AN INVESTIGATION OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS IN L2 LEARNERS' E-MAILS

THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MEDİHA TORAMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

MAY, 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Deniz Zeyrek Bozşahin
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Deniz Zeyrek Bozşahin (METU, COGS) _____

Prof. Dr. Hüsnü Enginarlar (METU, FLE) _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hale Işık Güler (METU, FLE) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Mediha TORAMAN

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS IN L2 LEARNERS' E-MAILS

Mediha Toraman

M.A., Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Deniz Zeyrek Bozşahin

May 2014, 123 pages

This study aims to find out and analyze the directive speech acts used by Turkish speakers of English while making a request or suggestion in their e-mails to their instructors. Data were collected by asking students to write e-mails to their Turkish instructors regarding certain exercises they had done. A group of these students were also contacted again regarding the e-mails they had sent to find out the reasons for their use of certain patterns of speech acts. A questionnaire which includes samples from the e-mails was evaluated by two native speakers regarding the appropriateness and politeness of the speech acts.

The results show that the participants mainly resort to direct strategies in their e-mails and eliminate the opening and closing forms most of the time. The participants also have a tendency to use inclusive pronouns in their e-mails while making use of a form of a directive speech act.

Keywords: Directive Speech Acts, E-mail, Request, Suggestion

ÖZ

ÖĞRENCİ E-POSTALARINDA KULLANILAN YÖNLENDİRİCİ SÖZ EDİMLERİNİN ÇÖZÜMLEMESİ

Mediha Toraman

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Deniz Zeyrek Bozşahin

Mayıs 2014, 123 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın amacı anadili Türkçe olan bir grup öğrencinin öğretmenlerine yolladıkları İngilizce e-posta mesajlarında öneri veya tavsiyede bulunurken kullandıkları yönlendirici söz edimlerini ortaya çıkarmak ve incelemektir. Veriler, öğrencilerin yaptıkları birtakım alıştırmayla ilgili yazdıkları e-postalardan oluşmaktadır. Bu öğrencilerden bazılarına yolladıkları e-postayla ilgili sorular sorulmuştur. Bu e-postalardan örneklerin olduğu bir anket anadili İngilizce olan iki kişiye verilmiş ve kendilerinden bu kullanımları o bağlamda uygunluk açısından değerlendirmeleri istenmiştir.

Sonuçlar katılımcıların e-postalarında genel olarak dolaysız izlemler kullandıklarını ve giriş ve kapanış kalıplarını kullanmadıklarını göstermiştir. Katılımcıların ayrıca bu yönlendirici söz edimlerini kullanırken daha çok kapsayıcı zamirleri kullandıkları görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yönlendirici Söz Edimleri, E-posta, Talep, Öneri

Geçmiş, Şu An ve Gelecekteki Tüm Öğrencilerime,

To All My Students,

Past, Present and Future

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCSARP   (Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns Project)

CMC   (Computer Mediated Communication)

DBE   (Department of Basic English)

EFL   (English as a Foreign Language)

ELT   (English Language Teaching)

EPE   (English Proficiency Exam)

ESL   (English as a Second Language)

FTA   (Face-threatening Acts)

INT   (Intermediate)

L1   (First Language)

L2   (Second Language)

METU   (Middle East Technical University)

NNS   (Non-native Speaker)

NS   (Native Speaker)

PIN   (Pre-intermediate)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter starts with the background to the study by focusing on the use of e-mails in an academic context with the purpose of analyzing requests, suggestions and orders in the main body of the e-mails. The significance of this study is stated by focusing on how this study can be important for the world of ELT and language use in general. The chapter also presents the research questions for this study and gives information about the terms used in the thesis.

1.1 Background to the Study

As technology has started to intervene in every phase of our lives, it has become a common practice for students to integrate the use of e-mails in their communication with their instructors. It can be used at anytime and anywhere and can be sent without thinking much about it like speaking. Thus, it promotes the opportunity to be corrected multiple times before being sent, which all makes it especially advantageous for foreign language learners who may not feel comfortable in participating in classroom discussions and having their say in front of other people (Chapman, 1997). Needless to say, writing an appropriate e-mail requires one to have a good command of pragmatic knowledge and sociopragmatic knowledge (Félix-Brasedefer, 2012, p. 90).

In an academic context, e-mail messages are written with different purposes to and from participants with differing power status. In a study, Bloch (2002) examined the content of e-mail messages sent by L2 graduate students over the course of 10 weeks

in two advanced L2 composition English courses. He divided all these e-mails into four main categories: messages expressing *phatic communication* (e.g. to maintain social relations and solidarity), *messages asking for help*, *messages making excuses*, and *messages expressing explicit requests*, with the first category dominating the others with a percentage of 48.

Biesenbach-Lucas (2005) did a similar study in which she came up with more detailed categories for the topics included in the e-mails of students, which are *facilitative* (about scheduling appointments, submission of work, class attendance, self identification, and message confirmation), *substantive* (about the clarification of assignments, content and format of work, resources, and evaluation of work) and *relational* (about maintaining the social relationship between the parties included in the conversation), and the *facilitative* category dominated the other groups. Her research revealed that Americans are more initiative in e-mailing than the non-native speakers.

Writing appropriate e-mails might be a difficult task to achieve. Chen (2006) asserts that there does not seem to be a standard procedure for e-mail writers to follow as this type of medium integrates both oral and written discourse (p. 35). Thus, adopting a pattern while writing an e-mail becomes a demanding process, especially for those who need to set the standards of 'appropriateness', which is required if the writer is in the position of a lower power. This idea is supported by Chen's further comments on this as he argues that e-mail users are not free to write in the way they want and that they need to obey the rules of appropriateness set by the dominant side (p. 35). She further comments that it is more and more difficult for non-native speakers to express themselves along with the critical awareness of power relations, identity and ideologies in the target culture (p. 35).

As a learner might have questions of how to write an appropriate e-mail to an instructor, he/she might have difficulty in adopting an appropriate style while writing an e-mail. After attempting to find an answer to the question of who sets the e-mail

style, Baron (2002) concludes that the sender is to decide whether the message should be a formal or an informal one and employ the necessities of resorting to either formal or informal style in the message. He also supports the idea that the e-mail style of today is more like the one of telegraphic language of 19th century which encouraged short messages. There is always, however, a kind of tension between personal messaging strategies and academic rules for writing online.

In writing an e-mail to an instructor, the student is expected to obey the rules of pragmatics in addition to the appropriate use of the language. However, the correct use of language in terms of grammar does not guarantee that the learner has the ability to use pragmatically appropriate language as well, a fact which is supported in the literature (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1992; Kasper & Rose, 1999). The language user may produce grammatically correct utterances but these might not be pragmatically appropriate, which may lead to 'pragmatic failure'. This brings about the problem of using appropriate speech acts and applying the rules of politeness in using a language.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The study of speech acts in general is not a new topic. Canale and Swain (1980) put forward their ideas regarding communicative competence, which gave rise to the attention paid to speech acts as the functions of a language. Studies regarding the use of speech acts, especially requests, are not quite old studies. In the late 1990s, when the use of e-mails was gaining popularity and the technology reaching its peak, studies related to the use of speech acts in e-mails and the framework of messages in electronic platforms started to be conducted.

The studies on the use of language and speech acts in e-mails mainly focused on requests of students to faculty (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2007; Chang & Hsu, 1998; Duthler, 2006; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Félix-Brasedefer, 2007; House & Kasper, 1987; Merrison, Wilson, Davies & Haugh, (2012)). This thesis is designed to

focus on a broader scope of speech acts, namely directives, rather than only requests. The thesis also deals with students' own perceptions regarding the use of language, which, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, is lacking in other studies.

In slight alignment with the other studies conducted in the use of speech acts in e-mails, this thesis aims at uncovering, finding and analyzing the directive speech acts used by non-native speakers of English emerging in their e-mails to their instructors. Another aim of this study is to find out the reasons for their use of these patterns.

1.3 Significance of the Study

There have been several attempts in examining the speech acts used in e-mails, specifically requests. These studies mainly look at the nature of directness and indirectness of speech acts used by students at different proficiency levels, and analyze the topics of the e-mails sent by students and the level of high and low imposition requests (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2007; Chang & Hsu, 1998; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Félix-Brasedefer, 2012; Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; House & Kasper, 1987; Lee, 2004; Merrison et al., (2012); Otcu and Zeyrek, 2008; Schauer, 2004). Certain studies have also focused on the salutation, terms of address and closure in e-mails (Bjorge, 2007; Duthler, 2006; Formentelli, 2009; Woodfield and Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011). There have also been few attempts in figuring out the meaning conveyed by the pictographs used in e-mail messages (Fukushima, 2008). What this thesis focuses on differently from these studies is to focus on the directive speech acts, thus focus on a variety of speech acts along with the perceptions of the users of the language.

There are numerous reasons for choosing this topic as an area to conduct an in-depth research on. As directive speech acts occupy every phase of our lives, it is of utmost importance for learners to be aware of the elements that they resort to. Language learners might use certain speech acts – direct or indirect- with different purposes, deliberately or not, and thus their awareness should be raised in their use of these speech acts if they happen to use them inappropriately. In addition, the researcher is

a language teacher, who frequently uses e-mails as a tool in her classes, and who has noticed some 'inappropriateness' in the language use of the students while they are making a request, suggestion or an order, just like what has been proven in some studies (Félix-Brasedefer, 2012; Félix-Brasedefer, 2007; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; and House and Kasper, 1987). Therefore, this subject has been chosen to analyze the tendencies of the students' use of language over different levels.

1.4 Research Questions

This thesis looks for answers to the questions below:

1. Do Turkish learners of English show a preference for direct or indirect speech acts of directives in their e-mails to Turkish instructors?

   a. What is the degree of directness or indirectness?

   b. What is the frequency of 'please' as a lexical modifier employed in the directives of English e-mails of Turkish university students?

2. Does proficiency level matter in the use of direct or indirect speech acts of directives in e-mails to their instructors?

3. What forms of greetings, address and closure do Turkish students employ in their e-mails to their instructors?

4. What forms of perspective do the Turkish learners of English employ in their e-mails to their instructors?

5. Do Turkish learners of English have an awareness of the appropriate use of pragmatic knowledge when they make use of a directive speech act?

1.5 Limitations of the Study

The present study focuses on directive speech acts, which is only one category of the whole set of speech acts, and thus disregards the other types that are not included in this thesis.

Another limitation is regarding the English proficiency level of the participants whose e-mails are analyzed in terms of these acts. The investigated levels are pre-intermediate and intermediate, so the difference is not that high, which gives rise to the question whether it would be really reliable to focus on two close levels and talk about the place of proficiency in writing an e-mail. Yet, in terms of student numbers and availability of participants, these two groups were included.

The study does not consider gender difference. Focusing on the use of directive speech acts over different genders might yield important results. However, adding this point would make the study focus too broad.

Lastly, the absence of native speaker data might be an important limitation. However, supporting the results with the relevant literature will give the opportunity to eliminate this limitation.

1.6 Definitions of Terms

As the focus of this thesis is the way students formulate requests, suggestions and orders in e-mails, what needs to be dealt with mainly is the so-called speech acts. The simplest and broadest definition provided is "Actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts." (Yule, 2011, p. 47).

Austin (1962) supports the idea that the key function of language is not to make true and false statements only. As it is put forward in 'How to Do Things with Words', the meaning is exploited in three main ways:

1. Locutionary (Propositional) meaning – the literal meaning of the utterance

2. Illocutionary meaning – the intended meaning of the utterance

3. Perlocutionary meaning – the effect of the utterance" (p. 94 – 102)

Searle proposed the classification of speech acts which are put into five main categories as follows:

Declarations change the world via their utterance. For example:

(1) Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

As it is clear from the example, the speaker has a special institutional role to perform a declaration in an appropriate way.

Representatives state what the speaker believes to be the case or not.

(2) The earth is flat.

As it is clear from the example, the speaker shows the world as he/she believes it.

Expressives show what the speaker feels. The example below shows a psychological state.

(3) Congratulations!

Directives are used to get someone else to do something. Requests can be given as examples of this, as seen in this example.

(4) Could you lend me a pen, please?

Commissives are used to commit oneself to some future action.

(5) I'll be back.

As it is clear from the example, the speaker makes a promise (p. 53 – 54).

Following Austin, Searle (1965) defines the term 'speech act' in more detailed terms in his article 'What is a Speech Act?' and puts forward some examples for locutionary & illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, which would support Austin's earlier views.

This study also focuses on the type of perspective used in directive speech acts. For that reason, it is important to define this term, as well. *Perspective* is the choice of the subject in making a request. In the present context, however, it also refers to the subjects used in suggestions.

The definitions and explanations regarding the more detailed parts of speech acts and other topics concerning this study will be presented in the Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This section focuses on the pertinent literature regarding the current study. Pragmatics is given a place in the first part of the section. Next, speech act theory and classification of this theory are examined, which is followed by the theory of politeness. After this part, studies on the use of directive speech acts in electronic mails are presented. The studies that focused on other elements such as terms of address, salutation and closure, the politeness marker 'please' and perspective in e-mails are also presented.

2.1 Pragmatics

When there is a study on language use, it is indispensible for the researcher to deal with what is referred to as 'pragmatics'. As Yule (2011) states in its simplest form, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of these forms (p. 4). It mainly focuses on what the speaker conveys and what the listener receives. Rather than focusing on the literal meanings of words, it analyzes the contextual meaning of the utterances (p. 3).

The starting point of pragmatics as a concept is due to the work of John L. Austin (1955) who focused on the meanings conveyed with words and utterances and dealt with what goes beyond what is said, and who set the milestone of the field of pragmatics as a discipline. Searle's *Speech Acts* (1969) was the continuation of what Austin had brought to this area. With this work, Searle brought the analysis of speech acts to the centre as an important element of language studies. Grice (1957) also

focused on the concept of meaning which is about getting other people to do things by only certain means in his ten-page article *Meaning*.

As pragmatics started to gain popularity, some different definitions of the term started to be given by different people who wanted to focus on this area in their studies. Fraser (1983) states that "pragmatics is the theory of linguistic communication" (p. 30). Similarly, Wierzbicka (1991) states pragmatics is defined as linguistic interaction between 'I' and 'you' and she points out the fact that this definition is different from she wants to focus on in her book by giving an example with the use of the word 'question' in different grammatical constructions. The word 'question' can be defined in a dictionary. The type of a question such as "What time is it?" can be discussed in a chapter of a grammar book. The type of a question such as "Do you know what time is it?" can be presented in a different section of the same grammar book as if they are different from each other. However, she claims that all of them are related to each other closely as they include concepts such as 'knowing' and 'not knowing' (p. 5).

Kasper and Rose (2001) depart from the linguistic definition to the pedagogical perspective and define pragmatics as a field of communicative action in its sociocultural context, in which communicative action includes the implication of different types of discourse and participating in speech events of various length and complexity in addition to the use of speech acts (p. 2). In alignment with the purpose of the study, which focuses on the speech acts used in the e-mails of foreign language speakers of English, some attention should be given to what is stated as 'interlanguage pragmatics', as well. Trosborg (1995) puts the concept of interlanguage into words, and she argues that "interlanguage is the language system(s) developed by the learners on his/her path to acquire the target language" (p. 53). The area of interlanguage pragmatics concentrates on learners' pragmatic and discourse knowledge rather than the phonological, morphological and syntactic knowledge of learners', which was quite popular in the 1970s (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 9).

Several studies have been conducted to analyze the requests used by learners (Walters, 1981; Fraser & Nolen, 1981; Blum-Kulka, 1982, 1983; Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 9). Studies such as the ones that belong to Fraser, Rintell & Walters (1980) also focus on the production and perception of different speech acts by the same group of learners. As the focus of these studies is mainly on English, the current study will be an important step in the investigation of such speech acts use in a different language, which is Turkish in the present context.

Thomas (1983) suggested two kinds of pragmatic failure in the area of interlanguage pragmatics: sociopragmatic failure and pragmalinguistic transfer. While the former term refers to the learner's assessment of the situational factors in accordance with their native sociopragmatic norms, the latter term is about the transfer of native procedures and linguistic means of speech act performance to interlanguage communication (Kasper, 1981; Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Beebe et al., 1990) In these studies, the notion of transferability of the learner is emphasized for the area of pragmatics (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 10-11).

2.2 Speech Acts

In a study where the focus is on meaning conveyed in a certain context, speech acts become an indispensible part, as well. Among many studies conducted in the area of interlanguage pragmatics, speech acts have taken an important part and have drawn a great deal of attention.

Before going into the details of speech acts, it would be wise to talk about the definitions of this term. In its simplest sense, Yule (2011) states that "actions performed via utterances are called speech acts" (p. 47). Cohen (1996) defines this term as follows: "A speech act is a functional unit in communication" (p. 384). Going back and looking at the origin of speech acts as a concept, we need to look at how Austin (1962) handles this concept. By saying that "many things which would once have been accepted without question as 'statements' by both philosophers and grammarians have been scrutinized with new care" (p. 2), he laid the ground for

speech acts. Following his ideas, Searle (1969) defined what a speech act is as follows: "The production or issuance of a sentence token under certain conditions is a speech act, and speech acts (of certain kinds to be explained later) are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication" (p. 16). Grundy (2008) formulates a similar definition of the term and suggests that a speech act is "the performative, or action accomplishing aspect of language use, and particularly the (illocutionary) force associated with an utterance" (p. 301).

2.3 Speech Act Theory & Classification

It is an undeniable fact that Austin set the milestone of what we know as speech acts today in his lectures which were later published as *How to Do Things with Words*. He showed that utterances are categorized into different sets according to the meanings they convey in certain contexts.

Austin distinguished 'performatives', which he wanted to make clear by going into the depths of the term by differentiating it from constatives. While uttering some words, we might not be interested in the truthfulness of the statement, but rather in the fact that we are doing something by saying it. He supports these views as follows:

> The term 'performative' will be used in a variety of cognate ways and constructions, much as the term 'imperative' is. The name is derived, of course, from 'perform', the usual verb with the noun 'action': it indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action -it is not normally thought of as just saying something (p. 6 – 7).

In addition to the performative aspect of utterances, Austin argues that utterances should have *felicity conditions*.

> Besides the uttering of the words of the so-called performative, a good many other things have as a general rule to be right and to go right if we are to be said to have happily brought off our action. What these are we may hope to discover by looking at and classifying types of case in which something *goes wrong* and the act-marrying, betting, bequeathing, christening, or what not-is therefore at least to some extent a failure: the utterance is then, we may say, not indeed false but in general *unhappy*. And for this reason we call the doctrine of *the things that can be and go wrong* on the occasion of such utterances, the doctrine of the *Infelicities*. We call the doctrine of *the things*

12

> *that can be and go wrong* on the occasion of such utterances, the doctrine of the *Infelicities* (p. 14).

In other words, when the speaker and the listener do not possess the appropriate illocutionary force, and the speech act fails, the utterance does not have the felicity conditions.

For the analysis of speech acts on different levels, Austin proposes the idea of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts and explains them as follows: Locutionary acts are "the basic acts of utterances or producing meaningful linguistic expressions" (Yule, 2011, p. 48). Illocutionary acts are "performed via the communicative force of utterances" (Yule, 2011, p. 48). In uttering a sentence, we might have different purposes in mind such as asking or answering questions, giving some information or making a suggestion, etc., which all go into the category of illocutionary acts. Perlocutionary acts, on the other hand, are about the utterances produced on the assumption that the hearer will recognize the effect you intended (Yule, 2011, p. 48). Austin (1955) clarified all these as follows: "We can similarly distinguish the locutionary act 'he said that . . .' from the illocutionary act 'he argued that. . .' and the perlocutionary act 'he convinced me that . . .'" (p. 102).

With a focus on the illocutionary forces of the utterances, utterances are classified in accordance with these five categories: The first one is the *Verdictives*, which are classified by the giving of a verdict by a jury as the name suggests. Some examples are an estimate, reckoning or appraisal. *Exercitives* are the exercising of powers, rights or influence. Some examples are advising, warning and ordering. *Commisives* are the third type typified by promising or being committed to doing something. The fourth type is *Behabitives* which are about attitudes and social behaviour. Apologizing, congratulating and commending are some examples of this. Austin allocates the last group for *Expositives* which have to do with how we are using words. Utterances such as 'I reply', 'I argue' and 'I illustrate' can be given as examples for this category (p. 156 – 157).

While distinguishing the types of utterances on different levels in accordance with their acts, Austin was very well aware of the fact that this classification had some

limitations as they are not quite clear and cross-classified and that some more clear categorization was needed. Searle (1969) introduces a new framework for the classification of speech acts in which he tried to recategorize Austin's categories. His framework is clearly defined in Hatch (1992), where speech acts are divided into five main categories: *directives, commissives, representatives, declaratives and expressives* (p. 121). *Directives*, which are the focus of this study, are the speech acts in which "a request is being made so that someone will do or stop doing something" (p. 122). More categorization of directives is given by Hatch (1992) in Table 2.3, which belongs to Ervin-Tripp (1972).

Table 2.3 Categorization of Directives (Hatch, 1992, 122)

Name	Example	Addressee
Personal Need / Desire Statements	I need /want X.	Subordinates
Imperative	Gimme x.	Subordinates or familiar equals
Imbedded Imperative	Could you give me X, (please, ok)?	Unfamiliar people, people differing in rank or physically distant; someone in his or her territory; someone whose willingness to comply is in doubt
Permission Directive	May I have X? Is there any X left? Do you have X?	Someone who might not comply; also used when there is an obstacle to compliance
Hint (Sometimes with Humor)	This has to be done over. What about the X?	Persons with shared rules such as members of a family, people living together, and work groups

The use of appropriate type of directive in certain conditions by taking the context and participants into account is of utmost importance. The term 'appropriateness' needs to be clearly defined, which will be discussed in Section 2.5.

The second category is *commissives*, which are about promises and threats. *Representatives* can be judged for their truth value (Hatch, 1992, 127). The presence of hedges might add a quite different effect to the meaning conveyed. For example,

the truth value of the following examples can be changed with the addition or omission of the hedging word 'maybe'.

(1) She appears to be feeling sad.

(2) Maybe she is feeling sad.

Declaratives "bring about a new state of being when they are uttered" (p. 128). When a teacher tells the students "You can leave now", she/he dismisses the class, and thus her /his utterance brings about a new state. The last category is *expressives*, which are about "the statements of joy and disappointment, likes and dislikes" (p. 129). An utterance like "What a horrible day!" can be put into this category.

2.4 Level of Directness and Indirectness in Speech Acts

In the studies conducted on speech acts, it is also necessary to talk about the notions of *directness* and *indirectness*. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) starts talking about these notions with clear examples.

> An utterance like "I am hungry" could be interpreted under appropriate conditions as a remark on the speaker's appetite, as a request for money, or, from a young child, as a request for attention. One of the basic distinctions offered is between speech acts, where the speaker says what he/she means, and indirect speech acts where he or she means more than, or something other than, what he or she says. Most of the standard speech act theories would accept this distinction, but, when it comes to precisely defining what is meant by the notion of *indirectness*, the situation becomes much more complex (p. 2).

Searle (1975) puts forward a term called *conventionality*, which says that some indirect forms are conventionally used to perform some certain acts, and other theorists like Sperber and Wilson (1986) focus on the theory of *relevance*, which is about encoding and decoding the indirect meanings in context. Both are out of the scope of the current study.

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) stress the importance of increase in familiarity, which fosters more directness, "as well as with the transition from the public to the private domain" (p. 4). On the other hand, when formality increases, the need to use more indirect forms is expected to be seen, and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) puts it in e-

mailing language as follows: "e-mail messages addressed upwards are expected to be characterized by greater formality, less directness and a greater degree of external and/or internal mitigation" (p. 3195). Even children develop the sense of directness and indirectness at early ages. Blum-Kulka et al. (1985) found that Israeli children and adults use less direct requests to hearers in a dominant position, which shows that they adapt the directness of their requests in accordance with the relative power of the addressee. In another study with children, Ervin-Tripp (1982) found that young (American) children use more imperatives when they communicate with their mothers than with the fathers, and use orders while talking to siblings and come up with polite requests with strangers.

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) provide the following generalization:

1. *The most direct, explicit level* realized by requests syntactically marked as such, for example, imperatives, or by other verbal means that name the act as a request, such as performatives (Austin, 1962) and hedged performatives (Fraser, 1975)

2. *The conventionally indirect level:* strategies that realize the act by reference to contextual preconditions necessary for its performance, as conventionalized in a given language.

3. *The non-conventionally indirect level,* i.e., the open-ended group of indirect strategies that realize the request either by partial reference to the object or element needed for the implementation of the act or by reliance on contextual clues (pp 46-47).

Originating from the work of Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), Delen (2010) presents the following chart of directness for requests.

Table 2.4: A summary of request strategies in terms of directness levels (Delen, 2010, 30-32)

Level of Directness	Strategy	Explanation	Example
Direct	*Mood derivable*	The grammatical mood of the verb demonstrates the illocutionary force of the request (e.g. imperatives).	*"Leave me alone!"* *„The menu please"* *"You shut up!"*

Table 2.4 (cont'd)

Direct	Explicit performative	The illocutionary intent is clearly mentioned with a verb.	*"I am asking you to move your car." "I am telling you to shut up."*
	Hedged performative	The verb demonstrating the illocutionary intent is replaced with hedging expressions such as modals and verbs expressing intention.	*"I must/have to ask you to clean the kitchen now." "I'd like to ask you to present a week earlier."*
	Locution derivable (Obligation statement)	The illocutionary intent is obvious from the semantic meaning of the locution. The obligation of the act to be carried out by the hearers is clearly stated.	*"Madam, you'll have to/should/must move your car." "I want you to shut up."*
	Want statement	The utterance reveals speaker's desire for the act to be carried out by the hearer.	*"I'd like to borrow your notes for a little while." "I really wish you'd stop bothering me."*
Conventionally Indirect	Suggestory formula	The illocutionary intent is stated with a suggestion formula.	*"Let"s play a game." "How about cleaning here?"*
	Preparatory (Query-preparatory)	There is a reference to the preparatory elements such as willingness and ability.	*"Can I borrow your notes?" "I was wondering if you would give me a lift." "Can you draw a horse for me?"*
Non-conventionally Indirect	Strong hint	The illocutionary intent is not directly reflected in the utterance, but there are certain elements related to the intent in it.	*"Will you be going home now?" (intent: getting a lift home) "This game is boring." (intent: get the others to quit the game)*

Table 2.4 (cont'd)

Non-conventionally Indirect	*Mild hint*	No obvious relevance can be found between the utterance and the elements of the intent. It is highly contextual and requires a great deal of inference.	*"You've been busy here, haven't you?" (intent: getting the hearer to clean the kitchen)* *"I am a nun." (intent: getting a persistent harasser out of the way)*

Such categorizations are universal, but notion of directness and indirectness can change in different cultures. In an intercultural perspective, Tannen (1981), for example, compares Greek to American culture. The study revealed that Greek-Americans resort to Greek cultural notions for indirectness and are more apt to be misunderstood by the more direct Americans.

The categorization for the directness and indirectness notions is mainly for requests as speech acts. However, it would not be wrong to adapt this framework to the other types of directive speech acts; namely, suggestions and orders, which is needed for the present study. Similar to requests, the addresser expects an activity to be done by the addressee in a suggestion or an order. For this reason, it would not be wrong to develop a framework by collating suggestions, orders and requests under one framework.

2.5 Politeness Theory

In much of what goes on in the name of communication in our world, some expressions are considered as being 'thoughtful', some as 'rude', and some as 'polite'. How do we come to label our words with these? What is the rationale for such decisions? Undoubtedly, the notion of politeness needs to be dealt with in this certain context as an addition to the context of speech acts.

To start with the different definitions that have been given for the term, the first can be given with Yule's (2011) explanations as follows: "Politeness, in an interaction, can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of the other person's face which means the public image of a person" (p. 60) Deriving from Brown and Lewinson's (1987) and Leech's (1988) conclusions about politeness, Thomas argues that politeness is a collection of strategies that a speaker resorts to in order to be on the same wavelength with the hearer when they communicate. Grundy (2008) defines politeness as follows: "It is the relationship between how something is said and the addressee's judgment as to how it should be said" (p. 300). Definitions such as these have one ultimate common point: politeness is about the addresser and the addressee, and more specifically about the extent to which the meaning of the utterance is shared.

2.5.1 Cooperative Principle

Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle is to be discussed in this section, and Cooperative Principle focuses on the interactions between people. This point needs to be dwelt on in that the current study concentrates on the interactions between people.

Grice's maxims are composed of four different sets as follows:

Maxim of Quality: be non-spurious (speak the truth, be sincere).
Maxims of Quantity: (a) Don't say less than is required.
(b) Don't say more than is required.
Maxim of Relevance: Be relevant.
Maxim of Manner: Be perspicuous; avoid ambiguity and obscurity (Brown & Levinson, 1987, 95).

These maxims describe the assumptions listeners and speakers normally have in mind in an interaction. Rather than being prescriptive, Grice tried to explain how speakers and hearers arrive at mutual understanding even when a set of utterances seem discontinuous. As an addition to Grice's work, Leech (1983) finds it crucial to add six more maxims to the one Grice developed. The six other maxims he

introduced are the maxims of Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement and Sympathy.

On Face Work (1967) presents the ritual elements in social interaction that were put forward by Goffman in 1955. In this essay, Goffman defined the term face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p. 5). He states that maintenance of face is a matter of interaction, not its objective, and the face-saving actions tend to have their own characteristics in each society and are known to the person who uses them (p. 12 – 13).

Borrowing the ideas of Goffman, Brown and Levinson (1987) incorporated the theories regarding this topic in their book *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*, which is to be dealt with more now. The starting point of the phenomenon is the so-called 'face', which needs to be maintained in conversations by threatening others' faces while ours is being threatened at some points. It is the self-image portrayed in public and something that we want to claim for ourselves. Brown and Levinson (1987) divide face into two categories: The first one, *negative face,* is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (p. 61). *Positive face*, on the other hand, is "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' claimed by others" (p. 61). As human beings and as part of our communication, we engage in some *face-threatening acts*. FTAs that threaten the negative face of the hearer include orders, suggestions, requests, and the like, which are the focus of the present study. The ones that threaten the positive face of the hearer are the expressions of disapproval and disagreements. When it comes to the FTAs that threaten the negative face of the speaker, they are the ones about thanking, while the positive face threatening acts of the speaker are mainly about apologies. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that "there is an overlap in this classification of FTAs because some FTAs intrinsically threaten both negative and positive face" (p. 67).

The presence of different kinds of FTAs give rise to the various strategies employed for doing FTAs. These strategies, which can be called *politeness strategies*, aim at

minimizing the effects of face-threatening acts and at some points avoiding them. The first one is called *bald-on record*, "which is about doing things in their most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible" (p. 69) as Brown and Lewinson point out (1987). Face loss is greater when direct, so whatever desired is directly said in this strategy as in the case of a teacher telling his student "Bring me that book!". The second one is *off-record*, in which there is more ambiguity in the sense that the speaker is not to be held responsible for one literal meaning of the utterance he produces. It is indirect and all kinds of hints are included in this category. A student's telling her classmate "I couldn't finish my homework as there are many things I had to do. I don't know what I'll do" might show her indirect request from the hearer or just a complaint of the situation, the real meaning of which may not be negotiated. *Positive politeness*, as the name suggests, is directed to the positive face of the hearer. The speaker treats the hearer "as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are known and liked" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, 70) *Negative politeness* is mainly avoidance-based and aims at "partially satisfying the hearer's negative, his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 70). While requesting something from the hearer, for example, the speaker tries not to intrude in the freedom of the hearer.

2.6 Speech Acts in E-mails

Crystal (2006) explains the difficulty involved in writing e-mails as follows: "At one level, it is extremely easy to define the linguistic identity of e-mail as a variety of language; at another level, it is surprisingly difficult" (p. 99). Undoubtedly as a convenient means for us to communicate with each other, e-mail makes our lives easier by giving us the chance to have our say in any condition with a few clicks. However, the question of how to write an appropriate e-mail becomes a demanding question that awaits an answer.

In ideal electronic communication, we expect to see some of the settled parts of the appropriate e-mail regardless of the content, context and the participants. The presence of an appropriate greeting and farewell along with an appropriate use of

language throughout the e-mail is crucial. Flynn and Flynn (1998) list some basic rules of writing a good e-mail as follows:

1. Write as though Mom were reading.

2. Think big picture.

3. Keep an eye on spelling.

4. Don't use e-mail to let off steam.

5. Don't send to the world (p. 57).

The question is whether electronic mails should be written as a piece of formal writing or whether it reflects everyday speech. Some researchers suggest that e-mailing is like speaking in that it is dynamic and interactive (Danet, 2001), but some others argue that it ''cannot be strictly labeled as spoken messages since the participants neither see nor hear each other'' (Collot and Belmore, 1996, 14). For that reason, it would not be wrong to categorize e-mailing somewhere between everyday speech and formal piece of writing.

Communication patterns in e-mail differ in accordance with the participants and context included. In the present context, the focus is electronic communication between the teacher and students. I will draw the attention to this part. Studies that have focused on this perspective found that students use e-mail communication with their professors for the purposes such as building good relationships, asking for a particular piece of information, talking about the in and outside class work not carried out on time, etc. (Martin, Myers, & Mottet, 1999, p. 160; Collins, 1998; Marbach-Ad & Sokolove, 2001; Payne, 1997; Poling, 1994). Section 2.7 focuses on the studies which deal with *how* students verbalize such messages in their e-mails.

2.7 Studies on E-mail Communication with Professors

There are studies focusing on e-mail conversations as a conversational exchange between native speakers and L2 learners or among L2 learners of different linguistic backgrounds. These studies investigate how students' use of language in e-mail facilitates second language learning, particularly writing (e.g., Cummins & Sayers, 1995; Pennington, 1996; Liaw, 1998; Singhal, 1998). To my knowledge, one of the

earliest studies in the issue of student-professor e-mail interaction is Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1996). This study examined the requesting style in NSs' and NNSs' e-mails. NSs and NNSs differed formally as the NNSs used fewer downgraders in their request, which the faculty evaluated with negative effect on the addressee. In terms of content, the NNSs expressed their personal time needs more often than NSs, and accepted the imposition of the request on the faculty less often compared to the NSs. Such findings showed that there are some important problems regarding the pragmatic knowledge and use of the L2 learners in that they did not seem to recognize the different status between themselves and their professors. Biesenbach-Lucas and Weasenforth (2000) conducted a study with L2 students showing that L2 learners resorted to inappropriate ways of requesting compared to the NSs. To illustrate, they used fewer modals and more hedged terms. Chen's (2001) study on the American and Taiwanese graduate students' e-mail practice was in alignment with the previous research. The students in both groups made use of query preparatory strategies and want statements. However, there was more indirectness in the NS data in that the number of lexical and syntactic downgraders was high in their messages.

Bloch (2002) conducted another study to see how L2 learners use e-mail when they need to communicate with their instructors. The results showed that the participants made use of different strategies in e-mailing; however, some of these strategies were not quite appropriate as the learners did not seem to be aware of the fact that the e-mails were to be read by somebody who was superior to them in terms of power. He came to the conclusion that writing an e-mail is more than knowing the language; it is also about using the appropriate forms at appropriate instances. Biesenbach-Lucas (2005) focused on e-mail conversation between the faculty and the students; this study further supported the idea that L2 learners were less successful in e-mail interactions in topics such as requesting a response from their professor and offering some response to them. The author suggests that NNSs are not exposed to the use of e-mail in their own cultures and what they use in the target language might be appropriate in their culture.

Duthler (2006) compared the politeness of requests made via e-mail and voice-mail and found important results for CMC. Participants using e-mail made more use of politeness strategies compared to voice-mail, implying that e-mail fosters politeness. In addition, with the imposition getting higher, the participants used more adjunct phrases. Chen (2006) focused on a Taiwanese graduate student's e-mail practice in English for two and a half years. The results of the research revealed that the student's frequent use of e-mail does not mean she is good at using the language of e-mail. In addition, learning to write a status-unequal e-mail is not an easy and simple task. Finally, it was found out that the term 'appropriateness' has multiple facets in status-unequal e-mail communication. Danielewicz-Betz (2013) focused on the student-faculty communication by e-mail from German, Saudi and Japanese students who are communicating with their professors in English. The research revealed that the impolite acts make up the majority of the acts in their data and students are not quite successful in employing appropriate e-mailing styles and elements in their e-mails to faculty. The researcher also drew several implications for language teaching.

2.7.1 Studies Focusing on the Directness and Indirectness of Speech Acts

When we talk about the directness and indirectness issue in e-mailing, it may be that e-mails that employ indirect speech acts are considered more polite and formal whereas the direct ones are preferred in more friendly instances. In studies of directness and indirectness in speech acts, a wide range of direct and indirect messages are seen when the receiver is a professor or a teacher; i.e. someone who is higher in terms of status. As Biesenbach-Lucas (2006) point out, student-faculty e-mail interaction might show the examples of inappropriate ways of interacting due to the inappropriateness of the directness seen in student messages when especially non-native speakers of English resort to request speech acts (p. 83). The studies that analyzed the directness and indirectness phenomenon in e-mails are mainly about requests. The rest of this section focuses on requests in e-mails.

In an earlier study, House and Kasper (1987) analyzed the requests of German learners of English and Danish learners of English. They found that second language

learners used more direct strategies, fewer syntactic downgraders and more external modification strategies compared to NSs. Chang and Hsu (1998) examined 44 e-mail messages of Chinese learners of English and American students in terms of requests. The results showed that American English speakers see e-mail communications as written memos while Chinese English learners treat e-mail communications like either formal letters or telephone conversations. In addition, Chinese senders express their politeness mainly through information sequencing and use their request acts in a more direct way while Americans prefer direct and concise messages, and word their requests in order to show their politeness, but the linguistic forms of their requesting styles were more indirect. Another study focusing on the developmental issues in making a request is by Félix-Brasedefer (2007), whose data were from beginner, intermediate and advanced learners of Spanish. The data were analyzed in terms of the type of request head acts. The findings show that as the proficiency level decreases, the use of direct requests increases. As the proficiency level increases, more conventional indirectness is seen.

Biesenbach-Lucas (2007) dealt with the e-politeness issue with native and non-native speakers of English and examined the level of directness with respect to high and low imposition using Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper's (1989) speech act analysis framework. The results showed that both native and non-native students selected more direct strategies for the lower imposition requests, but not for the highest imposition request and that there is not a significant difference between both groups in terms of the requesting strategies. This showed that the level of imposition affected the directness of the request. Also, in requesting, NSs resorted more to the syntactic politeness devices (progressive aspect, past tense...) while NNSs made use of lexical modifiers such as 'please'. Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) analyzed the e-mail requests of Greek university students sent to the faculty. It examined the degree of directness employed, the degree and type of supportive moves and lexical/phrasal modifiers. It was found that NNS students' e-mails show many examples of significant directness in requests and an absence of lexical/phrasal downgraders, which might cause the readers to read the e-mails as impolite and discourteous and cause a pragmatic failure. Félix-Brasedefer (2012) examined the pragmalinguistic devices used by U.S. university-level students when writing e-mail requests in L1

English and L2 Spanish to the faculty. The results showed that both groups resorted mainly to direct questions and conventionally indirect requests and the learners made more use of 'want' statements. The use of direct requests more for feedback was also seen. Merrison et al. (2012) compared e-mail requests from students in higher education in Britain and Australia. In the 190 e-mails analyzed, it was found that the British resort to deferential dependence, in which institutional hierarchy is seen more, and that the Australians resort to interdependent egalitarianism, and thus make use of more geniality. In addition, it was seen that conventional indirectness is the most common way used in both groups, and the Australian students use both fewer direct and more implicit requests. Lee (2004) focused on some adult Chinese learners of English and analyzed their requests. The results showed that the participants made use of syntactic downgraders like 'Can I', 'May I', and 'I would like to', which turned the tone of the message into a polite one.

2.7.2 Studies Focusing on 'Please' as a Syntactic Downgrader and Other Hedged Terms

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) define the politeness marker *'please'* as follows: It is "an optional element added to a request to bid for cooperative behavior' (p. 283). It may not serve an important function on its own; however, when combined with requests (in which the use of please can be included with the use of directive speech acts), they aim to mitigate the request, order or suggestion. Schauer (2004) studied the developmental patterns of requests by German learners of English on a longitudinal basis. The researcher found that certain lexical downgraders such as the politeness marker (*'please'*) and downtoner (*'perhaps'*) showed high frequencies in the learner data in the first stage of data collection, which shows that these had already been learnt by this group of learners. Biesenbach-Lucas (2006) focused on the degree of directness and politeness features in student e-mails to the faculty. An important finding regarding NNSs was that they did not make use of different syntactic and lexical downgraders, but resorted mainly to the marker *'please'* among some other syntactic ones. Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1996) found that there were more lexical and syntactic downgraders in NSs' requests than those of the NNSs in

requests. Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) also focused on lexical/phrasal downgraders, and the study revealed that lexical/phrasal downgraders were not used by Greek university students' e-mails to the faculty. She suggests that there might be another cause of pragmatic failure in their interactions. Félix-Brasedefer's (2012) found L1 English data included more lexical and syntactic modifiers. It was also found that NNSs made less use of lexical and syntactic modifiers in formal requests.

2.7.3 Perspective in the Use of Speech Acts of Directives

"Choice of perspective presents an important source of variation in requests." (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 19) Although this statement is made only for requests, it surely has a place for orders and suggestions, as well. Thus, the choice of perspective in e-mails by students needs to be dealt with so as to understand the underlying message. Unfortunately, however, not many studies to date have been conducted in the field of perspective choice in e-mails. Below, I review the studies that are available:

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) present four different categories for perspective:
  (a) *Hearer dominance/oriented:* As the name suggests, the speaker includes the hearer in the request being made. "Can *you* bring that book to me?" can be an example.
  (b) *Speaker dominance/oriented:* This time, the speaker is oriented to include himself/herself while requesting something from the hearer as in the case of the example "I guess *I* can take your notes from you now, right?"
  (c) *Speaker and hearer dominance (Inclusive/Joint perspective):* Rather than focusing on only the hearer or speaker, the request-maker includes both groups. An example can be as follows: "Can *we* start now?"
  (d) *Impersonal:* The use of 'people', 'they', 'one', and their equivalences such as passive forms and neutral agents is included in this category. "Is *it* possible to be quiet now?" can be given as an example (p. 58, 278).

Blum-Kulka and Levenstion (1987) investigated learner and NSs of Hebrew and English. The study found that the participants did not commonly use the inclusive perspective, and that the learner data included the use of verbs such as 'give/have' a

lot while the NSs used the verbs 'lend' with the hearer perspective and 'borrow' with the speaker perspective (p. 162). Ellis (1997) studied two young beginner learners' requests. The result was that the use of mood-derivable requests fostered the use of hearer dominance perspective in the initial stages, but as the learners got to the 'query preparatory' and 'want' statements stages, they were more inclined to use speaker perspective (p. 186). Woodfield and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2010) focused on perspective as part of their research with the e-mails of learners of English and native speakers. Both groups resorted mainly to speaker-oriented requests while native speakers made use of impersonal perspective more.

2.7.4 Salutation, closure and address terms

Looking at e-mail messages from different angles is important in trying to identify the patterns of a learner's e-mail. In addition to the main elements like directness and politeness markers, it is crucial to allocate some space for salutation, closure and address terms in an electronic mail.

Gains (1998) made a genre-based analysis of e-mails of commercial and academic types. He found that e-mail writers make use of very different forms of opening and closing in alignment with the formality of the e-mail.

Bunz and Campbell (2004) studied politeness in e-mails. They focused on the verbal markers such as 'please' and 'thank you' and structural elements such as salutation and closing remarks used by students. It was found that they responded more politely; in other words, made use of more verbal markers and structural elements when the e-mails they received included either of them.

Duthler (2006) hypothesized that the address phrases take the shape of more formal terms when the imposition is high in the research conducted. Contrary to the hypothesis, there were more formal address phrases when the requests were of unimposing kinds.

Bjorge (2007) focused on the forms of address and closure that the international students of Norway include in their e-mails. The findings showed that students from a high power-distance culture resorted to more formal greetings while those from a low power-distance culture made more use of less informal ones. In terms of greetings and closure altogether, the results show variation in their use by the target students.

Formentelli (2009) investigated the address strategies used by British English speakers in academic settings. The findings showed that the participants made use of formal strategies as a sign of respect although informal style in institutional settings is quite common in Britain. The fact that some students did not use any address terms might mean that they try to find a common line between formality and informality.

Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) analyzed the e-mail requests of Greek university students sent to the faculty and focused on the forms of address and closings. The study revealed that the NN participants omitted greetings and forms of closure and used inappropriate or unacceptable forms of address, which might be considered as a pragmatic failure.

2.7.5 Awareness of the Use of Speech Acts and Native Speaker Judgement

Kasper (1991) presents different types of methods that can be used in studies regarding pragmatics and focuses on interviews by mentioning their place in this field.

> A way to compensate for the inherent lack of comparability with NNSs' LI pragmatic behavior in culture-specific speech events, or indeed in all situations where comparative data are hard to come by, would be to conduct *retrospective interviews* with the participants which could shed light on their perceptions of the preceding interaction (p. 231).

Although the tool used in this study is not an 'interview' in its conventional sense, it can still be regarded so in that it gets the ideas of the participants. Takahashi and DuFon (1989) investigated the request strategies used by Japanese ESL learners at different levels in open-ended role plays. After the role plays, the participants were

interviewed with the aim of identifying indirect requests and understanding the speaker's intention behind ambiguous requestive utterances (hints). It was seen that Japanese learners proceeded from more indirect request strategies, which were attributed to LI transfer, to more direct, targetlike requests. The advanced learners formulated their requests more efficiently and were more successful in achieving compliance. Kasper (1991) confirms that the interview proved to be an important supplementary data source as it showed different perceptions of request strategies by the NNS and NS subjects (p. 238).

The studies that focus on requests or other types of directive speech acts often focus on natural data received from groups of participants. Chen (2006) focuses on the inadequacy of such work by pointing out that most studies provide analyses from the researcher's perspective, not including the viewpoint of the participants (p. 38). An example for such a study can be by J. César Felix-Brasdefer (2008) which examined the cognitive processes involved in the production of speech acts. The context was responding to refusals in Spanish. After the data collection, participants were asked to give verbal reports. These participants provided information regarding cognition, the selection of the language of thought (in English and Spanish) for conveying pragmatic intent and the perception of insistence after refusing an invitation.

Economidou (2011) administered a perception questionnaire to 24 lecturers. The questionnaire asked them to offer their perceptions on the politeness and/or appropriateness of the six e-mail messages and evaluate each e-mail message on a 5-point Likert scale in terms of two dimensions politeness and abruptness. The results revealed that there was a high degree of directness and lack of elaborate lexical/phrasal or external modifiers in the e-mails chosen for the questionnaire.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the participants who took part in this study and gives background information regarding them. Then, information related to tools and data collection is given.

3.1 Participants

The subjects of this study were students of the Department of Basic English at METU. The total number of the students is 186. Ninety-two of them were from intermediate level and the 94 of them were from the pre-intermediate level. The levels are determined in accordance with the results of Placement Exam that all the new students of DBE have to take at the beginning of the first term. The exam consists of multiple choice questions only, for which approximately 1 hour is given to students, and in this exam, reading, vocabulary and grammar are tested. The first term-levels are beginner, elementary, intermediate and upper-intermediate, and the students are placed in these levels in the first term according to the scores that they have received from this exam. Provided that the students receive the minimum required average from the first-term midterm exams, which is 64.50, they continue with the continuation of their first-term classes; in other words, in the second term, beginner students continue with the pre-intermediate level, elementary students with the intermediate, intermediate students with the upper-intermediate and the upper-intermediate with the advanced level. If their average falls below the required average, they need to continue with the lower level unless they become successful in the Achievement Exam given at the end of the semester. To illustrate, an elementary student who has not received the required average in the first term needs to continue

with the pre-intermediate level in the second-term unless she succeeds in the Achievement Exam given at the end of the semester. Similarly, the students at DBE have the chance to continue with a higher level in the second term provided that they receive the minimum required average, which is 79.50, and become successful in the Achievement Exam. For example, a beginner student in the first term can continue with the intermediate level in the second term if he/she has received a minimum average of 79.50 from the midterms and is successful in the Achievement Exam. The number of students who go to an upper or a lower level in the second term is generally quite low as they mostly remain in the continuation of their first-term levels in the second term. Similarly, in this study, the number of the students who came from a lower and upper first-term level is low.

The ages of the subjects ranged from 18 to 20, but the majority were 19. They were in their second semester when the data were collected. The language program they receive has a tight schedule: the students have to attend 90% of the classes. The pre-intermediate students receive 5-hour-a-day instruction, and the intermediate students receive 4-hour-a-day instruction. Most of the instructors are non-native speakers of English. Every semester, students have one instructor who is to teach them during that term.

In addition to the in-class instruction, the students might also have the chance to contact their instructors via e-mail outside class if they want to ask their questions. Although they practice different types of writing throughout the term, they do not receive instruction about how to write an electronic mail in an academic setting as this is not included in the programme. At the end of one academic year, the students take the EPE (English Proficiency Exam) to be eligible to enter their departments provided that they have the required average (74.50 for the pre-intermediate group and 64.50 for all of the other groups) to take the exam and the required score (59.50) to pass it. As pre-intermediate and intermediate students need to study more than the students from other proficiency levels to receive this average and score, they are often enthusiastic to do extra exercises.

The information that they provided in the Demographic Data Form can be summarized as follows (see Appendix A). Most of the students had started to study English in either high school or before, but due to their studies for the university entrance exams, they could not give adequate importance to language learning in their last year in high school. They generally did not have much experience of being in a foreign country and confirmed that they did not allocate a lot of time for outside studies.

As part of the research, the study also includes two participants who are native speakers of English. One of them is 26 years old and teaches English at the university level. The other one is 33 years old and teaches English at a private school.

3.2 Data Collection Instruments and Analysis

In this part, the tools used for data collection will be explained in detail. The tools used for this study are as follows:

3.2.1 E-mails from Students and Categorization

As the first part of the research, data were collected through the e-mail messages sent by the students in response to a set of tasks on a listening website. As listening is one of the areas that students find most challenging and important, listening exercises are thought to promote motivation. After doing listening exercises on the provided webpage, the students were asked to write an e-mail following specific instructions (See Appendix B). Difficult tasks were chosen for students so that they would come up with requests, suggestions and offers in their e-mails. The responses given for the last two questions of the instructions which ask what kind of support they need from their teacher about these exercises and what kind of support they need from their teacher about listening in general aimed at this. A pilot study was conducted with two students from the pre-intermediate level to see whether the expected outcome would be seen in student e-mails. Both the participants for the pilot study made suggestions in their e-mails. However, the last two questions in the instructions

"What kind of support do you need from your teacher about these exercises?" and *"What kind of support do you need from your teacher about listening in general?"* (See Appendix B) had been asked as one question in the pilot study as follows: *"What kind of support do you need from your teacher about these exercises? and also about listening in general?"* As the two students focused only on the first part of the question, the questions were separated. In accordance with these e-mails, the researcher made minor changes to the vocabulary of the questions and the instructions.

The e-mails that were collected from students were analyzed one by one and coded with respect to the categories in the tables of speech act strategies, the types of perspective used and the presence and absence of the greetings and closing terms. The first 4 research questions focused on these and were answered with the help of the categorizations and data coding. These 4 research questions were as follows:

1. Do Turkish learners of English show a preference for direct or indirect speech acts of directives in their e-mails to Turkish instructors?
   a. What is the degree of directness or indirectness?
   b. What is the frequency of 'please' as a lexical modifier employed in the directives of English e-mails of Turkish university students?
2. Does proficiency level matter in the use of direct or indirect speech acts of directives in e-mails to their instructors?
3. What forms of address, greetings and closings do Turkish students employ in their e-mails to their instructors?
4. What forms of perspective do the Turkish learners of English employ in their e-mails to their instructors?

Different chi-square tests were conducted to analyze these categories. To see the relationship between the types of strategy, perception or presence and absence of greetings and closing terms and the proficiency level, Chi-square tests of Independence were conducted. To see whether there were significant differences among the categories regardless of the proficiency level, different Chi-square tests for Goodness of Fit were also conducted.

3.2.1.1 Analysis of E-mails from Students and Categorizations

The e-mail messages collected for this study were analyzed in alignment with the tools described in the literature review. The proportion of directness/indirectness in directive speech acts, terms of address, openings, closings and perspectives, the use of 'please', and their reflections on this are the main focus, and a comparison was made between the two groups of participants to see whether proficiency level matters (See Chapter 4 for more details).

In order for the data coding to be reliable, 80 e-mails (40 from PIN and 40 from INT) were coded with respect to the categories by another rater who is also an instructor of English at the university level. How the coding was made was explained to her. After this data coding was completed, the two codings were compared, and small differences were seen. These items were examined again, and a final decision was made for each of them by the researcher and the rater. 61 out of 80 e-mails were put in the same categories in the categorization of the researcher and the rater, which shows that 76.25 % of the data were coded in the same way. For the 33.75% percent, the rater and the researcher came together and discussed these e-mails. It was seen that 10 of these e-mails were put in other categories just because the rater missed a few points and did not see the request/suggestion part or accidentally put the e-mail in another category. The other 9 e-mails were put in different categories by the rater just because she did not focus on the suggestion or request in a particular sentence. This point needs to be exemplified as follows in Example (1):

> (1) (An extract from an e-mail of a PIN student)
>
> My teacher can't do anything about these exercise for me. **I must study more**.

The rater put the following statement 'I must study more.' in the 'locution derivable' category just because there is a 'must' in the sentence. However, the student says that there is nothing the teacher can do about these exercises, so the utterance 'I must study more.' cannot be taken as a request or a suggestion. The reason is that the student just says what he/she must do himself/herself, not what the teacher must help

him/her do. Such problematic categorizations were seen. In addition, certain problems regarding the use of 'if clause' was seen. The rater put all the utterances with if-clauses in the query preparatory category regardless of the possible suggestions and requests that need to be present in the utterance. An example for this can be given as follows in Example (2):

(2) (An extract from an e-mail of an INT student)

If i could focus on the exercises, my results would be better.

Here, the student just says what he/she needs to do himself/herself rather than a possible request or a suggestion. Thinking that this is an if-clause and needs to be put in the query preparatory, the rater miscategorised it, but this was discussed and its category was changed like the other misplacements.

3.2.1.2 CCSARP (Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns Project)

The present categorization is based upon the framework that Searle (1969) introduced for the classification of speech acts (See the Table 2.3 on page 30). The CCSARP scheme is in alignment with this framework, and it presents a classification for the requests which can also be adapted to other types of directives. Before the present categorization is presented, the CCSARP Request Strategies need to be focused on.

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) state that CCSARP was designed to investigate cross-cultural and intralingual variation in requests and apologies (p. 11). The objectives of CCSARP are further explained as follows:

1. To investigate the similarities and differences in the realization patterns of speech acts across different languages, relative to the same social constraints (cross-cultural variation)

2. To investigate the effect of social variables on the realization patterns of given speech acts within specific speech act communities (sociopragmatic variation).

3. To investigate the similarities and differences in the realization patterns of given speech acts between native and non-native speakers of a given language, relative to the same social constraints (interlanguage variation) (p. 12 – 13).

Nine strategy types are introduced, and they are as follows:

1. Mood derivable: utterances in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force (e.g. 'Leave me alone').

2. Performatives: utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named (e.g. 'I'm asking you to clean up the mess').

3. Hedged performatives: utterances in which the naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions (e.g. 'I would like to ask you to give your presentation a week earlier than scheduled').

4. Obligation statements: utterances which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act (e.g. 'You'll have to move that car').

5. Want statements: utterances which state the speaker's desire that the hearer carries out the act (e.g. 'I really wish you'd stop bothering me').

6. Suggestory formulae: utterances which contain a suggestion to do (e.g. 'How about cleaning up?').

7. Query preparatory: utterances containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g., ability) as conventionalized in any specific language (e.g. 'Could you clear up the kitchen, please?').

8. Strong hints: utterances containing partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act (e.g. 'You have left the kitchen in a right mess').

9. Mild hints: utterances that make no reference to the request proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as requests by context (e.g. 'I am a nun' in response to a persistent hassler) (p.18).

While the strategies from 1 to 5 are direct strategies, numbers 6 and 7 are conventionally indirect and numbers 8 and 9 are nonconventionally indirect strategies (p. 18). As the data in this study do not include nonconventionally indirect strategies, the name 'indirect strategy' is used for conventionally indirect strategies.

Similar to this categorization, the researcher designed a classification for the directives (see Table 3.4). As the original framework is based only on requests, the researcher needed to make some changes on the present table. The modals 'can/could'may', which are used to make suggestions in the present context, were put in the hedged performatives category. In addition to that, as there are more modals such as 'should/need to' in the present data compared to ones in the original framework, these modals are also placed in the direct category under the obligation statement category. More detailed categorizations such as seeking advice and suggestion could have been made, but that way, the data would have been too small to be analyzed. For that reason, all the directive speech acts were put in one categorization framework. Other details can be seen from Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Categorization of Directive Speech Acts

				Examples[1]
DIRECT	Mood derivable		Hearer dominance	*Please help me.*
	Performatives	Use of present simple/future	Speaker dominance	*I always going to get help from you to do the exercises.*
			Joint perspective	*We study a lot of listening exercises and we study more than that in our class on problem of listening exercise, and that's enough.*
			Hearer dominance	*My teacher know better than me.*
			Impersonal	*More exercises will be fine for us.*
		Need (as a main verb) statements	Speaker dominance	*I need more practice in listening exercises.*

Table 3.4 (cont'd)

DIRECT	Obligation Statements (Locution Derivable)	Must/have to statements	Hearer dominance	*Teacher must get used me to understand fast listening.*
			Speaker dominance	*I must do diffirent exercises to improve my listening skill.*
			Joint perspective	*We must watch an english film once a week which is with correct accent and correct speaking speed all together.*
			Impersonal	*The listenings must be faster than old listenings.*
		Should statements	Hearer dominance	*You should give exercises like this for us weekly.*
			Speaker dominance	*I should learn to speak fluent and fast in English.*
			Joint perspective	*We should do more exercises.*
			Impersonal	*Native voices should be used in listening exercises in class.*
		Need statements	Speaker dominance	*I need to watch films or series with an english subtitle, in class maybe.*
			Joint perspective	*We need to do lots of listening excercise in class.*

Table 3.4 (cont'd)

DIRECT	Hedged Performatives	Want statements	Speaker dominance	*I want my teacher materials in order to improve writing skills.*
		Would like statements	Speaker dominance	*I would like to do practise in class together more than now.*
		Can/could/may statements	Hearer dominance	*The teacher can give listening homework.*
			Joint perspective	*We can do a lot of short dialog listening exercises.*
			Impersonal	*Listening in class more may be helpful.*
CONVENTIONALLY INDIRECT	Query preparatory	Questions with can/could/may	Hearer dominance	*Could you tell me which tactics I use while I'm doing listening exercises?*
			Speaker dominance	*How can I solve this problem ?*
			Joint perspective	*Can we do listening exercises before last hour?*
		If clause		*If we do like this homework more frequently, it would be better for us.*

[1]*The e-mails are given as they are since they belong to students.*

In Table 3.4, the utterances were coded with respect to the relevant categories, and the numbers of utterances were written under relevant categories. Then, different

Chi-square tests were conducted. First, the focus was on the type of the directive speech acts and the levels, and also between the subcategories of the directive speech acts (e.g. query preparatory vs. hedged performatives). Secondly, the type of perspective was focused on with respect to the levels again, and the subcategories of perspective type were also focused on (e.g. hearer and speaker dominance). Table 3.4 shows that the 'if-clause' part does not have any subcategories for perspective. The reason for this is that an if-clause includes at least two clauses, and these clauses can include different types of perspective. For that reason, no categorization for the type of perspective is made in this part.

In addition to the type of directive and perspective used, a framework which was adapted from the one developed by Economidou (2011) was designed for forms of closure and opening (See tables 3.5 and 3.6).

Table 3.5 Categorization of Forms of Closure (Adapted from Economidou 2011)

Form of Closure	Explanation
Thanking	
	Thanking + Idiomatic sayings
	Thanking + Student's own information
	Thanking + Idiomatic sayings + NS (Name Surname)
Idiomatic (Informal) sayings	See you (tomorrow/next week)
	Have a good/nice day/good night
	Have a good/nice day/good night + NS
Idiomatic (Formal) sayings	Formal sayings (Best wishes/Sincerely) + NS

Table 3.6 Categorization of Forms of Address (Adapted from Economidou 2011)

Form of Address	Explanation
Use of 'Dear'	Dear + hocam/(my) teacher/title
	Hi/Hello + dear + hocam/(my) teacher/title
Omission of 'Dear'	Title
Use of greeting (e.g. hi, hello)	Hi/Hello
	Hi/Hello + teacher/hocam
	Good afternoon/night + teacher/hocam
Student's own information	NS + Class + St. No
Zero forms of address	
Total	

In these categorizations, the types of greetings and closing terms were coded with respect to the relevant categories. They were also analyzed in terms of the presence and absence of the greetings and closing terms. The numbers were written under relevant categories, and different chi-square tests (Chi-square Test of Independence and Chi-square Goodness of Fit Test) were conducted.

3.2.2 Questionnaire for Reliability

To find out to what extent native English speaker instructors perceive e-mails from students as appropriate, a questionnaire that includes 26 authentic e-mails was given to two native speakers of English (Appendix D). A 5-point Likert scale questionnaire, in which e-mail samples were selected from student e-mails, was designed with this purpose. The raters were asked to evaluate each e-mail message on a 5-point Likert scale in terms of politeness and appropriateness (Appendix E).

3.2.2.1 Analysis of Questionnaires for Reliability

An interrater reliability analysis using the Kappa statistic was performed to determine consistency among the raters (See Chapter 4 for more details).

3.2.3 Student Questionnaire

In order to answer the 5th research question which asks whether Turkish learners of English have the awareness of the appropriate use of pragmatic knowledge when they make use of a directive speech act, a questionnaire was sent to the students as an e-mail along with the e-mail message they sent to their teacher (Appendix C). 18 participants responded to the questionnaires. The questionnaire is in their native language, Turkish, for certain reasons. First of all, as the proficiency levels of the students are not that high, the questionnaire was given in their mother tongue so that they could convey their message in a better way. Secondly. as the important point here is to see the real perceptions of the students, but not to see their use of English, it was thought that the use of Turkish would be better. Finally, one question requires the students to write the e-mail in Turkish, and rather than having only this part in Turkish, Turkish was used in all the other parts, as well.

3.2.3.1 Analysis of Student Questionnaires

In order to see the awareness of the students in their language use, the questionnaire given to the students was analyzed qualitatively to support the findings of the previous parts. Tables and numbers were used to support these findings (See Chapter 4 for more details).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter starts with reliability results and the overall distribution of the directive speech acts under discussion. The level of directness and indirectness over the two different proficiency levels is presented. The chapter also provides the overall distribution of the terms of address, openings, and closings used in the e-mails. The reflections of the students on their own electronic mails are discussed.

4.1 Reliability

The 1st tool of the study (student e-mails) was first coded by the researcher in terms of certain directive speech acts. For reliability, these codings were checked by two native speakers of English. In this part, these procedures are reported (See Appendix D for ratings from 2 native speakers).

After following a set of post-processing steps, two different analyses using the Kappa statistic was performed to determine consistency among the raters. The first analysis focused on the whole answers by disregarding the 3 categories (perspective, tenses/modality and overall politeness/appropriateness) given in the questionnaire. The interrater reliability for the raters was found to be Kappa = 0.42 (p <.0.001). This measure of agreement is statistically significant and is equal to the 'moderate agreement' band. As a rule of thumb, values of Kappa from 0.40 to 0.59 are considered moderate, 0.60 to 0.79 substantial, and 0.80 outstanding, which is also reflected in the table below (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Table 4.0 Kappa Interpretation (Landis & Koch 1977)

Kappa	Interpretation
< 0	Poor agreement
0.0 – 0.20	Slight agreement
0.21 – 0.40	Fair agreement
0.41 – 0.60	Moderate agreement
0.61 – 0.80	Substantial agreement
0.81 – 1.00	Almost perfect agreement

Regarding the analysis focusing on separate categories, the interrater reliability for perspective was found to be Kappa = 0.39 (p <.0.05), which shows that there is fair agreement. For the modality and tense, the interrater reliability was found to be Kappa = 0.16 (p <.0.05), which shows there is slight agreement. For the overall politeness/appropriateness, the interrater reliability was found to be Kappa = 0.52 (p <.0.05), and this shows there is moderate agreement. The questionnaire (see Appendix D) includes 26 e-mails from different students. As the numbers of the e-mails go up; in other words, as we move away from the direct speech acts and get closer to the indirect speech acts, the raters rank them closer to the appropriate scale in the questionnaire. However, this ranking does not follow a regular pattern, which is also reflected in the Kappa results as these results do not show almost perfect or substantial agreement in Kappa Interpretation Table (see the table 4.0).

The items that showed the mismatches between the researcher's and the raters' codings were reanalyzed in terms of relevant speech act categories. To illustrate, the first example with 'if-clause' (See Example (1)) in the data was given '1' by the raters, so this utterance (and similar utterances) was taken out from the indirect category. This was because the researcher had put it in the indirect category and gave it '5', thinking that it is an if-clause, which should definitely be in the indirect category.

(1) If there are a lot of wrong in exercises, you may be help me, and you can answer my questions.

4.2 Overall Distribution of the Directive Speech Acts

Table 4.1 Total Number of Directive Speech Acts with respect to the number of words

	Total Number of E-mails	Total Number of Words per E-mail	Total Number of Words in Utterances with Directive Speech Acts	Total Number of Utterances with Directive Speech Acts
Pre-Intermediate	94	7233	689	78
Intermediate	92	8766	1045	90

Looking at the results in Table 4.1, we can say that the intermediate group of students made use of more words in their electronic mails, which is also seen in the numbers of the words and sentences with directive speech acts.

Table 4.2 Total Number of Directive Speech Acts with respect to the number of E-mails

	Total Number of Utterances with Directive Speech Acts	Total Number of E-mails without the use of Directive Speech Acts
Pre-Intermediate	78	34
Intermediate	90	31

Similar to the results in Table 4.1, Table 4.2 shows that the intermediate group of learners resorted to directive speech acts more in relation to the amount of e-mails received, compared to the pre-intermediate group.

4.3 Direct and Indirect Utterances in the E-mails

In accordance with the universal categories for the notions of directness and indirectness notions which are given by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) (See Section

46

3.2.1.2), Table 4.3 provides the strategies used in the current study to analyze students' e-mails and gives the numbers of utterances of the respective strategies.

Table 4.3 Direct and indirect strategies in the e-mails and number of utterances with respect to each strategy (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989)

				PIN	INT
DIRECT	Mood derivable		Hearer dominance	2	0
	Performatives	Use of present simple/future	Speaker dominance	2	0
			Joint perspective	1	1
			Hearer dominance	2	4
			Impersonal	1	2
		Need (as a main verb) statements	Speaker dominance	10	11
	TOTAL			**18**	**18**
	Obligation Statements (Locution Derivable)	Must/have to statements	Hearer dominance	2	1
			Speaker dominance	4	1
			Joint perspective	1	2
			Impersonal	2	3
		Should statements	Hearer dominance	6	4
			Speaker dominance	0	2
			Joint perspective	5	9
			Impersonal	0	2
		Need statements	Speaker dominance	7	4
			Joint perspective	2	3
	TOTAL			**29**	**31**

Table 4.3 (cont'd)

DIRECT	Hedged Performatives	Want statements	Speaker dominance	4	1
		Would like statements	Speaker dominance	1	0
		Can/could/may statements	Hearer dominance	7	12
			Joint perspective	5	15
			Impersonal	2	5
	TOTAL			**19**	**33**
	TOTAL of the DIRECT			**66**	**82**
CONV. INDIRECT	Query preparatory	Questions with can/could/may	Hearer dominance	1	1
			Speaker dominance	1	2
			Joint perspective	1	0
		If clause		9	5
	TOTAL of the INDIRECT			**12**	**8**
	TOTALS of the GROUPS			**78**	**90**

As it is clearly seen in the results, the direct strategies are the most used ones in the data with a total number of 66 utterances in the Pre-intermediate group and with a number of 82 in the Intermediate group. When it comes to the conventionally indirect strategy, the number of the utterances is 12 in the Pre-intermediate group and it is 8 in the Intermediate group. The non-conventionally indirect strategies are not seen in any groups. The numbers in the part 'zero form of directive speech acts' are not used in the statistical analyses. The numbers show that as the proficiency level goes up, the number of the utterances in both direct and indirect goes up, as well. Examples for each strategy type can be found in Appendix D.

4.3.1 Direct and Indirect Strategies: Statistical Comparison

In all the statistical analyses of this chapter, the significance level is set at p = 0.05. A Chi-square test of Independence, which is suitable for such types of data, was conducted in order to examine the relation between the direct and indirect strategies employed in the students' e-mails and the proficiency levels (variable 1: direct and indirect strategies employed in students' e-mails, variable 2: proficiency levels). The results of the test showed that the relation between the variables was not significant, χ^2 (1) = 1,681, p > 0.05. See table 4.4 for the numbers.

Table 4.4 Total Number of Direct and Indirect Utterances with respect to Proficiency Levels

	Total Number of Utterances in the Direct Category	Total Number of Utterances in the Indirect Category	Totals
Pre-Intermediate	66	12	78
Intermediate	82	8	90

A Chi-square test for Goodness of Fit was conducted to see whether there were significant differences between the direct and indirect strategies employed in all students' e-mails regardless of proficiency levels (variable 1: direct strategies employed in students' e-mails, variable 2: indirect strategies employed in students' e-mails). The results of the test showed that the preference for directness was not equal in the population and that there is a statistically significant difference between direct (N=148) and indirect (N=20) utterances used in the student e-mails, χ^2 (1) = 97,524, p = 0.000. See table 4.5 for the numbers.

Table 4.5 Total Number of Direct and Indirect Utterances in both Proficiency Levels

	Total Number of Utterances in the Direct Category	Total Number of Utterances in the Indirect Category	Total
Both Levels	148	20	168

4.3.2 Strategy Type

As there are four subcategories under the direct level, it is important to see the relation between these four strategy types as Performatives +Mood Derivables (these two are combined as the number of the former group is really low), Locution Derivable, Hedged Performative and Query Preparatory) and the proficiency levels.

A Chi-square test of Independence was performed in order to examine the relation between the strategy types employed in the students' e-mails and the proficiency levels (variable 1: strategy types, variable 2: proficiency levels). The results of the test showed that the relation between these variables was not significant, χ^2 (3) = 3,798, p > 0.05. See table 4.6 for the numbers.

Table 4.6 Total Number of Strategy Types with respect to Proficiency Levels

	Mood Derivable + Performatives	Locution Derivable	Hedged Performatives	Query Preparatory	Total
Pre-Intermediate	18	29	19	12	78
Intermediate	18	31	33	8	90

A Chi-square test for Goodness of Fit was conducted to see whether there were significant differences between the numbers of the strategy types employed in all students' e-mails regardless of proficiency levels (variable 1: Mood Derivable + Performatives, variable 2: Locution Derivable, variable 3: Hedged Performatives, variable 4: Query Preparatory). The results of the test showed that the preference for the strategy types was not equal in the population and that there is a statistically significant difference between the strategy types used in the student e-mails, χ^2 (3) = 22,476, p = 0.000. See table 4.7 for the numbers.

Table 4.7 Total Number of Strategy Types in both Proficiency Levels

	Mood Derivable + Performatives	Locution Derivable	Hedged Performatives	Query Preparatory	Total
Both Levels	36	60	52	20	168

In order to see which numbers of which strategies are statistically different, separate Chi-square tests for Goodness of Fit were conducted. The results showed that there are different distributions between some groups. Comparisons found a statistical difference between Mood Derivable + Performatives and Locution Derivable (χ^2 (1) = 6,000, p = 0.01), between Hedged Performatives and Query Preparatory (χ^2 (1) = 14,222, p = 0.000), between Mood Derivable + Performatives and Query Preparatory (χ^2 (1) = 14,222, p = 0.03), and between Locution Derivable and Query Preparatory (χ^2 (1) = 20,000, p = 0.000).

4.4 The use of 'Please' as a Politeness Marker

Regarding the use of 'please' in the student e-mails to the instructors, no statistical analysis was needed as the total number of the marker 'please' was only 2 in the PIN group (N=2). The INT group did not resort to this marker (N=0).

4.5 Perspective

Choice of perspective was analyzed in four groups and a Chi-square test of Independence was conducted in order to examine the relation between the perspective choices employed in students' e-mails and proficiency levels (variable 1: perspective types, variable 2: proficiency levels). The results of the test showed that there is no statistically significant relation between the two variables, χ^2 (3) = 7,678, p > 0.05. See table 4.8 for the numbers. Examples for each perspective type can be found in Appendix D.

Table 4.8 Total Number of Perspective Strategy with respect to Proficiency Levels

	Hearer Dominance	Speaker Dominance	Joint Perspective	Impersonal	Total
Pre-Intermediate	20	29	15	5	69
Intermediate	22	21	30	12	85

A Chi-square test for Goodness of Fit was conducted to see whether there were significant differences between the types of perspective employed in all students' e-mails regardless of proficiency levels (variable 1: Hearer Dominance, variable 2: Speaker Dominance, variable 3: Joint Perspective, variable 4: Impersonal). The results of the test showed that the preference for the choice of perspective was not equal in the population and there is a statistically significant difference between the perspective types used in the student e-mails, χ^2 (3) = 16,857, p = 0.001. See table 4.9 for the numbers.

Table 4.9 Total Number of Perspective Strategy in both Proficiency Levels

	Hearer Dominance	Speaker Dominance	Joint Perspective	Impersonal	Total
Both Levels	42	50	45	17	154

In order to see which numbers of which groups are statistically different, separate Chi-square tests for Goodness of Fit were conducted. The results showed that there are different distributions between some groups. Comparisons found a statistical difference between Hearer Dominance and Impersonal perspective (χ^2 (1) = 10,593, p = 0.001), between Speaker Dominance and Impersonal perspective (χ^2 (1) = 16,254, p = 0.000), and between Joint Perspective and Impersonal perspective (χ^2 (1) = 16,254, p = 0.000).

4.6 Forms of Address, Greetings and Closings

In this part, the results regarding forms of address, greetings and closings are presented.

4.6.1 Forms of Address and Greetings

The relation between the presence or absence of openings in e-mails and the proficiency levels was also examined with a Chi-square test of Independence (variable 1: presence or absence of openings in e-mails, variable 2: proficiency levels). The results of the test showed that there is no statistically-significant relation between the two variables, $\chi^2 (1) = 0,555$, $p > 0.05$. See table 4.10 for the numbers.

Table 4.10 Total Number of Presence or Absence of Openings with respect to Proficiency Levels

	Presence	Absence	Total
Pre-Intermediate	31	64	95
Intermediate	26	68	94

A Chi-square test for Goodness of Fit was conducted to see whether there were significant differences between the numbers of presence or absence of openings in all students' e-mails regardless of proficiency levels (variable 1: presence of openings in e-mails, variable 2: absence of openings in e-mails). The results of the test showed that the preference for the use of openings was not equal in the population and there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $\chi^2 (1) = 29,762$, $p = 0.000$. See table 4.11 for the numbers.

Table 4.11 Total Number of Presence or Absence of Openings in both Proficiency Levels

	Presence	Absence	Total
Both levels	57	132	189

In terms of the type of address terms used, there is no significant difference with respect to proficiency levels. The difference between the types of address terms is also insignificant. See tables 4.12 and 4.13 for the numbers.

Table 4.12 Total Number of Type of Address Terms with respect to the levels

	Dear	Hi/Hello	Total
Pre-Intermediate	13	18	31
Intermediate	13	13	26

Table 4.13 Total Number of Type of Address in the two levels

	Dear	Hi/Hello	Total
Both levels	26	31	57

4.6.2 Forms of Closure

The relation between the presence or absence of closings in e-mails and the proficiency levels was also examined with a Chi-square test of Independence (variable 1: presence or absence of forms of closure in e-mails, variable 2: proficiency levels). The results of the test showed that there is no statistically significant relation between the two variables, $\chi^2 (1) = 0,286$, $p > 0.05$. See table 4.14 for the numbers.

Table 4.14 Total Number of Presence or Absence of Closings with respect to the levels

	Present	Absent	Total
Pre-Intermediate	31	63	94
Intermediate	27	65	92

A Chi-square test for Goodness of Fit was conducted to see whether there were significant differences between the presence and the absence of closings in all students' e-mails regardless of proficiency levels (variable 1: presence of forms of closure in e-mails, variable 2: absence of forms of closure in e-mails). The results of the test showed that the preference for the use of closings was not equal in the population and there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $\chi^2 (1) = 26,344$, $p = 0.000$. See table 4.15 for the numbers.

Table 4.15 Total Number of Presence or Absence of Closings in the two levels

	Present	Absent	Total
Both levels	58	128	186

4.7 Student Reflections on their E-mails

In this part of this study, student reflections on their e-mails will be focused on. As the questionnaire that was sent to them includes 4 questions, the results will be analyzed in terms of 4 categories with the help of 18 student responses to this questionnaire. Since the number of the students who responded to these 4 questions is low, no statistical test was run, and the results were analyzed qualitatively. The researcher grouped the participants in accordance with the answers they provided for each question.

4.7.1 Appropriate Use of Lexis and Grammar

In this part, the students were expected to comment on the appropriateness of their use of language. Most of the students (N=13) confirmed that they gave importance to the vocabulary and grammar they used before sending the e-mail as the receiver was a teacher. One participant wrote that whatever the context is, use of English should be given importance. Five participants wrote that they actually did not pay a lot of attention to the appropriate use of lexis and grammar. The numbers can be seen in the table 4.16.

Table 4.16 Total Number of Students who gave feedback on their use of lexis and grammar

	Those who paid attention to their use of lexis and grammar	Those who did not pay attention to their use of lexis and grammar	Total
Both levels	13	5	18

4.7.2 Expectations from the Teacher

In this part, the students were expected to comment on the expectations from the teacher as a response to their e-mails. A group of students (N=11) wrote that their main purpose was to be understood by the teacher and to receive an answer which would include a positive response to the suggestions and requests made by them.

Seven participants (N=7) claimed that they had no expectations from the teacher. Two of these expressed that they just wanted to reflect on their work as this was an assignment. One of these students confirmed that it was not possible for the teacher to do something out of the curriculum. The numbers can be seen in the table 4.17.

Table 4.17 Total Number of Students who expressed their expectations from the teacher

	Those who expected a response from the teacher	Those who did not expect a response from the teacher	Total
Both levels	11	7	18

4.7.3 Appropriateness of the Discourse

In this part, the students were expected to comment on the appropriateness of their use of discourse.

To start with those who did not use any speech acts in their e-mails (N=7), they thought that their use of language for a teacher was quite appropriate. Only one of them (N=1) wrote that she/he did not make any requests, thinking that there was nothing the teacher could do, and thus his/her language was appropriate.

Out of 18 participants, only ten of them (N=10) had used directive speech acts in their e-mails. These students also thought that their use of language for a teacher was quite appropriate. The ones who used 'must/should' in the original e-mails translated these as –malı/-meli and 'can/may' into –ebilmek in Turkish. Only one of them

56

translated the use of 'should' as 'daha iyi olur', which means 'it would be better if you could'. The numbers can be seen in the table 4.18.

Table 4.18 Total Number of Students who gave feedback on the appropriateness of the discourse

	Those who thought their language use was appropriate in that context	Those who thought their language use was not appropriate in that context	Total
Those who did not use directive speech acts	7	1	8
Those who used directive speech acts	10	0	10

4.7.4 Turkish Interference

In this part, the students were expected to comment on whether their native language, Turkish, has had any influence on their use of language in the e-mails.

To start with those who are of the opinion that Turkish interfered in their use of language (N=12), some confirmed the fact that their native tongue makes it impossible to do away with translating from Turkish into English. The degrees of interference changed according to different people. The fact that the students' proficiency levels were not quite high was also put forward as a reason for their thinking in Turkish first and translating into English. The fact that this way of thinking prevented them from using English in its appropriate way was also seen in the answers.

Six students wrote that English was the only language in their minds (N=6). One of these students wrote that English was the language he/she mainly focused on because the exercises that were done in and outside the class helped him/her to concentrate only on English while writing e-mails. The numbers can be seen in the table 4.19.

Table 4.19 Total Number of Students who expressed their ideas about Turkish interference

	Those who thought Turkish interfered in their use of English	Those who thought Turkish did not interfere in their use of English	Total
Both levels	12	6	18

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter mainly discusses the results obtained in the previous chapter and aims to link them to the literature. Firstly, reliability results are discussed, which is followed by the discussion of the degree of directness and indirectness over the two different levels. The chapter also discusses the overall distribution of terms of address, the openings and closing in the e-mails and discusses these. The reflections of the students on their own electronic mails are discussed.

5.1 Reliability

The ratings of the native speakers on the questionnaire (see Appendix D) showed that it is not quite an easy task to decide on the appropriateness and/or politeness of the utterances which include a form of directive speech act. However, in general, it can still be argued that the use of if-clauses and interrogative forms are more appropriate and polite in such contexts. When it comes to specific categorizations, when the focus is on the speaker (as 'I'), both the speaker and the hearer (as 'we') or impersonal subjects which include neither the speaker, nor the hearer (such as the use of passive forms), the raters ranked them as more appropriate. In other words, the raters did not quite favour the use of the pronoun 'you' as a subject. That might tell us that the dominant figure in a conversation, which is 'the teacher' in the current context, should not be held responsible for a possible request to be complied with or a suggestion to be accepted. The agreement on modality and tense did not yield significant results, thus should not be focused on separately. However, in terms of overall politeness, the use of modals such as must, have to, should, can, may is less

favoured compared to the questions and use of if-clauses and subjects that do not include the speaker and the hearer.

5.2 Overall Distribution of the Directive Speech Acts

Before discussing the numbers of the utterances with directive speech acts, it is important to focus on the e-mail messages without these forms. Looking at the literature, it can be argued that the high number of e-mails without any form of directive speech acts in this study can be attributed to the fact that the students' concept of e-mailing might mainly be about maintaining relations and solidarity as found in Bloch's (2002) study. In Biesenbach-Lucas's (2005) study, the results showed that the contents were mainly facilitative, which did not include forms of request and suggestion, in support of the current study. Some other certain studies that were mentioned in the literature also supported this view (Martin, Myers, & Mottet, 1999, p. 160; Collins, 1998; Marbach-Ad & Sokolove, 2001; Payne, 1997; Poling, 1994). The fact that students were required to write an e-mail answering a set of questions that were given to them can be another reason why they did not make use of suggestions and orders in their e-mails, Some questions (i.e. questions 4, 5) required them to make a request or suggestion, and they left them blank. This might show that students either avoided making requests or suggestions to their teacher or using more complicated structures, which was needed to make requests and suggestions in this context.

The numbers in the overall distribution of the directive speech acts show that there is a relation between the number of the words used in the e-mail and the proficiency level. As the students get to the higher proficiency levels, which is 'pre-intermediate vs. intermediate' in this context, the numbers of the words they resort to increases though this was not supported by a statistical test.

5.3 Categorization and Degree of Directness and Indirectness in the E-mails

In this section, the numbers and results regarding the direct and indirect strategies and also the strategy types will be dealt with.

5.3.1 Direct and Indirect Strategies

Looking at the numbers of the direct and indirect utterances, it can be asserted that the direct utterances outweigh the indirect ones in both groups. As Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) has pointed out, familiarity increases the notion of directness. The students probably resorted to more direct uses since they know their teachers well. However, the findings are different from what Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) argued by saying that the use of indirect forms increases as formality increases. Most likely, the students in the current context did not think that e-mailing their teacher was a formal process. Similarly, these results do not support the findings of Blum-Kulka et al. (1985) and Ervin-Tripp (1982) who worked with children and found that children resort to more indirect forms while talking to strangers and people in a dominant position compared to the people they know well. An example from the current data can be given as follows in Example 1:

> (1) (An e-mail from a pre-intermediate student)
>
> Thirdly, I had only one problem that speaker sometimes spoke fast. Finally, I believe that I can improve my listening skill if I practice regularly, **so you should give exercises like this for us weekly.**[1]

In the example above, the use of the modal 'should' together with the pronoun 'you', which shows the teacher, is not appropriate in a context where a student sends an e-mail to a teacher.

The studies conducted by Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1996), Biesenbach-Lucas and Weasenforth (2000) and Chen (2001), however, support the findings of the present study in that the NNS students do not seem to recognize the different status compared to the NSs. Bloch (2001), Biesenbach-Lucas (2005) and Danielewicz-Betz (2013) had also come to the conclusion that the NNS students were not quite aware of the fact that their e-mails were to be read by somebody in a more dominant position, thus were not quite successful in using the appropriate elements in their e-mails, which was also seen in this study.

[1]*The e-mail is given as it is since it belongs to a student. The same applies to all the other e-mails.*

Although this study does not focus on the differences between the native and non-native speakers of English, it is still important to note the results regarding the non-native speakers. The findings from the studies of Chang and Hsu (1998), House and Kasper (1987), Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011) and Félix-Brasedefer (2012) further support the present study in that second language learners in all these studies make use of direct strategies. However, Felix-Bresedefer (2007) found that the level of proficiency determines the directness of the utterance, which was not seen in the present study. The reason for this can be supported with the results of Biesenbach-Lucas (2007), who found that the level of imposition has a great impact on the directness of the utterance. In other words, as the imposition was not of a higher one, the students in the present study might have felt the need to use direct strategies more. If there had been requests of higher imposition, there could have been some difference in terms of the directness. The results of Merrison et al. (2012) unfortunately cannot be used in a comparison because the participants in that study are native speakers of English, which is not the case in this study.

Although there is no significant difference between the direct and indirect utterances within the groups in the present study, the difference is seen in the overall directness and indirectness, regardless of the levels. Another reason why the difference is not significant is that the levels are quite close to each other, and could actually be considered as one level. As these levels (pre-intermediate and intermediate) are lower proficiency levels, compared to upper-intermediate and advanced levels, it is natural to see that the direct utterances are significantly high (see the table 5.2). Some examples for direct and indirect utterances can be given as follows in Examples (2) and (3):

(2) (An example for a direct speech act use from an intermediate student)

...Except for the last question, I can understand behind these questions. The second exercise's score is %90 as I couldn't understand the word "running". **To conclude, we should watch films or series with an english subtitle.**

(3) (An example for an indirect speech act use from a pre-intermediate student)

...I think this exercises are more difficult than exercises which we did in class. Because faster. However,not very complex,so I think they were at my level.

While I were doing exercise, I didn't concentrate very well, so I have had some difficulties. **Could you tell me which tactics I use while I'm doing listening exercises?**

Table 5.2 Total Number of Direct and Indirect Strategies

	Direct	Indirect	Total
Pre-Intermediate	66	12	78
Intermediate	82	8	90
Total	148	20	168

When we look at the numbers of each category in detail, we can see that the dominant elements used for producing a directive speech utterance are the modals 'can/could/may' in suggestions made to the teacher. An example can be given as follows in Example (4):

(4) (An example of the use of 'can' from a pre-intermediate student)

...My performance was not enough, but is OK.

ı think they were not at my level. Because listening Exercises were fast.

I could not catch the speakers while i was doing.

Teacher **we can do a lot of short dialog listening exercises in a class.**

The students who used the modals 'can/could/may' most probably wanted to mitigate the tone of the message by resorting to an element of suggestion in their e-mails. These results support neither the findings of Felix-Brasedefer (2012), in whose study the participants mainly resorted to 'want' statements, nor those of Lee (2004), in whose study, the uses of 'Can I', 'May I', 'I would like to' were quite high. The numbers regarding the current study can be seen in the table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Total Number of the Use of the Modals 'Can/Could/May'

	Can/Could/May
Pre-Intermediate	14
Intermediate	32
Total	46

The second most dominant element is the verb/modal 'need' (see table 5.4), which also caused the direct category to be significantly different from the indirect one. An example can be given as follows in Example (5):

> (5) (An example for the use of 'need' from an intermediate student)
>
> ...While I was doing second excercise, I didn't know some vocabularies means. While I was doing third and fourth excercise, I sometimes didn't understand what the woman said. **I think, we need to do lots of listening excercise in class**.

The main reason for the use of 'need' can be given as the presence of the word 'need' in the questions "What kind of support do you *need* from your teacher about these exercises / about listening in general?" (see Appendix B). As the students were required to write an e-mail to their instructors answering these questions in Appendix B, most of them directly took the verb *need* from the question and used it in their answers. This actually should not have meant that the students needed to be that direct and use the word 'need' as it was in the questions in their suggestions or requests.

Table 5.4 Total Number of the Use of the Modal 'Need'

	Need
Pre-Intermediate	19
Intermediate	18
Total	37

The next most-used modal verb for their requests was 'should' (see table 5.5). The use of this modal verb also showed that the students preferred to make use of direct strategies. An example can be given as follows in Example (6):

> (6) (An example for the use of 'should' from a pre-intermediate student)
>
> ...I think it is an useful website for listening. We can improve listening, **so we should do more exercises.**

Table 5.5 Total Number of the Use of the Modal 'Should'

	Should
Pre-Intermediate	11
Intermediate	17
Total	28

'Must' and 'Have to' were also preferred by the students in their requests/suggestions, which also shows that the students resorted to direct strategies (see Table 5.6). An example can be given as follows in Example (7):

> (7) (An example for the use of 'must/have to' from an intermediate student)
> At the first exercise I couldn't understand very well but at the last ı looked the answers and I thought that the words were easy for me and ı could understand them.I think the girl's speaking at first exercise was so bad and misunderstanding. **In my opinion we must watch an english film once a week which is with correct accent and correct speaking speed all together.**

Table 5.6 Total Number of the Use of the Modals 'Must/Have to'

	Must/Have to
Pre-Intermediate	9
Intermediate	7
Total	16

5.3.2 Strategy Type

Looking at all the strategy types used in the e-mails, we can conclude that the participants significantly tended to make use of certain strategies while making their requests or suggestions. As was already put forward by Biesenbach-Lucas (2006), the data included a lot of examples from the direct category, some of which might be interpreted as somehow inappropriate. Examples for each type can be given as follows in Examples (1) to (5):

(1) (Mood Derivable – pre-intermediate)

..."Text Completion Quiz" : %80 (because my 7th answer is wrong she say unless but i didn't hear completely. i think she says maybe "and" but not true.) **Please help me,** how do i understand?

(2) (Performatives – pre-intermediate)

...I had difficulty in doing these exercises because of their speed.

I don't think thaht the exercises weren't at our level but we have to do them so the homework was good idea.

I couldn't understand which word was spoken (pronunciation).

I think **more exercises wiil be fine for us.**

(3) (Locution Derivable – intermediate)

...5-I think that I'm bad at fast listenings so **teacher must get used me to understand fast listening**.

(4) (Hedged Performatives – intermediate)

...3-)My biggest problem,being concentrated while listening.. 5-)I don't do listening exercises,so **The teacher can give listening homework**.

(5) (Query Preparatory – intermediate)

3) Sometimes, the speakers talked too fast and I missed some words. In addition, I didn't know some meanings of the vocabulary. I study but after some times I forget some of them. **How can I solve this problem?**

Mood Derivable + Performatives vs. Locution Derivable

Table 5.7 Total Number of the Use of the Strategies in 'Mood Derivable + Performatives vs. Locution Derivable'

	Mood Derivable + Performatives	Locution Derivable	Total
Both Levels	36	60	96

The results show that the students made more use of the strategies in locution derivable category compared to the ones in the mood derivable and performatives

category, which means that they used more obligatory statements and the modals such as 'must/have to/should' rather than the use of tenses or imperatives to express their needs. This can be explained in terms of the nature of the messages they needed to write, in which they had to express a request or suggestion, which would be explained better with the help of a modal verb. See the table 5.7 for the numbers.

Hedged Performatives / Mood Derivable + Performatives / Locution Derivable vs. Query Preparatory

Table 5.8 Total Number of the Use of the Strategies in 'Hedged Performatives vs. Query Preparatory'

	Hedged Performatives	**Query Preparatory**	**Total**
Both Levels	52	20	72

Table 5.9 Total Number of the Use of the Strategies in 'Mood Derivable + Performatives vs. Query Preparatory'

	Mood Derivable + Performatives	**Query Preparatory**	**Total**
Both Levels	36	20	56

Table 5.10 Total Number of the Use of the Strategies in 'Locution Derivable vs. Query Preparatory'

	Locution Derivable	**Query Preparatory**	**Total**
Both Levels	60	20	80

As the use of indirect strategies is lower than the ones in the direct category, it was expected that there would be a significant difference between the query preparatory category and at least one of the categories in the direct category. The numbers and statistical results show that the use of the strategies in query preparatory is significantly lower than all of the categories in the direct strategies. In other words, compared to the use of tenses, the use of obligatory and suggestive modals, of

modals of probability, of setting conditions and results and of using interrogative sentences to express requests or suggestions is significantly lower. See Tables 5.8, 5.9. and 5.10 for the numbers.

5.4 The use of 'Please' as a Politeness Marker

Although the literature showed that the use of 'please' is unnecessarily excessive with non-native speakers of English (Schauer, 2004; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2006), the results of this study showed that the students did not resort to the use of this politeness marker at all. Other sets of studies (Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Félix-Brasedefer, 2012) had found that it is actually NSs who resort to lexical downgraders more than the NNSs, but some lexical downgraders other than 'please' were included in those studies. The reasons for the absence of the use of 'please' in the present study can be explained with the overwhelming use of obligatory and suggestive modals in declarative sentences, which naturally do not lend themselves to the use of the word 'please'. It would be more suitable to use 'please' with the interrogative and imperative forms. To illustrate, the use of 'please' is marked here in Example (1):

    (1) ***We should have more listening exercises please**."

As the learner is aware of the problem with the use of 'please' in such a context, it was not preferred. The number of the utterances with 'please' in the current data is only 2, which supports this view because 'please' was used in the categories of indirect strategies, which includes interrogative forms, and indirect strategies were already rarely used in the data. One of the uses of 'please' in the current data is as follows in Example (2):

    (2) (Pre-intermediate)

    ..."Text Completion Quiz" : %80 (because my 7th answer is wrong she say unless but i didn't hear completely. i think she says maybe "and" but not true.) **Please** help me, how do i understand?

5.5 Perspective

Choice of perspective was analyzed in the same way with the strategy type. Similar to strategy types, there is no significant difference between the two proficiency levels in perspective types; the difference was between the perspective types in the overall data regardless of the proficiency levels. Out of the four strategies that were used (Hearer Dominance, Speaker Dominance, Joint Perspective and Impersonal), the statistical results and numbers showed that the significant difference was between the Impersonal strategy and all the others separately, that is, the Hearer, Speaker Dominance, Joint Perspective strategies. The study by Blum-Kulka and Levenstion's (1987) partly supports these findings in that that research showed the uses of inclusive perspective as 'I' and 'we' outnumbering the others, which was partly the case in the present study. As there was not a statistically significant difference among the levels with respect to perspective strategy, this study does not relate to the one by Ellis' (1997). However, Woodfield and Economidou-Kogetsidis' study (2010) can shed light on the present study as the impersonal perspective was the least preferred one by the NNSs, with the speaker-oriented one being the dominant one. As seen in table 5.11, the numbers of the use of Impersonal strategies is lower than the other ones. This shows that the use of passive forms and the dummy pronoun 'it' was not quite preferred compared to the use of the subjects that would include the speaker, listener or both.

Table 5.11 Total Number of Perspective Strategy with respect to Proficiency Levels

	Hearer Dominance	Speaker Dominance	Joint Perspective	Impersonal	Total
	42	50	45	17	154

Examples for every perspective type can be given as follows in Examples (1) to (4):

(1) (Speaker Dominance – intermediate)

I had some problems understanding the things they talked about, because of their pronounciation and pace of voice.

I need more practice to understand foreign style of pronunciations in listenings.

(2) (Hearer Dominance – pre-intermediate)

If there are a lot of wrong in exercises, **you** may be help me, and you can answer my questions.

(3) (Joint Perspective – pre-intermediate)

- Sometimes, we have done listening exercises at last hour, so I don't concentrate it.Of course, I know this problem is my problem, but can **we** do listening exercises before last hour? :)

(4) (Impersonal – intermediate)

I don't think that there are lots of things that the teachers can do because I believe that we can improve our listening skills by ourselves, but **listening in class more** may be helpful.

5.6 Forms of Address, Greetings and Closings

In this section, the results concerning terms of address, opening and closing terms will be discussed in alignment with the statistical results reported in Chapter 4. Similar to what Bjorge (2007) found, greetings and closure show variation in their use by the target students in the present study.

5.6.1 Forms of Address and Greetings

Looking at the results and numbers of the use of openings/address terms, we can say that most students did not resort to any forms of openings in their e-mails. This supports the findings of Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011), showing a lack of the concept of the need to have address terms at the beginning of e-mails. This might be attributed to the fact that e-mailing is not practiced and thus taught as a separate language structure in classes. Another reason might be the fact that they try to find a common line between formality and informality, as was put forward by Formentelli (2009). They might also see e-mailing as a form of communication in which they

need to answer some questions, so they might have omitted forms of openings in their e-mails.

The type of the openings in e-mails was analyzed to see whether the students had a tendency towards a specific usage. The results showed that the students make use of 'Hi/Hello/Dear' types of words in similar amounts, which is partly in alignment with what Gains (1998) found in his study: different forms of openings and closings were used in alignment with the formality of the e-mail. The present study did not include many formal address phrases and the imposition level was not high. This does not support the findings of Duthler (2006) who found that there were more formal address phrases when the requests were of the unimposing kinds.

5.6.2 Forms of Closure

Similar to the results gained in the previous part, the presence and absence of the closing terms also showed a difference in the participants' e-mails. The numbers showed that the students generally sent their e-mails without closing their e-mails with some signalling words, regardless of the proficiency level. The reasons for this can be attributed to the same listed in Section 5.5.

5.7 Student Reflections on their E-mails

In this section, the categories included in the questionnaire will be focused on separately.

5.7.1 Appropriate Use of Lexis and Grammar

The answers provided for this tool (see Appendix C) show that most of the students thought they used the correct vocabulary and language structures when they were writing their e-mail messages. As they had not mastered many points in terms of grammar and vocabulary use, which is related to their proficiency level, the structures they used did not show variety.

5.7.2 Expectations from the Teacher

The responses received for this section show that the students actually have an awareness of e-mail communication. Mostly, they confirmed that they expected an answer, which means it is not something that is one-way, but a means of communication that requires a form of response from the receiver. However, the fact that some students still take e-mail as a form of 'doing homework' also means that the real function of e-mailing should be brought to the stage for students. As stated in Biesenbach-Lucas's (2005) study, the fact that students are not exposed to e-mailing might explain their perception of this medium as a tool of communication. Alternatively, as the students might see e-mailing as a form of communication they use only to express the ideas they may not in class (Chapman, 1997), it is normal to see that they did not expect any forms of response.

5.7.3 Appropriateness of the Discourse

As it has already been noted before, writing a proper e-mail requires students to have a good command of the pragmatic and sociopragmatic knowledge (Félix-Brasedefer, 2012, p. 90). As Chen (2006) and Baron (2012) also stated in their studies, writing an e-mail is quite difficult as it is not only about choosing the correct words, but also appropriate expressions for the context as well, and it is the sender's job to be careful about the language. In addition, in other studies (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1992; Kasper & Rose, 1999), the importance of combining syntactic and pragmatic information was emphasized. Bloch (2002) also stated that writing an e-mail is more than what we know about the language. The importance and awareness of these ideas was also seen in the current study. Although the data collected from the questionnaires of the students (see Appendix C) are not high in number, the following idea can still be argued: the fact that all the students thought they used an appropriate way of using the language for the teacher means they may need to work on how to address their requests and suggestions to a teacher by making use of different structures. This can bring us to the pragmatic failure put forward by Thomas (1983). Rather than a pragmalinguistic failure, the failure that was seen in the current context is sociopragmatic failure since

there seems to be a problem regarding the assessment of the situational factors by the learners in accordance with the sociopragmatic norms. In other words, the learners were not quite aware of the social context in which they interacted with their instructor. However, the fact that these students' proficiency level was not high when the data were collected also means that there was actually not much that could have been different in terms of appropriateness as the structures they covered did not include much sophisticated ones that would make their utterances more indirect and polite. The students had not mastered many forms of asking indirect questions, or even if they had, they had not had enough time to internalize them. Therefore, the language structures they could use were limited. For this reason, there was also pragmalinguistic failure.

5.7.4 Turkish Interference

It is undoubtedly true that especially at the beginning of language learning, native-tongue interference cannot be avoided fully, which is also seen in the reflections of the students in this study. As clear in the numbers, most students confirmed that they needed to resort to Turkish first, and some had only English in mind. Looking at the language structures, namely modals 'must, should, can, may' in the context of the students who gave feedback on Turkish interference, it can be said that the Turkish and English modals under discussion here are in alignment with each other; in other words, they have equivalences for each other in both English and Turkish, and this was seen in the Turkish translations of the e-mails by the students. At this stage of the study, the results that Tannen (1981) observed were expected, i.e. Turkish speakers could have resorted to the conventions that are indirect for their mother tongue but might have been interpreted in a different way by the native speakers of English. That was not the case. Namely, the students did not write anything in English totally different from what they were thinking in Turkish. To illustrate this point, an example can be given as follows: A student wrote this in his/her original e-mail: "I think that the speakers must speak comprehensible in listening exercises in general." For the Turkish translation of this utterance, he/she wrote: "Bence konuşmacılar dinleme alıştırmalarında genel olarak anlaşılır olmalı", which is the direct translation of the modal 'must' into its Turkish equivalence '-meli, -malı'.

73

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the results by taking the research questions into account. Concluding remarks will be made regarding the implications for ELT and for further research.

6.1 Summary of Findings in relation to Research Questions

1. Do Turkish learners of English show a preference for direct or indirect speech acts of directives in their e-mails to Turkish instructors?
> *a.   What is the degree of directness or indirectness?*
> *b.   What is the frequency of 'please' as a lexical modifier employed in the directives of English e-mails of Turkish university students?*

With the help of this study, we have had the chance to see that pre-intermediate and intermediate level students have the tendency to use the direct forms over the indirect ones. As the data did not include any forms of non-conventionally indirect strategies, there were only two categories: direct and (conventionally) indirect strategies. The number of the (conventionally) indirect utterances was significantly lower than that of the direct ones. In addition to that, the use of the lexical modifier 'please' was extremely low - only two - in the whole data: the use of obligatory and suggestive modals in declarative sentences made it almost impossible to resort to the use of 'please'. In addition, the fact that this study covered not only the request strategies but also suggestions might be another reason why this lexical modifier was not used.

When it comes to the reliability of the 1ˢᵗ tool (student e-mails), the agreement between the raters is only at a moderate and substantial level (see the Kappa Interpretation Table 4.20 on page 73). Therefore, it cannot be wholeheartedly said that the two raters' agreement is high. In terms of modality and tenses, the agreement is low, which means that it is hard to judge the appropriateness of the use of modals and tenses in a context and can be open to discussion. One reason for the low agreement on modality and tenses is that perspective choice also plays an important role in making the request or suggestion. Still, it can be said that the uses of modals 'can/may/might' is favoured more than the uses of 'must/have to/need to' by the native speakers. The agreement on the appropriateness of perspective is higher. The impersonal perspective as in the case of "**It** would be better if..." and the use of 'we' are favoured more. Rather than focusing on perspective and modality/tense separately, the raters agree more on the overall appropriateness/politeness more, and they rank closer to the 'appropriate' scale as they get closer to the 'indirect' level. This shows that the appropriateness/politeness should be focused on as a 'whole', not as separate pieces such as 'perspective only' or 'tense/modality only'.

2. Does proficiency level matter in the use of direct or indirect speech acts of directives in e-mails to their instructors?

One point that could not be supported with the results was the issue regarding the proficiency level. In none of the phases of the study; i.e. in the analysis of the use of directive speech acts, perspective and use of opening and closing terms, the proficiency level did not matter. There were no statistically significant differences in terms of the levels. As already mentioned as one of the drawbacks of the study, the main reason for this was the fact that the levels were too close to each other.

3. What forms of address, greetings and closing forms do Turkish students employ in their e-mails to their instructors?

The tendencies to use particular forms of opening and closing terms did not differ between the levels. Regarding the forms the students resorted to at the beginning of their e-mails, it was seen that they did not resort to formal structures, but made use of

forms such as 'Hi', 'Hello', and 'Dear', which was also quite commonly seen in the literature. For the closing terms, again no formal structures were preferred except for a few terms such as 'Sincerely', but other than that, the students generally used different forms of thanking and had wishes like 'Have a nice day', 'Good night', etc. The choice of such structures shows that the students did not consider e-mailing as a formal form of communication.

4. What forms of perspective do the Turkish learners of English employ in their e-mails to their instructors?

The choice of perspective did not show differences between the levels. What was found regarding the choice of perspective was that the participants did not resort to the use of impersonal perspective, but mainly focused on themselves, the hearer, or both, and the use of 'I' dominated the other uses in terms of the numbers. This shows that students have the tendency to focus on the participants (hearer and speaker) in the e-mails as in the case of **"We need more practice"** rather than putting the emphasis on the request, suggestion or order as in the case of **"More exercises will be fine for us"**.

5. Do Turkish learners have an awareness of the appropriate use of pragmatic knowledge when they make use of a directive speech act?

This question could not be fully answered because of the low number of the participants. However, it can still be argued that the students in this study thought they made use of appropriate language structures. Still, the fact that they had not mastered most sophisticated and indirect ways of making a request or a suggestion could explain the reason why the utterances they made sounded all right for them.

6.2 Implications for ELT

Although the current study is focusing mainly on the linguistic point of language, it definitely sheds light on the field of English Language Teaching. Taking all the other areas and skills of language teaching such as vocabulary and listening into account,

we may not safely state that e-mailing appropriately is the most important aspect of teaching. Still, as technology is becoming a closer part of our lives, appropriate e-mail communication becomes important, and thus it should be included in the syllabus. It might also be a good idea to integrate it not only into the curriculum of the basic English courses, but also into the syllabus of departmental courses. The students might need to work on e-mailing strategies in English for a longer period of time because it is a learnt skill.

As the research showed that students mainly resort to direct strategies and omit addressing and closing forms in e-mail communication, the importance of integrating the communication via e-mail is clearly seen. As the students in the present study were not quite familiar with e-mailing as a means of communication, it would not have been a logical idea for us to expect too much in terms of the appropriate use of the elements to be found in an e-mail. Nevertheless, the need to focus on the appropriate ways of making a request or a suggestion in an online platform emerges in this study.

6.3 Implications for Further Research

This study tried to see how students make use of the language while making a suggestion, request or an order and how they make use of e-mailing in a teacher-student context in different levels.

Further studies could focus on the differences among levels, such as upper-intermediate and advanced and see how results change over these levels. More emphasis on the ideas of the participants on their own use of the language could be given as there are not enough data regarding the ideas of the learners in the present study. Additionally, comparisons can be made between the NSs and Turkish NNSs of English regarding their use of directive speech acts to see whether there are any significant changes.

This study can be considered as a contribution to the area of linguistics and ELT by trying to see the patterns that the NNS learners of English, whose proficiency levels

are pre-intermediate and intermediate, use in e-mailing. It is possible for some other researchers to choose a different approach and their starting point can be the same as the one in this study. Hopefully, this study will help them to answer some of the questions that they might have regarding these issues.

REFERENCES

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

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32* (2), 233-262.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph 3* (pp. 21-39). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Division of English as an International Language.

Baron, N.S. (2002). Who sets e-mail style? Prescriptivism, e-mail strategies, and democratizing communication access. *The Information Society,* 18, 403-413.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. *Developing communicative competence in a second language,5573*.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2005). Communication topics and strategies in e-mail consultation: Comparison between American and international university students. *Language Learning & Technology*, *9*(2), 24-46.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2006). Making requests in e-mail: Do cyber-consultations entail directness? Toward conventions in a new medium.*Pragmatics and language learning*, *11*, 81-108.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S. (2007). Students writing e-mails to faculty: An examination of E-politeness among native and non-native speakers of English. *Language Learning &Technology, 11* (2), 59-81.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Weasenforth, D. (2000). Could We Talk? Pragmatic Variations in Student-Professor Negotiations.

Bjorge, A. (2007). Power distance in English lingua franca e-mail communication. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 17 (1), 60–80.

Bloch, J. (2002). Student/teacher interaction via e-mail: the social context of Internet discourse. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11 (2002), 117 – 134.

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

Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language: A cross cultural study of Hebrew and English. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 36 – 55). Rowley, MA: Newburry House.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Danet, B. R. Gerson. (1985). The language of requesting in Israeli society. *Language and the social situation. New York: Springer*, 113-141.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1987). Lexical-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *9*(02), 155-170.

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

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

Bunz, U., Campbell, S. W. (2004). Politeness accommodation in electronic mail. *Communication Research Reports,* 21, 11-25.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of com-municative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, *1*(1), 1-47.

Chang, Y., Hsu, Y. (1998). Requests on e-mail: a cross-cultural comparison. *RELC Journal,* 29, 121-151.

Chapman, D. (1997). A Comparison of Oral and E-Mail Discourse in Japanese as a Second Language, *On-Call*, 11, 31-39.

Chen, C. E. (2006). The development of e-mail literacy: from writing to peers to writing to authority figures. *Language Learning and Technology,* 10(2), 35-55.

Chen, C. F. E. (2001). *Making E-mail requests to professors: Taiwanese vs. American students*. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*, 383-420.

Collins, M. (1998). The use of e-mail and electronic bulletin boards in college-level biology. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*,*17*(1), 75-94.

Collot, M., & Belrnore, N. (1996). Electronic language: a new variety of language. *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social, and cross-cultural perspectives*, *39*, 13-28.

Crystal, D. (2006). *Language and the Internet.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. & Sayers, D. (1995). *Brave new schools: Challenging cultural illiteracy through global learning networks*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Curl, Traci, S., Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41, 129-153.

Danet, B. (2001). Cyberpl@y. *Communication Online.* Berg.

Danielewicz-Betz, A. (April 2013). (Mis)use of e-mail in student-faculty interaction: Implications for university instruction in Germany, Saudi Arabia and Japan, The JALT CALL Journal, (9) 1.

Delen, B. (2010). Evaluation of the four coursebooks used in TOBB ETU in terms of three speech acts: Requests, refusals, complaints. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Duthler, K. W. (2006). The politeness of requests made via e-mail and voice-mail: Support for the hyprerpersonal model. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 11, 500-521.

Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2011). "Please answer me as soon as possible": Pragmatic failure in non-native speakers' e-mail requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics (Elsevier)*, 43, 3193-3215.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). Sociolinguistic rules of address. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 225-240). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1982). Ask and it shall be given unto you: children's requests. *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Contemporary perceptions of language: Interdisciplinary dimensions*, 235-245.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics,* 4(2), 253-286.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). Perceptions of refusals to invitations: Exploring the minds of foreign language learners. *Language Awareness*, 17(3), 195-211.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2012). E-mail requests to faculty: E-politeness and internal modification. In M. Economidou-Kogetsidis & H. Woodfield (eds.), *Interlanguage Request Modification* (pp. 87-118). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Flynn, N. & Flynn, T. (1998). *Writing effective e-mail*. Menlo Park, CA: Crisp Publications.

Formentelli, M. (2009). Address strategies in a British Academic setting. *Pragmatics,* 19 (2), 179–196.

Fraser, B. (1975). Hedged performatives. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts.* New York: Academic Press.

Fraser, B. (1983). The domain of pragmatics. *Language and communication*, 29-59.

Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International journal of the Sociology of Language*, *1981*(27), 93-110.

Fraser, B., Rintell, E., & Walters, J. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. *Discourse analysis in second language research*, 75-91.

Fukushima, S. (1990). 'Offers and requests: performance by Japanese learners of English'. *World Englishes,* 9(3), 317-25.

Fukushima, S. (2008). Pictographs in Japanese e-mail requests. *The Tsuru University School Review,* 12, 13-29.

Gains, J. (1999). Electronic mail—a new style of communication or just a new medium?: An investigation into the text features of e-mail. *English for specific purposes*, *18*(1), 81-101.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction.

Grundy, P. (2008). Doing pragmatics 3rd ed. *London: Hodder Education*.

Hartford, B. S., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Experimental and Observational Data in the Study of Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Pragmatics and language learning*, *3*, 33-52.

Hartford, B. S., Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). "At Your Earliest Convenience:" A Study of Written Student Requests to Faculty. In Bouton, Lawrence F. (ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (pp. 55-69).

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge University Press.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Lörscher & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance. Festschrift for Werner Hüllen* (pp. 1250-1288). Tübingen: Narr.

Kasper, G. (1981). *Pragmatische Aspelite inder Interim-sprache: eine Untersuchung des Englischen forigeschrittener deutscher Lerner*. Gunter Narr Verlag.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *13*(02), 215-247.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81-104.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Landis, J. R., Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159-174.

Lee, C. (2004). Written requests in e-mails sent by adult Chinese learners of English. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. 4(1), 58-72.

Leech, G. (1983). *The principles of pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Liaw, M. L. (1998). Using electronic mail for English as a foreign language instruction. *System*, *26*(3), 335-351.

Marbach-Ad, G., & Sokolove, P. (2001). Creating Direct Channels of Communication: Fostering Interaction with E-mail and In-class Notes. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, *31*(3), 178-182.

Martin, M. M., Myers, S. A., & Mottet, T. P. (1999). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors. *Communication Education*, *48*(2), 155-164.

Merrison, Andrew John, Wilson, Jack J., Davies, Bethan L. & Haugh, Michael. (2012). Getting Stuff Done: Comparing 'E-mail Requests' from Students in Higher Education in Britain and Australia, *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, 18-35.

Otcu, B., Zeyrek, D. (2008). Development of requests: A study on Turkish learners of English. In Martin Pütz and JoAnne Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and crosscultural perspectives* (pp.265-298). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Payne, C. (1997). Opening the door with e-mail: From no tech to low-tech.

Pennington, M. C. (1996). *The computer and the non-native writer: A natural partnership*. Cresskill, NJ (USA): Hampton Press.

Schauer, G. A. (2004). May you speak louder maybe? Interlanguage pragmatic development in requests. In Foster-Cohen, S., Smith, M. S., Sorace, A. & Mitsuhiko, O. (Eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook* (pp. 253-273). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Searle, J. (1965). *What is a speech act?*. Retrieved from http://faculty.unlv.edu/jwood/unlv/SearleWhatIsASpeechAct.pdf

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

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and semantics*, *3*, 59-82.

Singhal, M. (1998). Computer mediated communication (CMC): Technology for enhancing foreign language/culture education. *On-Call; 12*, *1*, 10-15.

Sperber, D., Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. London: Basel Blackwell.

Takahashi, S., & Dufon, M. A. (1989). Cross-Linguistic Influence in Indirectness: The Case of English Directives Performed by Native Japanese Speakers.

Tannen, D. (1981). Indirectness in discourse: Ethnicity as conversational style∗. *Discourse processes*, *4*(3), 221-238.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, *4*(2), 91-112.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Walter de Gruyter.

Walters, J. (1981). Variation in the requesting behavior of bilingual children. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *1981*(27), 77-92.

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

Woodfield, H., Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2010). 'I just need more time.': a study of native and non-native students' requests to faculty for an extension. *Multilingua,* 29, 77-118.

Yule, G. (2011). *Pragmatics*. H. G. Widdowson (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

Last Name: *First Name:*

Age:

Gender: ☐ *Female*   ☐ *Male*

How long have you been learning English?

☐ *3 – 6 months*   ☐ *6 months – 1 year*   ☐ *1 – 3 years*   ☐ *3 years – 6 years*   ☐ *over 6 years*

☐ *other:*

Your proficiency level in English:

Have you lived abroad?   ☐ *Yes*   ☐ *No*

If YES, where, how long and why?

1.

2.

3.

How many hours of English lessons are you attending in a week presently?

☐ *20 hours*   ☐ *other:*

How often do you read English books, newspapers, etc.?

☐ *every day*   ☐ *once – 4 times a week*   ☐ *once in every month*   ☐ *other:*

How often do you watch films in English?

☐ *every day*   ☐ *once – 4 times a week*   ☐ *once in every month*   ☐ *other:*

Do you have any English speaking friend? ☐ *Yes*   ☐ *No*

If YES, where, how often do you speak English with each other?

☐ *every day*   ☐ *once – 4 times a week*   ☐ *once in every month*   ☐ *other:*

DATA COLLECTION TOOL 1 - INSTRUCTIONS

Instructions for pre-intermediate students:

Dear student,

Here are the things you need to do today.

→ Go to (the name of the website).

→ Click on "Camping Under the Stars" under the "Easy" column.

Read the 5 questions and the options in 1 minute in part II – Listening Exercises, and then, answer the questions as you listen only once.

After that, do the "Multiple Choice and Short Answer Questions" in part III – Vocabulary Exercises.

→ Go back to the main page and click on "Hotel Reservations" in the "Easy" part.

Read the 5 questions and the options in 1 minute in part II – Listening Exercises, and then, answer the questions as you listen only once.

After that, do the "Text Completion Quiz" in part III – Vocabulary Exercises.

→ When you finish these exercises, write an e-mail in English to (instructor's e-mail address) and in your e-mail, talk about these points:

1. What's your score for each exercise? How's your performance in each of them?
2. Do you think the exercises were at your level? Why?/Why not?

3. What kind of problems did you have while you were doing each exercise?

4. What kind of support do you need from your teacher about these exercises?

5. What kind of support do you need from your teacher about listening in general?

<u>Instructions for intermediate students:</u>

Dear student,

Here are the things you need to do today.

→ Go to (the name of the website).

→ Click on "Driver's Licence" under the "Medium" column.

Read the 5 questions and the options in 1 minute in part II – Listening Exercises, and then, answer the questions as you listen only once.

After that, do the "Multiple Choice and Short Answer Questions" in part III – Vocabulary Exercises.

→ Go to the main page and click on "A Healthy Lifesytle" in the "Medium" part.

Read the 5 questions and the options in 1 minute in part II – Listening Exercises, and then, answer the questions as you listen to the dialogue only once.

After that, do the "Text Completion Quiz" in part III – Vocabulary Exercises.

→ When you finish these exercises, write an e-mail in English to (instructor's e-mail address) and in your e-mail, talk about these points:

1. What's your score for each exercise? How's your performance in each of them?

2. Do you think the exercises were at your level? Why?/Why not?

3. What kind of problems did you have while you were doing each exercise?

4. What kind of support do you need from your teacher about these exercises?

5. What kind of support do you need from your teacher about listening in general?

APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION TOOL 2 – STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız.

1. E-posta mesajınızı yazarken kullandığınız grammar & vocabulary gibi konulara özel olarak dikkat ettiniz mi?

   a) Dikkat etmediyseniz sebebini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Ettiyseniz mesajınızda <u>tam olarak hangi noktalara (cümlelere, kelimelere, vb.)</u> dikkat ettiğinizi lütfen belirtiniz.

2. Hocanızın ne tür bir cevap vermesini düşünerek bu e-posta mesajını yazdınız? Mesajınızda yapılmasını istediğiniz etkinliklerle ilgili <u>hocanızın tam olarak nasıl bir cevap yazmasını beklediğinizi</u> lütfen yazınız.

3. Hocanızdan listening ile ilgili yapmasını beklediğiniz şeyleri söylerken uygun bir dil kullandığınızı düşünüyor musunuz? Neden (veya neden değil?)

   a) Bu e-posta mesajınızı Türkçe yazmış olsaydınız nasıl yazardınız? <u>E-posta mesajınızı Türkçe olarak lütfen baştan yazınız.</u>

4. Mesajınızı yazarken Türkçe düşünüp İngilizce'ye çevirdiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz? Ne ölçüde Türkçe düşünüp yazdığınızı düşünüyorsunuz?

   a) Türkçe düşünüp yazmadığınızı düşünüyorsanız sebebini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Türkçe düşünüp yazdığınızı düşünüyorsanız mesajınızda <u>hangi bölümleri (cümleleri, kelimeleri, vb.) bu şekilde yazdığınızı lütfen tam olarak</u> belirtiniz.

DATA COLLECTION TOOL 3 – RELIABILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

The aim of this questionnaire is to see whether the e-mails specifically including suggestions and request and written to the instructors by students with pre-intermediate and intermediate levels of proficiency in English are appropriate or not in terms of the pragmatic use of the language, **regardless of the grammaticality of the utterances**.

Before writing their electronic mails to their instructors, these students did some listening exercises from a website, and after doing these, they sent an e-mail to them, expressing their suggestions and requests about listening.

Below you will see some authentic electronic mails from these students. All of these have been sent from students to their instructors. The part to focus on here is **whether these suggestions and requests (which are highlighted) from e-mails are appropriate and/or polite or not in this context. The dimensions to be focused on are as follows:**
(1) Perspective (i.e. the use of subject such as *I, you, it, we, they, etc.*)
(2) Politeness of the utterance (regarding the use of modal and/or tense)
(3) Overall politeness/appropriateness

In questions 3, 4 and 24, there are some extra questions to be answered.

Please put a tick under the relevant number in accordance with how you feel about each one.

1 = Completely inappropriate

2 = Somewhat inappropriate

3 = Neutral

4 = Somewhat appropriate

5 = Completely appropriate

(Table D.1 is a collection from student e-mails from different levels. The levels and categories are included at the beginning of each e-mail. This information was not shared by the native speakers.)

Table D.1 Sample Student E-mails

E-mails		Dimension	Politeness/ Appropriateness				
			1	2	3	4	5
1	(PIN-mood derivable-hearer dominance) Hi, teacher i do my hw and this is my score "Camping Under the Stars" Listening Exercise : %100 "Multiple Choice and Short Answer Questions" Q.1. %100	**(1)**					
	Q.2. %75 Q.3. %83 Q.4. %87 Q.5. %90 "Hotel Reservations" Listening Exercise : %60 (because i mark 2 wrong answer, firstly Q.1. then Q.4. but finish the exercise i listen that text and i didn't hear these) "Text Completion" : %80 (because my 7th answer is	**(2)**					
	wrong she say unless but i didn't hear completely. i think she says maybe "and" but not true.) **Please help me,** how do i understand? Name- Surname	**(3)**					
2	(PIN-performatives-speaker dominance) first listening exercises score %80 vocab. exercise	**(1)**					
	%60 second exercise %40 vocab. %40. I think my performance very bad. I think our level appropriate because not it was not complicated. speakers was very fast so I could not good do the exercise. I think **I**	**(2)**					
	always going to get help from you to do the **exercises.** this make me very sad.	**(3)**					

93

Table D.1 (cont'd)

3	(PIN-performatives-joint perspective) Hello teacher :) I am sorry, i send this homework late to you. 1) a. 100 I think that it was good but i can make better than this. b.80 c.80 d.80 2) I think this exercise is easy because i heard that lightly. I should study more than this in order to be successful in English 3) I have only problem. I didn't know two or three words 4) My teacher do the necessary exercise but ı want to study a lot more than this so ı want to help to you. I think that **we study a lot of listening exercises and we study more than that to work study in our class on problem of listening exercise, and that's enough.** thanks, my teacher. see you :)) goodnight :)	**(1)**					
		(2)					
		(3)					
		1. Does the use of smiling faces in the e-mail soften the tone of the request/ suggestion? Why/Why not? **2. If there were no similing faces, would your rating change? If so, how?**					

94

Table D.1 (cont'd)

4	(INT-performatives-hearer dominance)
	
	1-)
	
	* Drivers licence
	
	-part 2 score %80
	
	-part 3 score %80
	
	* A Healthy lifestyle
	
	-part 2 score &80
	
	-part 3 score %67
	
	2-)
	
	  Yes,I do.Because I didn't do all of the question,but I did most.
	
	3-)
	
	  I didn't hear some words, so I didn't filled some blanks.
	
	4-)
	
	  I don't know. **My teacher know better than me.** :)
		(1)					

		(2)					
		(3)					
		1. Does the use of smiling faces in the e-mail soften the tone of the request/ suggestion? Why/Why not? **2. If there were no similing faces, would your rating change? If so, how?**					

5	(PIN-performatives-impersonal perspective)
	
	Good afternon Ms/Mr…,
	
	First off all, my scores are listening 1-- 100%
	                    vocabulary 1- 60%
	                    listening 2-- 80%
	                    vocabulary 2- 90%
		(1)					

	I had difficulty in doing these exercises because of their speed. I don't think thaht the exercises weren't at our level but we have to do them so the homework was good	**(2)**					

Table D.1 (cont'd)

	idea. I couldn't understand which word was spoken (pronunciation). I think **more exercises wiil be fine for us.** Have a nice day. Sincerely (Name Surname)	**(3)**						
6	(INT-performatives-speaker dominance) Driver's License: II. Listening Exercises Score = 100% III. Multiple-Choice and Short-Answer Questions Your score is 90%. Questions answered correctly first time: 4/5	**(1)**						
	You have completed the exercise. A Healty Lifestyle : II. Listening Exercises Score = 80% III. Multiple-Choice and Short-Answer Questions Your score is 80%. Questions answered correctly first time: 3/5 You have completed the exercise.	**(2)**						
	*I had some problems understanding the things they talked about, because of their pronounciation and pace of voice. ***I need more practice to understand foreign style of pronunciations in listening exercises.**	**(3)**						

Table D.1 (cont'd)

7	(INT-obligation statements-hearer dominance) 1-Driver's License =%100 A Healthy Lifestyle= Listening %60 , Voc. = %83 2-I was not good at seoond listening 3-Yes,listenings were a bit fast but I must do them 4-when I was listening,I couldnt understand all words 5-I think that I'm bad at fast listenings so **teacher must get used me to understand fast listening**	**(1)** **(2)** **(3)**					
8	(INT-obligation statements-speaker dominance) My scores are from 60 till 70 . My performance was not good. I was able to do better, but this exercise was diffucult for me. I couldn't catch words obviously. **I must do diffirent exercises to improve my listening skill** (Name Surname)	**(1)** **(2)** **(3)**					
9	(INT-obligation statements-joint perspective) Hello teacher.I am sorry for my delay.I did the homework. My score was,part1,%60 and at part 2 my correct answers was 3.At the second exercise,my score was & 80 and at part 2 &83.I think they were at my level because,there is no words which ı don't know.I think the accent was different from your speaking and our speaking.At the first exercise I couldn't understand very well but at the last ı looked the answers and I thought that the words were easy for me and ı could understand them.I think the girl's speaking at first exercise was so bad and misunderstanding. **In my opinion we must watch an english film once a week which is with correct accent and correct speaking speed all together.** Thank you my teacher.Good afternoon	**(1)** **(2)** **(3)**					

Table D.1 (cont'd)

10	(PIN-obligation statements-impersonal) Camping under the stars' listening's score : 80%Multiple choice and short answer questions' score : 60%Hotel reservations' listening's score : 60% Text completion quiz's score : 80% -I think my performance is good because this test is my first test so my score good. -I don't think that the exercises weren't at my level. For example, listening sections were very fast and i didn't understand easily and vocabulary was difficult for me. -I didn't understand listenings because speakers spoke very fast and I didn't catch up them and I don't know this vocabulary. -My teacher can't do anything about these exercise for me. I must study more. -My teacher is able to do more listening. **However, the listenings must be faster than old listenings.** Thanks.	**(1)** **(2)** **(3)**					
11	(PIN-obligation statements-hearer dominance) Firs of all, my scores are here. 1. %100 2. %60 3. %60 4. %90 condly, I think these exercises were at my level because I could do that easily by listening only once, but I just missed some parts of them. Thirdly, I had only one problem that speaker sometimes spoke fast. Finally, I believe that I can improve my listening skill if I practice regularly, **so you should give exercises like this for us weekly**. I also thank you for this homework. It was useful for me.	**(1)** **(2)** **(3)**					

Table D.1 (cont'd)

12	(INT-obligation statements-speaker dominance)	**(1)**					
	-What's your score for each exercise? How's your performance in each of them?						
	%50 in driver's licence listening exercise						
	%60 in driver's licence multiple choice and short answer questions						
	%40 in a healthy lifestyle listening exercise						
	%66 in a healthy lifestyle text completion quiz	**(2)**					
	-Do you think the exercises were at your level? Why?/Why not?						
	They weren't . In the exercise people were talking in american accent.						
	-What kind of problems did you have while you were doing each exercise?						
	Accent problem and they were talking very fast						
	-What kind of support do you need from your teacher about these exercises?	**(3)**					
	I think i should learn to speak fluent and fast in english						
	-What kind of support do you need from your teacher about listening in general?						
	I think i should learn to speak fluent and fast in English						
13	(PIN-obligation statements-joint perspective)	**(1)**					
	Camping Under the Stars						
	- part II - Listening Exercises %80						
	- Multiple Choice and Short Answer Questions %60	**(2)**					
	Hotel Reservations						
	- part II - Listening Exercises %100						
	- Text Completion Quiz %80	**(3)**					
	I think it is an useful website for listening. We can improve listening, **so we should do more exercises.**						

Table D.1 (cont'd)

14	(INT-obligation statements-impersonal)	**(1)**					
	1) In the first pod-cast , I got %100 from the multiple choice exercise. And then , I answered five questions in the second part. I got %70 .						
	In the second pod-cast I got %60 from the first part. My second score was %70						
	2) I think the exercises were not extremely difficult for me, but accent of the speakers was slightly difficult to understand than our listening exercises at class.	**(2)**					
	3)Some of the speakers were talking exteremely fast , in different cases.						
	Since I listened it at my home , I cannot focus on it very well.	**(3)**					
	4)I checked my answers with the computer, so I don't need any help from my teacher. Thanks.						
	In addition **, native voices should be used in listening exercises in class.**						
15	(INT-obligation statements-speaker dominance) My score is %80 for "Driver's Licence" ' first exercise. My wrong answer is 3. question because I don't know the meaning of "to get drowsy". The	**(1)**					
	second exercise's score is %100. For "A Healthy Lifestyle" in the first exercise, my score is again %80. Except for the last question, I can understand behind these questions. The second exercise's score is	**(2)**					
	%90 as I couldn't understand the word "running". **To conclude, I need to watch films or series with an english subtitle, in class maybe.** (Name-Surname)	**(3)**					

Table D.1 (cont'd)

16	(INT-obligation statements-joint perspective)
	 1. My scores are 80%,90%,80%,83%.I think my performances are medial in each of them.
	 2. Yes,I do. Because, although they speak fast, durations are short.
	 If durations were long, I couldn't do these.
	 3. While I was doing first excercise,I didn't understand clearly because the girl spoke puzzling.
	    While I was doing second excercise,I didn't know some vocabularies means.
	    While I was doing third and fourth excercise,I sometimes didn't understand what the woman said.
	 I think, **we need to do lots of listening excercise in class.**
		(1)					

		(2)					
		(3)					
17	(INT-hedged performatives-speaker dominance) According to me, my performance is not good. I think my level is normal because speaker was fast I cannot be concentrate. I do not know enoug words **I want my teacher materials in order to improve writing skills.** (Name Surname)	**(1)**					
		(2)					
		(3)					

18	(PIN- hedged performatives-speaker dominance)
	 (Name Surname)
	 (Class/Number)
	 fist question's answer
	    camping under the stars section score is %80
	    multiple choice and short answer questions section score is %60
		(1)					

	hotel reservations listening section is %60 hotel resrvation text completion quiz score is %60 ı think my performance is too bad second question's answer exercises is easy level but my performans too bad so ı should improve my performans is bad because ı don't study enough	**(2)**						
	third qouestion's answer the exercises voice did not high enough and voice were sizzling fourth question's answer **ı would like to do practise in class together more** **than now** fifth question's answer **ı would like to do practise in class together more** **than now**	**(3)**						
19	(INT-hedged performatives-hearer dominance) Dear Teacher;1-)My score at Driver's License:70% but at other exercise :%50.The second exercise is	**(1)**						
	more difficult,I think.2-)Actually,the exercises at my level but I couldn't concentrate.3-)My biggest problem,being concentrated while listening.. 5-)I	**(2)**						
	don't do listening exercises,so **The teacher can give** **listening homework** Thank you very much,have a nice weekend teacher.. (Name Surname)	**(3)**						
20	(PIN-hedged performatives-joint perspective) Hi teacher, good night. My score are below the sentence 1. 40 2. 60	**(1)**						

Table D.1 (cont'd)

	3. 60 4. 70 My performance was not enough, but is OK. ı think they were not at my level. Because listening Exercises were fast.	**(2)**					
	I could not catch the speakers while i was doing. Teacher **we can do a lot of short dialog listening** **exercises in a class.** See tomorrow .	**(3)**					
21	(INT-hedged performatives-impersonal perspective) My score, on "drivers licence" in answering the questions in part 2 was % 60, and in vocabulary part in part 3 was %90. On " a healthy life" text my score was %60 in part 2, and %60 in part 3.	**(1)**					
	I had some difficulties in understanding the listenings because they were a little hard for me to understand. They spoke very fast, so I couldn't hear some words, but I think the best way to solve this is listen more	**(2)**					
	and more. I don't think that there are lots of things that the teachers can do because I believe that we can improve our listening skills by ourselves, **but** **listening in class more may be helpful.**	**(3)**					
22	(PIN-query preparatory-hearer dominance) To my teacher, My score for each exercises, Firstly,listening exercise 's score is 80%	**(1)**					
	Vocabulary score is 60% .question answered correctly first time 2/5 Secondly,other listening exercise's score is 60%,and vocabulary exercise's is %50. In 10 question, I answered 5 question correctly.	**(2)**					

Table D.1 (cont'd)

	I think this exercises are more difficult than exercises which we did in class. Because faster. However,not very complex,so I think they were at my level.... While I were doing exercise, I didn't concentrate very well,so I have had some difficulties. **Could you tell me which tactics I use while I'm doing listening exercises?**	**(3)**						
23	(INT- query preparatory-speaker dominance - 1) In the first listening part which is Driving Licence, I have scored 80%. However, in vocabulary part of it I have scored 40%. In the second listening part which is A Healthy Lifestyle, I have scored 60%. On the other hand, in vocabulary part of it, I have scored 67%. I think my performance is good in the first listening part but vocabulary is a fair and in the second listening part is not bad and vocabulary is better than the first one.	**(1)**						
		(2)						
	- 2) I think the exercises are actually at my level because I could understand the stories and I can't say that I have slogged. - 3) Sometimes, the speakers talked too fast and I missed some words. In addition, I didn't know some meanings of the vocabulary. I study but after some times I forget some of them. **How can I solve this problem ?** (Name Surname)	**(3)**						
24	(PIN- query preparatory-joint perspective) Camping under the Stars: Listen and choose correct answer ----> &100	**(1)**						

Table D.1 (cont'd)

	Vocabulary exercises -----> %40 :) Hotel Reservations: Listen and choose correct answer -----> %80 write the words which you hear in the correct blank ----> %80 Do you think the exercises were at your level? Why/ Why not? -Yes, because I don't have perfect scores What kind of problems did you have while you were doing each exercises? - I'm not sure, but I guess my vocabulary isn't enough. What kind of support do you need from your teacher about these exercises? - I need something, but it isn't my teacher's support. I need to be ambitious. What kind of support do you need from your teacher about listening in general? - Sometimes, we have done listening exercises at last hour, so I don't concentrate it.Of course, I know this problem is my problem, **but can we do listening exercises before last hour?** :) Thanks for reading :) (Name Surname)	**(2)**						
		(3)						
		1. Does the use of smiling faces in the e-mail soften the tone of the request/ suggestion? Why/Why not? **2. If there were no similing faces, would your rating change? If so, how?**						
25	(PIN-query preparatory) Dear teacher, I have finished these exercises · I got 80% correct answer in each of them. · I think these are ideal for me. Because I did all of them easily but if these exercises had been more	**(1)**						

Table D.1 (cont'd)

	difficult, I couldn't have done. · While I was doing "Multiple Choice and Short Answer Question" in part III-vocabulary exercises, I forgot some details. Because I did not note taking.7	**(2)**						
	If there are a lot of wrong in exercises, you may be help me, and you can answer my questions. Thank you so much for being so interested in our success. (Name Surname) (Class)	**(3)**						
26	(PIN-query preparatory) Dear my teacher, 1 - In first exercise, Driver's Licence, my score is 100% in part 2. It's incredible. However, my score is 60% in part 3 - In second exercise, A Healthy Lifestyle, my	**(1)**						
	score is 80% in part 2. I have only 1 mistake (Third question). Unforunately, my score is teribble, 17% in part 3. I have only a correct answer. 2- No, I think the exercises weren't at my level. Because speakers in exercises were native and they spoke very much fluently. I didn't understand some vocabularies and sentences.	**(2)**						
	3- Because I didn't understand some vocabularies and sentences, I guess as far as I could understand how events progress in the listenings. Maybe, if we are some small group in the class when we do listening, we can understand better and we can improve this skill. Moreover, **if we do like this homework more frequently, it would be better for us.** (Name Surname)	**(3)**						

APPENDIX E

RATERS' EVALUATION

Below are the results regarding the raters' evaluation of each e-mail message on a 5-point Likert scale in terms of politeness and appropriateness (See Table E.1).

Several post-processing steps were followed to maintain more consistency among raters. At the beginning part of the study, the ratings were as follows:

1 → completely inappropriate

2 → appropriate

3 → neutral

4 → appropriate

5 → completely appropriate

After the post-processings, the ratings are as follows:

1 → non-appropriate

5 → appropriate

Table E.1. Native Speakers' Judgement

E-mail No	Categories	Rater 1	Rater 2
1	1	1	1
1	2	1	1
1	3	1	1
2	1	1	1
2	2	1	1
2	3	1	1

Table E.1 (cont'd)

3	1	1	1
3	2	1	1
3	3	1	1
4	1	5	1
4	2	1	1
4	3	5	1
5	1	5	5
5	2	1	5
5	3	5	5
6	1	1	5
6	2	1	1
6	3	1	5
7	1	1	1
7	2	1	1
7	3	1	1
8	1	5	5
8	2	5	5
8	3	5	5
9	1	5	1
9	2	1	1
9	3	1	1
10	1	1	1
10	2	1	1
10	3	1	1
11	1	5	1
11	2	1	1
11	3	1	1

Table E.1 (cont'd)

12	1	1	1
12	2	1	1
12	3	1	1
13	1	5	5
13	2	1	5
13	3	1	5
14	1	5	1
14	2	1	1
14	3	1	1
15	1	5	5
15	2	1	1
15	3	1	5
16	1	5	5
16	2	1	5
16	3	1	5
17	1	5	1
17	2	1	1
17	3	1	1
18	1	5	1
18	2	5	5
18	3	5	5
19	1	1	1
19	2	1	1
19	3	1	1
20	1	1	5
20	2	1	5
20	3	1	5

Table E.1 (cont'd)

21	1	5	5
21	2	5	5
21	3	5	5
22	1	5	5
22	2	5	5
22	3	5	5
23	1	5	5
23	2	5	5
23	3	1	5
24	1	5	1
24	2	1	5
24	3	1	5
25	1	1	1
25	2	1	1
25	3	1	1
26	1	5	5
26	2	5	5
26	3	5	5

TURKISH SUMMARY

Giriş

Bu araştırmanın amacı anadili Türkçe olan bir grup öğrencinin öğretmenlerine yolladıkları İngilizce e-posta mesajlarında öneri veya tavsiyede bulunurken kullandıkları yönlendirici söz edimlerini ortaya çıkarmak ve incelemektir. Şu ana kadar e-posta ile ilgili yapılan çalışmalar genel olarak öğrencilerin hocalarından herhangi bir konuyla ilgili talepte bulunurken kullandıkları dil üzerine yoğunlaşmıştır (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2007; Chang & Hsu, 1998; Duthler, 2006; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Félix-Brasedefer, 2007; House & Kasper, 1987; Merrison et al., 2012). Çalışmada, sadece talepler değil öneriler üzerinde de durulmuştur. Bu yönde yapılan diğer çalışmaların çoğu, verileri incelenen öğrenci görüşleri üzerinde durmaktansa, öğrenci verilerinin araştırmacılar tarafından nasıl değerlendirildiği üzerinde yoğunlaşmıştır.

Teknolojinin insan hayatına günbegün daha fazla girdiği bir dünyada, öğrencilerin teknolojiyi eğitimleri için kullanması kaçınılmazdır. E-posta yoluyla iletişim, teknolojinin en çok kullanılan alanlarından biridir. E-posta yoluyla iletişim hem konuşma hem de yazma dilinin yapılarını kullanmayı gerektirdiği için, bu iletişim aracını kullanan yazarların uygulaması gereken ve herkes tarafından doğruluğu kabul edilmiş bir yol bulması zordur (Chen, 2006, p. 35). Bu nedenle, değişik çalışmalar, e-posta kullanımında kullanılan dili değişik açılardan incelemiştir. Bu çalışma, aşağıdaki sorulara cevap bulmayı amaçlamıştır:

6. İngilizce öğrenen ve anadili Türkçe olan öğrenciler, yine anadili Türkçe olan İngilizce öğretmenlerine yolladıkları e-postalarda kullandıkları yönlendirici söz edimlerinde dolaylı mı yoksa dolaysız mı stratejiler kullanmayı tercih ederler?

    a. Kullanılan dolaylı veya dolaysız yönlendirici söz edimlerinin sıklığı nedir?

    b. Bu yönlendirici söz edimlerinde kullanılan 'lütfen' kelimesinin sıklığı nedir?

7. Öğrencilerin İngilizce yeterlilik seviyelerinin, kullanılan dolaylı veya dolaysız yönlendirici söz edimleriyle bir ilişkisi var mıdır?

8. Öğrenciler e-postalarında ne tür giriş ve bitiriş ifadelerini kullanmaktadırlar?

9. Öğrenciler e-postalarında ne tür perspektif (özne) kullanmayı tercih etmektedirler?

10. Öğrencilerin yönlendirici söz edimlerini kullanırken, kullandıkları dilin uygun olup olmadığı konusunda fikirleri nedir?

Öğrenci ve öğretmen arasındaki e-posta iletişimi konusuyla ilgili yapılan en eski çalışmalardan biri Hartford ve Bardovi-Harlig'e (1996) aittir. Bu çalışmada anadili İngilizce olmayan kişilerin taleplerinde, talep mesajlarında kullanılması beklenen sözcüklerin sayısının daha az olduğu ve bu durumun öğretmenler tarafından, gönderilen kişi üzerinde olumsuz etkiye sebebiyet verdiği yönünde değerlendirildiği ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca İngilizce öğrenenlerin edimbilim bilgisi ve kullanımı ile ilgili problemler olduğu görülmüştür. Biesenbach-Lucas ve Weasenforth (2000) İngilizce öğrenenlerin daha az kip ve daha fazla dolaylı sözcükler kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Chen (2001) anadili İngilizce olanlar tarafından daha fazla dolaylı yapılar kullanıldığını göstermiştir. Bazı çalışmalarsa talep etme konularında İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin daha az başarılı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur (Bloch, 2002; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005; Danielewicz-Betz, 2013). Yine başka bir grup çalışma ise anadili İngilizce olmayan konuşmacıların daha dolaysız stratejiler kullandığını göstermiştir (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2007; Félix-Brasedefer, 2012).

Öğrenci e-postaları üzerine yapılan çalışmalardan bazıları giriş ve bitiriş ifadeleri gibi e-posta bölümleri üzerinde durmuştur. Bazı çalışmalar yükümlülük ve resmiyet derecesinin kullanılan giriş ve bitiriş ifadeleri üzerinde etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir (Bjorg, 2007; Formentelli, 2009). Anadili İngilizce olmayan öğrencilerin büyük bir oranda giriş ve bitiriş ifadelerini e-postalarında kullanmadıkları ve bu durumun edimbilimsel bir hata olarak algılanabileceği görülmüştür (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011).

Yine bir e-posta öğesi olarak talepte bulunurken kullanılan 'perspektif' yani özne kullanımı (ben/siz) üzerine de bazı çalışmalar yapılmıştır (Blum-Kulka ve Levenstion, 1987; Ellis, 1997; Woodfield ve Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010). Talep kullanımında, dört çeşit özne kullanımı vardır (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). Bunların ilki *dinleyici odaklı* olandır. Bu ulamda, talepte bulunan kişi 'sen' ve 'siz' öznelerini kullanmayı tercih eder. İkincisi *konuşmacı odaklı* olandır. Bunda, konuşmacı veya yazar özne olarak 'ben' kullanır. Üçüncü ulamın adı *dinleyici ve konuşmacı odaklı*dır ve bunda da konuşmacı özne olarak 'biz' kullanmayı tercih eder. Son ulam ise *kişisiz* olandır ve bundaysa, konuşmacı herhangi bir etken yapı kullanmaktansa edilgen yapıları veya özne olarak konuşmacı ve dinleyici dışındaki nesneleri kullanmayı tercih eder. Blum-Kulka ve Levenstion (1987) yaptıkları çalışmada katılımcalrın 'ben' ve 'biz' gibi öznelere çok sık başvurmadıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Woodfield ve Economidou-Kogetsidis (2010) ise İngilizce öğrenen ve anadili İngilizce olan öğrencilerin genel olarak konuşmacı odaklı özne kullanımına yönelirken anadili İngilizce olanların, konuşmacı veya dinleyici odaklı olmayan öznelere yöneldiklerini ortaya koymuşlardır.

Ayrıca bazı çalışmalar, taleplerde 'lütfen' kullanımı üzerinde de durmuş ve bu konuyla ilgili farklı görüşler ortaya konmuştur. Bazı çalışmalarda 'lütfen' kullanımının İngilizce öğrenen öğrenci verilerinde sıklıkla görüldüğü (Schauer, 2004; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2006) fakat bazılarındaysa tam tersi öğrenciler tarafından

kullanılmadığı gözlemlenmiştir (Hartford veBardovi-Harlig, 1996; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2011).

Şu ana kadar yapılan çalışmaların genel olarak bu gibi veriler üzerinde durduğu ve belirli yapıları kullanan öğrenci görüşlerini alma konusuna çok odaklanmadığı bahsedilmişti. Chen (2006) çoğu çalışmanın katılımcıların değil de araştırmacıların bakış açıları üzerinde yoğunlaştıkları konusuna dikkat çekmiştir (p. 38). Bu tez için yapılan çalışmaysa, katılımcıların da görüşleri üzerinde odaklanmıştır. Konuyla ilgili, Kasper (1991) edimbilim alanında kullanılabilecek bazı yöntemler ve stratejiler üzerinde durmuştur. Takahashi ve DuFon (1989) çalışmalarında yaptıkları mülakatlarda, Japon öğrencilerinin dolaylı talep stratejilerinden daha çok dolaysız stratejilere doğru yöneldiklerini görmüşlerdir. Economidou (2011) gibi bazı araştırmacılarsa araştırmacı ve katılımcıların da yanısıra anadili İngilizce olan kişilerin değerlendirmelerine de yer vermişlerdir. Economidou (2011) araştırmasında, öğrenci e-postalarından derlediği bir sormacayı anadili İngilizce olan kişilere vermiş ve sonuçlar, bu öğrenci e-postalarında dolaysız stratejilerin sıklığı ve derecesi konusunda önemli fikirler vermiştir.

Yöntemler

Bu çalışma için toplanan verilerin ilk kısmı, öğrencilerin yaptıkları birtakım alıştırmalarla ilgili İngilizce öğretmenlerine yazdıkları 186 e-postadan oluşmaktadır. E-postaların 94'ü İngilizce öğrenen orta öncesi seviye grubu öğrencilerinden, kalan kısmıysa orta seviye grubu öğrencilerinden toplanmıştır. E-postaları öğrenciler yazmadan önce, kendilerine öğretmenleri tarafından ne yapmaları gerektiğini söyleyen bir takım talimatlar verilmiştir. Örnek olarak, orta öncesi seviye grubu öğrenciler için verilen açıklamaların Türkçesi aşağıda verilmiştir:

Orta öncesi seviye grubu öğrencileri için talimatlar:

Sevgili öğrenci,

Bugün yapmanız gerekenler aşağıda verilmiştir.

→ *(Web sayfasının adı)'nı ziyaret ediniz.*

→ *"Easy" başlığı altındaki "Camping Under the Stars" başlığına tıklayınız.*

→ *İkinci yani dinleme kısmındaki 5 soruyu ve seçenekleri 1 dakikada okuyunuz ve sonrasında bu soruları, dinleme esnasında cevaplayınız.*

→ *Bu kısımdan sonra, üçüncü yani kelime alıştırmaları kısmındaki çoktan seçmeli ve kısa cevaplı soruları cevaplayınız.*

→ *Ana sayfaya geri dönüp "Easy" başlığı altındaki "Hotel Reservations" başlığına tıklayınız.*

→ *İkinci yani dinleme kısmındaki 5 soruyu ve seçenekleri 1 dakikada okuyunuz ve sonrasında bu soruları, dinleme esnasında cevaplayınız.*

→ *Bu kısımdan sonra, üçüncü yani kelime alıştırmaları kısmındaki parça tamamlama sorularını cevaplayınız.*

→ *Bu alıştırmaları yapmayı bitirdiğinizde lütfen öğretmeninize aşağıdaki konulardan bahsettiğiniz bir e-posta yazınız.*

6. *Her bir alıştırmadan aldığınız puanlar nedir? Bu alıştırmadaki performansınız nasıldı?*
7. *Alıştırmaların kendi seviyenizde olup olmadığı konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?*
8. *Bu alıştırmaları yaparken ne tür sorunlarla karşılaştınız?*
9. *Bu tür alıştırmalar konusunda öğretmeninizden ne tür bir yardım bekliyorsunuz?*
10. *Dinleme konusunda genel olarak öğretmeninizden ne tür bir yardım bekliyorsunuz?*

Teşekkürler ☺

Öğrencilerden e-posta yazımı öncesinden istenen bu alıştırmalar, öğrencilerin tavsiye ve taleplerde bulunabilmeleri için, seviyelerinin biraz üstünde olanlardan seçilmiştir. Yazılan e-postalar, kullanılan yönlendirici söz edimlerine, kullanılan özneye, giriş ve bitiriş ifadelerine göre sınıflara bölünmüştür ve analizleri ki-kare testi yardımıyla yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmada kullanılan sınıflandırma Searle'in (1969) söz edimi sınıflandırması temel alınarak yapılmıştır. Şu anki çalışma için düzenlenen sınıflandırma şu 5 ana sınıf altında incelenmiştir:

Türetilebilir kip (Mood derivable): Bu tür altında incelenen edimler emir kipleridir. Bu yapıya örnek olarak "Please help me (Lütfen bana yardım et)." verilebilir.

Edimseller (Performatives): Bu türde incelenen edimler şimdiki zaman, gelecek zaman kullanımı içeren cümlelerdir. Bu yapıya örnek olarak "I am always going to get help from you to do the exercises (Bu alıştırmaları yapmak için sizden hep yardım isteyeceğim)." verilebilir.

Zorunluluk cümleleri (Obligation statements): Bu türde incelenen edimler zorunluluk ve tavsiye belirten cümlelerdir. Bu yapıya örnek olarak "You should give exercises like this for us weekly (Bize her hafta bu tür alıştırmalar vermelisiniz)." verilebilir.

Kaçınma edimselleri (Hedged performatives): Bu tür altında incelenen edimler olasılık ve istek bildiren belli başlı kiplerdir. Bu yapıya örnek olarak "We can do a lot of short dialog listening exercises (Çokça kısa diyalog dinleme alıştırmaları yapabiliriz)." verilebilir.

Sorgu hazırlayıcı (Query preparatory): Bu türde incelenen edimler izin belirten ve soru yönelterek sorulan ifadelerdir. Bu yapıya örnek olarak "Can we do listening

exercises before the last hour? (Dinleme alıştırmalarını son saatten önce yapabilir miyiz?)." verilebilir.

Bu sınıflandırmaların yanı sıra giriş ve bitiriş ifadeleri için Economidou'nun (2011) yaptığı sınıflandırmadan yararlanılmıştır. Bu sınıflandırma kullanılan giriş ve bitiriş ifadelerinin çeşitlerine ve kullanılıp kullanılmamasına göre şekillendirilmiştir.

Ayrıca güvenilirlik amacıyla e-postalardan örneklerin olduğu bir anket anadili İngilizce olan iki kişiye verilmiş ve kendilerinden bu kullanımları verilen bağlamda uygunluk açısından değerlendirmeleri istenmiştir. Bu değerlendirmeler Kappa testi yardımıyla yorumlanmıştır. İkinci grup verilerse, öğrencilerden bazılarına, kendilerinin öğretmenlerine yolladıkları e-postayla ilgili sorulan sorular aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Sorulara toplam 18 öğrenci cevap vermiştir. Verilerin çözümlemesi, sayının azlığından dolayı istatistikî bir test aracılığıyla değil, nitel olarak yapılmıştır. On sekiz öğrencinin e-postalarıyla ilgili cevaplamış olduğu sorular şu şekildedir:

5. E-posta mesajınızı yazarken kullandığınız grammar & vocabulary gibi konulara özel olarak dikkat ettiniz mi?

   a) Dikkat etmediyseniz sebebini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Ettiyseniz mesajınızda tam olarak hangi noktalara (cümlelere, kelimelere, vb.) dikkat ettiğinizi lütfen belirtiniz.

6. Hocanızın ne tür bir cevap vermesini düşünerek bu e-posta mesajını yazdınız? Mesajınızda yapılmasını istediğiniz etkinliklerle ilgili hocanızın tam olarak nasıl bir cevap yazmasını beklediğinizi lütfen yazınız.

7. Hocanızdan listening ile ilgili yapmasını beklediğiniz şeyleri söylerken uygun bir dil kullandığınızı düşünüyor musunuz? Neden (veya neden değil?)

   a) Bu e-posta mesajınızı Türkçe yazmış olsaydınız nasıl yazardınız? E-posta mesajınızı Türkçe olarak lütfen baştan yazınız.

8. Mesajınızı yazarken Türkçe düşünüp İngilizce'ye çevirdiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz? Ne ölçüde Türkçe düşünüp yazdığınızı düşünüyorsunuz?

   a) Türkçe düşünüp yazmadığınızı düşünüyorsanız sebebini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Türkçe düşünüp yazdığınızı düşünüyorsanız mesajınızda <u>hangi bölümleri (cümleleri, kelimeleri, vb.) bu şekilde yazdığınızı lütfen tam olarak</u> belirtiniz.

Sonuçlar ve Yorumlar

Yüz seksen altı e-posta verisinden alınan sonuçlar, katılımcıların e-postalarında genel olarak dolaysız stratejiler kullandıklarını ve giriş ve kapanış ifadelerini kullanmadıklarını göstermiştir. Dolaysız stratejilerin her iki İngilizce seviye grubunda da daha fazla kullanıldığı gözlemlenmiştir. Bu sonuçlar Economidou-Kogetsidis (2011), Blum-Kulka et al. (1985) ve Ervin-Tripp'in (1982) sonuçlarını desteklememekte; fakat anadili İngilizce olmayan öğrencilerin anadili İngilizce olanlara göre öğretmenleriyle aralarındaki mesafeyi iletişime dökme konusunda daha az başarılı olduklarını gösteren çalışmaların sonuçlarını desteklemektedir (House and Kasper, 1987; Hartford ve Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Chang ve Hsu, 1998; Biesenbach-Lucas ve Weasenforth, 2000; Chen, 2001; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 201; ve Félix-Brasedefer, 2012). Çalışmadaki öğrenciler dolaysız stratejiler kategorisindeki yöntemleri daha fazla kullanmışlardır. 'Lütfen' kullanımı konusunda yapılan bazı çalışmalar, anadili İngilizce olmayan öğrencilerin bu kelimeyi gereğinden çok kullandığını göstermiş olsa da (Schauer, 2004; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2006), çalışma öğrencilerin bu kelimeye çok yönelmediklerini göstermiştir. Bunun bir sebebi olarak, verilerin genelde zorunluluk ve tavsiye belirten kiplerden oluşması ve bu şekilde kullanılan ifadelerin 'lütfen' kelimesiyle kullanımına pek uygun olmaması gösterilebilir. Giriş ve bitiriş ifadeleri konusunda, her iki grubun da bu ifadeleri genelde kullanmadıkları ve e-posta mesajlarına doğrudan söylemek istedikleriyle başladıkları görülmüştür. Bunun sebebi olarak, bu öğrencilerin e-posta gönderiminin nasıl olması gerektiğiyle ilgili yeterince bir bilgiye sahip olmamaları gösterilebilir.

İkinci grup verilerden alınan sonuçlarsa, sormaca dört soru içerdiği için, dört açıdan incelenmiştir ve sorularıyla birlikte cevaplar şu şekildedir:

1. E-posta mesajınızı yazarken kullandığınız grammar & vocabulary gibi konulara özel olarak dikkat ettiniz mi?

    a) Dikkat etmediyseniz sebebini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Ettiyseniz mesajınızda tam olarak hangi noktalara (cümlelere, kelimelere, vb.) dikkat ettiğinizi lütfen belirtiniz.

İlk soruya verilen cevaplar çoğu öğrencinin e-postalarını yazarken doğru yapıları ve kelimeleri kullandıklarını düşündüklerini göstermiştir. Verilerin toplandığı dönemde öğrencilerin çok ileri seviyedeki yapı ve kelimeleri öğrenmemiş olmaları, kullandıkları dilin daha basit seviyede olmasına sebebiyet vermiştir.

2. Hocanızın ne tür bir cevap vermesini düşünerek bu e-posta mesajını yazdınız? Mesajınızda yapılmasını istediğiniz etkinliklerle ilgili hocanızın tam olarak nasıl bir cevap yazmasını beklediğinizi lütfen yazınız.

Bu soruya verilen cevaplar ise öğrencilerin e-posta iletişimi konusunda farkındalıkları olduklarını göstermiştir. Bunun sebebi, e-posta iletişimini bir ödev gibi tek taraflı değil de, karşılarındaki kişiden cevap bekledikleri bir iletişim aracı olarak görmeleridir. Yani bu öğrencilerin çoğu için e-posta tek taraflı yürütülmesi gereken değil, karşıdaki kişiden de bir dönüt alınması gereken bir iletişim yöntemidir. Fakat yine de, bir grup öğrenci için, bu iletişim aracının 'ödev yapmak' gibi görüldüğü ve bu sebeple, e-postanın gerçek işlevinin anlatılması gerektiği görülmüştür. Biesenbach-Lucas'ın (2005) çalışmasında anlatıldığı gibi, öğrencilerin e-posta yoluyla iletişime çok fazla maruz bırakılmaması, onların bu iletişim aracıyla ilgili görüşlerinin oluşmasındaki etkenlerden biridir. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin e-posta haberleşmesini, sınıf içerisindeki fikirlerini açıkça dile getiremedikleri zaman

kullanabilecekleri bir araç olarak görmeleri (Chapman, 1997), onların e-posta yolladıkları öğretmenlerinden bir cevap beklememesinin bir açıklaması olabilir.

3. Hocanızdan listening ile ilgili yapmasını beklediğiniz şeyleri söylerken uygun bir dil kullandığınızı düşünüyor musunuz? Neden (veya neden değil?)

   a) Bu e-posta mesajınızı Türkçe yazmış olsaydınız nasıl yazardınız? E-posta mesajınızı Türkçe olarak lütfen baştan yazınız.

Bu soruya verilen cevaplar, öğrencilerin kendi kullandıkları yapıların doğru ve bağlama uygun olduğunu düşündüklerini göstermiş, öğretmenlerine bir tavsiyede veya talepte bulunurken kullanmaları gereken dil yapıları üzerinde çalışmaları ve bilgilendirilmeleri gerektiğini göstermiştir. Bu durum, öğrencilerin sadece dilbilgisi ve kelime konuları üzerinde değil, e-posta iletişiminde karşılarındaki kişinin mevkilerine göre nasıl hitap edilmesi ve nasıl bağlama uygun ifadeler kullanılması yönünde bilinçlendirilmesi gerektiğini göstermektedir.

4. Mesajınızı yazarken Türkçe düşünüp İngilizce'ye çevirdiğinizi düşünüyor musunuz? Ne ölçüde Türkçe düşünüp yazdığınızı düşünüyorsunuz?

   a) Türkçe düşünüp yazmadığınızı düşünüyorsanız sebebini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Türkçe düşünüp yazdığınızı düşünüyorsanız mesajınızda hangi bölümleri (cümleleri, kelimeleri, vb.) bu şekilde yazdığınızı lütfen tam olarak belirtiniz.

Sormacanın son kısmı, öğrencilerin e-postalarında kullandıkları yapılarda anadillerinin, yani Türkçenin, ne kadar etkisi olduğunu saptamayı hedeflemiştir. İngilizce dışında başka herhangi bir dili öğrenirken de, öğrencinin kendi anadilinden etkilenmesi durumu olağan bir durumdur. Çalışmada Türkçe etkisi üzerine sorulan soruya alınan cevaplar göstermiştir ki öğrencilerin sadece küçük bir kısmı doğrudan İngilizce düşünerek yazarken, öğrencilerin çoğu mesajlarını yazarken Türkçe

düşünüp çevirmeye çalışmaktadır. Bu durum, bir önceki sorunun ikinci kısmına cevap olarak, kendilerinden e-postalarını tekrar Türkçe yazmaları istenildiğinde fark edilmiştir.

Sonuç

Sonuç olarak, araştırma sorularının ayrı ayrı cevaplanması gerekmektedir.

1. İngilizce öğrenen ve anadili Türkçe olan öğrenciler, yine anadili Türkçe olan İngilizce öğretmenlerine yolladıkları e-postalarda kullandıkları yönlendirici söz edimlerinde dolaylı mı yoksa dolaysız mı stratejiler kullanmayı tercih ederler?

   a) Kullanılan dolaylı veya dolaysız yönlendirici söz edimlerinin sıklığı nedir?

   b) Bu yönlendirici söz edimlerinde kullanılan 'lütfen' kelimesinin sıklığı nedir?

Yapılan çalışma, öğrencilerin yönlendirici söz edimlerini kullanırken dolaylı stratejiler yerine dolaysız olanlara yöneldiğini göstermiştir. Dolaysız söz edimleri kullanmaya karşı olan eğilim hem orta öncesi hem de orta seviye grubunda aynıdır. Ayrıca, tüm veriler içerisinde sadece iki kez 'lütfen' kelimesine başvurulduğu için, yönlendirici söz edimleriyle birlikte kullanmak amacıyla 'lütfen' kelimesine öğrencilerin çok başvurmadıkları ortaya çıkmıştır.

2. Öğrencilerin İngilizce yeterlilik seviyelerinin, kullanılan dolaylı veya dolaysız yönlendirici söz edimleriyle bir ilişkisi var mıdır?

İstatistikî açıdan anlamlı sonuçların alınamadığı konulardan biri İngilizce yeterlilik seviyesinin diğer tüm değişkenler üzerindeki etkisidir. Çalışmada, İngilizce yeterlilik seviyesinin, kullanılan yönlendirici söz edimleri, özne seçimi veya giriş ve bitiriş ifadeleri üzerinde herhangi bir etkisinin olmadığı görülmüştür. Daha önceden

121

bahsedildiği gibi, bunun en önemli sebebi, grupların İngilizce seviyelerinin birbirlerine çok yakın olmasıdır.

3. Öğrenciler e-postalarında ne tür giriş ve bitiriş ifadelerini kullanmaktadırlar?

Belirli giriş ve kapanış ifadelerini kullanma konusunda iki seviye arasında bir fark görülmemiştir. E-postalarının giriş kısmında kullandıkları ifadelerle başlamak gerekirse, öğrenciler bu kısımda genellikle 'Merhaba ...' ve 'Sevgili ...' kalıplarını kullanmışlardır. Kapanış ifadeleri içinse tercih edilen sözcükler genellikle 'Teşekkürler' ve 'İyi günler / akşamlar' tarzı kalıplardan oluşmuştur. Bu tarz sözcüklerin kullanımı, öğrencilerin e-posta yazımını çok resmi bir iletişim aracı olarak görmediklerini göstermiştir.

4. Öğrenciler e-postalarında ne tür perspektif (özne) kullanmayı tercih etmektedirler?

Önceki bölümler gibi, yönlendirici söz edimleri kullanımında özne kullanımı iki grup arasında anlamlı bir fark göstermemiştir. Özne tercihi konusunda bulunan sonuç, katılımcıların özne kullanımında genellikle kendileri, öğretmenleri veya her ikisine birden yoğunlaştıkları yönündedir. Öğrenciler, edilgen yapılar veya kendileri ve karşılarındaki dışındakileri, yani nesneleri, özne olarak kullanma durumlarından kaçınmışlardır.

5. Öğrencilerin yönlendirici söz edimlerini kullanırken, kullandıkları dilin uygun olup olmadığı konusunda fikirleri nedir?

Bu soru, katılımcıların bu kısma olan katılımlarının azlığı yüzünden tam anlamıyla cevaplandırılamamaktadır. Fakat yine de, çalışmada yer alan öğrencilerin kullandıkları yapıların bağlama ve duruma uygun olduğunu düşündükleri görülmüştür. Bu öğrencilerin, veriler toplanırken, talepte veya öneride bulunurken kullanabilecekleri ileri ve daha karmaşık seviyede yapıları tam anlamıyla öğrenememeleri veya içselleştirememiş olmaları da söylenebilir.

Dolaylı-dolaysız söz edimi kullanımı farkının İngilizce seviyesi açısından anlamlı bir farklılık göstermediği görülmüş ve bunun sebebi olarak da çalışmada ele alınan iki grubun İngilizce seviyelerinin birbirine çok yakın olması gösterilmiştir. Yine, öğrencilerin önemli bir kısmının, e-postalarda giriş ve bitiriş ifadelerini kullanmadıkları, kullananların da resmi ifadelere çok fazla başvurmadıkları gözlemlenmiştir.

Çalışma, e-posta haberleşmesinin öğrenci öğretmen arasında nasıl olması gerektiği konusunun müfredatta yer alması gerektiği önemini göstermiştir. Her ne kadar konuşma, yazma, okuma ve dinleme becerileri kadar en üst düzeyde olmasa da, teknolojinin son hızla geliştiği ve e-posta kullanımının yaygınlıkla kullanıldığı bu çağda, bu iletişim aracının akademik ortamda nasıl kullanılması gerektiği konusunda öğrenciler biraz daha bilinçlendirilmelidir. Konuyla ilgili daha sonra yapılabilecek çalışmalar, bu araştırmadan farklı olarak birkaç kısım üzerinde odaklanabilir. Birincisi, İngilizce yeterlilik seviyesinin yönlendirici söylem belirleyiciler üzerinde etkisi olup olmadığını saptayabilmek için yeterlilik seviyeleri birbirlerinden daha uzak olan öğrenciler üzerinde çalışılabilir. Örneğin; orta öncesi grupla en yüksek seviye grubu öğrencileri arasında bir karşılaştırma yapılabilir. Buna ek olarak, öğrencilerin kendi anadillerinde ve İngilizce yazdıkları e-postalar arasında karşılaştırmalar yapılabilir. Ayrıca, anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğrenci e-postaları arasında karşılaştırmalar yapılabilir.