

THE EFFECTS OF VIEWING PRE-SELECTED VIDEO CLIPS ON LOW-LEVEL
TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' USE OF SPEECH ACTS

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

ÖZNR ALVER-YÜCEL

THE PROGRAM OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

MAY 2017

To my beloved son, mom,

dad & husband...

The Effects of Viewing Pre-Selected Video Clips on Low-Level

Turkish EFL Learners' Use of Speech Acts

The Graduate School of Education

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

By

Öznur Alver-Yücel

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

The Program of

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Ankara

May 2017

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis Title: The Effects of Viewing Pre-Selected Video Clips on Low-Level
Turkish EFL Learners' Use of Speech Acts

Öznur Alver-Yücel
May, 2017

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

Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe (Supervisor)

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

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

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

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

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Alipaşa Ayas (Director)

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF VIEWING PRE-SELECTED VIDEO CLIPS ON LOW-LEVEL
TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' USE OF SPEECH ACTS

Öznur Alver-Yücel

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

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

May 2017

This study aimed to investigate the effects of video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' pragmatic competence in using speech acts.

The pre-test in a DCT format was administered in low-intermediate level classes at the Department of Basic English (DBE) at Middle East Technical University (METU) in Turkey. After the analysis of it, the speech acts in which the participants had difficulty in using were determined to be explicitly taught. The treatment sessions included the tasks during which the participants watched the video clips and discussed the relationship between the characters. Then, some other appropriate structures were covered to improve the participants' pragmatic competence in speech acts. The analysis of the DCT items in the mid-test revealed that participants formed more appropriate responses in the post-test. Four weeks later, a post-test which included DCT items was administered. The participants were able to write mostly appropriate responses in the post-test, which also revealed the

effectiveness of the integration of the video clips while teaching English speech act to low level Turkish EFL learners. The semi-structured interviews with the teachers also indicated the importance of instruction while teaching speech acts. The findings related to the perception questionnaire revealed the importance of providing input via the use of video clips which offer conceptualized input and facilitate learning by having students get more motivated and pay attention during treatment sessions for a longer period. The analysis of the index cards showed that watching videos outside the class can contribute to learning speech acts to some extent because the participants who did not watch videos a lot outside the class performed well because of the treatment sessions.

Key words: Speech acts, low-level EFL learners, video clips, pragmatic competence

ÖZET

ÖNCEDEDEN BELİRLENMİŞ VIDEO KLİPLERİ İZLEMENİN DÜŞÜK SEVİYELİ SINIFLARDA İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN SÖZ EDİMLERİNİ KULLANIMINA ETKİLERİ

Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Deniz ORTAÇTEPE

Mayıs 2017

Bu araştırma video kliplerin düşük seviyeli sınıflarda İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin söz edimleri kullanımında pragmatik yetkinlik kazanması üzerine etkilerini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır.

Söylem tamamlama aktivitesi formatında hazırlanan ön sınav Türkiye’de Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi (ODTÜ) Temel İngilizce Bölümü’nde bulunan üç düşük seviyeli sınıfta uygulandı. Bu testin incelemesi sonrasında öğretimde üzerinde durulacak söz edimleri belirlendi. Öğretim derslerinde öğrenciler video klipleri izleyip karakterlerin birbirleriyle ilişki hakkında konuştular. Daha sonra öğrencilerin belirli söz edimlerini kullanarak edimsel yetilerinin gelişmesi için diğer uygun olan kullanımlar üzerinde duruldu. Bu öğretim dersleri sonrasında başka bir yazılı söylem tamamlama testi son test olarak verildi. Katılımcıların son testte söz edimlerini daha

uygun bir şekilde kullandılar. Dört hafta sonra katılımcıların ne kadar hatırladığını belirlemek için bir ertelenmiş-son test uygulandı. Katılımcılar bu testte de çoğunlukla uygun cevaplar yazarak düşük seviyeli sınıflarda söz edimleri öğretilirken video kullanımının etkinliğini göstermiştir. Bu sınıfların öğretmenleriyle yapılan görüşmeler söz edimlerinin sınıfta öğretiminin önemini göstermiştir. Algı anketlerinden elde edilen bulgular video klipler kullanılarak kavramsallaştırılmış girdi sunmanın sağlamanın önemini vurgulamıştır. Ayrıca video klip kullanımı öğrencilerin motivasyonunun artmasını ve öğretim dersleri boyunca daha uzun süre dikkatlerini korumalarını sağlamıştır. İndeks kartlarının incelenmesi sınıf dışında video izlemenin söz edimlerini öğrenmede bir nebze ekili olduğunu gösterdi. Sınıf dışında çok fazla video klip izlemeyen katılımcılar öğretim derslerinin sonucu olarak iyi bir performans sergilediler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Söz edimleri, düşük seviyeli İngilizce yabancı dil sınıfları, video klipler, pragmatik yetkinlik

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis was a challenging experience, which has contributed to my academic and personal improvement. I would like to thank those who provided great support in this process.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe, for her constructive and quick feedback through which she provided enormous guidance and support. Thanks to her suggestions and what she taught, I achieved more than I had expected in terms of personal and academic development. I was able to write my thesis in an elaborate way. I am aware of the great efforts that she made to improve my thesis.

I also would like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı for her contributions to my improvement throughout this process. She supported me with her positive and encouraging attitude. She was always ready to answer my questions, which helped me feel more enthusiastic.

I would like to express my appreciation to Özlem Atalay, the director of the School of Foreign Languages, and also Aliye Hale Bingöl, the director of Basic English Language, for providing me with this opportunity to attend the MA TEFL program.

I am also grateful to Beth Elaine Doğan, who provided feedback on my DCT items. She also helped me to evaluate the responses of the participants by providing information about what is socially appropriate and what is not. I also want to thank

Lorie Marie Tan, who provided feedback on the tests I prepared. Without their support, this thesis would not have been completed.

I would like to share my appreciation for Esragül Torun, Ezgi Bircan Bahçe and Sevde Yüksel, who allowed me to have the treatment sessions in their classes despite their heavy loaded program.

I would like to express my gratitude to Sibel Özdemir- Çağatay and İlkim Merve Yıldız, who introduced me to this distinguished program.

Last but not least, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved parents. They have always supported me, which has caused me to become self-confident. They were always with me whenever I needed their help throughout this demanding process. I would like to thank my son and husband who were patient and encouraging, which enabled me to complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ÖZET..... | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | vii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | ix |
| LIST OF TABLES | xii |
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Background of the Study | 2 |
| Statement of the Problem | 5 |
| Significance of the Study | 7 |
| Conclusion..... | 8 |
| CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW | 9 |
| Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Education | 9 |
| Pragmatic Competence and Speech Acts | 10 |
| Instruction of Pragmatics in EFL Classes | 14 |
| Explicit and Implicit Teaching of L2 Pragmatics..... | 14 |
| Instruction of Speech Acts in EFL Classes | 15 |
| Explicit and Implicit Teaching of Speech Acts | 16 |
| Deductive and Inductive Teaching of Speech Acts | 20 |
| The Use of Coursebooks to Teach Speech Acts..... | 22 |
| Limitations of EFL Coursebooks to Teach Speech Acts | 22 |
| Using Technology for Instruction of Pragmatic Competence | 24 |
| Conclusion..... | 27 |
| CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY | 28 |
| Introduction | 28 |
| Setting..... | 28 |
| Participants | 30 |
| Instruments | 31 |
| Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs)..... | 31 |
| Index Cards | 33 |
| Perception Questionnaire | 33 |
| Semi-Structured Interviews | 34 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Videos Used During the Treatment Sessions..... | 34 |
| Procedures | 35 |
| Data Analysis | 38 |
| Conclusion..... | 38 |
| CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS | 39 |
| Introduction | 39 |
| The Analysis of the DCT Scores | 39 |
| The Analysis of the Responses to a Higher-Status Person..... | 40 |
| Making an Offer..... | 40 |
| Refusing a Request | 41 |
| Making a Request | 43 |
| Invitation..... | 44 |
| Responding to a Compliment | 44 |
| Complaint..... | 46 |
| The Analysis of the Responses to an Equal-Status Person..... | 47 |
| Invitation..... | 47 |
| Suggestion..... | 48 |
| Complaint..... | 49 |
| The Analysis of the Responses to Lower-Status People | 50 |
| Suggestion | 50 |
| The Analysis of Factors Causing Possible Changes | 51 |
| The Analysis of the Perception Questionnaire | 52 |
| The Contribution to Learning in Class | 53 |
| The Contribution to Learning Outside Class | 54 |
| The Effects on the Affective Factors | 56 |
| The Analysis of the Interviews with the Teachers | 57 |
| Advantages of Explicit Teaching of Speech Acts | 58 |
| Challenges Faced | 58 |
| How the Instructors Teach Speech Acts | 59 |
| The Analysis of the Index Cards | 60 |
| The Comparison of Scores Assigned to “Regular” and “Seldom or Never Watchers” | 62 |
| Conclusion..... | 64 |
| CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION..... | 65 |
| Introduction | 65 |
| Findings and Discussion..... | 65 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Pedagogical Implications of the Study | 70 |
| Limitations of the Study | 72 |
| Suggestions for Further Research..... | 73 |
| Conclusion..... | 74 |
| References | 75 |
| APPENDICES | 81 |
| Appendix A1: Sample Pages from the Coursebook | 81 |
| Appendix B1: DCT Items in the PreTest | 83 |
| Appendix B2: DCT Items in the Mid-Test..... | 89 |
| Appendix B3: DCT Items in the Post-Test | 92 |
| Appendix C: Index Cards | 96 |
| Appendix D: Perception Questionnaire..... | 97 |
| Appendix E: Questions Asked in the Semi-Structured Interview | 98 |
| Appendix F: Transcripts of the Interviews | 99 |
| The Semi-Structured Interview with the Instructor (PIN 26)..... | 96 |
| The Semi-Structured Interview with the Instructor (PIN 26)..... | 98 |
| Appendix G: Speech Acts Tested in the Pre-Test | 106 |
| Appendix H1:Rubric Used in the Institution | 107 |
| Appendix H2: Rubric for the DCTs | 108 |
| Appendix I1: Sample Scores Assigned to the Responses in the Pre-Test..... | 109 |
| Appendix I2: Sample Scores Assigned to the Responses in the Mid-Test..... | 112 |
| Appendix I3: Sample Scores Assigned to the Responses in the Post-Test | 115 |
| Appendix J: The Analysis of the Pre-Test..... | 118 |
| Appendix K1: Handouts for the Treatment Sessions | 123 |
| Appendix K2: Source of the Video Clips..... | 138 |
| Appendix L: The Scores of the Chosen Participants..... | 141 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1 Speech Acts Tested in the Mid and Post-Test..... | 32 |
| 2 Sample Scoring of the DCTs | 35 |
| 3 One-way ANOVA Results for “Making an Offer to a Higher Status Person” | 41 |
| 4 One-way ANOVA Results for “Refusing a Request from a Higher Status Person”..... | 42 |
| 5 One-way ANOVA Results for “Making a Request to a Higher Status Person” | 43 |
| 6 One-way ANOVA Results for “Invitation of a Higher Status Person”..... | 44 |
| 7 One-way ANOVA Results for “Responding to a Compliment from a Higher Status Person”..... | 45 |
| 8 One-way ANOVA Results for “Complaint- a Higher Status Person” | 46 |
| 9 One-way ANOVA Results for “Invitation of an Equal Status Person”..... | 47 |
| 10 One-way ANOVA Results for “Suggestion to an Equal Status Person” | 48 |
| 11 One-way ANOVA Results for “Complaint- an Equal Status Person” | 49 |
| 12 One-way ANOVA Results for “Suggestion to Lower Status People” | 51 |
| 13 Descriptive Statistics of the Perception Questionnaire Part 1 | 53 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 14 | Descriptive Statistics of the Perception Questionnaire Part 2 | 55 |
| 15 | Descriptive Statistics of the Perception Questionnaire Part 3 | 56 |
| 16 | Categories Based on the Criteria | 61 |
| 17 | Pre-test Scores of the Chosen Participants..... | 63 |

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

One of the requirements of being competent for second language (L2) learners is developing pragmatic competence which can be defined as having the ability to understand what is intended in written or spoken interaction (Yule, 1996). Helping learners improve their pragmatic competence has been emphasized in the recent decades. If learners do not have pragmatic competence, they may experience *pragmatic failure* which means learners may form grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate sentences which can cause communication breakdowns - (Delen & Tavil, 2010). To avoid such problems, *speech acts*, which are regarded as one of the central concepts of pragmatic competence (Bella, 2014; Çapar, 2014; Delen & Tavil, 2010) should be used appropriately in different social situations.

Speech acts can be defined as functions of language such as apologizing, requesting, complaining, and so on (Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015). Learners of a new language need to develop competency in using speech acts to learn when to talk, how to talk, what to say, or not to talk, and so on by considering the social and cultural contexts of the target language. Otherwise, they may experience cross-cultural misunderstandings which can result from negative pragmatic transfer, limited knowledge in grammar, overgeneralization in L2 pragmatic norms or insufficient instruction and instructional materials (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). To help learners avoid misunderstandings, speech acts should be taught in EFL classes (Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015). However, the studies on coursebooks which can be regarded as the

cornerstones of instruction have concluded that most of the analysed coursebooks fail in providing sufficient amount of input and context (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015; Vellenga, 2004). Thus, researchers have started to look for new ways to teach speech acts with the help of technology like films (Derakshan & Eslami, 2015).

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the effects of pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' pragmatic competence in using speech acts. It focuses on low level students studying at the Department of Basic English (DBE) at Middle East Technical University (METU) in Turkey to improve their pragmatic competence by providing the instructors with a supporting material to teach speech acts more effectively.

Background of the Study

Speech act theory was first proposed by Austin in the 1960s and developed by Searle, one of her former students (as cited in Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015). Speech acts are “the ways in which people carry out specific social functions in speaking such as apologizing, complaining, making requests, refusing things/invitations, complimenting, or thanking” (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 6). Since they play an important role in developing pragmatic competence by providing information about speakers' actions, or feelings, or what they want from the listener, the research on this type of competence has mainly concentrated on speech acts (Bella, 2014).

A great number of studies have been conducted on the effects of speech act instruction in EFL classes. A study by Martinez-Flor and Alcon (2007) pointed out the positive effects of both implicit and explicit instruction on EFL learners' awareness of suggestions. In a recent study, Nguyen, Pham and Pham (2012)

examined the effects of implicit and explicit instruction in constructive criticism speech act and stated that implicit and explicit groups scored higher than the control group which had no instruction, but the participants in the explicit group became more successful than those in the implicit group. Many other studies have also revealed that explicit teaching of speech acts is more useful for learners. For instance, Rajabia, Azizifara and Gowhary (2015) analyzed the effects of explicit teaching of request speech act and found that pragmatics should be taught together with grammatical knowledge. It was in line with another study by Halenko and Jones (2011) which found that explicit instruction improved pragmatic development of request speech act. All these findings have caused researchers and teachers to pay attention to coursebooks used in especially EFL classes because pragmatic knowledge can be facilitated mostly via course books (Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

Much of the recent research focused on the effectiveness of some specific textbooks with respect to pragmatics has revealed that the examined coursebooks are not adequate in terms of providing pragmatic development (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015). A study by Delen and Tavit (2010) analyzed the coursebooks used in a private university in Ankara, Turkey to find out whether request, refusal and complaint speech acts are efficiently covered in those books. The findings showed that refusal speech act appeared less frequently than requests in the course books, and the speech act of complaints was almost non-existent. Aksoyalp and Toprak (2015) focused on how 17 textbooks used at Schools of English of different universities in Turkey with learners of different proficiency levels presented the speech acts of complaints, apologies and suggestions. The study stated another problem related to course books apart from limited frequency of some speech acts.

The books included an artificial and decontextualized context. The findings were similar to those provided by Vellenga (2004), who examined eight textbooks in terms of the amount and quality of pragmatic information. She found out that “students are only occasionally given models (either in audio recordings or more commonly as printed dialogues or examples) of the speech acts with very little contextual information or explicit metapragmatic discussion” (p. 5). The importance of *metapragmatic competence* which enables learners to better understand the relationship between the speaker and the listener considering their social status and relationship (Glasgow, 2008) is mentioned in another study by Yıldız-Ekin (2013), who investigated how the speech act of suggestion was covered in ten coursebooks. His findings are similar to what Vellenga (2004) stated: Metapragmatic information, the relationship between the interlocutors, is not sufficiently provided in most of the analysed coursebooks. As indicated by these studies, most materials that students are exposed to fail to provide enough context (Derakshan & Eslami, 2015) and lack metapragmatic information (Vellenga, 2004; Yıldız-Ekin, 2013;).

Numerous studies have been conducted to find ways to provide learners with consciousness-raising activities to help them develop metapragmatic competence. One of the studies by Derakshan and Eslami (2015) aimed to evaluate “the effectiveness of consciousness-raising video-driven prompts on the development of two-commonly used speech acts of apology and request” (p. 1). The participants were upper-intermediate Persian EFL learners who watched the above mentioned prompts for six sessions. The findings showed that the participants developed awareness considering the use of apology and request speech acts. The results were consistent with those of another study by Kondo (2008) revealing the importance of

awareness-raising instruction to develop pragmatic competency of Japanese EFL learners in terms of refusal speech act (as cited in Derakshan & Eslami, 2015).

In a study conducted by Abrams (2014), German beginner level EFL learners participated in activities designed to improve their metapragmatic awareness. Learners in the experiment group watched and analysed some parts of a movie, *The Edukators*, in a seven-session period. The study concentrated on pragmalinguistic, such as register, expression of politeness, and sociopragmatic features like directness/indirectness, “appropriate” language, and so on. (Abrams, 2014). The researcher claimed that the activities done to improve learners’ metapragmatic ability were useful and suggested further research being conducted to explore the development of L2 pragmatics at low levels (Abrams, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

A great number of studies have focused on how some specific speech acts are used in different contexts (Bayat, 2012), how L1 influences the use of speech acts in L2 (Çapar, 2014), and the kind of strategies applied in using speech acts, especially in cross-sectional studies (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Bella, 2014; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010). Most of these studies have revealed that learners have difficulty in choosing the correct strategy in a variety of contexts (El Hiani, 2015; Tuncel, 2011). Therefore, many studies have concluded that speech acts should be taught explicitly (Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015; Derakhshan, & Eslami, 2015; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

As explicit teaching of speech acts has gained importance, some studies (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015; Delen & Tavit, 2010; Vellenga, 2004) have evaluated selected coursebooks used at different levels. The results have indicated that the course books are not capable of providing enough

contextualized input or strategies in using speech acts. This gap resulted in further studies to find alternatives, one of which included having learners watch some parts of pre-selected movies to provide authentic context for the learners to improve their competency. However, Derakshan and Eslami, (2015) worked with only high level students to teach some pre-selected speech acts. Although Abrams (2014) concentrated on low level learners, she did not aim to teach any specific speech acts. The focus of her study was to analyse the effects of using a movie to provide context on the participants' general pragmatic ability. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, no study has focused on improving the competence of low-level learners in speech acts through pre-selected video clips.

Turkish EFL learners are not frequently exposed to native speakers to enhance their competency in using speech acts. Another point to consider is related to the number of low-level learners which is increasing year by year (2013-2014, 820 students enrolled in the beginner level classes; 2014-2015, 670; 2015-2016, 705). At the DBE, at METU, there are approximately 1550 students at lower levels in the preparatory school, which is higher compared to the previous years since the preparatory year in high schools was abolished. Also, the coursebooks used at METU do not provide enough input (see Appendix A), so the instructors working there need to develop their own materials, which is time consuming and may be ignored. Therefore, a great number of METU students in low levels have difficulties in using speech acts appropriately in the classroom. Not being competent in speech acts causes them not to get high grades in the exams which include some parts testing their pragmatic competence. These parts require students to read some situations and write what can be said in the provided contexts. There are also two parts in the proficiency exam in the form of written DCTs, five items requiring appropriate

responses to the given situations, and 5 items requiring test takers to complete the given dialogues considering the context. These two parts including ten items are out of ten points of their overall score. However, students at low levels cannot perform well in these parts. As a result, there is a crucial need to solve the problems of low-level learners about using speech acts in an appropriate way. Therefore, the present study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of viewing pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts?
2. What other factors contribute to changes, if any, in low level learners' use of speech acts?

Significance of the Study

Recent studies have focused mostly on how to improve the competency of high level learners in using speech acts (Derakshan & Eslami, 2015; Jeon & Kaya, 2006) and emphasized the need for studies focusing on low-level students as coursebooks used with such students do not include a variety of strategies or enough contextualized input (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Delen & Tavi, 2010). However, the number of studies focusing on low-level EFL students is limited. Therefore, this study can provide an effective way to teach speech acts at lower levels. Also, there is little research about using video clips to teach speech acts explicitly. Therefore, the findings of this study may help teachers to use particular video clips in their classes while teaching specific speech acts in low-level EFL classes.

At the local level, the instructors at the DBE, METU will be provided with a booklet of activities for explicit teaching of speech acts. Therefore, this study can be of great importance to the instructors who can incorporate the same or similar video clips in their own lessons in order to teach low level students more efficiently. These

instructors may provide more contextualized input via the video clips and the intervention sessions designed by the researcher so that their students can better comprehend the correct use of speech acts considering the interlocutor, which is usually ignored by their course books. Also, this study may help learners become more motivated with the help of watching video clips as many young adults enjoy watching them outside school for various reasons. Their becoming more motivated can result in being more proficient in using speech acts appropriately, which can improve their performance in the exams. It will hopefully lead to a decrease in the high number of repeat students, which places a heavy burden on the institution as it is required to allocate instructors and classes for about 400 repeat students.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the first part provides an overview of literature on the importance of pragmatic competence for EFL learners, how speech acts can contribute to this improvement and the importance of instruction on speech acts. In the second part, the statement of the problem part, the need for the study has been given. After writing the research questions, the possible contributions of this research have been stated in the significance of the study part. The next chapter presents a detailed review of literature on pragmatic competence in foreign language education, instruction of speech acts in EFL classes, limitations of EFL coursebooks, using technology for instruction of pragmatic competence and teaching speech acts to low-level learners.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide literature review related to this study which aimed to analyse the effects of viewing video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts. It also aimed to find out what other factors contributed to changes, if any, in this group of learners' use of speech acts. This chapter includes some relevant studies on the main parts of the study. The first part concentrates on pragmatic competence and its importance in foreign language education. The second part gives details about speech acts and the instruction of speech acts in EFL classes. After providing details about the use of coursebooks and their limitations, the importance of integrating videos into low-level EFL classes will be covered.

Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Education

Research on language learning and teaching has concentrated on providing efficient ways to become competent in another language. Although the early studies aimed to develop mostly the linguistic ability of language learners, the recent ones have also focused on how to improve L2 learners' pragmatic competence both in English as a Second Language (ESL) (Glaser, 2013) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015; Bella, 2014; Li, 2012; Murray, 2011). In this part, the terms *pragmatic competence* and *speech acts* will be explained and some studies on these concepts will be discussed.

Pragmatic competence refers to having knowledge about social and functional rules of a language. Therefore, language learners need to improve their pragmatic

competence as well as linguistic competence to have communicative competence. Otherwise, they may face problems because of not knowing the culture and the norms of the target culture (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, İstifçi, 2009) To avoid such problems resulting from cross-cultural misunderstandings, language learners are supposed to develop some strategies to produce and perceive the language appropriately in different situations (Abrams, 2014; Allami & Naeimi, 2011; İstifçi, 2009; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

Pragmatic Competence and Speech Acts

Speech acts can be defined as the basic components of a language through which people can perform and interpret specific social functions such as making a request, suggestion, offer and so on (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). To better understand the functions of speech acts, three important dimensions should be analysed. The first one is *locutionary act*, which refers to producing a meaningful linguistic expression. The second one is called *illocutionary act*, related to what is meant by the linguistic expression. The last one is *perlocutionary act*, referring to the effect of what is said (İstifçi, 2009, Yule, 1996). Speech acts exist in all languages; however, the way how they are used vary across cultures. Therefore, learning when, how and why they are applied in a specific language has utmost importance to become competent in a language.

Speech acts are regarded to have the utmost importance in developing L2 pragmatic competence (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015) since they enable language learners to better communicate with others in L2. Being able to use speech acts appropriately in different contexts is so essential that even learners with a high proficiency level may not express themselves in the target language accurately if they are not competent in using speech acts. In other words,

even students at higher levels may have difficulty in having a smooth communication in L2 even if they know a considerable number of vocabulary items and grammatical structures (Bella, 2014; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). Apart from having difficulty in conveying their messages accurately because of not being able to use speech acts appropriately, L2 learners who have not acquired sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence can experience *pragmatic failure*, which can cause these learners to face misunderstandings or suffer from communication breakdown and even to be considered impolite because of lacking the knowledge of how to use speech acts appropriately (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

To provide more information about how speech acts are used in different languages to avoid possible misunderstandings, some cross-linguistic studies have been conducted. Allami and Naeimi (2011) conducted such a study on the pragmatic competence of Iranian EFL learners and explored the relationship between pragmatic transfer and language proficiency. The study focused on the strategies people use in refusing requests, invitations, suggestions, and offers in English as an L2. They worked with 30 Persian EFL learners at three different levels of proficiency: ten upper-intermediate, ten intermediate and ten low-intermediate learners of English. To conduct a cross-linguistic study, the researchers asked 31 native speakers of Persian to participate in the study, and they also examined the responses of 37 native speakers of English who participated in a study conducted by Kwon (2004). Allami and Naeimi (2011) asked the participants to respond to a 12-item discourse completion test (DCT), which was used by Kwon. The items required the participants to refute people with higher, equal, and lower status. The researchers concluded that Iranians generally referred to their poor physical health while

Americans stated that they had another engagement not to accept a request. They also concluded that unlike their American counterparts, the Iranian EFL learners used more direct refusal strategies while refuting a lower-status person. The study revealed that the lower intermediate and intermediate level participants used pragmatic transfer less than the upper-intermediate level participants, which hindered their performance in the DCTs. Also, low-level learners were not able to use a variety of refusal strategies appropriately, which caused the researchers to suggest that teachers should also cover sociolinguistic and sociocultural differences in their classes to help students avoid misunderstandings (Allami & Naeimi, 2011).

Another study on refusals compared the performance of 20 native speakers of Greek and 60 people who wanted to learn Greek as a foreign language (Bella, 2014). As a cross-sectional study, the researcher worked with a lower intermediate, an intermediate, and an advanced group. Each group included 20 learners of Greek from different backgrounds who did not have special instruction in pragmatics. The interactions of the participants at different proficiency levels during an open role play activity were transcribed. The researcher analysed the responses of native speakers to compare them with those of the lower- intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate level of students who took part in the study and presented the findings in terms of the use of direct strategies like saying: “No”, indirect strategies like saying: “It is not possible...”, and adjunct, which refers to the addition of praise or a positive statement while refuting others. Analyzing the data, Bella (2014) also focused on the lexical/phrasal downgraders used in the study. While evaluating the performance of the participants, she also considered the verbal reports in which the participants commented on the role play activities which required them to refute their partner during the role play activities (Bella, 2014). The findings indicated that the

participants with a high level of proficiency used a greater variety of indirect strategies as well as employing lexical/phrasal downgraders more frequently. However, native speakers used more adjuncts while refusing people compared to all the three groups. The native speakers also used lexical/ phrasal downgraders more frequently. However, it was also concluded that even advanced learners of Greek did not have sufficient sociocultural knowledge, which prevented them from using the speech act of refusal appropriately (Bella, 2014).

A number of cross-cultural studies also revealed the importance of teaching sociolinguistic and sociopragmatic features (Leech, 1983 as cited in Derakhshan & Eslami-Rasekh, 2015) to help language learners become more competent by improving their knowledge of how to use speech acts (e.g. Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Derakhshan & Eslami-Rasekh, 2015; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Li, 2012; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015). Sociopragmatic competence is related to formality, the level of directness, and politeness while pragmalinguistic competence refers to the use of structures, vocabulary items, phrases, strategies for a speech act in different contexts (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). A study conducted by Cheng (2011) analysed how 15 native speakers of English, 15 ESL learners and 15 EFL learners responded to compliments through the naturalistic role-play activities during which the participants were not aware of what the study aimed to investigate. The learners of English who participated in the study were paired up with a native speaker of English who needed to compliment their partner. The researcher also had a retrospective interview with each of the 15 Chinese ESL learners immediately after the role play activities. The researcher focused on compliment strategies because how people respond to compliments varies among cultures. While English speaking people mostly used accepting strategies, people from Asia generally applied

downgrading and rejection strategies (Cheng, 2011). After analyzing how L2 learners responded to compliments during the naturalistic role-play activities, the researcher stated that between the two L2 groups, the EFL participants seemed to experience more difficulties in using various strategies in responding to compliments, which indicated the importance of teaching speech acts in EFL classes by having L2 learners more aware of cultural factors as well as sociolinguistic features of the target language.

Instruction of Pragmatics in EFL Classes

Developing pragmatic competence in a foreign language takes a long time although learners can gain linguistic competence in a shorter period (Vasquez & Fioramonte, 2011) and even high level learners have difficulty in expressing themselves in different contexts (Bella, 2014; Cohen, 2008). Therefore, learners need instruction to acquire pragmatic competence in the target language (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Vasquez & Fioramonte, 2011).

Explicit and Implicit Teaching of L2 Pragmatics

A number of studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of instruction of L2 pragmatics in EFL classes. One of these studies conducted by van Compernelle and Henery (2014) focused on the effectiveness of concept-based instruction in teaching L2 pragmatics. The researchers benefitted from the Vygotskian sociocultural theory to investigate how such type of instruction can help increase learners' pragmatic awareness. The theory they based their study on is called concept-based pragmatics instruction (CBPI), which "aims to guide learners to think through holistic concepts (sociopragmatic meanings) first and then to consider which patterns of language are appropriate for accomplishing one's intended social meaning" (van Compernelle & Henery, 2014, p. 550). In this way, L2 learners can

choose more accurate structures after thinking about sociopragmatic features. The study aimed to provide learners who studied French at university with more appropriate pragmatic choices while using the second-person pronouns *tu* and *vous* in French. With the integration of some enrichment sessions which had the participants reflect on their understanding of how the above mentioned pronouns were used in French in discussion sessions, which were held in English, their native language (van Compernelle & Henery, 2014). The results indicated that the participants improved their sociopragmatic knowledge of using *tu* and *vous* in different social situations because of the explicit teaching of these concepts using a method that is informed by Vygotskian sociocultural theory. According to van Compernelle and Henery, the study is significant for the literature in terms of finding effective ways to teach L2 pragmatics since concept-based instruction is advantageous because it can start with abstract, systematic information which can be applied to any context (van Compernelle & Henery, 2014). If learners start with a systematic method, they can improve their knowledge of L2 pragmatics.

Instruction of Speech Acts in EFL Classes

An important number of studies have concluded that incorporating speech acts into their instruction can help teachers improve their EFL students' pragmatic competence (Alcon, 2005; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Li, 2012; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015; Takimoto, 2008). When language learners have only mere exposure to the target language, it is not enough for them to develop pragmatic competence or to learn how to use speech acts appropriately since they need to notice these items with the help of the instruction (Halenko & Jones, 2011; Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Ortaçtepe, 2012).

The studies which have concentrated on the importance of teaching speech acts in EFL classes (Alcon, 2005; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Li, 2012; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015) have resulted in extensive investigation of the effects of explicit and implicit approaches in teaching speech acts, which is considered to facilitate L2 pragmatic competence (Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015; Takimoto, 2008).

Explicit and Implicit Teaching of Speech Acts

Explicit teaching of speech acts can be described as teachers providing metapragmatic rules during the instruction while *implicit teaching* refers to not providing any rule explanations at any point in lessons (Halenko & Jones, 2011). Explicit instruction includes making learners aware of new structures covered during the instruction. Therefore, it requires learners to notice and pay attention to the covered structures, which is related to two of the most influential cognitive processing approaches: Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1993) and Smith's Consciousness- Raising Hypothesis (Sharwood- Smith, 1981).

The Noticing Hypothesis requires learners to direct their attention to a specific learning domain, which is the initial stage of turning the input into the intake (Schmidt, 2001). In terms of pragmatic instruction, the hypothesis point out the importance of paying attention to both the linguistic features and the social and contextual features (Schmidt, 2001). The Consciousness-Raising approach has learners focus on the formal properties of a language point to enhance their knowledge in the target language (Derakshan & Eslami- Rasekh, 2015).

Some researchers have investigated the effectiveness of explicit and implicit instruction of speech acts my means of quasi-experimental studies in which they have benefitted from the noticing and the consciousness-raising hypotheses. One of

these studies was conducted by Martinez-Flor and Alcon-Soler (2007), who evaluated the effectiveness of implicit and explicit types of instruction to develop pragmatic awareness of suggestions. Eighty-one intermediate level university students took part in the study which included 16 weeks of treatment sessions. The first group was taught explicitly, and the second group received implicit instruction of the speech act of suggestion. The participants in these two groups were exposed to a high number of suggestions through the use of videotaped situations, and they also had the opportunity to practice how to make suggestions (Martinez-Flor & Alcon-Soler, 2007). The third group, the control group, did not get any instruction. The findings of the study revealed that the explicitly and implicitly taught groups outperformed the control group. However, the reason why the implicit treatment was also facilitative in improving the participants' competence may have resulted from the length of the treatment period which lasted for a whole semester (Martinez-Flor & Alcon-Soler, 2007). Such a long period might have provided the learners in the implicit group with much exposure to the strategies used to make suggestions.

Some other studies on types of instruction concluded that explicit teaching can help L2 learners more in using a variety of speech acts appropriately in different contexts. One of these studies was conducted by Rajabia, Azizifara and Gowhary (2015). The researchers administered a pre-test in the format of a DCT to determine what kind of aspects they needed to include in the treatment sessions. Seventy-three Persian EFL learners in four classes (two intermediate and two advanced level classes) wrote what they would say in the situations written in the pre-test. The researchers conducted the treatment sessions through awareness-raising activities in two classes: an intermediate and an advanced level class. The others were the control groups and did not receive any special instruction. At the end of the term, the post-

test, another DCT, was administered to all the participants to collect data on the effect of the treatment sessions. The findings indicated that the advanced learners in the study outperformed the ones in the intermediate level classes. They also indicated that the participants who received explicit type of instruction, significantly improved their competence in using appropriate request strategies after the treatment sessions. Therefore, the researchers suggested providing EFL learners with sociolinguistic rules as well as ways to perform speech acts in different social contexts considering the values of the target culture (Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015)

Another study on the significance of explicit instruction was conducted by Derakhshan and Eslami (2015). The study focused on how to teach the speech acts of apology and request to upper-intermediate EFL learners of English with the help of consciousness raising instruction which included video vignettes. The researchers claimed that the explicit treatment sessions resulted in significant improvement in the participants' competence in using apology and request speech acts (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015).

A similar study was conducted in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) context (Halenko & Jones, 2011) to investigate whether explicit instruction could foster pragmatic development of requests. The experimental group consisted of 13 Chinese university students who started to study in the UK, and the control group was composed of 13 Chinese university students in the same context. The experimental group received six hours of explicit instruction in three main phases, each of which took two hours. The first phase guided the participants to notice sociopragmatic aspects. In the second phase, sociolinguistic aspects were covered through explicit teaching. In the third one, the participants had practice, production and discussion activities. After six hours of instruction, the participants were asked to

take another DCT as a post-test. The researchers administered a delayed post-test as well to better evaluate the effectiveness of explicit teaching of request speech act. The study revealed that the learners in the experimental group improved their pragmatic competence in using request strategies after the treatment sessions, and they performed better in the immediate post-test. However, in the delayed post-test, the learners in the experimental group were not as successful as they were in the post-test, which made the necessity of regular instruction more clear (Halenko & Jones, 2011).

Li (2012) investigated the effect of different types of instruction in three Chinese Grade 7 EFL classes. This study is significant because the researcher focused on beginner level students unlike most of the studies on L2 pragmatics, which have investigated what advanced level learners can achieve (Li, 2012). Another significance of the study is that he aimed to investigate which type of instruction can provide more durable effects, which has been ignored by many of the studies on L2 pragmatics (Li, 2012). The researcher analysed adolescent beginners' acquisition of request modification strategies, which can be external, internal or both. External modification includes supportive moves such as grounders, preparators, disarmers, and so on. In internal modification, however, people making a request try to downgrade or mitigate what they want by using specific syntactic or lexical devices (Li, 2012). The researcher covered twelve dialogues including request modification strategies used in different social situations to teach all the three Grade 7 EFL classes in the study. He taught the first group explicitly by explaining the rules after analysing the dialogues. He taught the second group implicitly by using the same dialogues. The third group, the input-output group, got extremely implicit instruction; in other words, they got an exposure-only condition. Li (2012) concluded

that explicit teaching of request modifications did not cause immediate effects, so the participants in the first group could not perform well in the post-test. However, the effects of the explicit instruction were long-lasting considering the performance of the explicit group on the delayed post-test (Li, 2012). The reason why the findings of this study are different from those of the study by Halenko and Jones (2011) may be related to age factors. While younger learners can recall what they have covered in the class for a longer period of time, older learners may require revision lessons at a regular basis.

Most of the studies examining the importance of explicit or implicit instruction have included consciousness-raising tasks to increase learners' pragmatic awareness (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015). These studies concentrated on teaching L2 pragmatics from a cognitivist perspective and concluded that learners who were guided to think about the linguistic and sociopragmatic features like power and social distance between the interlocutors became more aware of these features following the treatment sessions (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Derakhshan & Eslami-Rasekh, 2015).

While some of the studies suggested that implicit teaching is effective in the instruction of speech acts, a great number of interventional studies on teaching speech acts concluded that explicit teaching is more influential in EFL classes (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

Deductive and Inductive Teaching of Speech Acts

Some research focusing on teaching speech acts in EFL classes in more efficient ways have investigated the relative effectiveness of *deductive* and *inductive*

teaching which is related to when and how to provide information during a lesson (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Takimoto, 2008). While the former approach provides learners with metapragmatic information on the accepted ways of using speech acts in the target language and then continues with activities to practice what has been covered, the latter approach introduces learners to how specific language features are used to encourage them to discover the rules related to the use of the target features (Glaser, 2013). While some studies have revealed the contribution of deductive teaching of speech acts, some other studies have focused on the importance of inductive teaching.

Some studies have aimed to analyse the effects of deductive teaching of speech acts. One of these studies was conducted by Alcon-Soler and Pitarch (2010) to evaluate the effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness by applying deductive teaching to provide the participants with refusal strategies. The participants in this study were 92 Spanish students who were studying in Translation at a university. The refusal strategies used in the series that they watched were identified and analysed so that the participants could become more aware of how the speech act of refusals can be used appropriately. The deductive instruction of refusals enabled the participants to improve their pragmatic awareness by focusing more on pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic features and caused them to pay less attention to linguistic forms (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010).

There have been some studies which have focused on investigating the effects of applying inductive teaching of speech acts in EFL classes. One of these studies was conducted by Takimoto (2008), who examined the effects of both approaches to teach how to use lexical/phrasal downgraders and syntactic downgraders in English while performing complex requests. The researcher randomly assigned the Japanese

participants whose ages ranged from 18-40 into one of four groups; a control group that received no special instruction in request making. The other three groups, the treatment groups, each received a different kind of instruction. The first treatment group received deductive instruction. The second one got inductive instruction which included problem-solving tasks, and the third one received inductive instruction which included structured input tasks (Takimoto, 2008). After the treatment sessions, all the participants took some tests: a discourse completion test (DCT), a role-play test, a listening test and an acceptability judgment test. The findings revealed that while there was no significant difference between the treatment groups in the tests during the treatment sessions, the group that received deductive teaching could not achieve the same performance level in the follow-up listening test, which caused the researcher to conclude that inductive approach helped the participants to process information about how to make a request better by storing it in their working memory (Takimoto, 2008).

The Use of Coursebooks to Teach Speech Acts

The research on how to teach speech acts has also focused on use of coursebooks in EFL classes since they are regarded as the core components of L2 instruction (İstifci, 2009; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

Limitations of EFL Coursebooks to Teach Speech Acts

Most of the studies on the effectiveness of EFL coursebooks in terms of teaching speech acts have revealed their inadequacy in providing necessary amount of frequency of speech acts, a variety of structures and strategies associated with specific speech acts (e.g. Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Delen & Tavi, 2010; Grant & Starks, 2001; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vellenga, 2004).

Vellenga (2004) analysed four EFL coursebooks and revealed that L2 learners cannot improve their pragmatic competence because the frequency of accepting requests, accepting invitations, refusal speech acts, and so on is limited in the coursebooks they analysed. Another study by Delen and Tavit (2010) evaluated eleven coursebooks used at intermediate level with a focus on request, refusal and complaints speech acts, which cause problems for Turkish EFL learners. The findings revealed that the coursebooks they analysed did not have sufficient frequency of refusal and complaint speech acts. Also, it was concluded that these books do not provide enough strategies regarding the use of the above-mentioned speech acts.

Aksoyalp and Toprak (2015) focused on how the speech acts of complaint as well as apology and suggestion speech acts were covered in seventeen coursebooks used at universities in Turkey. The coursebooks were designed for different proficiency levels from beginner to advanced. The study pointed out to the strong link between the proficiency level of the coursebooks and the frequency and difficulty level of the strategies covered. While simple, mostly sentence level utterances are provided in lower level coursebooks, more complex structures and idioms are used in advanced level books (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015). Although most of the research on EFL coursebooks in terms of teaching speech acts have focused on intermediate or more advanced level books, the study by Kohandani, Farzaneh, and Kazemi (2014) focused on how Top Notch Fundamentals, designed for beginner level students, and Top Notch 1, for false beginners, present speech acts. The study claimed that the conversations in the analysed books are not adequate with respect to providing pragmatic information.

How the speech act of suggestion is covered in five low-intermediate and five intermediate level coursebooks was investigated in a recent study by Yıldız-Ekin (2013) who reached the conclusion that the coursebooks she analysed did not provide enough contextual information. Also, the use of some specific structures like “should” or imperatives can cause learners to think that only these structures can be used while making a suggestion (Yıldız-Ekin, 2013).

As many studies have indicated a variety of problems related to EFL coursebooks (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Delen & Tavil, 2010; Grant & Starks, 2001; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vellenga, 2004; Yıldız-Ekin, 2013), there is a need for supplementing them preferably with authentic materials. These materials can provide sufficient exposure to input and different appropriate strategies (Jiang, 2006). The studies, which have revealed the limitations of coursebooks used in EFL classes, have led language teachers to look for supplementary materials. A number of studies which have suggested ways for teachers who are aware of the limitations of coursebooks have concentrated on the use of technology to improve learners’ L2 pragmatic competence.

Using Technology for Instruction of Pragmatic Competence

Some studies aimed to enable learners to improve their pragmatic competence through guided practice accompanying movie viewing, which can provide language learners with an opportunity to have more contextualized input (Abrams, 2014; Derakhshan & Eslami-Rasekh, 2015). Abrams (2014) investigated the effectiveness of using movies in her low-level German class. The researcher applied a pre-test before having the learners watch some parts of the movie, *The Edukator*, to determine whether there would be some improvements in terms of her students’ level of pragmatic competence, in particular how the learners could be regarded as more

polite in the target language. The pre-test included three situations which the participants read and responded to considering the social level of their interlocutors. The students in the treatment group watched the movie for 10-15 minutes and analysed some parts to raise their pragmatic awareness while the students in the control group only answered the comprehension questions on these segments without focusing on any pragmatic aspects. After the treatment sessions, the researcher had the participants take a post-test, which had the same prompts with the pre-test. The findings revealed that the students who analysed the movie outperformed the ones in the control group by improving their pragmatic competence and using more mitigating devices, a variety of conjunctions, and vocabulary items (Abrams, 2014).

Derakhshan and Eslami-Rasekh (2015) designed a study to investigate how technology could be used to improve the competence of EFL learners in speech acts. The researchers specifically aimed to investigate the effects of consciousness-raising video-driven prompts on the participants' pragmatic development of apology and request speech acts. They worked with 60 upper-intermediate Persian EFL learners who were divided into three groups: discussion, role play, and interactive translation. After the administration of a pre-test, the researchers had all of the groups watch 36 (18 requests and 18 apologies) video vignettes from different episodes of *the Flash Forward*, *Stargate* series, and the movie *Annie Hall*. The purpose of the researchers in exposing the participants to these vignettes was to help them become aware of the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic features. After the treatment sessions and the analysis sessions, Derakhshan and Eslami- Rasekh (2015) concluded that over a 4-week period, the EFL learners improved their pragmatic ability in terms of making direct requests, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect requests and also apologizing by employing a variety of strategies. Having made some

conclusions based on the findings, Derakhshan and Eslami-Rasekh (2015) also suggested that teachers should use some videos in their classes so that their students can be exposed to a variety of conversational exchanges supported by contextualized input.

Another significant study by Alcon (2005) investigated the effect of using some vignettes taken from the TV series *Stargate* on the competency level of learners in the use of request strategies. The three groups (explicit, implicit and control) watched some excerpts including requests. The study revealed that all of the groups improved their ability to use request strategies, but the group that received explicit instruction, which included awareness-raising tasks and written metapragmatic feedback outperformed both the implicit and the control group.

Another study, which benefitted from some excerpts taken from the TV series *Stargate* to teach speech acts, was conducted by Alcon-Soler and Pitarch (2010). The study applied explicit deductive approach to teach refusals to 92 Spanish participants who were students in the Degree of Translation at university. The participants were exposed to some video-prompts extracted from the series and analysed the strategies used in the excerpts with the help of some questions such as “is the refusal sequence realized directly or indirectly?”, “how is it initiated?”, and “who initiates the sequence?” (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010). Then, in a teacher-led activity, the speech act set was explained by focusing on pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features. As the third step, the participants in the explicit group were asked to analyse some tapescripts including refusals. The researchers concluded that learners’ awareness of pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics increased after the instructional treatment, which included some videos providing contextualized input and a variety of

strategies to use the speech act of refusal appropriately in different social situations (Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010).

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the literature on L2 pragmatics, the instruction of speech acts in EFL classes and the limitations of most of the examined EFL coursebooks. It also has provided information revealed by some studies concentrated on how to teach speech acts in EFL contexts by integrating videos. As shown in the studies reviewed in this section, the studies mostly focused on the performance of high level learners. Some studies included both low and high level learners to evaluate what they can perform through cross-linguistic and cross-sectional studies. However, a limited number of studies have been conducted to teach speech acts to improve L2 pragmatic competence of low-level learners. That's why, this study focuses on the effects of viewing pre-selected video clips on low level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts.

The next chapter will present the methodology in terms of the setting, participants and procedures to collect and analyse the data.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary aim of this mixed-method (QUAN-qual) study was to investigate the effects of viewing pre-selected video-clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts. The secondary aim was to find out what other factors contributed to any changes, if any, in this group of learners' competences with regards to the use of speech acts. The study was conducted at the Department of Basic English (DBE) at Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Turkey. This chapter gives information about the setting, participants, instruments, data collection and analysis methods. The study was aimed at finding answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of viewing pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts?
2. What other factors contribute to changes, if any, in low level learners' use of speech acts?

Setting

The participants of this study were 42 low-intermediate level students in the Department of Basic English (DBE) at Middle East Technical University (METU). Students who could not pass or did not take the proficiency exam at the beginning of the year are placed at different levels considering their performance in the placement exam administered at the beginning of the first semester. In the second semester, the classes are reconstructed considering students' performance in the first semester in

accordance with some regulations at the institution. The students are placed in the following levels in the second semester: Pre-intermediate, which is a term used by low-intermediate classes at METU, intermediate, upper-intermediate and advanced. The students who participated in this study were chosen among the low-intermediate students from three different classes in the second semester of the academic year 2105-2016.

Low-intermediate level students were chosen for three reasons. The first reason is that the coursebooks do not provide enough input on speech acts. Although students at this level get reading, listening, writing, speaking instruction in the first term as well as vocabulary and grammar instruction, these students usually do not receive enough instruction in L2 pragmatics, in particular how to use speech acts appropriately in a variety of contexts. Most of the coursebooks used in these classes do not include any sections focusing on teaching L2 pragmatics. Only the commercial book, *Language Leader Pre-Intermediate*, used at this level has sections at the end of each unit which require students to have speaking activities based on what they have covered in that particular unit. However, these sections fail in covering strategies necessary to use in different contexts, and they cannot provide sufficient contextualized input. The second reason is that speech acts are a part of the proficiency exam. The proficiency exam has two parts testing their pragmatic ability: “response to a situation” and “dialogue completion”. Low-intermediate level learners need to have competence in using speech acts, which is required to get points from the above-mentioned parts in the exam. As these are ten items, each of which is out of one point, students who can give correct answers can get ten points in total. It can make a huge difference in such an exam. The third reason is speech acts are important for communication to be able to express themselves in English without

experiencing miscommunication or communication breakdowns. However, low-intermediate learners who do not get specific instruction in speech acts have difficulty participating in the lesson, which hinders their performance both in the DBE and their own department. Also, these students have difficulty in listening or reading activities which require them to find the intended meaning.

Participants

42 Turkish students, 18 male and 24 female, whose ages ranged from 18 to 21 participated in this study voluntarily. The students in these three low-intermediate classes got a consent form which explained the research practices to avoid any possible controversies related to the confidentiality of personal data (Hesse-Biber, 2010). The participants were informed that their participation was on a voluntary basis; their identities would not be revealed and their answers in the tests would not have any effects on their overall score. After the participants signed the consent form indicating that they allowed the researcher to use the data they provided for academic purposes, the researcher gave the perception questionnaire to collect detailed information about the perceptions of the participants.

Three instructors who taught these classes throughout the semester were also interviewed to get more data about factors affecting learners' competency level in speech acts because of what these teachers did in their classes. These teachers were asked to share whether they focused on teaching speech acts by sharing their ideas on teaching them, which might have caused the possible differences among the classes. These instructors had 9 to 12 years of teaching experience when the study was being conducted.

Instruments

To analyse the effects of pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' competence in speech acts and find out what factors contribute to learning speech acts in low-level classes, discourse completion tests (DCTs), index cards, a perception questionnaire given to the participants, semi-structured interviews with the teachers were employed.

Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs)

Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) have been used to collect data in most of the studies on pragmatics for several reasons. First of all, they can enable researchers to gather information about how language, especially speech acts are used by providing participants with a real-life like task in which participants write what they would say in specific situations. They can also help researchers collect data in a shorter time compared to field notes which require researchers to write down what is produced in real life conversations (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010).

A written DCT was prepared by the researcher after getting feedback from two native speaker instructors. It was used as a pre-test to find out which speech acts the participants needed to learn more about in the treatment sessions. The DCT, consisting of 20 items in total, included two parts (see Appendix B1). The first part included eighteen items which required the participants to read the situations and write a response considering the situation. The second part included two dialogues with a missing part that the participants needed to complete in an appropriate way by taking the context into consideration. Both of the parts aimed to test the participants' competence level in speech acts in English. The following speech acts were covered in the pre-test: refusals (to a suggestion, request, an offer and invitation), request, offer, complaint, suggestion, apology, permission, invitation, and responding to a

compliment (see Appendix G). The analysis of the responses on the pre-test determined which speech acts were covered during the treatment sessions (see Appendix I1).

Another DCT, which was also prepared by the researcher, was used as a mid-test to investigate the effectiveness of the treatment sessions in the study. The mid-test was given after covering all the speech acts which the participants had difficulty in while responding to the items in the pre-test (see Table 1).

Table 1

Speech Acts Tested in the Mid and Post-Test

| Item | Speech Act | Distance | Status |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1. | Offer | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 2. | Refusing a request | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 3. | Invitation | Acquaintance | Equal |
| 4. | Request | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 5. | Invitation | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 6. | Receiving a compliment | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 7. | Suggestion | Close | Equal |
| 8. | Complaint | Close | Equal |
| 9. | Complaint | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 10. | Suggestion | Acquaintance | Lower |

Unlike the pre-test, the mid-test consisted of only “response to a situation” part requiring the use of the speech acts which were taught explicitly in the treatment sessions through the incorporation of the video clips and the awareness-raising activities (see Appendix B2). The reason for having only “response to a situation”

part was to increase the validity rate by preventing students from writing sentences using the keywords in other parts of a dialogue, which would be misleading for the researcher. It was called mid-test since the participants learned the grades assigned to their responses, which might have caused learning more about how to use the speech acts.

The post-test, which was designed by the researcher in the format of a DCT, was administered four weeks after the last intervention session to better investigate the effectiveness of the treatment sessions based on the integration of some video clips. The post-test included situations (see Table 1) similar to the ones used in the mid-test in a new DCT. It included the speech acts which were taught during the treatment sessions so that the durability of those sessions could be examined (see Appendix B3).

Index Cards

To be able to determine other factors contributing to possible improvement of the participants' competence in speech acts, the researcher asked the participants to fill-in the index cards prepared by herself. The participants wrote how long they watched videos in a week by giving details about the type and the name of those videos, which could also help them become exposed to speech acts and improve their competence (see Appendix C). While analyzing the data, only descriptive results were shared since inferential statistics would not be meaningful because there was only one participant in the last group named.

Perception Questionnaire

The researcher asked the participants to fill in the questionnaire prepared by herself so that what the participants thought about the effectiveness of the treatment

sessions and what they do outside the class to improve their competence in speech acts could be investigated (see Appendix D).

Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews with the instructors who taught the classes were held to get more data about other factors contributing to the improvement of the participants' competence. The instructors were asked to share what they thought about teaching speech acts, whether they taught them in class, what they did to deal with speech acts in English, and so on (see Appendix E). The interviews were used as a data-gathering tool because interviews can be employed to collect data on participants' beliefs, feelings, and so on about what is investigated (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh & Sorensen, 2006).

Semi-structured interview type was used as it enabled the researcher to ask the pre-determined questions as well as new ones shaped through an interview (Ary et al, 2006). The interviews, which were done in English, were transcribed for data analysis (see Appendix F).

Videos Used During the Treatment Sessions

The treatment sessions lasted for four weeks in three different low-level Turkish EFL classes. A different speech act (see Table 1) was covered in each treatment session. The videos were extracted from *youtube.com*. The video clips were chosen among the scenes of the television series named *The Big Bang Theory*, *Game of Thrones*, and *Breaking Bad* (see Appendix K2). The participants watched two or three video clips in each session and completed the tasks, in which they focused on how the speech act was used in the scene and how other structures and strategies can be used in similar or different social situations (see Appendix K1).

Procedures

The pre-test in the form of a DCT was prepared by making the necessary changes after getting feedback from two native speaker instructors. Then, it was piloted in a low-intermediate level class in the same institution. The pre-test aimed to determine whether the participants were competent in using the speech acts of requests, refusals, offers, complaints, suggestions, receiving compliments, apologies, permissions, and invitations (see Appendix G). The evaluation of the participants' responses was completed by using the rubric adapted from what is used in the institution (see Appendix H1). A native speaker instructor guided the researcher especially about which response can be accepted as socially appropriate while analyzing and grading the responses. Table 2 displays grades assigned to sample responses in the pre-test.

Table 2

Sample Scoring of the DCTs

| Speech Act | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------|-------------|
| Refusing a suggestion - | I heard that the café's meals are too expensive, so why don't we cook pasta? | 1 | Appropriate |
| Equal status person – | I think this café isn't good idea. We should go to cheaper than this one. | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| Acquaintance | I think we mustn't go to the café. | 0.5 | Social |
| (Pre-test -Item 1) (see Appendix I) | I think we will have lunch who wants to wherever, later we will meet in there. | 0 | Linguistic |
| | I don't want to come with you. | 0 | Social |

As shown in Table 2, all the responses were assigned a score considering whether they are appropriate in the given social context by using the rubric which was formed by adapting the rubric used in the institution (see Appendix H2). If the structure was

used accurately and if it was socially appropriate as well, the participant got “1”. However, the participant got “0.5” when there was a linguistic mistake resulting from the use of an inappropriate tense, structure, vocabulary item and so on. Also, a response which was not considered polite enough in the given context, the participant was assigned “0.5.” The participants got “0” if their response either was incomprehensible because of linguistic problems or was considered impolite because of cultural factors (see Appendix I1).

After the analysis was completed, the speech acts in which the participants needed treatment sessions were determined (see Appendix J). The treatment sessions, which were held by applying explicit-inductive approach, included the viewing of some video clips extracted from “*youtube.com*” which included some scenes from *The Big Bang Theory*, *Game of Thrones*, and *Breaking Bad* (see Appendix K2). The treatment sessions had almost the same order. After a warm-up session, the participants watched a video clip including the specific speech act while completing the chart to analyse the relationship between the interlocutors, which aimed to cause them to pay attention to the speech act and raise their consciousness to help them better comprehend. After the feedback, the participants were asked to think about other structures which can be employed while using the speech act covered in the treatment session. A list of structures was reflected on the board, and the handout was distributed to the participants. Then, the structures were analysed focusing on the distance and power relations between the interlocutors. After giving feedback, the participants were asked to choose a role-card. They read their situation and had two minutes to think about what they would say to their partner during the role-play activity (see Appendix K1). The pairs had their conversations which included the speech act. Then, some pairs acted out in front of the others who

answered the questions about the relationship between the pairs while listening to them. After the performance of each pair, the questions were checked and the feedback was given considering the appropriateness of how the speech act was used in the role-play activity.

While the treatment sessions were being held, the participants were asked to complete the index cards every day to provide information on whether they watched videos, and if so, how long they watched videos. They were required to give information about the type of videos they watched. After the last treatment session was held, the participants were also asked to fill in the questionnaire designed to learn about their perceptions on the treatment sessions including the video clips.

After the treatment sessions, two of the instructors who taught the participants, in three different low-intermediate level classes, throughout the term in which the study was conducted were interviewed to collect data on whether they taught speech acts, how they taught them, and so on. The interviews aimed to find out other factors contributed to any changes in the participants' pragmatic competence in speech acts. However, one of the instructors provided written answers since she did not want to be audio recorded.

Having completed the treatment sessions in four weeks, the researcher administered the mid-test to determine the effects of the sessions including the video clips. The responses were evaluated with the help of the same native speaker instructor by using the same rubric used in the evaluation of the pre-test (see Appendix I2). Four weeks after the mid-test, the participants were asked to take a new test in the form of DCT which was used as a post-test to investigate the durability of the treatment sessions. The same rubric was employed to evaluate the responses on the post-test to analyse the data (see Appendix I3).

Data Analysis

The responses on the pre-test, which was administered to analyse the competency of the participants in using above-mentioned speech acts in English, were evaluated by the researcher and a native speaker instructor working at the institution, using a rubric adapted from the one used at the DBE to grade the parts testing pragmatic competence of students (see Appendix H1 and Appendix H2). After the analysis of the responses, the speech acts which were taught explicitly in the treatment sessions were determined.

Having completed the treatment sessions, the researcher asked the participants to write their responses on the mid-test, which was designed to investigate the effectiveness of the treatment sessions. The responses were evaluated with the same native speaker instructor by using the same rubric.

To better investigate how effective the treatment sessions were, a post-test was administered in the form of another DCT, which also included only the covered speech acts. The data collected via the evaluation of the responses on the three tests were analysed through one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which can be used to assess the differences in the means of more than three groups (Dörnyei, 2007). The data were analysed by using descriptive statistics.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology part, which includes details about the setting, participants, instruments, and data analysis processes are described. The following chapter will include details about the findings of the study which also includes descriptive analysis.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study aimed to analyze the effects of pre-selected video-clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' competence in using speech acts. It also concentrated on finding out what other factors contributed to any changes in this group of learners' competence in terms of using speech acts. This chapter presents the analysis of the data and the results to address the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of viewing pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts?
2. What other factors contribute to changes, if any, in low level learners' use of speech acts?

The study was conducted at the Department of Basic English (DBE) at Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Turkey. The data were collected in the second semester of the academic year 2015-2016 with the participation of 42 students in three different low-intermediate level classes. To collect the data, discourse completion tests (DCTs), a perception questionnaire, a semi-structured interview with the instructors and index cards were used.

The Analysis of the DCT Scores

The first part of this chapter concentrates on the findings based on the analysis of the scores assigned to the DCT items which were used before and after the treatment sessions to find answers to the following research question:

RQ1. What are the effects of viewing pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts?

The responses to the DCT items which tested the competency of the participants in using a specific speech act in the pre, mid and the post-test were analyzed, and a score was assigned to each response considering whether the responses were appropriate in the given situations. Then, the scores were analyzed by conducting a one-way ANOVA test to find out whether there were any statistically significant differences among the scores after the treatment sessions, which included the use of pre-selected video clips.

The video clips provided audio-visual input including the use of a variety of structures to use the speech acts determined after the analysis of the pre-test. They also provided different strategies considering the power relations between the interlocutors. To find answers to RQ 1, the responses were analyzed comparatively to find out whether the participants used the structures accurately and the strategies appropriately by considering the social status of the interlocutors. Therefore, the results are presented in three main parts as in the following:

1. Responses to a higher-status person
2. Responses to an equal-status person
3. Responses to lower-status people

The Analysis of the Responses to a Higher-Status Person

Six of the DCT items in the mid and the post-test concentrated on whether the participants could use appropriate responses while talking to a higher-status person.

Making an Offer

A one-way ANOVA test was run to determine whether there were some statistically significant differences among the scores assigned to the pre-, mid and post-test items which required the participants to use the speech act of making an offer. Table 3 shows the results of the one-way ANOVA test for the speech act of

“making an offer to a higher status person” (DCT # 6 in the pre-test / DCT # 1 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 3

One-way ANOVA Results for “Making an Offer to a Higher Status Person”

| Speech Act | Test Type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------|-----|--------|-------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Making an offer to a higher status person | Pre-test | .35 | .36 | 2, 123 | 10.66 | .000 |
| | Mid-test | .54 | .37 | | | |
| | Post-test | .71 | .37 | | | |

As indicated in Table 3, one-way ANOVA test results showed that there was a significant effect of the pre-selected video clips at the at the $p < 01$ level considering the scores of the participants in the three tests $F(2, 123) = 10.66, p = .00$.

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the pre-test was not significantly different from the mid-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .49$). However, there was a statistically significant difference between the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .35, SD = .55$) and the post-test ($\bar{x} = .71, SD = .37$) with $p < .01$ ($p = .00$). These results suggest that the participants could produce more appropriate responses in the post-test mostly because of the written and oral feedback given to the mid-test item.

Refusing a Request

Another one-way ANOVA test was applied to find out whether there were any statistically significant differences among the pre, mid and post-test scores related to the item which focused on the speech act of refusal. Table 4 shows the

results for the one-way ANOVA test for “refusing a request from a higher status person” (DCT # 3 in the pre-test / DCT # 2 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 4

One-way ANOVA Results for “Refusing a Request from a Higher Status Person”

| Speech Act | Test type | \bar{X} | SD | One-way ANOVA | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----|---------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Refusing a request from a higher status person | Pre-test | .37 | .37 | 2.123 | 22.47 | .000 |
| | Mid-test | .75 | .30 | | | |
| | Post-test | .80 | .29 | | | |

As indicated in Table 4, one-way ANOVA test results showed that there was a significant effect of the pre-selected video clips at the at the $p < .01$ level for the three test types $F(2, 123) = 22.47, p = .00$.

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .37, SD = .37$) was statistically significantly different from the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .75, SD = .30$) and the post-test ($\bar{x} = .80, SD = .29$) with $p < .01$ ($p = .00$). There was not a statistically significant difference between the mid-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .78$). These results suggest that the participants could produce more appropriate responses after analyzing the pre-selected videos. They could also use much more appropriate strategies and structures in the post-test, which showed that analyzing the video clips enabled the participants remember what they learnt over a long period.

Making a Request

The responses to the items in the pre, mid and post-test were also analyzed to find out whether there were any statistically significant differences among them with respect to the appropriateness of the use of request speech act. The items required the participants to make a request to a higher status person. Table 5 shows the results (DCT # 4 in the pre-test / DCT # 4 in the mid and post test).

Table 5

One-way ANOVA Results for “Making a Request to a Higher Status Person”

| Speech Act | Test type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----|-------|------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Making a Request to a Higher Status Person | Pre-test | .57 | .30 | 2.123 | 1.12 | .331 |
| | Mid-test | .61 | .34 | | | |
| | Post-test | .49 | .46 | | | |

As shown in Table 5, one-way ANOVA test revealed that there was no significant effect of the pre-selected video clips at the at the $p > .01$ level for the three test types $F(2, 123) = 1.12, p = .33$.

Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test revealed that the mean score for the pre-test was not significantly different from the mid-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .90$). There is no statistically significance difference between the pre-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .57$) and between the mid-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .32$).

Invitation

One of the DCT items in each test focused on the speech act of invitation.

Table 6 shows the differences among how appropriate the responses were in all the tests (DCT # 18 in the pre-test / DCT # 5 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 6

One-way ANOVA Results for "Invitation of a Higher Status Person"

| Speech Act | Test type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----|-------|------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Invitation of a Higher Status Person | Pre-test | .43 | .39 | 2.123 | 1.19 | .307 |
| | Mid-test | .56 | .39 | | | |
| | Post-test | .49 | .39 | | | |

As Table 6 indicates, another one-way ANOVA test results showed that there was no significant effect of the pre-selected video clips at the at the $p > .01$ level for the above mentioned test scores $F(2, 123) = 1.19, p = .31$.

After the application of Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test, it was found out that the mean score for the pre-test was not significantly different from the mid-test with $p = .28$, and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .76$). Also, there was not a statistically significant difference between the mid-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .68$). The findings suggest that the participants benefitted from the textbook and what they did in the class to master the speech act as well as making use of the treatment sessions.

Responding to a Compliment

Another test was run to find out whether the responses given to a compliment became more appropriate while talking to a higher status person. Table 7 shows the

results of the one- way ANOVA test (DCT # 20 in the pre-test / DCT # 6 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 7

One-way ANOVA Results for “Responding to a Compliment from a Higher Status Person”

| Speech Act | Test type | \bar{X} | SD | One-way ANOVA | | |
|--|------------|-----------|-----|---------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Responding to a Compliment from a Higher Status Person | Pre-test | .32 | .36 | 2.123 | 16.23 | .000 |
| | Mid-test | .70 | .40 | | | |
| | Post -test | .75 | .37 | | | |

Table 7 indicates that the treatment sessions caused a statistically significant difference at the $p < .01$ level after comparing the scores gained in the tests. $F(2, 123) = 16.23, p = .00$.

Taking the Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test results into consideration, it can be concluded that the mean score for the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .32, SD = .36$) was significantly different from the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .70, SD = .40$) and the post-test ($\bar{x} = .75, SD = .37$) with $p < .01$. The results suggest that the participants made use of the video-clips and the feedback given in the treatment sessions while concentrating on how to respond to a compliment. There was not a statistically significant difference between the mid-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .83$). This finding suggests that the effects of the treatment sessions were significant, so the participants could provide appropriate responses in the post-test as well.

Complaint

Having analyzed the responses to the DCT item which focused on how to make a complaint about a higher status person, the researcher applied another one-way ANOVA test to find out whether there were any differences among the scores in terms of the level of appropriateness (see Table 8) (DCT # 10 in the pre-test / DCT # 9 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 8

One-way ANOVA Results for "Complaint- a Higher Status Person"

| Speech Act | Test type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Complaint - A Higher Status Person | Pre-test | .38 | .35 | 2.123 | 2.641 | .075 |
| | Mid-test | .56 | .39 | | | |
| | Post-test | .42 | .40 | | | |

Table 8 shows that there was not a statistically significant difference at the $p < .01$ level among the scores of the participants considering the level of appropriateness in the pre, post and the post-test $F(2, 123) = 2.64, p = .075$.

Based on the Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test results, it can be concluded that the level of the appropriateness of the responses increased in the mid-test. However, the mean score for the pre-test was not significantly different from the mid-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .08$). Also, there was not a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test with $p = .90$. Another finding was that the mean score for the mid-test was not significantly different from the post-test score with $p > .01$ ($p = .20$). The results suggest that the participants became more

competent in using more appropriate strategies and structures to complain about a person of a higher status in time.

The Analysis of the Responses to an Equal-Status Person

The analysis of the pre-test indicated that the participants had some difficulty in giving appropriate responses while talking to an equal-status person, especially when they needed to use the speech acts of invitation, suggestion, and complaint. Therefore, the treatment sessions included some video clips in which the above mentioned speech acts were used in a variety of contexts. The analysis of the mid and the post-test scores helped to find out whether the treatment sessions caused a statistically significant difference.

Invitation

To analyze the differences in terms of the appropriateness of the responses given to the test items, another one-way ANOVA test was employed. Table 9 shows the results for the speech act of invitation with a focus on how to invite a person of equal status (DCT # 17 in the pre-test / DCT # 3 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 9

One-way ANOVA Results for "Invitation of an Equal Status Person"

| Speech Act | Test type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Invitation of an Equal Status Person | Pre-test | .11 | .21 | 2.123 | 44.49 | .000 |
| | Mid-test | .73 | .42 | | | |
| | Post-test | .68 | .35 | | | |

Table 9 indicates that one-way ANOVA test revealed a significant effect of the pre-selected video clips at the at the $p < .01$ level for the three test types $F(2, 123) = 44.49, p = .00$.

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test showed that the mean score for the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .11, SD = .21$) was significantly different from the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .73, SD = .42$) and the post-test ($\bar{x} = .68, SD = .35$) with $p < .01$ ($p = .00$). These results suggest that the responses after analyzing the pre-selected videos were became more appropriate. There was not a statistically significant difference between the mid-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .79$). The participants could produce much more appropriate responses in the post-test because of the increase in the amount of the exposure. It shows that the analysis of the video clips and the activities in the treatment sessions had a longer effect.

Suggestion

The responses to the pre, mid and the post-test items related to the speech act of suggestion were examined. The following table gives information about the statistically significant difference among the scores given to the items testing the speech act of suggestion with a focus on equal status people. (DCT # 12 in the pre-test / DCT # 7 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 10

One-way ANOVA Results for "Suggestion to an Equal Status Person"

| Speech Act | Test type | \bar{X} | SD | One-way ANOVA | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----|---------------|------|------|
| | | | | df | F | p |
| Suggestion to an Equal Status Person | Pre-test | .49 | .45 | 2.123 | 7.08 | .001 |
| | Mid-test | .75 | .30 | | | |
| | Post -test | .76 | .37 | | | |

As indicated in Table 10, one-way ANOVA test results revealed that the difference among the scores was statistically significant at the level of $p < .01$ $F(2, 123) = 7.08$, $p = .001$.

The Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test results indicated that the mean score for the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .49$, $SD = .45$) was significantly different from the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .75$, $SD = .30$) and the post-test ($\bar{x} = .76$, $SD = .37$) with $p < .01$. There was not a statistically significant difference between the mid-test and the post-test with $p > .01$ ($p = .99$). The results suggest that the participants made use of the treatment sessions and the video-clips analyzed in the session, which caused them to use more appropriate strategies and structures in the mid and the post-test while making a suggestion to equal status people.

Complaint

Another one-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the scores of the participants after evaluating the responses to the items which required them to complain about an equal status person (see Table 11) (DCT # 9 in the pre-test / DCT # 8 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 11

One-way ANOVA Results for "Complaint- an Equal Status Person"

| Speech Act | Test type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | p |
| Complaint- An Equal Status Person | Pre-test | .32 | .38 | 2.123 | 8.886 | .000 |
| | Mid-test | .68 | .38 | | | |
| | Post-test | .49 | .41 | | | |

Table 11 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .01$ level after comparing the scores the participants got in the pre, mid and the post-test $F(2, 123) = 8.89, p = .00$.

The Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test results show that the mean score for the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .32, SD = .38$) was significantly different from the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .68, SD = .38$) with $p < .01$. However, the difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores was not statistically significant with $p > .01$ ($p = .12$). The difference between the mid-test and the post-test was not statistically significant with $p > .01$ ($p = .07$). The results suggest that the participants became more competent in using some strategies and structures considered to be more appropriate while making a complaint, and this increase in their competency level was remarkable.

The Analysis of the Responses to Lower-Status People

The analysis of the pre-test revealed that the participants could produce mostly appropriate sentences for the DCT items which required them to respond to a lower status person. However, most of the participants had difficulty in making a suggestion to lower status people while responding to an item in the pre-test. Therefore, the treatment sessions included some video clips to teach appropriate structures and strategies in making a suggestion considering interlocutors at different status. The last DCT item both in the mid and the post-test aimed to reveal whether the sessions caused a statistically significant difference.

Suggestion

Another one-way ANOVA test was applied to check whether the participants improved their competence in using the speech act of suggestion while interacting with lower status people. The test results are shared in Table 12 (DCT # 11 in the pre-test / DCT # 10 in the mid and the post-test).

Table 12

One-way ANOVA Results for “Suggestion to Lower Status People”

| Speech Act | Test type | One-way ANOVA | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------|-----|-------|--------|----------|
| | | \bar{X} | SD | df | F | <i>p</i> |
| Suggestion to Lower Status People | Pre-test | .13 | .22 | 2.123 | 38.027 | .000 |
| | Mid-test | .45 | .40 | | | |
| | Post-test | .77 | .37 | | | |

As shown in Table 12, there was a statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.01$ level considering the scores of the participants with respect to the level of appropriateness in the pre, mid and the post-test $F(2, 123) = 38.03, p = .00$.

According to the Post hoc comparisons and the Tukey HSD test results, the mean score for the pre-test ($\bar{x} = .13, SD = .22$) was significantly different from the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .45, SD = .40$) with $p < .01$. Also, the mid-test ($\bar{x} = .45, SD = .40$) was statistically different from the post-test ($\bar{x} = .77, SD = .37$) with $p < .01$. The results reveal that the level of the appropriateness of the responses increased after the treatment sessions.

The Analysis of Factors Causing Possible Changes

A perception questionnaire was used to find answers to the following research question:

RQ2: What other factors contribute to changes, if any, in low level learners' using speech acts?

The questionnaire also included items to find out whether video clips they watched outside the class contributed to learning more about the use of speech acts. Also, semi-structured interviews with the instructors were held to get more

information about possible factors which might have caused changes in the competence level of learners in terms of using speech acts. Finally, the index cards were used to get data about other factors which can result in an increase in the participants' pragmatic competence in using speech acts. The cards required the participants to share whether they watched video clips outside the class. The ones who watched videos were asked to share information about what kind of programs they watched and how long they watched them. The following parts give information about the findings after the analysis of the data provided by these measures.

The Analysis of the Perception Questionnaire

The participants were also asked to complete a 6 point Likert-scale questionnaire prepared by the researcher with the help of the feedback provided by her thesis advisor. It included three parts. In the first part, the participants commented on whether the video-clips contributed to learning the appropriate use of the speech acts in class. In the second part, they were asked to share ideas on whether they started to pay attention to the relationship among the characters, different strategies and structures related to the use of speech acts in videos they watched outside the class. The last part required them to comment on the affective factors like the level of their motivation, competency, and so on.

51 students filled-in the questionnaire in the same class hour; however, the ones who did not take any of the pre, mid or post-tests were excluded. Therefore, the responses of 42 students were analysed through descriptive statistics by using the SPSS (Version 22) to find out whether the participants thought the use of the video-clips to teach the speech acts in low-intermediate classes was beneficial for them in terms of the following parts:

1. the contribution to learning in class
2. the contribution to learning outside class
3. the effects on the affective factors

The Contribution to Learning in Class

The average scores of the responses given to each part was calculated by taking the 6 point Likert-scale into consideration. The results, which were obtained by calculating the scores of each student for each question in part 1, are presented in the following table.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics of the Perception Questionnaire Part 1

| | N | Min. Score | Max. Score | \bar{X} | SD |
|--|----|---------------|---------------|-----------|------|
| 1. The video clips helped me understand better the level of distance between the speakers and the listeners. | 42 | 2 | 6 | 4.33 | 1.00 |
| 2. The video clips helped me understand better the status of the speakers and the listeners. | 42 | 2 | 6 | 4.50 | .83 |
| 3. The visual input in the video clips helped me understand better the conversational situations/contexts. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 4.21 | 1.22 |
| 4. The video clips provided different strategies to use speech acts. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 4.02 | 1.41 |
| 5. The video clips provided different structures. | 42 | 2 | 6 | 4.17 | 1.27 |
| Part 1: Contribution to in-class learning (Overall Results) | 42 | 11 | 30 | 21.24 | 4.37 |

As seen in Table 13, the mean score for the first item in Part 1 was 4.33 with a standard deviation of 1.00, which indicated that the participants thought that the video clips used in the treatment sessions helped them understand better the level of distance between the speakers and the listeners. As for the second item in this part, the mean score was 4.50 with a standard deviation of .83. This showed that the participants found the video clips beneficial to better understand the status of the speakers and the listeners. The third item was prepared to find out whether the participants found the visual input in the video clips helpful to better understand the conversational situations/contexts. The mean score was 4.21 with a standard deviation of 1.22, which revealed that the visual input was adequate for most of the participants. The 4th item in this part required the participants to share whether they thought the video clips provided different strategies to use speech acts or not. The mean score was 4.02 with a standard deviation of 1.41. The last one in Part 1 focused on the perceptions of the participants on whether they thought the video clips provided different structures. The mean score was 4.17 with a standard deviation of 1.27. This result indicated that the video clips helped students to learn different structures to use speech acts.

The overall results were also analyzed for Part 1. The mean for 42 students was 21.24 out of 30, which is equal to 70.8 out of 100. The findings suggest that a great percent of the participants found the video-clips useful for learning in class.

The Contribution to Learning outside Class

The responses given to Part 2 were also statistically analyzed to find out what the participants thought about the contribution to learning outside the class. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics of the Perception Questionnaire Part 2

| | N | Min. Score | Max. Score | \bar{X} | SD |
|--|----|---------------|---------------|-----------|------|
| 1. I have started to analyse the relation among the characters in the videos I watch outside the class. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 3.69 | 1.55 |
| 2. I have started to pay attention to strategies to use speech acts in the videos I watch outside the class. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 3.64 | 1.45 |
| 3. I have started to pay attention to the speech acts used in the videos I watch outside the class. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 3.69 | 1.39 |
| Part 2: Contribution to outside-class learning | 42 | 3 | 18 | 10.9 | 3.99 |
| (Overall Scores) | | | | 8 | |

As seen in Table 14, the mean score for the first item in Part 2 was 3.69 with a standard deviation of 1.55. This result showed that although 23 of the participants shared that they started to analyse the relation among the characters in the videos they watched outside the class, the rest of them did not focus on this much. The second one required the participants to think about whether they started to pay attention to strategies in the videos they watched outside the class to use speech acts more appropriately. The mean score was 3.64 with a standard deviation of 1.45. This indicated that 18 of the participants did not focus on the videos to learn more about strategies outside the class. The last item in Part 2 was aimed at finding out whether the participants paid attention to speech acts while watching videos outside the class. The mean score was 3.69 with a standard deviation of 1.39. This result also indicated

that the number of the participants who paid attention to videos to learn more about speech acts outside the class was not high.

The mean score for the overall responses to the items in Part 2 was 10.98, which is equal to 61 out of 100. The analysis of this part indicates that the use of video-clips was considered to be beneficial for their learning more about speech acts outside the class. However, this contribution was not regarded as high as the contribution to their in-class learning.

The Effects on the Affective Factors

Part 3 was prepared to investigate the effects of using the video clips on the affecting factors. The results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics of the Perception Questionnaire Part 3

| | N | Min. Score | Max. Score | \bar{X} | SD |
|---|----|---------------|---------------|-----------|------|
| 1. I liked learning about the speech acts because of the integration of the video clips. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 4.24 | 1.34 |
| 2. I paid attention during the lessons for a longer time. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 3.86 | 1.28 |
| 3. I think the use of video clips makes it easier to learn more about how to use speech acts. | 42 | 2 | 6 | 4.45 | 1.06 |
| 4. I feel more competent in using the speech acts covered in the lessons. | 42 | 1 | 6 | 3.62 | 1.10 |
| Part 3: The effects on the affecting factors (Overall Scores) | 42 | 10 | 24 | 16.17 | 3.49 |

As indicated in Table 15, the mean score for the first item was 4.24 with a standard deviation of 1.34, which indicated that most of the participants liked learning about the speech acts because of the integration of the video clips. The mean score for the second item was 3.86 with a standard deviation of 1.28. This indicated that 30 of the participants paid attention during the lessons for a longer time because of watching the video clips. The third item aimed to find out whether the participants thought the use of video clips made it easier to learn more about how to use speech acts. The mean was 4.45 with a standard deviation of 1.06, which indicated that the integration of the video clips facilitated learning. The mean score for the last item in this part was 3.62 with a standard deviation of 1.10, which suggested that more than half of the participants felt more competent in using the speech acts covered in the lessons. However, 19 of them did not feel competent enough.

After the overall analysis of the responses, the mean for this part was 16.17, which is equal to 67.37 out of 100. The results show that the use of the video clips was effective in terms of increasing the level of motivation to learn more about the speech acts by keeping their concentration for a longer period of time and facilitating learning.

The Analysis of the Interviews with the Teachers

Semi-structured interviews were held with two of the instructors who taught the participants for 25 hours per week during the spring term at the DBE. The interviews were conducted after the administration of the post-test at the end of the spring term. The interview with one of the instructors was 4 minutes 40 seconds, and the one with the other instructor was 3 minutes 34 seconds. One of the instructors did not accept to be recorded, so she provided her written responses to the same

questions asked to the others during the semi-structured interviews (see Appendix F). Their responses were analyzed in the following parts.

Advantages of Explicit Teaching of Speech Acts

All the teachers think that speech acts should be taught explicitly in EFL classes because learning the grammar structures is not enough to communicate properly in different contexts. One of the teachers pointed out that it is not enough for the students just to memorize grammar rules to develop a deep understanding of language. Therefore, she said that speech acts should be taught so that our students can interpret what somebody says. One of the teachers wrote that speech acts “help students avoid misunderstandings, have better interaction with the native speakers and understand the intended meaning in conversations”.

One of the teachers also mentioned another advantage of explicit teaching of speech acts by stating a problem. She said that the students at the DBE are not very successful in the speaking exams and the two parts in the proficiency exam which require the test takers to use some speech acts in a variety of situations. Therefore, she thinks that teaching speech acts can be beneficial for students. All of the teachers support the idea that explicit teaching of speech acts increases the competency level of EFL students and enables them to be more successful in the exams at the DBE.

Challenges Faced

Although the teachers are well-aware of the advantages of teaching speech acts explicitly, they stated that they face some challenges which prevent them from teaching speech acts in the way they find useful.

One of the challenges pointed out by the teachers is that they cannot find enough time to teach speech acts explicitly in their classes because of the loaded program they have to follow throughout the semesters. The teacher who provided

written responses mentioned that speech acts are not highly emphasized in the programs. If they lack time, instructors are asked to omit the parts in the coursebook which includes some use of limited number of speech acts.

Another challenge they face result from lack of materials which provide enough input in terms of a variety of strategies and structures. The teachers stated that they can cover speech acts only in the scenario parts in the coursebooks, *Language Leader Pre-Intermediate* and *Language Leader Intermediate*, which was not enough because of the limited amount of input. Each unit has one scenario part which requires students to use some communication strategies, such as expressing their opinion, agreement or disagreement, and so on. Some scenario parts focus on the use of speech acts, however, these parts do not include a wide variety of speech acts.

How the Instructors Teach Speech Acts

Although the teachers face some difficulties, they try to cover some speech acts in class. The teachers said they want to give some situations and ask the students to create some dialogues similar to the ones in the scenario parts in the main coursebook so that the students can have practice in using the limited number of speech acts covered in the book. While talking about how they focused on speech acts throughout the semester during which this research was conducted, teachers pointed out that there was not enough time to cover speech acts in their classes since the limited number of parts focusing on speech acts were either omitted or optional in the course program. It means that if instructors cannot cover the other parts and sections in the coursebooks or the handouts, they can omit the “scenario sections” in the coursebook, *Language Leader Pre-Intermediate*, which is the usual case because of the loaded program. One of the instructors said she did not have instruction in speech acts adding that the students got instruction in the treatment sessions held by the

researcher. The other instructor stated that it was difficult for students to create similar dialogues because they lacked some communication skills such as turn taking, negotiation, and so on.

One of the teachers pointed out that she has a tendency to highlight such structures while introducing some language patterns when students hear them in the listening texts. In other words, she benefits from opportunity teaching so that she can provide her students with more input in speech acts.

All the teachers believe that there are some factors which can contribute to an improvement for low-level students. Some of them are observing others using speech acts, watching some programs like television series to get more exposure. However, they added that watching videos outside the class can be helpful provided that students have a clear purpose like analyzing the power relations between the characters and the structures used to express themselves.

The Analysis of the Index Cards

The second research question aims at finding out what other factors, if any, contribute to changes in low level learners' pragmatic competence in using speech acts. To find some answers, the researcher focused on what is done in the class by having an interview with the teachers and analyzed the responses of the participants to see whether there were any statistically significant differences after the treatments sessions. However, what is done outside class as well may play an important role to improve competency level. To learn more about what the participants did outside school to improve their competence in using English speech acts, the participants were asked to fill-in the index cards prepared by the researcher to get more information about how much the participants got exposure to the target structures. The index cards required the participants to give information about whether they watched any videos

in English after class, and if yes, they wrote about what kind of programs and how long they watched them. The instructors who taught the classes collected the index cards at the end of each week throughout the weeks during which the treatment sessions were held.

The analysis included the index cards completed by only the participants who took the pre, mid and the post-test. However, ten of these participants did not submit their cards although they took all the tests. Therefore, the number of the participants who handed the index-cards was 32. The participants who submitted their index cards were classified into categories based on the frequency and the length of watching videos in a week via the criteria prepared by the researcher. The participants who watched videos six or seven days a week were classified as the “regular watchers” category. Those who watched some videos four to five days in a week were put under the category of the “often watchers” category. Another group of them who watched video clips two or three days a week were named as the “seldom watchers”. The last group was called “(almost) never watchers” since these participants claimed that they either watched video clips just once a week or never. The following table shows the categories formed based on the criteria.

Table 16

Categories Based on the Criteria

| Category | Criteria | Number of the Participants |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Regular Watchers | 6 to 7 days | 4 |
| Often Watchers | 4 to 5 days | 6 |
| Seldom Watchers | 2 to 3 days | 7 |
| (Almost) Never Watchers | 0 to 1 days | 1 |

The Comparison of Scores Assigned to “Regular” and “Seldom or Never Watchers”

After deciding on the categories, the index cards of the participants who submitted only once or twice were excluded to increase the reliability of the following analysis. In other words, the participants who submitted index cards for at least three weeks were included in the following part.

Table 16 compares the scores of eight participants. Four of the participants were chosen because they stated to have watched videos outside the class more regularly and for a longer period than other regular watchers. The other four participants were chosen because one of them stated not to have watched videos, and the other three participants stated to have watched videos outside the class less frequently than the other “seldom watchers”. Table 17 shows the scores assigned to the responses of these participants to the DCT items in the pre, mid and post-test (see Appendix L).

The pre-test scores of these above-mentioned participants were compared. The analysis revealed that the four participants in the “regular watchers” category outperformed the three participants in the “seldom watchers” category and the last participant who was in the “(almost) never watchers” category. Table 17 includes the scores these participants were assigned in the pre-test which was administered at the beginning of the spring semester.

As indicated in the table, the “regular watchers” performed better than most of the “seldom watchers” with an exception although these students covered the same subjects in the previous semester. One of the participants who stated not to have watched any videos in English outside the class could not give an appropriate

response to the items on the speech acts which were taught during the treatment sessions.

After the administration of the mid-test, the scores of the above-mentioned participants were analyzed. The findings showed that the scores of the “regular watchers” were higher compared to those in the pre-test. Also, the “seldom watchers” performed better in the mid-test. In fact, their scores were higher than the ones who claimed to have watched videos more often.

The scores of these participants were compared once again after the administration of the post-test. The analysis indicated that the “regular watchers” performed better than they did in the mid-test. Except for one of them, the “seldom watchers” also performed better in the post-test considering their mid-test scores. The participant who stated that she had not watched any videos outside the class got the same score she was assigned in the mid-test, 6 out of 10, although the treatment sessions were over almost five weeks before the administration of the post-test.

Table 17

Test Scores of the Chosen Participants

| Category | Name of the Participants | Total Score (Pre-test) | Total Score (Mid-test) | Total Score (Post-test) |
|------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Regular Watchers | RS 1 | 5 | 6 | 7.5 |
| | RS2 | 5.5 | 8 | 9.5 |
| | RS 3. | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| | RS 4 | 3 | 5 | 6.5 |
| Seldom Watchers | SS 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.5 |
| | SS 2 | 2 | 7 | 8.5 |
| | SS 3 | 5.5 | 7.5 | 8.5 |
| Never Watcher | NS 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 |

When the scores of the “regular” and “seldom watchers” were compared, it was seen that the former group outperformed in the post-test most probably because of constant exposure to the target language.

Conclusion

This chapter explained whether there were any statistically significant differences among the scores that the participants got in the pre, mid and the post-test. This chapter also provided some details about the analysis of the perception questionnaire prepared to learn how the participants thought about the use of video-clips in teaching and learning speech acts. The last part concentrated on the semi-structured interviews by giving some details about what the instructors, who taught the low-level students in this study, thought about teaching speech acts in EFL classes.

The following chapter will provide more details about the findings, suggest some pedagogical implications. Then, the limitations of the study will be presented. Finally, some suggestions for further research will be made

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of pre-selected video-clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' pragmatic competence in using speech acts. It also aimed to find out what other factors contributed to any changes in this group of learners' pragmatic competence with respect to using speech acts. Thus, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of viewing pre-selected video clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' use of speech acts?
2. What other factors contribute to changes, if any, in low level learners' use of speech acts?

This chapter is composed of four main parts. The first part discusses the findings in relation to the research questions. The second part concentrates on the pedagogical implications of the study. The next part includes some details about the limitations of it. The last part is aimed at making some suggestions for further research.

Findings and Discussion

In relation to RQ1, the findings have indicated that video clips are important in the improvement of the use of English speech acts since they can provide conceptualized input and a variety of structures, both of which contribute to the development of not only sociopragmatic but also sociolinguistic competence as well as leading to an increase in their accurate use of speech acts.

The findings indicated that the integration of video clips enhanced the participants' use of speech acts appropriately in various contexts. The reason for this improvement may have resulted from the conceptualized input provided by the video clips which were used throughout the treatment sessions. This type of input enables learners to better comprehend the situations with the help of audiovisual input provided by them. The importance of conceptualized input was also revealed in some other studies which analysed some coursebooks (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Delen & Tavit, 2010; Grant & Starks, 2001; Vellenga, 2004). These studies found out that unlike the video clips in the treatment sessions, most of the examined coursebooks do not have sufficient frequency of the speech acts that these studies focused on. Therefore, these studies provided evidence for the need for such kind of conceptualized input, which can help learners better understand the relationship between the interlocutors. Therefore, it can be concluded that the findings of this study corroborate the findings of the above-mentioned studies by revealing the importance of conceptualized input to teach speech acts in EFL classes.

Another finding was that the participants, who were low-level EFL learners, improved their pragmatic competence in using English speech acts because of watching the video clips which included different structures and pragmatic information for the same speech act in various contexts. This finding of the study concurs with those revealed by some other studies which analysed some coursebooks for low level EFL learners (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Kohandani, Farzaneh & Kazemi, 2014; Yıldız-Ekin, 2013). These studies concluded that the books analyzed in their studies do not include a variety of structures. While the analyzed coursebooks for lower levels include simple, mostly sentence level utterances, more complex structures and idioms are used in advanced level books (Aksoyalp &

Toprak, 2015). Kohandani, Farzaneh, and Kazemi (2014) focused on how *Top Notch Fundamentals*, designed for beginner level students, and *Top Notch 1*, for false beginners, present speech acts to low level EFL classes. The conversations in the analyzed books were found to be inadequate in terms of providing pragmatic information and a variety of structures. Therefore, this study aimed to have the participants watch a few video clips including different structures and pragmatic information for the same speech act in various contexts, which caused the participants to improve their pragmatic competency in using the speech acts covered in the study.

A related finding was that the participants could produce more appropriate responses because they improved their sociopragmatic competence with the help of the conceptualized input and a variety of grammatical structures used in the videos. Therefore, they could form more appropriate responses in the mid and the post-test by considering the social status and the distance of the interlocutors. This finding also concurs with a great number of studies conducted on the effect of videos on speech acts, most of which found a remarkable improvement in the participants' sociopragmatic competence (Abrams, 2014; Alcon, 2005; Alcon-Soler & Pitarch, 2010; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015). In Alcon's (2005) study, the effects of using some video vignettes on the competence of the participants in using the speech act of request were investigated. The findings of Alcon's (2005) study indicated that the experiment group which was taught the speech act explicitly after watching some vignettes taken from the TV series *Stargate* outperformed the implicit and the control group. The findings of this study also concur with a study carried out by Derakhshan and Eslami (2015) which indicated that conceptualized input provided in videos can help learners better comprehend

which speech acts and structures will be more appropriate to use in a specific social context. In their study, Derakhshan and Eslami (2015) investigated the effects of the treatment sessions including video vignettes on the pragmatic competence level of upper-intermediate level participants. They focused on the speech acts of apology and request, and concluded that the sessions led to improvement in the participants' pragmatic competence.

Another finding of this study was that the video clips had a remarkable effect on the pragmatic competence level of the participants mostly because of the impacts of explicit teaching of the speech acts. The analysis of the post-test showed that the majority of the participants were able to use the speech acts in a suitable way even though the instructors of these three low-intermediate level classes did not have any instruction on speech acts in their classes, especially for four weeks after the administration of the mid-test. In other words, the video clips used in the study helped the participants to not only learn which structures are appropriate in a specific situation but also recall what they have learnt over a long period of time, showing that they have internalized the proper use of these structures. The importance of explicit instruction which may have caused great impacts was also stated by the participants in the perception questionnaire. A great number of the participants claimed that the use of video clips made it easier to learn more about how to use speech acts because the strategies and structures in the videos helped them better understand. This finding corroborates with the findings of a study by Alcon (2005) and Alcon-Soler and Pitarch (2010) which revealed the permanent effects of integrating video clips into the explicit instruction of speech acts which probably resulted from having the participants get more conceptualized input and

consciousness-raising tasks during the treatment sessions which improved their pragmatic awareness.

Yet another important finding was that most of the participants stated in the perception questionnaire that they had found the video clips in the sessions useful to get more motivated. They claimed in the questionnaire that they paid attention during the treatment sessions for a longer time as they got more motivated because of the integration of the video clips, which also resulted in their feeling more competent in using the covered speech acts. These findings corroborate with a great number of previous studies which revealed the importance of motivation in learning speech acts. One of these studies was conducted by Derakhshan and Eslami (2015), who stated that video prompts increase motivation. Therefore, it can be stated that the participants in this study stated in the perception questionnaire that they felt more motivated since these low-level EFL learners may have had increased self-efficacy because of the type of the input which facilitated their learning the speech acts. In other words, they could comprehend the input provided by the video clips, and they had enough strategies and structures to use in similar situations, which might have helped them to get more motivated to form appropriate responses in similar contexts. When low-level learners feel competent, their motivation level increases leading them to participate in the lesson and eventually learning more.

In relation to RQ2, which aimed to find out other factors which may contribute to changes in low level learners' use of speech acts, one of the most important findings was related to the importance of explicit teaching of speech acts in the classroom. The analysis of the perception questionnaire revealed that the students could pay more attention to the use of the speech acts while watching the pre-selected video clips in the class with the guidance of the researcher. Also, a great

number of participants also stated that they did not pay enough attention to the relationship between the characters or the strategies used in the videos they watched outside the class. This finding was also supported by the analysis of the index cards. In addition, the analysis of the mid-test responses indicated that the participants who claimed not to have watched video clips outside the class regularly performed better than some of the other participants who claimed to have watched video clips, movies, television series, and so on more often and mostly for a longer period. The importance of explicit teaching was also stated by the instructors during the semi-structured interviews. This finding showing the importance of explicit teaching of speech acts is in line with those revealed in numerous studies (Alcon, 2005; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Martinez-Flor & Alcon-Soler, 2007; Rajabia, Azizifara & Gowhary, 2015).

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The findings of this study provide essential pedagogical implications which can facilitate teaching and learning English as a foreign language. They can be beneficial for teachers, course developers, and coursebook writers both in Turkey, where the study was carried out, and other countries where English is taught as a foreign language.

One of the implications is that teachers can benefit from various video clips including the use of English speech acts in their classes. In this way, they can help their students better realize the social status of the interlocutors. Therefore, students can learn which structures are regarded as appropriate in such contexts because of the contextualized input provided by these video clips. Also, teachers can facilitate learning with the help of video clips as the distance between the interlocutors are clearer compared to the input provided in coursebooks, many of which fail to provide

enough visual and auditory input. When students watch how people in the videos use a specific speech act, for example, when they have a close relationship with native speakers of English during and after their university education, these students will probably recall what they have learnt in the class more easily compared to other students who have just covered the same speech act only through the input given in their coursebook. Therefore, teachers can guide their students to pay attention to not only the form but also the social contexts so that their students can use English speech acts appropriately.

Another implication is that course developers can consider the findings useful while designing a new curriculum. People who develop a course for low level EFL learners have difficulty in choosing appropriate coursebooks since either most of such books include structures which are too challenging for low level students or they fail to provide enough variety of structures to enable EFL learners to form an appropriate response in various contexts. This problem was stated in numerous studies which concentrated on the necessity of providing a variety of structures and pragmatic input to teach speech acts explicitly to EFL learners to help them avoid miscommunication and misunderstandings (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Kohandani, Farzaneh & Kazemi, 2014; Yıldız-Ekin, 2013). If course developers integrate the use of video clips in their programs, students can get more conceptualized input. Another advantage of the integration of video clips to the program is that when EFL learners watch video clips in the class, they can better comprehend the structures and strategies because of the audiovisual input provided by them. Therefore, they can use what they have learnt with the help of these videos more easily. In this respect, course developers can provide EFL learners with more structures and strategies which can be used in various contexts. This is especially important for low-level EFL

learners because of the limited input in many of the coursebooks aimed at low-level learners of English (Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Delen & Tavail, 2010; Grant & Starks, 2001; Kohandani, Farzaneh & Kazemi, 2014; Yıldız-Ekin, 2013; Vellenga, 2004).

The findings can be beneficial for coursebook writers whose books are aimed at improving the pragmatic competence of not only advanced but also low-level EFL learners. These writers can provide more useful input with the help of video clips. In other words, if coursebook writers integrate some video clips including interlocutors with different social status and distance levels, they can help learners to get input which may help them to improve their conceptual socialization. As stated by Kohandani, Farzaneh, and Kazemi (2014) and Yıldız-Ekin (2013), the conversations in the analyzed books for low-level EFL learners are not satisfying with respect to providing pragmatic information. In this respect, coursebook writers can also benefit from these findings to have EFL learners make an accelerated progress in improving their pragmatic competence.

Limitations of the Study

This study aimed to examine the effects of pre-selected video-clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' competence in using speech acts and find out what other factors may have contributed to any changes in this group of learners' pragmatic competence level. The study, however, includes two limitations which should be taken into consideration.

The first limitation is related to the use of the index cards. The participants were asked to give details about what type of videos they watched. However, some of them did not provide detailed information claiming that they forgot to complete them at the end of each day. The participants should have been asked to give details

on a daily basis to prevent this problem. Also, they should have been asked to write the name of the videos they watched outside class to get more details about what kind of videos resulted in more improvement in terms of the use of speech acts.

The second limitation is about not conducting interviews with the participants, which could have provided more insights, especially regarding factors which may contribute to an improvement in their competence. Asking them to fill in the index cards provided some data; however, asking questions during semi-structured interviews with the participants could have provided more valuable data to understand whether they used any strategies while watching videos outside the class and whether they thought these videos were helpful to improve their competence in using speech acts.

Although there are such limitations, this study provides essential insights for the field of foreign language teaching as well as suggestions for further study.

Suggestions for Further Research

Considering the findings and the limitations of this study, two main suggestions can be made for further studies. The first suggestion is that participants can be interviewed so that more data about factors which may contribute to improvements in their pragmatic competence in using English speech acts can be obtained. Semi-structured interviews with participants can provide more information about the effects of watching video clips in class because they may comment on whether they found the selected video clips effective in terms of getting adequate input via a variety of appropriate structures and strategies. Also, interviews with participants can help researchers get information about whether they find the tasks in the treatment sessions effective to better comprehend the use of speech acts. The second suggestion is that another study which may focus on whether watching some

video clips outside the class enhances the competence of low-level EFL learners in speech acts can be conducted. Although many teachers advise their students to watch some videos outside the class to improve their skills in the target language, they do not have adequate information about how this suggestion can provide their students with the intended result. Such a study can concentrate on how and to what extent watching video clips outside the class may help EFL learners to achieve their aims. Therefore, EFL instructors teaching low levels can get sufficient information to guide their students while advising them to watch video clips to improve their pragmatic competence in using English speech acts.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of pre-selected video-clips on low-level Turkish EFL learners' pragmatic competence in using speech acts. Another purpose was to find out what other factors contributed to any changes in this group of learners' pragmatic competence level with respect to using speech acts. The findings of this study revealed that the use of videos can lead low-level Turkish EFL learners to enhance their pragmatic competence by providing conceptualized input, a variety of structures which improve their sociopragmatic competence. It can also be concluded that the integration of videos can cause noticeable impacts because of explicit instruction which provides conceptualized input and a variety of strategies.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, Z. I. (2014). Using film to provide a context for teaching L2 pragmatics. *System, 46*, 55-64.
- Aksoyalp, Y. & Toprak, T.E. (2015). Incorporating pragmatics in English language teaching: To what extent do EFL course books address speech acts? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 4(2)*, 125-133.
- Alcon, E. (2005). Does instruction work for pragmatic learning in EFL Contexts? *System, 33(3)*, 417- 435.
- Alcon-Soler, E. & Pitarch, J. G. (2010). The effect of instruction on learners' pragmatic awareness: A focus on refusals. *International Journal of English Studies, 10(1)*, 65-80.
- Allami, H. & Naeimi, A. (2011). A cross-linguistic study of refusals: An analysis of pragmatic competence development in Iranian EFL classes. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*, 385-406. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.010
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education* (7th ed.). Canada: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Baleghizadeh, S. & Rastin, H. (2015). Investigating metapragmatic information in language teachers' books: A case of Top Notch. *IJSCL, ISSN 2323-2210*
Retrieved from
http://www.ijsc1.net/pdf_13650_71da16b30d126227d2c9603ecb6f1fd6.html

- Bayat, N. (2012). A study on the use of speech acts. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 231-221.
- Bella, S. (2014). Developing the ability to refuse: A cross-sectional study of Greek FL refusals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 61, 35-62.
- Boxer, D. & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49, 44-58.
- Cheng, D. (2011). New insights on compliment responses: A comparison between native English speakers and Chinese L2 speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2204-2214. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.003
- Cohen, A. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching*, 41(2), 213-235.
- van Compernelle, & Hennery, A. (2014). Instructed concept appropriation and L2 pragmatic development in the classroom. *Language Learning*, 64(3), 549-578.
- Çapar, M. (2014). How do Turkish EFL learners say “No”? *International Journal of Language Academy*, 2(3), 262-282.
- Delen, B. & Tavail, Z. M. (2010). Evaluation of four coursebooks in terms of three speech acts: Requests, refusals and complaints. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 692-697.
- Derakhshan, A. & Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2015). The effect of consciousness-raising instruction on the pragmatic development of apology and request. *TESL-EJ*, 18(4), 1-23 Retrieved from <http://www.teslej.org/wordpress/issues/volume18/ej72/ej72a6/>

- Dewaele, J. M. (2008). "Appropriateness" in foreign language acquisition and use: Some theoretical, methodological and ethical considerations. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 46, 245-265.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2010). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behavior: Perceptions of social situations and strategic usage of request patterns *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2262-2281. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.02.001
- El Hiani, K. (2015). Performing speech acts among Moroccan EFL advanced learners. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 479-485.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 199-208. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccio39
- Glaser, K. (2013). The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(7), 150-163.
- Glasgow, G (2008). Language awareness, metapragmatics and the L2 teacher. *Accents Asia*, 2(2), 1-16. Retrieved from <http://www.accentsasia.org/2-2/glasgowg.pdf>
- Grant, L. & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap operas. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 39, 39-50.

- Halenko, N. & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System*, 39, 240-250.
- Hesse-Biber, S.N. (2010). *Mixed methods research: Merging theory with practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. United Kingdom: Pearson.
- İstifçi, İ. (2009). The use of apologies by EFL learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 15-25.
- Jeon, E. H. & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development. A meta-analysis. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds). *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp.165-211). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *System*, 34, 36-54.
- Kohandani, M., Farzaneh, N. & Kazemi, M. (2014). A critical analysis of speech acts and language functions in Top Notch series. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1009-1015. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.511
- Kwon, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua*, 23, 339-364.
- Li, Q. (2012). Effects of instruction on adolescent beginners' acquisition of request modification. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 30-56.

- Li, S. (2012). The effects of input-based practice on pragmatic development of requests in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning*, 62(2), 403-438. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00629
- Martinez-Flor, A. & Alcon, E. (2007). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 47-76.
- Murray, J. C. (2011). Do bears fly? Revisiting conversational implicature in instructional pragmatics. *TESL-EJ*, 15(2), 1-30.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 416-434.
- 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.
- Rajabia, S., Azizifara, A. & Gowhary, H. (2015). The effect of explicit instruction on pragmatic competence development; teaching requests to EFL learners of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 231-239.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In Kasper & Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Eds.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-33). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Sharwood- Smith, M. (1981) Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics 11*, 159-168.
- Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*, 369-386.
- Tuncel, R. (2011). Apologizing and speech act realizations of Turkish EFL learners. *International Conference on Management, Economics and Social Sciences (ICMESS'2011)*, 545-555.
- Vasquez, C. & Fioramonte, A. (2011). Integrating pragmatics into the MA-TESL program: Perspectives from former students, *TESL-EJ, 15*(2), 1-22.
- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL&EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ, 8*(2). Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej30/a3.html>
- 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. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.033.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Sample Pages from the Coursebook

8.3
SCENARIO

PREPARATION

1 Do you do these things when you go out in the evening or at night? How often do you do them? What other things do you do? Discuss with other students.

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| go to a museum | go to the theatre |
| go to the cinema | go to a firework display |
| go out for dinner | go to a sports event |
| go to a concert | go on a boat trip |
| go dancing | |

SITUATION

Every year, for the month of August, there is a large arts festival in Edinburgh in Scotland. There are classical and popular music concerts, large and small theatrical productions, comedy shows, films, dance shows, talks and special events.

2a Look quickly at the festival events listing and answer these questions. At which event(s) can you:

- 1 see a film?
- 2 see a play?
- 3 hear some music?
- 4 see something from Britain?
- 5 see something from other countries?

2b Complete the events listing with the words in the box.

actor around famous father forget location plays popcorn songs world

3a 2.11 Listen to Paul, Christine and Emma, three American tourists, plan a night out. Which of the events at the festival do they decide to go to?



Edinburgh

FESTIVAL

AFTER DINNER EVENTS (8 P.M.–11 P.M.)

CASTLE CLASSICS

Great music, great orchestra, great 1 ____.
Tonight: The world 2 ____ National Orchestra perform Beethoven's Symphony No. 3 in the main hall of the wonderful Edinburgh Castle.

MOVIES IN THE PARK

Enjoy movies from around the 3 ____ in the festival's outdoor cinema – the 4 ____ is free!
Tonight: *Hum Tum* – an Indian film made in the true Bollywood style. This is a romantic comedy filled with great 5 ____ and dances.

LATE NIGHT EVENTS (11 P.M.–2 A.M.)

MINI-THEATRE

Powerful 6 ____ with the smallest of casts.
Tonight: *Shakespeare – a writer's life*. One 7 ____ performs the full story of Shakespeare's life. He acts as Shakespeare, his mother and 8 ____, his wife and even his children! You'll laugh out loud.

WORLD BEATS

Music and dance from all 9 ____ the world.
Tonight: Japanese drumming. An incredible performance by 45 drummers that you'll never 10 _____. Powerful and unique.



70 UNIT 8 The night

A night out

8.3

3b Listen again. Who has these opinions; Paul, Christine or Emma? Write P, C or E.

- 1 The film is a funny love story.
- 2 He/She doesn't like the Bollywood film.
- 3 He/She doesn't like classical music.
- 4 He/She likes all kinds of music.
- 5 He/She wants to visit the castle after dark.
- 6 People go to bed late during the festival.
- 7 A second music performance is not a good idea.
- 8 He/She thinks the drum show is something unusual.

KEY LANGUAGE:
expressing preferences

4a **2.12** Can you complete these sentences from the conversation with the words in the box? Listen and check.

than prefer (x2) love fancy
rather (x2) keen would mind

- 1 What would you _____ to do, Christine?
- 2 I don't _____ that.
- 3 I'd _____ to go to the classical concert.
- 4 I'd _____ see the film.
- 5 I'm not that _____ on the concert.
- 6 What would you rather do?
- 7 Well, to be honest, I don't _____.
- 8 I'm more interested in the Japanese drummers _____ the one-man theatre show.
- 9 I'd love to see the drummers.
- 10 I'd rather see that than a play about Shakespeare.

4b Which sentences in Exercise 4a:

- a) ask for someone's favourite thing or choice?
- b) mean you like one thing more than another thing?
- c) mean you don't like something?
- d) mean you'd really like to do something?
- e) mean you don't have a strong opinion?

pronunciation

5 **2.13** Intonation in *Wh-* questions Listen to these questions. Does the intonation go up or down at the end? Listen again and repeat.

- 1 What would you like to do?
- 2 Where would you like to go?
- 3 What would you prefer to do?
- 4 What would you rather do?
- 5 What do you fancy doing?

6 Look back at the events listing in Exercise 2a and write sentences about your preferences. Use the language from Exercise 4a. Compare your preferences with a partner.

TASK: planning a night out

7a You are visiting the Edinburgh festival. Look at the events listing on page 119 and decide which of the things you would/wouldn't like to do.

7b Work in groups of three or four students. Plan your night out together. Choose three different things to do.

7c Compare your plans with another group. Do you prefer your group's plan?

First of all we're going to go to ...

OTHER USEFUL PHRASES

What shall we do tonight?
What about you?
Why don't we ...?
I'd like to ...
What would you like to do after that?
I think we should ...
I think that'll be fun/boring/tiring.
That sounds great/unusual/interesting.



Appendix B1: DCT Items in the Pre-Test

This study is conducted under the supervision of Assist. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe as part of the MA TEFL program at Bilkent University. The purpose of the study is to elicit your pragmatic competence in using speech acts in English. Your participation is voluntary, and your names will be kept confidential. You can contact Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL (oznur.alver@bilkent.edu.tr) to get further information about the study.

Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL
Bilkent University MA TEFL
E-mail: oznur.alver@bilkent.edu.tr

Thank you for your cooperation.

Section A: Read each situation below very carefully and write what you would say in such a situation.

1. You, your roommate, and two of your roommate's friends who you have just met for the first time are discussing where to have lunch. One of them suggests going to a café on campus. You have heard that the café serves a variety of dishes which are too expensive for you. You have been trying hard to manage your budget as a university student who isn't on a scholarship. What would you say?

YOU: _____

2. While watching an exciting movie one evening, your fifteen-year-old sister asks for your help. She has to use a software program to do her homework and she is having difficulty using it. She needs to complete her homework and submit it two days later via the software program. However, you don't want to deal with that problem at 10 p.m. because you want to rest and enjoy the movie. What would you say?

YOU: _____

3. You need to prepare a presentation as part of your course. You have already started to do your research and collect data. However, it is clear that you need at least two weeks to analyse your data to get ready for the presentation. As you are scheduled to present it in the session two weeks later, you think you will be well-prepared. However, the professor asks you to present it next week as he needs to make changes in the schedule. You know it won't be possible to prepare it in such a short time. What would you say?

YOU: _____

4. You need a specific book to complete your homework, but you cannot borrow it from the library as someone else has already borrowed it. You have seen that particular book in the office of a distinguished professor. You want to borrow that book from the professor. What would you say to her?

YOU: _____

5. You have a girlfriend/boyfriend. Tomorrow, you are going out to celebrate his/her birthday; however, you do not have enough money to organize a good birthday party. Therefore, you want to borrow some money from your best friend for the first time. What would you say?

YOU: _____

6. While you are driving to the library, you see one of the professors whose course you took last year. She is carrying a lot of books, so you stop and offer to take her wherever she wants. She says that she is going to the library. What would you say to her next?

YOU: _____

7. Your grandfather has invited you to a dinner with some other family members. You respect your grandfather very much, and you know that he becomes really upset when he is rejected. However, you have to go on a business trip to İstanbul that day. What would you say to him?

YOU: _____

8. While you are walking home on a hot day carrying your heavy shopping bags, a car stops near you, and the driver offers to take you to your house. As you do not know the driver, you do not want to get in the car. However, you do not want to sound rude, either. What would you say?

YOU: _____

9. After waiting for your friend in front of the cinema for about 20 minutes, you call him several times. When he doesn't answer, you realize that he has broken his promise. As it is not the first time, you get really angry at him, and you want to complain about his behaviour. What would you say to your friend when you see him later in the evening?

YOU: _____

10. Although you are trying hard to study for an exam that you are going to take the following day, you cannot concentrate on it because your neighbors' children are making too much noise. After waiting for about half an hour, you decide to complain about the noise, so you go to their house. What would you say?

YOU: _____

11. While having a meeting in the office together with some of the employees working in your company, you explain that there will be a business trip to Japan. As the manager, you also say that the time of the trip should be carefully organized. After thinking about a suitable time, you suggest that the trip should be held two weeks later as there are no holidays or meetings that week. How would you suggest it?

YOU: _____

12. You are talking with your classmates and trying to decide what to do after school. Since the weather is warm, you want to ride around the campus and enjoy the beauty of the campus together. What would you say?

YOU: _____

13. You are a teacher in a crowded school. During the break, you accidentally step on a student's foot in the crowded corridor. You feel really bad about it. What would you say to him?

YOU: _____

14. You were supposed to submit your homework two days ago, but you could not complete it because of an illness. You feel ashamed and go to your professor's office to talk about it. What would you say?

YOU: _____

15. You are participating in a group activity in class. While you are trying to complete the task, one of the members of another group asks to use your dictionary. As you do not need it, you can lend the dictionary to them. What would you say?

YOU: _____

16. You are going to your hometown for the weekend. Your bus will leave the terminal at 14:30. You do not want to miss your bus, and there is heavy traffic. Therefore, you want to leave the class ten minutes before the bell rings. What would you say to your teacher before the lesson?

YOU: _____

17. You are a member of a student club. Although the club organizes quality activities, only a limited number of students attend those activities because most of the students do not know anything about them. You want your classmates to attend an activity which has been organized by the club. The activity will help them learn how to write a well-prepared CV. What would you say to invite them to the activity?

YOU: _____

18. It is almost the end of the term, so you have organized a dinner together with your classmates. As a class, you want your teacher to join you. Your classmates have asked you to invite her. What would you say to her?

YOU: _____

Section B: Read each situation very carefully to complete the dialogue.

19. Your aunt has visited you and after asking about your lessons, exams, and so on, she has learnt that you have high grades. She is really happy, and she says:

Aunt: I am proud of you because of your academic success.

You: _____

20. You have been playing basketball in a team for two years. You can shoot baskets from a distance and jump really high. Your team has just won a game because you scored from outside the three-point line. After the game, your coach said:

Coach: You are very good at playing basketball. You have great talent for it.

YOU: _____

Section C: Please share your personal information by completing the following. Your personal information will not be shared and will be discarded at the conclusion of this study.

Name: _____

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Age: 16-18 _____ 19-21 _____ 22+ _____

Level: _____

Appendix B2: DCT Items in the Mid-Test

This study is conducted under the supervision of Assist. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe as part of the MA TEFL program at Bilkent University. The purpose of the study is to elicit your pragmatic competence in using speech acts in English. Your participation is voluntary, and your names will be kept confidential. You can contact Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL (oznur.alver@bilkent.edu.tr) to get further information about the study.

Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL

Bilkent University MA TEFL

E-mail: oznur.alver@bilkent.edu.tr

Thank you for your cooperation.

Section A: Please share your personal information by completing the following. Your personal information will not be shared and will be discarded at the conclusion of this study.

Name: _____

Class Code: _____

Age: _____

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Section B: Read each situation below very carefully and write what you would say in such a situation.

1. Your supervisor who works in the same office with you needs to complete a report within three hours. However, he isn't feeling well. You want to offer help. What would you say?

YOU: _____

2. Your manager wants you to go on a business trip to Paris next week. If you go, you won't be able to attend your cousin's wedding ceremony. Therefore, you don't want to go to Paris. What would you say?

YOU: _____

3. You are organizing a birthday party for your daughter. The party will be on Saturday at a cafe. You want Mrs. Jackson, whose child is your daughter's classmate, to join the party together with her daughter. What would you say?

YOU: _____

4. You need to complete your assignment by Friday. Although you have three days left, you don't think you'll be able to finish it on time because you need more time to read the materials/sources. You go to your professor's office to explain. What would you say?

YOU: _____

5. You are a player on a volleyball team. After a successful game, you want to have a barbeque party as a team. You want your trainer to join you as well. What would you say to your trainer?

YOU: _____

6. While your teacher is giving oral feedback on your paragraph during her office hour, she says you are good at writing paragraphs and giving details in an organized way. What would you say to her?

YOU: _____

7. You usually go out for lunch together with your colleagues who work in the same department. You would like to go to a Chinese restaurant which is close to your office. What would you say?

YOU: _____

8. You are a student at university. You need to prepare a presentation with your partner, Susan, whom your teacher paired you up with. As she is not responsible enough, she hasn't completed her part yet, even though although you have only three days left to present your topic. You call her because you aren't happy about this situation. What would you say?

YOU: _____

9. Your manager is always asking you to complete projects in a very short amount of time. You cannot work well because of the constant pressure of these short time limits. You are unhappy with this situation so you decide to talk to the manager. What would you say?

YOU: _____

10. You are an instructor at the Department of Basic English at METU. You want your students to write a paragraph during the third lesson, but you think some of your students may not attend the next two lessons. What would you say to your students in the first lesson to make sure all of the students attend the third lesson?

YOU: _____

Appendix B3: DCT Items in the Post-Test

This study is conducted under the supervision of Assist. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe as part of the MA TEFL program at Bilkent University. The purpose of the study is to elicit your pragmatic competence in using speech acts in English. Your participation is voluntary, and your names will be kept confidential. You can contact Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL (oznur.alver@bilkent.edu.tr) to get further information about the study.

Öznur ALVER-YÜCEL

Bilkent University MA TEFL

E-mail: oznur.alver@bilkent.edu.tr

Thank you for your cooperation.

Section A: Please share your personal information by completing the following. Your personal information will not be shared and will be discarded at the conclusion of this study.

Name: _____

Class Code: _____

Age: _____

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Section B: Read each situation below very carefully and write what you would say in such a situation.

1. You are a teacher at a primary school. When you enter the office of the school headmaster, you see him trying to enter some data on the program, Excel. However, you realize that he needs your help. What would you say to him?

YOU: _____

2. You need to run 10.000 meters to train for the coming race. You want to be the fastest athlete in Europe. After training for four hours, your trainer asks you to run an extra 2.000 meters. However, you feel too tired. What would you say to her?

YOU: _____

3. You have organized a dinner to celebrate your promotion. You want one of your friends, Justin, to be with you. While you are inviting him, his cousin, Julie, enters the room and learns about the dinner. Although you are not close with her, you invite Julie as well. What would you say to her?

YOU: _____

4. You are trying hard to complete an important project. While you are working on it, the manager asks you to send an e-mail to the CEO of another company to inform him about the meeting you'll have with him next week. However, you are too busy, so you ask your supervisor to do it. What would you say to your supervisor?

YOU: _____

5. You are a student on a master's program. After writing your thesis, you want to go to Alanya, where you spend a few weeks every year in your summer house. You want your thesis advisor to stay with you there. What would you say to her?

YOU: _____

6. You have been working for three years for a company which builds luxury houses. You generally design villas and hotels. At a cocktail party, where you just shared your latest project, your employer tells you that your projects are really great and that a lot of people admire them. What would you say to him?

YOU: _____

7. You want to be a hairdresser, so you apply for a course. During the training period, you need to attend some seminars about the latest trends related to hair. After a tiring day, you want to go to the café on 8th West Street, which serves delicious burgers, together with the other trainees. What would you say to them?

YOU: _____

8. One of your many cousins, Tim, has difficulty in managing his budget. He spends more than he earns. He has borrowed a lot of money from you on many occasions but hasn't paid it back yet. It has turned into a habit for him, which makes you angry. What would you say to Tim?

YOU: _____

9. Your instructor does not nominate you as often as she does other students in the class although you raise your hand many times in her lessons. You have started to lose your motivation because you aren't given the opportunity to share your ideas or answer any questions. What would you say to your teacher?

YOU: _____

10. You are an English teacher. You are in the last lesson on Friday. You have covered all the items in the weekly program together with your students. You have about 20 minutes before the bell rings. You think playing a game to revise the week's vocabulary may be a good idea. What would you say to your students?

YOU: _____

Appendix C: Index Cards

Name:

Class Code:

| Days | How many hours/minutes did you watch videos in English this past week? What did you watch? (tv shows, documentaries, and so on) |
|-------------|--|
| Monday | |
| Tuesday | |
| Wednesday | |
| Thursday | |
| Friday | |
| Saturday | |
| Sunday | |

Name:

Class Code:

| Days | How many hours/minutes did you watch videos in English this past week? What did you watch? (tv shows, documentaries, and so on) |
|-------------|--|
| Monday | |
| Tuesday | |
| Wednesday | |
| Thursday | |
| Friday | |
| Saturday | |
| Sunday | |

Appendix D: Perception Questionnaire

To indicate your perception of the following items, please put a tick (√) in the relevant box.

1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Slightly Disagree 4. Slightly Agree
5. Agree 6. Strongly Agree

| Perceptions of the participants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I. Contribution to learning in class | | | | | | |
| 1. The video clips helped me understand better the level of distance between the speakers and the listeners. | | | | | | |
| 2. The video clips helped me understand better the status of the speakers and the listeners. | | | | | | |
| 3. The visual input in the video clips helped me understand better the conversational situations/contexts. | | | | | | |
| 4. The video clips provided different strategies to use speech acts. | | | | | | |
| 5. The video clips provided different structures. | | | | | | |
| II. Contribution to learning outside the class | | | | | | |
| 1. I have started to analyse the relation among the characters in the videos I watch outside the class. | | | | | | |
| 2. I have started to pay attention to strategies to use speech acts in the videos I watch outside the class. | | | | | | |
| 3. I have started to pay attention to the speech acts used in the videos I watch outside the class. | | | | | | |
| III. Motivation /Affective Factors | | | | | | |
| 1. I liked learning about the speech acts because of the integration of the video clips. | | | | | | |
| 2. I paid attention during the lessons for a longer time. | | | | | | |
| 3. I think the use of video clips makes it easier to learn more about how to use speech acts. | | | | | | |
| 4. I feel more competent in using the speech acts covered in the lessons. | | | | | | |

Appendix E: Questions Asked in the Semi-Structured Interview

1. Do you think speech acts should be taught explicitly in EFL classes?
- Why do you think we should teach them? What do they help us achieve? / What do you think we lack if we don't teach them?
2. Do you teach speech acts in your classes?
3. Did you teach speech acts explicitly in this class?
4. What kind of activities did you have with your students to improve their competence in using English speech acts?
5. What factors do you think can contribute to an improvement for low-level students in using speech acts appropriately?

Appendix F: Transcripts of the Interviews

The Semi-Structured Interview with the Instructor (PIN 26)

Ö: Hi, Esra

E: Hi, Öznur.

Ö: I have a few questions for you and thank you very much for accepting to answer them.

E: You're welcome.

Ö: The first one is do you think speech acts should explicitly taught in EFL classes?

E: Yes, actually they're very important. Our students need to use them when they're speaking ...errr... so we should teach them in the class.

Ö: And... What do they help us to achieve?

E: They help our students Express themselves clearly... actually.

Ö: Yeah, thank you. And what do you think we lack if we don't teach them?

E: If we don't teach them, our student miss an important point. They have difficulty while communicating.

Ö: Yeah, with whom? With native speakers? Or...

E: With native speakers, actually when they're abroad most probably.

Ö: Do you teach speech acts in your classes?

E: Especially in the scenario parts, I try to teach some of them to my students and I find them very useful.

Ö: And do you teach them explicitly or implicitly?

E: Sometimes explicitly... sometimes implicitly.

Ö: If it is covered in the scenario part in Language Leader. You're right ... as I do. And let's focus on the class you taught in the second semester. Did you teach speech acts explicitly in that class?

E: Actually, I didn't do it, but I think you did it in the class.

Ö: Yes... Yes I covered speech acts... a lot of speech acts, yes...

E: They said that they benefitted from this...

Ö: Thank you very much... Thank you...

E: Hi hi...

Ö: Erm...

E: It was a useful... I think...

Ö: Erm... Hopefully. And the other one is rather than teaching explicitly, we can cover them implicitly as well, so what kind of activities did you have with your students to improve their competence in using English speech acts? Or did you do any activities?

E: Actually, I didn't do any special activities...

Ö: Thank you for mentioning that... And the other one is what we do in class is important, but what they do outside is also important for students, so what factors do

you think can contribute to an improvement for low-level students to use speech acts appropriately?

E: Hmmm...Erm.. Actually, maybe watching series, listening to music... Outside the class actually, they don't have much to do about this because they need interaction, they need to communicate with somebody...

Ö: Hı hı... They need to get feedback may be...

E: Yeah, they need to give, get feedback... You're right... This is difficult for them to improve with outside the class.

Ö: But it can be said watching Tv serials can be important.

E: Yes.

Ö: can lead to...

E: Hı hı... Yes, they can contribute to it.

Ö: But how?

E: They just catch some structures and they may use them when they need... them maybe.

Ö: You're right. They may be exposed to them.

E: Yeah, hı hı...

Ö: Thank you very much for answering them. Do you want to add other things related to teaching speech acts?

E: Actually, no.

Ö: Thank you very much.

The Semi-Structured Interview with the Instructor (PIN 26)

Ö: Hi, Sevde

S: Hi.

Ö: Today, I am going to ask a few questions to you. The first one is that do you think speech acts should be taught explicitly in EFL classes?

S: I can say: “Yes” in fact. If students’ difficulty in speaking is taken into consideration, I think we should certainly teach them, speech acts. Err... we try to teach them different skills at the same time, but whether they can apply this knowledge in a variety of situations is the matter I think. When they can do this, we can say that a student has developed a deep understanding of the language, but unfortunately, our students just know the grammar rules, but this is not enough to interpret what somebody says as you know. Err they just memorise some rules, but these work only in mechanic exercises, but we don’t prefer these. When it comes to real life situations, they feel hopeless, and they feel as if they hadn’t learnt anything up to that point. And actually, I think that’s why our students are not very successful in speaking exams or the response to a situation and err...

Ö: Dialogue completion.

S: Dialogue completion part of our proficiency exam...

Ö: Hi hi..

S: So, we need to teach I think.

Ö: Thank you. The second one is that do you... do you teach speech acts in your classes?

S: Errr I can say that I cannot find enough time or many opportunities to teach them, speech acts in class because of our programme we have to follow each span.

Ö: H1 h1...

S: When we have a look at our programme we can see that there are a lot of things we need to cover in a week...

Ö: H1 h1...

S: And we have just five-hour a day.. While doing this, unfortunately, I have the chance to focus on speech acts just in scenario parts of our main coursebook. Err there students see real life situations generally and listen to people who talking about these situations... At those times, I can find an opportunity.

Ö: Can I continue with the third one? It's a little bit more specific.

S: Yes, go forward.

Ö: Did you teach speech acts explicitly in this class?

S:As I have said only in scenario parts.

Ö: In Language Leader.

S: H1 h1 in Language Leader. We didn't have another.. any other chance of it.

Ö: And what kind of activities did you have with yours students to improve their competence in using speech acts?

S: Erm... I gave them some situations and I asked them to create their own dialogues similar to the ones in the scenario part. This was the most common one.

Ö: H1 h1..

S: In fact...And...Erm... But, this was also difficult for them because they don't have any idea about turn-taking rules or negotiation, or they don't know how to react in different situations.

Ö: H1 h1...

S: It wasn't as I would... I had expected from them in fact. But, this was the only thing I could do.

Ö: Giving the situations...

S: H1 h1... what we did in dialogues...

Ö: H1 h1...

S: Those situations in fact or given in the book.

Ö: Yeah, you're right. Was it a pair-work or group-work?

S: Erm... Generally, pair work, but erm... according to time limitation, of course, sometimes group work...

Ö: Thanks for it. And the last question is that what factors do you think can contribute to an improvement for low-level students in using speech acts appropriately?

S: H1 h1.. Erm... I think frequently using interesting activities in class can be encouraging. And also we can ask them to observe some speech acts in class, especially the ones teachers have used. And also they can watch some TV series maybe and they can keep some diaries.

Ö: H1 h1...

S: It can be useful, but if we have enough time and students should feel the need.

And they should erm... know why they are doing this. They should be aware of why they should learn all of these. But, this is hard work I think. That's all.

Ö: OK, thank you very much for your participation and your valuable help.

Appendix G: Speech Acts Tested in the Pre-Test

Speech Acts Tested in the Pre-Test

| Item | Speech Act | Distance | Status |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1. | Refusing a suggestion | Acquaintance | Equal |
| 2. | Refusing a request | Close | Lower-equal |
| 3. | Refusing a request | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 4. | Request | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 5. | Request | Close | Equal |
| 6. | Offer | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 7. | Refusing an invitation | Close | Higher |
| 8. | Refusing an offer | Stranger | Equal |
| 9. | Complaint | Close | Equal |
| 10. | Complaint | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 11. | Suggestion | Acquaintance | Lower |
| 12. | Suggestion | Close | Equal |
| 13. | Apology | Stranger | Lower |
| 14. | Apology | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 15. | Giving permission | Close | Equal |
| 16. | Asking for permission | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 17. | Invitation | Acquaintance | Equal |
| 18. | Invitation | Acquaintance | Higher |
| 19. | Receiving a compliment | Close | Equal |
| 20. | Receiving a compliment | Acquaintance | Higher |

Appendix H1: Rubric Used in the Institution

PART C: RESPONSE TO A SITUATION (5 pts/ 1 pt. each)

Suggested full credit answers are given for the items in this section. Use your discretion in grading other different answers according to the principles below:

Give full credit if:

- The communicative function is appropriate and intelligible in terms of meaning and structure;
- There are minor grammatical errors (e.g. preposition, article, spelling, etc) which do not affect the intended communication

Deduct 0.5 pt. if:

- The appropriate communicative function is used, but there is a global structure error (e.g. word order, tense, lexical error, etc) which does not affect the intended communication;
- The appropriate communicative function is used, there are no/minor grammatical errors, but the explanation, reason etc. stated is different from what is expected or does not exist at all.

Give zero if:

- The communicative function used is incorrect or inappropriate (even there are no structural errors in the statement) and if the overall meaning has changed or is incomprehensible due to global grammatical errors.

Appendix H2: Rubric for the DCTs**Class Code****Item No**

| | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |
| 5. | | | |
| 6. | | | |
| 7. | | | |
| 8. | | | |
| 9. | | | |
| 10. | | | |
| 11. | | | |
| 12. | | | |
| 13. | | | |
| 14. | | | |
| 15. | | | |

Appendix I 1: Sample Scores Assigned to the Responses in the Pre-Test

ITEM 6: Making an Offer

PIN 25

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----|--|-------|-----------------------|
| 1. | I'm going to the library. I can help you. | 0.5 | Social |
| 2. | That's great because I'm going to go to the library, so why don't you join me? | 0.5 | Social |
| 3. | Sir, please get in the car in order to go to the library together. | 1 | |
| 4. | Can I help you? | 0 | Too general |
| 5. | I'm driving to the library. Do you like to come with me? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 6. | I'm going to the library, so I can come with you. | 0 | Linguistic and Social |
| 7. | --- | 0 | NA |
| 8. | Then, let's go to the library. | 0.5 | Social |
| 9. | I'm going to the library and you can come to there with me. | 0.5 | Social |
| 10. | Professor, would you like to join me? | 1 | |
| 11. | I' going to library too, so do you wanna join me? | 0.5 | Social |
| 12. | --- | 0 | NA |
| 13. | I'm going to go to the library. Can you join me? | 0.5 | Social |
| 14. | Hello teacher. I'm going to the library. I can help you. | 0.5 | Social |
| 15. | You can come to my car because I'm also going to the library. | 0.5 | Social |
| 16. | I want to help you so we can go together with my car. | 0.5 | Social |
| 17. | I'm going to library too. Do you want to come with me? | 0.5 | Social |
| 18. | How can I help you? | 0 | Irrelevant |

PIN 26

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----------|--|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | --- | 0 | NA |
| 2. | I am going to the library, too. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 3. | I'm going to the library, too. I can take you. | 0.5 | Social |
| 4. | It is surprising that I'm driving already to the library. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 5. | Fortunately, I'm driving to the library. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 6. | I'm going to library, too. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 7. | I'm going to the library, too and I can take you to the library. | 0.5 | Social |

PIN 30

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----|---|-------|--------------------------|
| 1. | I help to carry books. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 2. | I'm also going to library, so you can come with me. | 0.5 | Social |
| 3. | That's great, so do I. Let's go. | 0.5 | Social |
| 4. | Oh, really, so am I. Let's go together with my car. | 0 | Linguistic and Social |
| 5. | I'm going to the library, too. If you want, I'll take you to the library. | 1 | |
| 6. | I'm driving to the library, too, so if you want, we can go together. | 1 | |
| 7. | Me too. Please come in. | 1 | |
| 8. | Me too! | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 9. | --- | 0 | NA |
| 10. | OK I can go to the library you? | 0 | Linguistic |
| 11. | --- | NA | |
| 12. | I'm going to the library and I can take you there if you want. | 1 | |
| 13. | I'm going to library too. Will we go together? | 0 | Social |
| 14. | Me too. We can go to the library by my car. | 0.5 | Social |
| 15. | I take you to library. | 0 | Linguistic and Social |
| 16. | --- | 0 | NA |
| 17. | I'm going to library too. I can take you. | 0.5 | Social |

Appendix I2: Sample Scores Assigned to the Responses in the Mid-Test

ITEM 1: Making an Offer

PIN 25

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----|--|-------|-------------|
| 1. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 2. | Could I help you to complete the report? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 3. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 4. | Could I want to help you? | 0 | Linguistic |
| 5. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 6. | Could I help you to complete a report? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 7. | If you aren't feeling well, you can go home. | 0 | Social |
| 8. | Could you give me the honour to help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 9. | Could I help you to complete a report? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 10. | Can I help you for your report? | 0.5 | Social |
| 11. | Are you OK? Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 12. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 13. | Can I want to your help for a report? | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 14. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 15. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 16. | If you want to help, I can help your works. | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 17. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 18. | Can I help you? | 1 | |

PIN 26

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----------|------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 2. | Could you want to help? | 0 | Linguistic |
| 3. | Do you need help? | 0.5 | Social |
| 4. | Could you want to help? | 0 | Linguistic |
| 5. | Do you need to help? | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 6. | If you care, I can help you. | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 7. | Could you want me to help? | 0.5 | Linguistic |

PIN 30

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----------|---|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Sorry, I can't because I need to complete a report. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 2. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 3. | If you don't mind, I can help you. | 0 | Social |
| 4. | If you want, I can complete the report. | 1 | |
| 5. | Can I help to you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 6. | Excuse me, if do you need to help about the report, I can help you. | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 7. | Don't worry. We can do it together. | 0.5 | Social |
| 8. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 9. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 10. | May I help you for reports? | 0.5 | Social |
| 11. | I guess, it will be difficult, so is there anyone help me? | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 12. | I could help you if you want. | 1 | |
| 13. | Could I help you to complete a report? You don't look fine. | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 14. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 15. | If you need any helps, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 16. | Could you help me, please? | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 17. | If you are not well, I can complete the report by myself. | 0.5 | Social |

Appendix I3: Sample Scores Assigned to the Post-Test

ITEM 1: Making an Offer

PIN 25

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----|--|-------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Can you need help? | 0 | Linguistic and Social |
| 2. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 3. | Would you like me to help you? | 1 | |
| 4. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 5. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 6. | I want to help you to enter some data on the program. | 0.5 | Social |
| 7. | Would you want to help about Excel? | 0 | Linguistic |
| 8. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 9. | I want to help you to enter some data on the program. | 0.5 | Social |
| 10. | Can I help you to enter some data on the program? | 1 | |
| 11. | Would you like me to help to enter some data on the program? | 1 | |
| 12. | Would you like me to help to enter some data on the program? | 1 | |
| 13 | May I help you? | 1 | |
| 14. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 15. | Do you need help? | 0.5 | Social |
| 16. | Could I help you? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 17. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 18 | Could you please help me? | 0 | Irrelevant |

PIN 26

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Can I help you if you want? | 1 | |
| 2. | I can help you if you want. | 1 | |
| 3. | Would you like me to help you? | 1 | |
| 4. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 5. | Can I help you? | 1 | |
| 6. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 7. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |

PIN 30

| No | Response | Score | Explanation |
|-----------|--|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Do you want me to help? | 1 | |
| 2. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 3. | Could I help you, sir? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 4. | If you want, I can help to enter data on the program. | 1 | |
| 5. | Would you like to need help? | 0 | Linguistic |
| 6. | I can help you, if you want. | 1 | |
| 7. | Sir, if it is not a problem for you I can help you. | 1 | |
| 8. | Would you like me to help to enter data? | 1 | |
| 9. | Could you help me? | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 10. | May I help you to enter the excel. | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 11. | If you want, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 12. | I could help you if you want. | 1 | |
| 13. | Do you want me to help you? | 1 | |
| 14. | Do you want to help from me? | 0.5 | Linguistic |
| 15. | If you want my help, I can help you. | 1 | |
| 16. | Could you help me to enter some data on the program, please. | 0 | Irrelevant |
| 17. | If you want, I can try to help you to do this. | 1 | |

Appendix J: The Analysis of the Pre-Test

| Item No | Point Tested | Item | Mean | St. Dev. |
|---------|---|--|-------|----------|
| 1 | Refusing a suggestion from equal status people - not close | You, your roommate, and two of your roommate's friends who you have just met for the first time are discussing where to have lunch. One of them suggests going to a café on campus. You have heard that the café serves a variety of dishes which are too expensive for you. You have been trying hard to manage your budget as a university student who isn't on a scholarship. What would you say? | 0.538 | 0.394 |
| 2 | Refusing a request from an equal status person - close (a younger sister) | While watching an exciting movie one evening, your fifteen-year-old sister asks for your help. She has to use a software program to do her homework and she is having difficulty using it. She needs to complete her homework and submit it two days later via the software program. However, you don't want to deal with that problem at 10 p.m. because you want to rest and enjoy the movie. What would you say? | 0.606 | 0.435 |
| 3 | Refusing a request from a higher status person - not close | You need to prepare a presentation as part of your course. You have already started to do your research and collect data. However, it is clear that you need at least two weeks to analyse your data to get ready for the presentation. As you are scheduled to present it in the session two weeks later, you think you will be well-prepared. However, the professor asks you to present it next week as he needs to make changes in the schedule. You know it won't be possible to prepare it in such a short time. What would you say? | 0.327 | 0.327 |

| Item No | Point Tested | Item | Mean | St. Dev. |
|----------------|---|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 4 | Making a request to a higher status person - not close | You need a specific book to complete your homework, but you cannot borrow it from the library as someone else has already borrowed it. You have seen that particular book in the office of a distinguished professor. You want to borrow that book from the professor. What would you say to her? | 0.462 | 0.311 |
| 5 | Making a request to an equal status person - close | You have a girlfriend/boyfriend. Tomorrow, you are going out to celebrate his/her birthday; however, you do not have enough money to organize a good birthday party. Therefore, you want to borrow some money from your best friend for the first time. What would you say? | 0.587 | 0.353 |
| 6 | Making an offer to a higher status person – not close | While you are driving to the library, you see one of the professors whose course you took last year. She is carrying a lot of books, so you stop and offer to take her wherever she wants. She says that she is going to the library. What would you say to her next? | 0.356 | 0.362 |
| 7 | Refusing an invitation - a higher status person - close | Your grandfather has invited you to a dinner with some other family members. You respect your grandfather very much, and you know that he becomes really upset when he is rejected. However, you have to go on a business trip to İstanbul that day. What would you say to him? | 0.683 | 0.343 |

| Item No | Point Tested | Item | Mean | St. Dev. |
|----------------|--|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 8 | Refusing an offer- an equal status person – a stranger | While you are walking home on a hot day carrying your heavy shopping bags, a car stops near you, and the driver offers to take you to your house. As you do not know the driver, you do not want to get in the car. However, you do not want to sound rude, either. What would you say? | 0.606 | 0.400 |
| 9 | Complaint - an equal status person – close | After waiting for your friend in front of the cinema for about 20 minutes, you call him several times. When he doesn't answer, you realize that he has broken his promise. As it is not the first time, you get really angry at him, and you want to complain about his behaviour. What would you say to your friend when you see him later in the evening? | 0.288 | 0.375 |
| 10 | Complaint - a higher status person – not close | Although you are trying hard to study for an exam that you are going to take the following day, you cannot concentrate on it because your neighbors' children are making too much noise. After waiting for about half an hour, you decide to complain about the noise, so you go to their house. What would you say? | 0.317 | 0.343 |
| 11 | Suggestion - lower status people – not close | While having a meeting in the office together with some of the employees working in your company, you explain that there will be a business trip to Japan. As the manager, you also say that the time of the trip should be carefully organized. After thinking about a suitable time, you suggest that the trip should be held two weeks later as there are no holidays or meetings that week. How would you suggest it? | 0.125 | 0.219 |
| Item | Point | Item | Mean | St. |

| No | Tested | | | Dev. |
|----|--|--|-------|-------|
| 12 | Suggestion – equal status people – close | You are talking with your classmates and trying to decide what to do after school. Since the weather is warm, you want to ride around the campus and enjoy the beauty of the campus together. What would you say? | 0.452 | 0.457 |
| 13 | Apology - a lower status person - not close | You are a teacher in a crowded school. During the break, you accidentally step on a student's foot in the crowded corridor. You feel really bad about it. What would you say to him? | 0.337 | 0.428 |
| 14 | Apology - a higher status person – not close | You were supposed to submit your homework two days ago, but you could not complete it because of an illness. You feel ashamed and go to your professor's office to talk about it. What would you say? | 0.356 | 0.412 |
| 15 | Giving permission to an equal status person - close | You are participating in a group activity in class. While you are trying to complete the task, one of the members of another group asks to use your dictionary. As you do not need it, you can lend the dictionary to them. What would you say? | 0.346 | 0.449 |
| 16 | Getting permission from a higher status person – not close | You are going to your hometown for the weekend. Your bus will leave the terminal at 14:30. You do not want to miss your bus, and there is heavy traffic. Therefore, you want to leave the class ten minutes before the bell rings. What would you say to your teacher before the lesson? | 0.308 | 0.373 |

| Item No | Point Tested | Item | Mean | St. Dev. |
|----------------|--|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 18 | Inviting a person of higher status – not close | It is almost the end of the term, so you have organized a dinner together with your classmates. As a class, you want your teacher to join you. Your classmates have asked you to invite her. What would you say to her? | 0.375 | 0.395 |
| 19 | Responding to a compliment from a higher status person - close | <p>Your aunt has visited you and after asking about your lessons, exams, and so on, she has learnt that you have high grades. She is really happy, and she says:</p> <p>Aunt: I am proud of you because of your academic success. You: _____ _____</p> | 0.356 | 0.412 |
| 20 | Responding to a compliment from a higher status person – not close | <p>You have been playing basketball in a team for two years. You can shoot baskets from a distance and jump really high. Your team has just won a game because you scored from outside the three-point line. After the game, your coach said:</p> <p>Coach: You are very good at playing basketball. You have great talent for it. You: _____ _____</p> | 0.279 | 0.349 |

Appendix K1: Handouts for the Treatment Sessions

Complete the table while watching the video clips.


Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oyX4ge17wBY>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kBV0uOLx8jM>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | b. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | b. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

How to Make an Offer

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Formal  Informal | Would you like me to Shall I | clean the board? bring your mobile phone? carry your books? |
| | Let me I'll | get you some water. switch the lights for you. help you with your homework. |

How to Respond to an Offer:

| Accepting an Offer | Declining an Offer |
|---|--|
| Thank you very much. Thank you. That would be nice. Yes, please, I'd love to. Thank you, that's kind of you. If you wouldn't mind. Thank you. Thanks. | No, thank you. I can manage. No, thank you. I'm fine. Don't worry, I'll do it. No, thanks. I'm good. No, thanks. |

Step 1: Read the card and think about what you would say in the situation written on your card in one minute.

Step 2: Talk with your partner by considering the situation on your card.

| Partner A | Partner B |
|---|---|
| You are in the class. You realise that one of your classmates doesn't have the coursebook with him/her. You offer him to share your book to do the exercise. | You are in the class. Your teacher has asked you to do one of the exercises in the coursebook. However, you have forgotten to bring the book to the class, and now you need help. |
| You are travelling on a bus to downtown. You see an old person who has just got on the bus. As there is no empty seat, you want to offer your seat to the old person. | You are in your 80s. You want to visit one of your friends at a café in downtown. When you get on the bus, you realise that there is no empty seat. Fortunately, one of the passengers offers his seat. |
| Your teacher has difficulty in setting the projector up. You want to help her. What would you say? | You are a teacher. You cannot set the projector up. Fortunately, one of your students has offered help. What would you say? |

Adapted from:

http://www.myenglishpages.com/site_php_files/communication-lesson-offers.php

<http://www.phrasemix.com/collections/9-ways-to-offer-to-help-someone>

<http://www.english-at-home.com/speaking/making-requests/>

Complete the table while watching the video clips.


Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YspAGRCeXc4>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LGWFrY9eY4U>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

How to Make an Invitation:

| | |
|---|--|
| Formal  Informal | Would you care to join me for a dinner tonight at my house? |
| | We'd be delighted to have you over for my birthday party. |
| | Would you be interested in going to the the stadium next Sunday? |
| | I was wondering if you would like to join us for a meal. |
| | We would like to invite you to dinner. |
| | I thought you might like to try some of our local cuisine. |
| | Do you want to go to the cinema tonight? |
| | There's a really nice place just a few minutes from here. |
| What about going out for a meal? | |

How to Respond to an Invitation:

| Accepting an Invitation | Declining an Invitation |
|---|--|
| <p>That's very kind of you. Thank you for inviting me. I'd like that very much.</p> <p>I'd be delighted to come.</p> <p>Thank you. That'd be very nice. I'll look forward to it.</p> <p>Yes, please. Thanks.</p> <p>That's/ What a good idea.</p> <p>That sounds good/ fun.</p> | <p>Thank you very much, but I'm afraid I can't come.</p> <p>That's very kind of you, but unfortunately, I have arranged something else.</p> <p>That's very kind of you, but I won't be here on Tuesday.</p> <p>Thanks, but I won't be able to make it then.</p> <p>No, thank you.</p> <p>No, thanks.</p> |

Adapted from:

<http://spokenenglish4u14tips.blogspot.com.tr/2012/01/invitation.html>

<https://www.espressoenglish.net/practical-english-making-an-invitation/>

http://www.myenglishpages.com/site_php_files/communication-lesson-inviting.php

<http://www.easypacelearning.com/all-lessons/english-level-2/1096-invitations-inviting-people-english-lesson>

Complete the table while watching the video clips.

Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hc5wwl1kjP4>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AEIn3T6nDAo>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qy_mIEnnlF4

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

How to Make a Complaint

- I'm afraid I have to make a serious complaint.
- I'm sorry to say this, but...
- I'm afraid I've got a complaint about...
- I'm afraid there is a slight problem with...
- Look, I'm sorry to trouble you, but....
- Excuse me, there seems to be something wrong with...
- Don't get me wrong, but I think we should...
- I'm angry about ...
- Will you please stop making so much noise?
- You shouldn't have said that.

How to Respond to a Complaint:

| Positive Response to a Complaint | Negative Response to a Complaint |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oh, I'm sorry about that. - I can't tell you how sorry I am. - I wish it never happened. - Oh dear, I'm really sorry. - I'm so sorry, I didn't realize ... - I just don't know what to say. - I'm so sorry, but this will never occur / happen again. - I'm sorry, we promise never to make the same mistake again. - I'm really sorry; we'll do our utmost/best not to make the same mistake again. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Well, I'm afraid -there is nothing we can do about it. -Well, I'm afraid there isn't much we can do about it. |

Adapted from:

<http://www.eslteachersboard.com/cgi-bin/lessons/index.pl?read=1456>

http://www.myenglishpages.com/site_php_files/communication-lesson-complaininig.php

<http://english-tonight.com/how-to-complain-in-english/>

Complete the table while watching the video clips.

Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjRy3E0oIHE>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=31Voz1H40zI>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6_dipuXXeM8

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | a. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | a. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

How to Make a Suggestion to do something together with others:

| | |
|--|--|
| - I'd like to suggest - I suggest us | going to the cafeteria for lunch? |
| - Do you think it would be a good idea to - Why don't we - Shall we - Let's | go to the cafeteria for lunch? |
| - What about - How about | going to the cafeteria for lunch? |

How to Make a Suggestion for another person to do something:

| | |
|--|--|
| - The best thing would be to - If I were you, I would | accept the job offer. |
| - Have you ever considered - Have you ever thought of | having a career related to fashion? |

How to Respond to a Suggestion:

| Accepting a Suggestion | Refusing a Suggestion |
|---|--|
| Yes, I'd like to. Yes, I'd love to. Yes, with pleasure. That sounds like a good idea. What a good idea! Yes, I feel like taking a walk. Ok. Yes, let's. Why not? | No, I'd rather not. No, let's not. I don't feel like it. I dislike going for a walk. Oh, it is not a good idea. What an awful / bad idea! |

Adapted from:

<http://spokenenglish4u14tips.blogspot.com.tr/2012/01/suggestions-advice.html>

http://www.myenglishpages.com/site_php_files/communication-lesson-suggesting.php

Complete the table while watching the video clips.


Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y0cvyVJd0oc>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | b. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | b. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FE69YbFVzj8>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | b. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | b. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

How to Make a Request

| | |
|---|---|
| Formal  Informal | I would be grateful if you could send me more information about the course. |
| | Would you call a taxi for me, please? |
| | Could you turn the volume down, please? |
| | Would you mind opening the window? |
| | Do you mind turning the lights on? |
| | Do you think you could give me more information about the assignment? |
| | Will you help me to do my homework? |
| | Can you wake me at seven o'clock? |

How to Respond to a Request

| Positive Response to a Request | Negative Response to a Request |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Yes, sure. | No, I'm sorry I need it |
| Yes, of course. | I'm afraid I can't. |
| Sure here you are. | Sorry, but... |
| Okey. | |

Important Point:

A: Would you mind giving me your book?

B: No, I don't mind."(which is **a positive response** to the request. It means that I accept to lend you my book)

B: Yes. (which is **a negative response** to the request. It means that I don't want to lend you my book.)

Adapted From:

<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/functions/requests>

<https://www.ecenglish.com/learnenglish/lessons/polite-requests>

<http://www.english-at-home.com/speaking/say-thank-you/>

Complete the table while watching the video clips.

Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbyUSCrY8QA>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | c. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | c. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y0cvyVJd0oc>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | c. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | c. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

REFUSAL STRATEGIES

| Direct | Indirect | Adjunct |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1. Performatives; e.g.: “I refuse.”</p> <p>2. Non-performative statement e.g.: “No.”</p> <p>3. Negative willingness ability e.g.: “I can’t./ I won’t./ I don’t think so.”</p> | <p>1. Statement of regret “I’m sorry.../ I feel terrible...”</p> <p>2. Wish “I wish I could help you...”</p> <p>3. Excuse, reason, explanation e.g.: “My children will be home that night./ I have a headache.”</p> <p>4. Statement of alternative a. I can do X instead of Y: e.g.: “I’d rather.../ I’d prefer...” b. Why don’t you do X instead of Y e.g.: “Why don’t you ask someone else?”</p> <p>5. Set condition for future or past acceptance e.g.: “If you had asked me earlier, I would have...”</p> <p>6. Promise of future acceptance; e.g.: “I’ll do it next time./ I promise I’ll.../ Next time I’ll...”</p> <p>7. Statement of principle e.g.: “I never do business with friends.”</p> <p>8. Statement of philosophy e.g.: “One can be too careful.”</p> <p>9. Attempt to dissuade the interlocutor a. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester: “I won’t be any fun tonight.” (to refuse an invitation) b. Criticize the request/ requester (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult attack: e.g.: “Who do you think you are?”, “That’s a terrible idea!”</p> <p>10. Avoidance; a. Non-verbal: silence, hesitation, doing nothing, physical departure. b. Verbal: topic switch, joke, repetition of part of the request such as “Monday?”, postponement, e.g.: “I’ll think about it., hedge, e.g.: “Gee, I don’t know./ I’m not sure.”</p> | <p>1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement e.g.: “That’s a good idea.../ I’d love to...”</p> <p>2. Statement of empathy e.g.: “I realize you are in a difficult situation, but ...”</p> <p>3. Pause fillers e.g.: “uhh/well/oh/uhm”</p> |

Complete the table while watching the video clips.

Scene 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JMjPe5uZrU>


| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | d. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | d. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

Scene 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OBeZqXSiRt4>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eiAwT6WpzB4>

| | |
|---|--|
| Interlocutors | _____ |
| Distance between the interlocutors | e. Close b. Acquaintance c. Stranger |
| Status of the listener | e. High b. Equal c. Lower |
| Statement | _____ |

How to Respond to a Compliment

| | |
|---|---|
| Formal  Informal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thank you. I appreciate your saying that. - Thank you. That's very kind of you to say so. - Thank you very much. - Thank you. - Thanks. |
|---|---|

Adapted From:

http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/radio/specials/1210_how_to_converse/page7.shtml

<http://ask.metafilter.com/255674/What-are-good-ways-to-respond-to-people-saying-nice-things-about-me>

Role-Play Cards

| PARTNER A | PARTNER B |
|--|--|
| <p>You have a midterm tomorrow. That's why, you have been studying hard recently without hanging with your friends. You want to go to a night club together with your close friends after the midterm. What would you say?</p> | <p>One of your close friends have been studying hard for an exam. S/He suggests going to a night club after the midterm. What would you say?</p> |
| <p>Your roommate feels upset because of one of her friends with whom she had an argument. You want to cheer her up. What would you suggest?</p> | <p>You feel upset because you have had an argument with one of your friends. Your roommate has a suggestion to cheer you up. What would you say?</p> |
| <p>You do not like pepper in your pizza. When you order your pizza, you always ask them not to add any pepper. You have your pizza and realize that it includes pepper. What would you say?</p> | <p>You are a waiter at a restaurant. One of the customers has a complaint. What would you say to him/her?</p> |
| <p>You are in a restaurant. While ordering your meal, you wanted them to cook it well. However, you realize that your meat is not well-cooked. What would you say?</p> | <p>You are a waiter at a restaurant. One of the customers has a complaint. What would you say to him/her?</p> |
| <p>Your flatmate does not help you to clean the house. He says he has lots of assignments to complete. However, you see him playing computer games or sending text messages rather than helping you or doing homework. What would you say?</p> | <p>You do not like cleaning the house you share with your friend. When he asks for help, you say you need to do your homework, but actually you play computer games or enjoy yourself. What would you say as a response to his/her complaints?</p> |
| <p>Your instructor does not nominate you as often as she does other students in the class. You have started to lose your concentration as you cannot take a turn although you raise your hand for many times in her lessons. What would you say.</p> | <p>You are a teacher who tries to treat all your students in a fair way. However, one of your students think you have not been nominating him/her as often as you nominate other students.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Your manager is always asking you to complete the most difficult projects. You cannot work as efficiently as you want because of being under too much pressure. What would you say?</p> | <p>You trust one of the employees more than all the others. That's why, you generally ask that person to complete the most difficult projects. However, s/he thinks that this puts too much pressure on him/her.</p> |
| <p>The weather is nice, so you want to go for a walk with your grandfather/grandmother in the park close to his/her house. What would you say?</p> | <p>The weather is nice, and your granddaughter/grandson suggests going for a walk in the park close to your house. What would you say?</p> |
| <p>You want to celebrate your being promoted. There will be a dinner on Saturday. You want your supervisor to join the party. When you go to your office, you invite her. What would you say?</p> | <p>One of the employees whom you have been supervising for some time has been promoted. S/He has invited you to a party which has been organized to celebrate his/her promotion.</p> |
| <p>You have difficulty in writing an academic paragraph, especially expanding your ideas. You want your teacher to give you oral feedback after the last lesson. What would you say?</p> | <p>You are a teacher. One of your students wants to get oral feedback as s/he has difficulty in expanding his/her ideas. What would you say to her/him?</p> |
| <p>You are going to the supermarket. You know that your next door neighbor has not been able to go out for three days because of her/his illness. You offer buying something for her. What would you say?</p> | <p>You are an 80-year-old man/woman who has not been able to go out for three days because of your illness. Your next door neighbor has offered to buy something from the supermarket. What would you say?</p> |

Appendix K2: Source of the Video Clips

| Speech Act | Source | Title of the Video Clips |
|------------|--|---|
| Offer | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oyX4ge17wBY (2.35 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kBV0uOLx8jM (2.58 min.) | -The Big Bang Theory-Hot Beverage - Arya & Jaqen H'ghar Valar Morghulis |
| Invitation | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YspAGRCeXc4 (3.15 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LGWFrY9eY4U (1.42 min.) | -The Big Bang Theory Penny Introduction -Outsourcing to an Indian boy (The big Bang theory season 6 episode 1) |
| Complaint | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hc5wwl1kjP4 (3.34 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qy_mIEnnIF4 (2.44 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AEIn3T6nDAo (6.57 min.) | -The Big Bang Theory - Sheldon Vs SyFy Channel -The Big Bang Theory - Sheldon Trains Penny -The Big Bang Theory - Sheldon teaches Penny Physics |

| Speech Act | Source | Title of the Video Clips |
|------------|--|---|
| Suggestion | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjRy3E0oIHE (0.59 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=31Voz1H40zl (2.02 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6_dIpuXXeM8 (0.42 min.) | -Game of Thrones - Melisandre suggests using the king's blood in Shireen -Breaking Bad - "I am the Danger" Scene S4 E6 1080p The Big Bang Theory Howard's Dinner Suggestion |
| Request | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y0cvyVJd0oc (1.01 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FE69YbFVzj8 (2.01 min.) | - Game of Thrones - Jon Snow I'm gonna refuse him I swore a vow to the Night's Watch - S3E10 05 Can We Do It In Private |

| Speech Act | Source | Title of the Video Clips |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Refusal | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbyUSCrY8QA (4.19 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y0cvyVJd0oc (1.01 min.) | -Game of Thrones 5x03 - Jon Snow declines Stannis Baratheon's offer - Game of Thrones - Jon Snow I'm gonna refuse him I swore a vow to the Night's Watch |
| Responding to a compliment | https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JMjPe5uZrU (0.49 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OBeZqXSiRt4 (3.56 min.) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eiAwT6WpzB4 (2.02 min.) | -These are great green beans Mrs. White. Jesse Pinkman BREAKING BAD Season 5 -Amy and her monkey's and Sheldon compliments Penny. -The Big Bang Theory - Howard, your shoes are delightful! |

Appendix L: The Scores of the Chosen Participants

| Speech Acts Tested in the Pre-test | RS 1 | RS 2 | RS 3 | RS 4 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | NS 1 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Making an offer to a high status person | 0.5 S | 0 L&S | 0 NA | 0 NA | 0.5 S | 0.5 S | 1 | 0 I |
| 2. Refusing a request from a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 0 L | 0.5 S | 0 L | 1 | 0 S | 0 I |
| 3. Making a request to a higher status person | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 S | 0.5 L | 0 L |
| 4. Inviting a person of higher status | 0.5 L | 1 | 0.5 S | 0 L&S | 1 | 0 NA | 1 | 0 NA |
| 5. Responding to a compliment from a higher status person | 0.5 S | 0.5 L | 0.5 S | 0.5 S | 0 L&S | 0 NA | 1 | 0 NA |
| 6. Complaint-a higher status person | 1 | 0.5 S | 0 NA | 0.5 S | 0.5 S | 0 NA | 0.5 S | 0 L&S |

| Speech Acts | RS 1 | RS 2 | RS 3 | RS 4 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | NS 1 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Tested in the Pre-test | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Inviting a person of equal status | 0.5 L | 0 G | 0 NA | 0 I | 0 NA | 0 NA | 0.5 L | 0 NA |
| 8. Suggestion – equal status people | 0 | I 0.5 L | 1 | 0 I | 1 | 0 NA | 0 G | 0 NA |
| 9. Complaint- a higher status person | 0 | I 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 S | 0.5 L | 0 NA | 0.5 L | 0 L |
| 10. Suggestion – lower status people | 0.5 | S 0 NA | 0 I | 0.5 S | 0 NA | 0 NA | 0.5 S | 0 NA |
| TOTAL | 5 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5.5 | 0 |

| Speech Acts Tested in the Mid-test | RS 1 | RS 2 | RS 3 | RS 4 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | NS 1 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Making an offer to a high status person | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 0 I |
| 2. Refusing a request from a higher status person | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3. Making a request to a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Inviting a person of higher status | 0 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 0 L&S | 0 | 0.5 L |
| 5. Responding to a compliment from a higher status person | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 L&S | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 1 |
| 6. Complaint- a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 |

| Speech Acts | RS 1 | RS 2 | RS 3 | RS 4 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | NS 1 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Tested in the Mid-test | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Inviting a person of equal status | 0.5 L | 0.5 S | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L |
| 8. Suggestion – equal status people | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 0 L |
| 9. Complaint- a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 L |
| 10. Suggestion – lower status people | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 L | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 L |
| TOTAL | 6 | 8 | 4.5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7.5 | 6 |

| Speech Acts Tested in the Post-test | RS 1 | RS 2 | RS 3 | RS 4 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | NS 1 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Making an offer to a high status person | 0.5 L | 1 | 0 I | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2. Refusing a request from a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3. Making a request to a higher status person | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Inviting a person of higher status | 0.5 L | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 0 NA | 0.5 L | 1 | 0 I |
| 5. Responding to a compliment from a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 0.5 S | 0.5 S | 0.5 S | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 |
| 6. Complaint- a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 1 | 0 I | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7. Inviting a person of equal status | 0 I | 1 | 0 NA | 1 | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 0 G |

| Speech Acts Tested in the Post-test | RS 1 | RS 2 | RS 3 | RS 4 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | NS 1 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 8. Suggestion – equal status people | 0.5 L | 1 | 0 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 0 L | 1 |
| 9. Complaint- a higher status person | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 S | 0.5 S | 1 | 0.5 S | 0 NA |
| 10. Suggestion – lower status people | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 L | 0.5 L | 1 | 1 | 0 NA |
| TOTAL | 7.5 | 9.5 | 4.5 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 6 |