2013). Refusing in L2 Spanish: The effects of the context of learning during a short-term study abroad program. In O. Martī-Arnándiz and P. Salazar-Campillo (Ed), *Refusals in instructional contexts and beyond* (p.147-173). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays of face to face behavior*. New York, NY: Anchor

Gudykunst, W.B. ve TingToomey, S. (1988). *Culture and Interpersonal Communication*. Newburry Park: Sage Publications.

Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Sociolinguistics and Communication in Small Groups. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Workrelated Values.* London: Sage Publications.

Harmer, *J.* (1991). Practice of English language teaching. London ; New York : Longman

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Johnson, J., & Rosano, T. (1993). Relation of cognitive style to metaphor interpretation and second language proficiency. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 14*(2), 159–159.

Kecskes, I. (2000). A cognitive-pragmatic approach to situation-bound utterances. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 605-625.

Kılıçkaya, F. (2004). Authentic materials andculture content in EFL classrooms. *The Internet ELT Journal, 10*(7).

Kılınç, A. K. (2019). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde/öğreniminde istek (rica) söz edimi* (Published Master's Thesis). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Ankara Türkiye.

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2023.32 (Şubat)/ **1693**

Ders kitaplarındaki söz edimlerinin özgünlüğü: İstek ve ret üzerine bir çalışma / Kökcü, Ş.

Kökcü, Ş., & Ortaçtepe Hart, D. (2022). Turkish EFL learners' interpretation of metaphors, *International Review of Pragmatics*, *14*(1), 95-114. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-01401004

Kurdghelaashvili, T. (2015). Speech acts and politeness strategies in an EFL classroom in Georgia. *International Journal of Cognitive and Language Science, 9*(1), 306-309.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics,* London, UK: Longman.

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

Li, G., & Zhou, W. (2018). Authentic materials in EIL. J. I. Liontas ve M. DelliCarpini (Ed) *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* içinde (s. 30-43). Wiley Publications.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marti, L. (2006). Indirectness and Politeness in Turkish-German Bilingual and Turkish Monolingual Requests. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(11), p. 1836-1869.

Martĩnez-Flor, A. (2013). Learners' production of refusals: Interactive written DCT versus oral role-play. In O. Martĩ-Arnándiz and P. Salazar-Campillo (Ed), *Refusals in instructional contexts and beyond* (p.175-211). Amsterdam: Rodopi

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.

Norton, B. (2008). Identity, language learning and critical pedagogies. In J. C. N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 6: Knowledge about Language* (2nd Ed., pp. 45-59): Springer Science.

Ortaçtepe, 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.

Özdemir, A. (2016). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin söz edimlerini anlama düzeyleri* (Published Master's Thesis). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Ankara Türkiye.

Polat, Y. (2010). *Yabancı dil öğretiminde söz edimleri*. Yayınlanmış doktora tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*: Studies in the theory of speech acts. 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.

Stavans, A., & Webman Shafran, R. (2018). The pragmatics of requests and refusals in multilingual settings. International Journal of Multilingualism, 15(2), 149–168. http://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1338708

Şanal, M., & Ortaçtepe, D. (2019). Conceptual socialization in EFL contexts: A case study on Turkish EFL learners' request speech acts realization. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(1), 376-399.

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

Taguchi, N., Xiao, F., & Li, S. (2016). Effects of intercultural competence and social contact on speech act production in a Chinese study abroad context. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(4), 775-796.

Turan, Ü. D. (2011). Edimbilim II: Bilgi Değeri, Bilgi Yapısı ve Dilde Kibarlık ve Kabalık. In S. Özsoy and Z. Erk Ekmeksiz (Eds.) *Genel Dilbilim II* (p. 116-148).

1694 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2023.32 (February)

Authenticity of the speech acts in coursebooks: A study on requests and refusals / Kökcü, Ş.

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

Yazıcı, N., & Demirel, İ. F. (2021). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretim setlerindeki video etkinliklerinin reddetme stratejileri açısından görünümü. *International Journal of Language Academy, 9*(3), 150-167.

Yemenici, A. (1996). Söylem çözümlemesi: Türk, İngiliz ve Amerikan Kültürlerinde Anlatılan Öykülerin Kültürel Bir Çerçeve İçinde İncelenmesi. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 37-57.

Yıldız Ekin, M. T. (2013). Do current EFL coursebooks work for the development of L2 pragmatic competence? The case of suggestions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*, 1306-1310

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

Zhu, W. (2012). Polite requestive strategies in emails: An investigation of pragmatic competence of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC Journal, 43*(2), 217-238.

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124