İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN RİCA ETME TERCİHLERİ:

YAŞ, CİNSİYET VE YABANCI DİL BİLGİSİ SEVİYESİ FAKTÖRLERİ *

REQUESTING PREFERENCES OF TURKISH EFL LEARNERS:

AGE, GENDER, AND PROFICIENCY LEVEL

Arş. Gör. Levent UZUN

Uludağ Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi A.B.D.

Abstract

The present study examined Turkish EFL learners' awareness of indirectness as a politeness strategy, and to what degree they considered or would consider the principles of 'power', 'social distance', and 'size of imposition' while performing their requests under various situations and conditions. The study aimed at revealing whether gender, age, and linguistic proficiency level affected the pragmatic competence of the learners. The participants were 35 High School students in Bursa, Turkey, and 14 native speakers of English from Britain and the USA. The data were collected by the help of a 15-item multiple-choice questionnaire which was prepared by the researcher. Direct, indirect, and non-conventional indirect requesting tendencies were tested. Results revealed that the strategies preferred by Turkish EFL learners are affected by linguistic proficiency level, age, and gender. It was observed that female students preferred mostly indirect requesting utterances,

---

which always surpassed male students' tendencies at all ages and linguistic proficiency levels. It was also observed that directness decreased as the age and linguistic proficiency level increased, which suggested that indirectness increases together with the age and linguistic proficiency. The major limitation of the study was the number of the participants. Nevertheless, it revealed information that should contribute to the field, and thus, deserve closer attention and investigation.

Key Words: Requesting, Age, Gender, Proficiency level, Turkish students

Öz

Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin dolaylı anlatım ve nezaket yaklaşımlarıyla ilgili farkındalıklarını anlamak ve farklı durum ve şartlarda İngilizce rica etme eylemlerini gerçekleştirirken, 'güç', 'sosyal mesafe' ve 'talebin boyutu' gibi edimbilim başlıklarını ne derece dikkate aldıklarını araştırmak için yapılmıştır. Çalışma, yaş, cinsiyet ve yabancı dil bilgisindeki seviyenin öğrencilerin pragmatik yeterliliklerini etkileyip etkilemediğini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın katılımcıları Bursa ilinde bir lisede okumakta olan 35 öğrenciyi ve ana dili İngilizce olan, İngiltere ve Amerikalı 14 yetişkini kapsamaktadır. Çalışmanın verisi 15 çoktan seçmeli sorudan oluşan ve araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan bir anket yardımıyla toplanmıştır. Doğrudan, dolaylı ve alışılagelmemiş dolaylı rica etme eğilimleri test edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin kullandığı stratejilerin yaş, cinsiyet ve yabancı dil bilgisindeki seviyeleri tarafından etkilendiğini göstermiştir. Kız öğrencilerin genellikle dolaylı ifadeleri tercih ettikleri ve bunun bütün yaş grupları ve yabancı dil bilgisi seviyelerinde erkek öğrencilerden daha yüksek oranda olduğu gözlenmiştir. Yine, yaş ve yabancı dil bilgisi seviyesi yükseldikçe, doğrudan rica etme eğiliminin azaldığı gözlenmiştir ki bu durum dolaylı anlatımın yaş ve yabancı dil seviyesinin artmasıyla doğru orantılı olarak arttığını göstermektedir. Çalışmanın ana sınırlaması katılımcı sayısıydı. Ancak, ortaya koyduğu bilgi bakımından alana katkı sağladığına ve bundan dolayı daha yakın bir dikkat ve incelemeyi hak ettiğine inanılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rica etme, Yaş, Cinsiyet, Bilgi seviyesi, Türk öğrenciler.

1. Introduction

Takimoto (2006) reminded that learning pragmatics rather than grammar has become one of the most significant areas of focus, especially where exposure to a foreign language is limited and where only limited class time is available for teaching a foreign language. Investigating the pragmatic competence of language learners has also helped to reveal how some particular properties of a certain language are learnt

and used in actual communication. And, maybe that's why this specific area of investigation has received a considerable and continuously growing interest. Pragmatics takes on an added importance, especially as global communication and interaction increases, and the programs such as 'Erasmus' and 'Comenius' (student and teacher exchange educational programs) are regularly and repeatedly launched. These kinds of programs bring a variety of individuals together who come from different social and cultural backgrounds, and who possess different styles of speech production and perception. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) postulated that cultural interactional differences may create culturally determined expectations and interpretative strategies, and can lead to breakdowns in communication. So, misunderstanding has been one of the main topics of investigation as a vital matter, especially in intercultural communication (Verdonik, 2010). Undoubtedly, understanding one another correctly, or at least being aware of the cultural and/or sociolinguistic differences of communities would help in improving the tolerance and interaction. For this reason, certainly there is need to fully comprehend the components and details of this subject matter.

The linguistic competence and pragmatic competence are both important in multinational communication, which can be investigated, interpreted, and comprehended by analyzing people's language styles (both produced and perceived). This is not only an important matter of investigation but also quite interesting, because in one culture or community saying something might be relatively different in another culture or community. Furthermore, sometimes very little things can hurt or make people feel offended during interaction as exemplified in the following:

Once, a person coming from Turkey was invited to a dinner by a British family, and everything went great until the end of the night. The conversation was as follows:

Turkish person: Thank you for the dinner. Everything was great.

British family: You're welcome. Would you like us to give you a lift to the bus stop?

Turkish person: Not important!

British family: … silence! …

What happened in this conversation was completely related to pragmatics and sociolinguistics. The 'Not important' words of the Turkish person must have offended or hurt the British family somehow, so that they made it obvious to the Turkish person, which in return made her feel uncomfortable, too. What the British family might have understood from the 'Not important!' utterance might be: a) their offer was not important; or b) it wasn't important if she stayed at their home or went; or c) something much different. Nevertheless, 'not important' is a fixed expression in Turkish (önemli değil), which is used very often by people to say something like 'it's

alright', and that either/every way would be appreciated. So, an obvious misunderstanding occurred in the example above. That is why, when individuals from various communities with a different cultural and sociolinguistic background meet, it might be helpful to be aware of the fact that what people say or how they say it does not always have to be in the way the other side says or means it. Thus, language use has been the focus of many studies (e.g. Harlow, 1990; Pennebaker et al., 2003; Silverstein, 2010; Andren et al., 2010; Morgan, 2010; Kiesling and Johnson, 2010; Pfister, 2010).

1.1. Speech acts and indirectness

Speech acts (Austin, 1962), indirect speech acts (Searle, 1975), and politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987) are notions that are often used and explained together and in relation with one another within the context of language use. When speakers perform utterances in context they accomplish 'interactional acts' and 'speech acts' (Ellis, 2001, p.159). According to the speech act theory, the performance of a speech act involves the performance of a 'locutionary act', an 'illocutionary act', or a 'perlocutionary act', where mostly the illocutionary acts are stressed as the most interesting and questionable. The illocutionary force of the utterances largely depends on the conventions, contexts, or a speaker's intention, rather than on the literal semantic content of the utterances. Thomas (1995, p.51) stated that just as the same utterances might have different meanings in different conditions or contexts, different words could be used to perform the same speech act. No matter whether speech acts operate by universal pragmatic principles, or vary in conceptualization and verbalization across cultures and languages; claiming that language users' performances will carry some individual implications that will vary widely should not be naive. Mikolic (2010) noted that language is not only a means of communication but also an expression of both personal and cultural identity that would be based on social circumstances. Likewise, Drager (2010) pointed out that there is a link between social factors and variation in production and perception of speech. Actually, it has been shown that cultures vary in their interactional styles and perception of messages, leading to different preferences of speech act behaviors and interpretation of conveyed messages (e.g. Cheung, 2010; Mikolic, 2010; Kramsch, 1995; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010; Schröder, 2010; Thorne, 2003; Fukushima, 1990; Wierzbicka, 1985; Walters, 1979; Mills, 2009). Therefore, the study of speech acts occupies a central concern, particularly in cross-cultural pragmatics. The basic proposition is that the minimal units of human communication are not linguistic expressions, but performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving directions, apologizing, thanking, promising, warning, etc. (Blum-Kulka et al., ibid.).

1.2. Requests and politeness

The present study is going to concentrate on 'requests' since they are regarded as 'face-threatening acts' (Brown and Levinson, 1987) that impose pressure on the interlocutors, and thus, making them special and delicate actions. They initiate an

action which triggers a reaction, granting or rejection (Lee, 2009). Ellis (2001, p.160) asserted that people have to take into consideration their relationship with the addressees, and the importance, or the size of the changes they are going to make in other people's lives, so that mutual response is carried out, and the nature of interaction between the speaker and the hearer is not damaged. Studies in the field of pragmatics showed that individuals use 'indirect speech' in their social relations as a politeness strategy in order to minimize the risk of miscommunication, and also consider the role of three significant factors such as 'size of imposition', 'power', and 'social distance' (LoCastro, 1997; Felix-Brasdefer, 2005; Marti, 2006; Fukushima, 1996; Rinnert and Kobayashi, 1999; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010; Limberg, 2009). Besides these, Blum-Kulka et al. (ibid.) provided a general frame of requesting strategies where they divided directness into three categories as 'direct', 'indirect', and 'non-conventional indirect'. So, it should be natural to expect speakers to consider these specific factors while realizing the requesting actions. The above mentioned features of requests were also considered in the preparation of the data collection tool of the present study.

The purpose of this study is to find out to what degree Turkish learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) are able to distinguish between polite and less polite forms of requests. It also attempts to provide a general overview of the differences between Turkish and English conventions in preferences in realizing requests under certain situations by comparing Turkish EFL learners with native speakers of English. The findings are expected to provide an idea about the pragmatic competence of learners of various linguistic proficiency levels, ages, and genders. Conclusions may catch the attention of those who are somehow in contact with Turkish students or people, and of those who investigate the pragmatic competence and/or politeness strategy preferences of males and females of various proficiency levels, and ages. The study aims at finding the answers of the following questions:

1. Do Turkish EFL learners are able to distinguish between polite and less polite forms of requests?

2. To what degree the notions such as 'size of imposition', 'social distance', and 'power' are considered while performing forms (direct, indirect, non-conventional indirect) of requests?

3. Is there any improvement in the pragmatic competence through different language proficiency levels?

4. Do gender and age factors affect the way learners realize their requesting strategies?

2. Method

Ellis (2001, p. 162) noted that when studying illocutionary acts, ideally there is need to collect three sets of data: a) speech performed by L2 learners in the target language, b) speech performed by native speakers in the target language, and c) samples performed by native speakers in L1; and that only that way it would be possible to determine to what degree learner performance differs from native speaker performance. However, Jucker (2009) postulated that there is no ideal research method for the investigation of speech acts, because one particular method might provide interesting results for one specific question, while it might be of little value for another set of questions. The present study followed the suggestion of Ellis.

2.1. Participants

Participants were 35 Turkish teenagers who have been learning English as a foreign language in the Anatolian Teacher Training High School, Bursa, Turkey. The learners ranged in age from 15 to 18 years, whose mother tongue was Turkish, and who represented culturally and educationally similar backgrounds. They ranged in linguistic proficiency levels from pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate (the pre-intermediate proficiency level group consisted of 12 students, the intermediate group of 10, and the upper-intermediate group of 13 students). All the students had become initially successful at a general placement exam in Turkey, as a result of which they became students at the High School.

The pre-intermediate group was composed of a preparatory class (8 male and 4 female). They had mandatory thirty two hours of English a week, and have been heavily exposed to English for almost an academic year (eight months). The intermediate group consisted of students (4 male and 6 female) who were attending their third year at the school. They had also successfully completed the preparatory class, and were having twelve hours of English a week mandatory besides other subject courses. They specialized in English and aimed at becoming teachers of English language in the future. And, the students in the upper-intermediate group (5 male and 8 female) were one year ahead of the students in the intermediate group, and were attending their last year in the school. They were also specializing in English, and were having 12 hours of English a week mandatory.

These groups were selected since they showed similar characteristics and motivation in the sense of past, present, and future decisions of their education. Besides the experimental groups, 14 randomly selected native speakers of English (British and American) were used as a control group (7 females and 7 males whose ages were between 16 and 29). The mean age was 20. The group represented a wide range of educational and professional background. Two of the participants were high school students, four were university students, and the other eight were working in various jobs.

2.2. Materials

15-item multiple-choice questionnaire (see the Appendix) that was prepared by the researcher was administered to all participants. Each item provided an option for 'direct', 'indirect', and 'non-conventional indirect' requesting utterances. The utterances presented various situations in the sense of 'size of imposition', 'social distance', and 'power'. The choices were provided in a mixed order. The participants were asked to choose the utterance that they would say in the given situation. For example:

You are short of money and you ask your father to give you some.

a) Dad, give me some money please. (direct requesting utterance)

b) Could you give me some money dad? (indirect requesting utterance)

c) I am short of money dad. (non-conventional indirect utterance)

The instructions were given in Turkish and the students were told the meanings of the words they didn't know, so that it was assured that the utterances were comprehended by the participants. For the native speakers instructions were provided in English.

2.3. Procedure

The participants selected one of the provided choices, which they individually perceived as the most appropriate one in the provided situations. The questionnaire was administered in the classroom during students' free time after lessons, which took less than 15 minutes in total for each group. The native speakers, on the other hand, were the acquaintances of the researcher, and were forwarded the questionnaire by e-mail. They were asked to complete it whenever they felt most comfortable. The questionnaires were collected back again by e-mail. The participants were informed that the investigation was a part of a research, and that all private information would be protected to make them feel relaxed.

2.4. Analyses

The data were quantified and analyzed regarding the groups, genders, ages, and individual responses provided in each linguistic proficiency level. A detailed frequency was estimated for each individual of the group focusing on the responses given for 'direct', 'indirect', and 'non-conventional indirect' choices provided in the questionnaire. Then, all answers were synthesized and frequencies were estimated for all groups.

3. Findings and Discussion

The results that derived from this study are presented in the tables below. All numbers are indicated in percentages and frequencies. Table 1.1 shows the total percentages and frequencies of the three requesting strategies (direct, indirect, non-conventional indirect) preferred by the three experimental groups and the control group, while Table 1.2 presents the genders and ages of the individuals in the experimental groups, together with their tendencies of using the mentioned three strategies. Table 2.1 shows the individual percentages and frequencies, and genders of participants in the pre-intermediate group, while Table 2.2 shows the values of the intermediate group, Table 2.3 shows the values of the upper-intermediate group.

Table 1.1. Requesting strategies by groups

Group	% F	Direct	Indirect	Non-conventional indirect	Total Participants	Total Answers
Native Speakers	%	21.9	48.6	29.5	100	**210**
	F	**46**	**102**	**62**	**14**	
Pre-Intermediate	%	27.8	40	32.2	100	**180**
	F	**50**	**72**	**58**	**12**	
Intermediate	%	24.7	52	23.3	100	**150**
	F	**37**	**78**	**35**	**10**	
Upper-Intermediate	%	23.6	54.9	21.5	100	**195**
	F	**46**	**107**	**42**	**13**	

According to the findings, the students were aware of the indirectness in the utterances as a politeness strategy. It was observed that directness was the most frequent in the pre-intermediate proficiency group where the measured percentage was 27.8%, and constantly decreased as the proficiency and age increased. The measured directness in the intermediate proficiency group was 24.7%, and 23.6% in the upper-intermediate group, which was the closest percentage to the native speakers group with the percentage of 21.9% (see Table 1.1). On the other hand, indirect utterances in general were preferred most frequently by all groups (40% by the pre-intermediate group, 52% by the intermediate group, 54.9% by the upper-intermediate group, and 48.6% by the native speakers group). Considering the experimental groups the non-conventional indirect strategy use was observed to decrease as age and linguistic proficiency increased (32.2% in pre-intermediate group, 23.3% in intermediate group, and 21.5% in upper-intermediate group). This value was 30% for native speakers group.

Table 1.2. The responses of the experimental groups by gender and age

Gender	Age	Number of the Students	Direct Tendency	Indirect Tendency	Non-conventional indirect Tendency
Male	15	8	28.3 %	36.7 %	35 %
	17	4	28.3 %	46.7 %	25 %
	18	5	26.7 %	56 %	17.3 %
Female	15	4	26.7 %	48.3 %	25 %
	17	6	27.4 %	51.3 %	21.3 %
	18	8	26.7 %	56.7 %	16.7 %

When male and female students' responses in the three experimental groups were compared it was observed that 50% of the pre-intermediate females (2/4 students) selected the indirect options in the eight or more items out of the total fifteen in the questionnaire, which was more than half of the items, while none of the males (0 students) selected the indirect options at that rate. It was observed that this rate was again 50% for the females (3/6 students) and 25% for the males (1/4 students) of the intermediate group, and approximately 63% for the females (5/8 students), and 60% for the males (3/5 students) in the upper-intermediate group. It was attention-catching that there was an increase of 60% in the males group. The females, on the other hand, already preferred indirectness as a dominant strategy that also increased over 12% (see Table 2.1, Table 2.2, and Table 2.3). Another observation was that female students preferred mostly indirect requesting strategies, which always surpassed male students' tendencies (pre-intermediate group, age 15, females 48.3% - males 36.7%; intermediate group, age 17, females 51.3% - males 46.7%; and upper-intermediate group, age 18, females 56.7% - males 56%) while, however, male students' preferences to use indirect strategies significantly increased correspondingly with the increased age and linguistic proficiency. So, directness decreased as the age and linguistic proficiency level increased.

Nevertheless, one might criticize that these values cannot be taken as improvement since the students in the pre-intermediate group were not the same students with those in the intermediate and upper-intermediate groups. Although the students in the three experimental groups were not exactly identical, they had similar characteristics regarding their educational, social, and pragmatic backgrounds. Although there might be individual differences, more or less their proficiency level progressed in the similar way since they had the same courses, teachers, and materials.

Table 2.1. The individual responses of the pre-intermediate experimental group (f = female, m = male)

Student	% F	Direct	Indirect	Non-Conventional Indirect	Total Responses
Student 1 (m)	%	13.3	26.7	60	100
	F	2	4	9	15
Student 2 (m)	%	40	40	20	100
	F	6	6	3	15
Student 3 (m)	%	26.7	46.7	26.7	100
	F	4	7	4	15
Student 4 (m)	%	33.3	46.7	20	100
	F	5	7	3	15
Student 5 (m)	%	33.3	33.3	33.3	100
	F	5	5	5	15
Student 6 (m)	%	40	33.3	26.7	100
	F	6	5	4	15
Student 7 (m)	%	33.3	40	26.7	100
	F	5	6	4	15
Student 8 (m)	%	6.7	26.7	66.7	100
	F	1	4	10	15
Student 9 (f)	%	26.7	60	13.3	100
	F	4	9	2	15
Student 10(f)	%	26.7	53.3	20	100
	F	4	8	3	15
Student 11(f)	%	33.3	33.3	33.3	100
	F	5	5	5	15
Student 12(f)	%	20	46.7	33.3	100
	F	3	7	5	15

Table 2.2. The individual responses of the intermediate experimental group (f = female, m = male)

Student	% F	Direct	Indirect	Non-Conventional Indirect	Total Responses
Student 1 (m)	%	26.7	46.7	26.7	100
	F	4	7	4	15
Student 2 (m)	%	20	46.7	33.3	100
	F	3	7	5	15
Student 3 (m)	%	40	20	40	100
	F	6	3	6	15
Student 4 (m)	%	26.7	73.3	0	100
	F	4	11	0	15
Student 5 (f)	%	26.7	33.3	40	100
	F	4	5	6	15
Student 6 (f)	%	80	20	0	100
	F	12	3	0	15
Student 7 (f)	%	33.3	40	26.7	100
	F	5	6	4	15
Student 8 (f)	%	26.7	53.3	20	100
	F	4	8	3	15
Student 9 (f)	%	26.7	66.7	6.7	100
	F	4	10	1	15
Student 10(f)	%	20	60	20	100
	F	3	9	3	15

Table 2.3. The individual responses of the upper-intermediate experimental group (f = female, m = male)

Student	% F	Direct	Indirect	Non-Conventional Indirect	Total Responses
Student 1 (m)	%	26.7	66.7	6.7	100
	F	4	10	1	15
Student 2 (m)	%	33.3	53.3	13.3	100
	F	5	8	2	15
Student 3 (m)	%	13.3	53.3	33.3	100
	F	2	8	5	15
Student 4 (m)	%	33.3	46.7	20	100
	F	5	7	3	15
Student 5 (m)	%	26.7	60	13.3	100
	F	4	9	2	15

Student 6 (f)	%	40	46.7	13.3	100
	F	6	7	2	15
Student 7 (f)	%	33.3	66.7	0	100
	F	5	10	0	15
Student 8 (f)	%	26.7	40	33.3	100
	F	4	6	5	15
Student 9 (f)	%	13.3	73.3	13.3	100
	F	2	11	2	15
Student 10(f)	%	6.7	66.7	26.7	100
	F	1	10	4	15
Student 11(f)	%	33.3	33.3	33.3	100
	F	5	5	5	15
Student 12(f)	%	26.7	53.3	20	100
	F	4	8	3	15
Student 13(f)	%	40	60	0	100
	F	6	9	0	15

To sum up, the results revealed that the strategies preferred by Turkish EFL learners are affected by linguistic proficiency level, age, and gender. The data also proposed that participants were quite conscious in their preferences considering the notions of 'power', 'size of imposition', and 'social distance'. One stunning observation was that the tendency of using indirect requesting strategy increased at a total rate of approximately 20% for males, which seems to be a strong indicator for the hypothesis that the use of indirect strategies is affected by age and proficiency level. Although the rate of increase was not that high, an increase over 8% was still observed for females, too. Another related and interesting observation was that the tendency to use non-conventional indirect strategy dropped significantly as the age and linguistic proficiency level increased. The difference between the pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups was approximately 18% for males and 9% for females. So, it would be possible to suggest that there is close connection between the two strategies (indirect versus non-conventional indirect) regarding the percentages attained from the present study. That is to say, the preference of using non-conventional indirect strategy by the students seems to decrease as the use of indirect strategy increases (see Table 1.2).

4. Conclusions

The goal of the present study was to examine to what degree Turkish EFL learners were aware of the politeness and indirectness notions, and which of the previously mentioned three strategies (direct, indirect, non-conventional indirect) they tended to prefer while performing their requests under various situations and conditions. The study also aimed at revealing whether gender, age, and proficiency level affected the pragmatic competence of Turkish EFL learners.

The findings of the study provided interesting information about Turkish EFL learners and their pragmatic development. However, as this was a small scale research

carried out with only 35 participants (plus 14 participants of the control group), one should be cautious while generalizing the findings to all learners and/or conditions. The control group, on the other hand, might be selected more carefully, so that it would represent similar characteristics with the experimental groups regarding gender and age factors.

The following studies might be carried out with a larger number of participants, and also observing the pragmatic development of the same participants through the linguistic levels they advance, and in various periods of their lives. Contrastive studies might provide valuable evidence about the sociocultural and sociolinguistic features of various societies, which in return might boost international communication and cooperation, and help the existing ones to be carried out more qualitatively.

Appendix

Questionnaire (Anket)

Select the most appropriate requesting utterance for the following situations. (Aşağıdaki durumlarda söylenebilecek en uygun rica ifadesini seçiniz.)

1. You are short of money and you ask your father to give you some.

a) Dad, give me some money please.

b) Could you give me some money dad?

c) I am short of money dad.

2. You are very bored and you want your brother to turn on the TV.

a) Can you turn on the TV?

b) Turn on the TV please.

c) There may be something interesting on the TV right now.

3. Your house needs to be painted. So, you ask your friend for help.

a) My house needs to be painted and I have to do it all on my own.

b) Help me to paint my house this weekend.

c) Could you help me to paint my house?

4. You are a commander in the army and you ask one of the soldiers to post a top secret letter.

a) Post this letter immediately soldier.

b) Could you post this letter soldier?

c) This letter must be posted urgently soldier.

5. Your neighbour is listening to music but it is too loud so, you say.

a) Can you turn down the music?

b) Turn down the music please.

c) Everybody can hear the music even from 2 kilometres.

6. You are travelling in a train compartment with an old man. It is very hot inside so, you say.

a) It is very hot inside, isn't it?

b) Open the window please.

c) Could you open the window?

7. The room is dark and your teacher is by the light switch so, you say.

a) Please switch on the light teacher.

b) Could you switch on the light teacher?

c) The room is very dark teacher.

8. You are in a big cloths shop so, you ask the sales assistant for a white shirt.

a) Do you have a white shirt?

b) Give me a white shirt please.

c) Can you show me your white shirts?

9. Your hair is untidy so, your school principal says.

a) Would you comb your hair?

b) Comb your hair.

c) Your hair is very untidy.

10. You are watching an exciting match on the TV with your sister and you feel very thirsty so, you say.

a) Bring me a glass of coke please.

b) Can you bring me a glass of coke?

c) I would like to have a glass of coke now.

11. Your boss wants to check the last agreement file so, he asks you for it.

a) Bring me the file of the last agreement.

b) Can you bring me the file of the last agreement?

c) Do you have the file of the last agreement?

12. You don't know where the post office is so, you ask an old woman about it.

a) I am looking for the post office.

b) Show me the post office please.

c) Could you show me the post office?

13. Your mobile phone needs to be recharged so, you ask your friend to let you make a call.

a) Give me your mobile phone. I have to make a call.

b) Would you let me use your phone?

c) I have to make a call but my mobile phone is not working.

14. One of your close friends is sitting on your notebook so, you say.

a) Could you stand up please? You are sitting on my notebook.

b) Stand up. You are sitting on my notebook.

c) You are sitting on my notebook.

15. You have some guests at home. You feel very sleepy and say.

a) Go home please. I feel very sleepy.

b) Would you mind leaving because I feel very sleepy?

c) What's the time? …Oh it is really late. Don't you feel tired too?

REFERENCES

ANDREN, Mats, Sanne, JOHAN M., Linell, Per, 2010. Striking the balance between formality and informality in safety-critical communication: Train traffic control calls. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 220-241.

AUSTIN, John L., 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press, London.

BLUM-KULKA, Shoshana, House, Juliane, 1989. *Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behaviour*. In: Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., Kasper, G. (Eds.), Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Ablex,Norwood, NJ, pp. 123–154.

BLUM-KULKA, Shoshana, House, Juliane, Kasper, Gabriele, 1989a. *Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: an introductory overview*. In: Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., Kasper, G. (Eds.), Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 1–34.

BROWN, Penelope, LEVINSON, Stephen C., 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

CHEUNG, Ming, 2010. The globalization and localization of persuasive marketing communication: A cross-linguistic socio-cultural analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 354-376.

DRAGER, Katie, 2010. Sociophonetic variation in speech perception. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 4 (7), 473-480.

ECONOMIDOU-KOGETSIDIS, Maria, 2010. Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behaviour: Perceptions of social situations and strategic usage of request patterns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 2262-2281.

ELLIS, Rod, 2001. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press, Hong Kong.

Felix-Brasdefer, Cesar J., 2005. *Indirectness and politeness in Mexican requests*. In: Eddington, D. (Ed.), Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistic Symposium. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA, pp. 66–78.

FUKUSHIMA, Saeko, 1990. Offers and requests: performance by Japanese learners of English. *World Englishes* 9 (3), 317–325.

FUKUSHIMA, Saeko, 1996. Request strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language Sciences* 18 (3–4), 671–688.

HARLOW, Linda L., 1990. Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *Modern Language Journal* 74 (3), 328-351.

JUCKER, Andreas H., 2009. Speech act research between armchair, field and laboratory: The case of compliments. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1611-1635.

KIESLING, Scott F., JOHNSON, Elka Ghosh, 2010. Four forms of interactional indirection. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 292-306.

KRAMSCH, Claire, 1995. The cultural component of language teaching. Language, *Culture and Curriculum* 8 (2), 83-92.

LEE, Seung-Hee, 2009. Extended requesting: Interaction and collaboration in the production and specification of requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1248-1271.

LIMBERG, Holger, 2009. Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1376-1394.

LOCASTRO, Virginia, 1997. Politeness and pragmatic competence in foreign language education. *Language Teaching Research* 1 (3), 239-267.

MARTI, Leyla, 2006. Indirectness and politeness in Turkish–German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 1836-1869.

MIKOLIC, Vesna, 2010. Culture and language awareness in the multicultural environment of Slovene Istria. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 637-649.

MILLS, Sara, 2009. Impoliteness in a cultural context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1047-1060.

MORGAN, Marcyliena, 2010. The presentation of indirectness and power in everyday life. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 283-291.

PENNEBAKER, James W., MEHL, Matthias R., Niederhoffer, Kate G., 2003. Psychological aspects of natural language use: Our words, our selves. *Annual Review of Psychology* 54, 547-577.

PFISTER, Jonas, 2010. Is there a need for a maxim of politeness? *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 1266-1282.

RINNERT, Carol, Kobayashi, Hiroe, 1999. Requestive hints in Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 1173-1201.

SCHRÖDER, Ulrike, 2010. Speech styles and functions of speech from a cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 466-476.

SEARLE, John R., 1975. *Indirect speech acts*. In: Cole, P., Morgan, J. (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts. Academic, New York, pp. 59-82.

SILVERSTEIN, Michael, 2010. ''Direct'' and ''indirect'' communicative acts in semiotic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 337-353.

TAKIMOTO, Masahiro, 2006. The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Language Teaching Research* 10 (4), 393-417.

THOMAS, Jenny, 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman, London.

THORNE, Steven L.,2003. Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language Learning and Technology* 7 (2), 38-67.

VERDONIK, Darinka, 2010. Between understanding and misunderstanding. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 1364-1379.

WALTERS, Joel, 1979. Strategıes for requestıng ın spanısh and englısh: Structural similarities and pragmatic differences. *Language Learning* 29 (2), 277-293.

WIERZBICKA, Anna, 1985. Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9, 145-178.