A comparative sociopragmatic analysis of the dialogues in Turkish and Azerbaijani B1-B2 EFL textbooks

Isgandar Bababayli [a] [1] , Nalan Kızıltan [b] [2]

ª Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey
ᵇ Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey

Abstract

Different communities assess social distance, social power, rights and obligations, and degree of imposition used in specific speech acts differently. As a result of this difference, foreign language learners are likely to make sociopragmatic failure. This kind of failure is harder to correct because of the learners' justifiable sensitivity in social (or political, religious, and moral) matters. Nevertheless, the research has proven the effectiveness of instruction on development of learners' awareness of sociopragmatic aspects of language use. However, there is almost no investigation on the representation of sociopragmatic variables in second or foreign language textbooks. Considering that textbooks are essential for providing input for the learners in development of their sociopragmatic competence, we compared EFL textbooks designed for and employed in public schools of Turkey with those designed for and employed in public schools of Azerbaijan, to evaluate how sociopragmatic and related variables have been addressed in dialogues present in these textbooks. The results of the investigation revealed that there are some significant differences between Turkish and Azerbaijani textbooks regarding representation of speech acts, vertical distance, and strength of socially defined rights and obligations. These differences, on the other hand, can be accounted for by the inadequate representation of speech situations. By this study, we aspired to draw textbook writers' attention to such inadequacies elimination of which may result in sociopragmatically more adequate textbooks, and attract second- or foreign language teachers and learners' attention on the significance of sociopragmatic competence for appropriate language use.

Keywords: competence; cross-culture; EFL; politeness; sociopragmatics; textbooks

---

[1] Corresponding author. Tel.:
  E-mail address: isgandar.baba@gmail.com

[2] Corresponding author. Tel.:
  E-mail address: kiziltannalan9@gmail.com

1. Introduction

After roughly half a century since communicative language teaching started to be implemented, we still observe teachers prescribing grammatical rules and learners meticulously memorizing them in foreign language classrooms. The result is obvious: overdose of memorized grammatical rules and incompetence in real communication. Unfortunately, the problem does not only involve foreign language learners, but also teachers who themselves were learners before. As if we are in a viscous circle in which the teaching grammar had been confused with foreign language teaching for 2500 years (Rutherford, 1987) and is still confused.

To get out of this viscous circle, it is necessary to realize that a goal of communicative language teaching is developing foreign language learners' communicative competence (Richards, 2005), and that grammatical competence is not a standalone competence but is one of the components of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972). Another major component of communicative competence is pragmatic competence which, in its turn, is composed of pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence (Leech, 2014). Sociopragmatic competence is of particular significance for second or foreign language teaching because there is a variation among speech communities regarding the evaluation of social distance, social power, the rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition of speakers and hearers involved in specific communicative acts (Kasper & Rose, 2001). As a result of this variation, the learners are likely to make a sociopragmatic failure, which unlike pragmalinguistic failure, is difficult to correct in foreign language classrooms, because it concerns not only with the learners' knowledge of language, but also their system of beliefs (Thomas, 1983).

The recent studies suggest that majority of aspects of L2 pragmatics are open to instruction (Kasper & Rover, 2005). Especially, in increasing learner's awareness of sociopragmatic dimensions, explicit instruction has been found more effective (Van Compernolle, 2011). Since textbooks are essential in pragmatics instruction and the provision of pragmatic input, there have been conducted a number of surveys exploring conversations, dialogues, etc. to observe how pragmatics represented in second- or foreign-language textbooks. However, there is almost no investigation on second- or foreign-language-textbook dialogues from sociopragmatic perspective for deciding whether they have been written adequately enough for developing learners' sociopragmatic competence. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to discuss how well the dialogues have been employed in Turkish and Azerbaijani B1-B2 EFL textbooks in terms of the representation of sociopragmatic and related variables. Thereby, we also intend to draw textbook writers, language teachers and learners' attention to the significance of sociopragmatics in second or foreign language teaching and learning.

1.1. Literature review

Communicative language teaching, as Richards (2005) defines, is "a set of principles about the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom" (p.2). It has a goal of developing communicative competence of foreign language learners (Richards, 2005). The term *communicative competence*, was first proposed by Hymes (1966, as cited in Leech, 2014), and beginning from mid-1970s started to be applied to second or foreign language teaching. It means the kind of knowledge or capability necessary for appropriate and successful language use (Leech, 2014). It has several components, as Leech (2014) asserts, of which pragmatic competence, along with grammatical competence, is a major one. On this basis, those who applied communicative competence to language teaching argued that "the syllabus of a language course should not be organized around grammar, but around subject matter, tasks/projects, or semantic notions and/or pragmatic functions" (Celce-Murcia, 1991, pp. 461-462).

As a major part of communicative competence, pragmatic competence refers to "the knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realising particular illocutions, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts, and finally, knowledge of the appropriate contextual use of the particular language's linguistic resources" (Barron, 2003, p. 10). Pragmatic competence of L2 learners has mainly been studied in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) which refers to, as Kasper and Dahl (1991) state, comprehension, production and ways of acquisition of L2 related speech acts. However, pragmatic competence, as Leech (2014) argues, is not all of one piece i.e. it has two closely connected parts: pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. Pragmalinguistic competence refers to the linguistic resources of different languages employed in performance of speech acts (Cenoz, 2008). Sociopragmatic competence, on the other hand, refers to a speaker's knowledge on the ways of using different speech act strategies in accordance with the situational and social variables existing during communication (Harlow, 1990). Investigating pragmatic failure made by foreign language learners, Thomas (1983) reveals that sociopragmatic failure is a result of cross culturally different assessment of size of imposition, cost/benefit, relative power and social distance, and relative rights and obligations. In addition, Thomas (1983) suggests that compared to pragmalinguistic failure, sociopragmatic failure is harder to correct. Since sociopragmatic decisions are first of all social then linguistic, as Thomas (1983) claims, language learners' reaction is negative when their social judgements are tried to be corrected, which is different form their reaction to linguistic corrections.

As is mentioned, acquisition of speech act competence is widely researched area of ILP, but its investigation is hardly possible without engagement with politeness (Leech, 2014). The research conducted in this field, as Leech (2014) explains, adopted research tradition employed in Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). According to this tradition, as Leech (2014) states, the use of specific speech act types (esp. directives and apologies) has been focused on, and test items varying in accordance with Brown and Levinson's (1987) P (relative power), D (social distance), and R (ranking of imposition) factors have been designed to explore learners' development of general politeness skills in the second or foreign language. However, Leech (2014) claims that since vast majority of the research conducted within the CCSARP research tradition, which is mainly influenced by Brown and Levinson's politeness model, research in ILP has not adequately enlightened learning of politeness. Accordingly, Leech (2014) puts forward his own model of politeness, i.e. General Strategy of Politeness (GSP) to overcome some weaknesses in future research projects.

GSP is a supermaxim (i.e. superconstraint) which comprehends several maxims of politeness (Leech 2014). It is defined as "in order to be polite, *S* expresses or implies meanings that associate a favorable value with what pertains to *O* or associates an unfavorable value with what pertains to *S* (*S* = self, speaker)" (Leech, 2014, p. 90). In this definition *O* refers to the addressee, but may also refer to a third person who either is present or related to the hearer (*H*). Component maxims of GSP are (i) Generosity maxim, (ii) Tact maxim, (iii) Approbation maxim, (iv) Modesty maxim, (v) Obligation (of S to O) maxim, (vi) Obligation (of O to S) maxim, (vii) Agreement maxim, (viii) Opinion reticence maxim, (ix) Sympathy maxim, and (x) Feeling reticence maxim (Leech, 2014).

Pragmatics, as Leech (2014) explains, deals only with interlocutors' *communicative* behavior, and in this respect, politeness is about how interlocutors convey *meanings* in accordance with the GSP. However, this kind of politeness depends, as Leech (2014) claims, on both the language and the social or cultural environment. Accordingly, Leech (2014) terms linguistically oriented aspects of politeness as *pragmalinguistic*, and socioculturally oriented aspects as *sociopragmatic* facet of politeness.

Moreover, assessing appropriate degree of sociopragmatic politeness, as Leech (2014) argues, is dependent on the significant scales of value which are the following ones:

1. *Vertical distance* between *S* and *O* (in terms of status, power, role, age, etc.);

2. *Horizontal distance* between *S* and *O* (intimate, familiar, acquaintance, stranger, etc.);

3. *Cost/benefit*: how large is the benefit, the cost, the favor, the obligation, etc., i.e., the real socially defined value of what is being transacted.

4. *Strength* of socially defined rights and obligations, e.g., a teacher's obligations to a student, a host's obligations to a guest, service providers' obligations to their clients or customers.

5. "*Self-territory*" and "*other-territory*" (in-group membership vs. out-group). There are degrees of membership of 'self-territory' and 'other territory' (p. 103).

Furthermore, Leech (2014) argues that although above sociopragmatic scales are reasonably common to all human societies, values according to which these scales vary differ from culture to culture. The difference, as Leech (2014) points out, can be both quantitative which refers to its degree on a scale, or qualitative concerning actual social content of the scales. On the basis of quantitative differences, Leech (2014) hypothesize that in Japanese or Korean societies, the Modesty maxim has high valuation, while in "Anglo" societies the Tact maxim is of high valuation. Based on qualitative differences, on the other hand, Leech (2014) suggests that different societies interpret the sociopragmatic scales differently. For instance, as an indicator of vertical distance, age is of particular significance in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, as well as Arabic societies (Leech, 2014).

ILP research design also aims at revealing to what extent the way of conscious receiving pragmatic input influences learner's pragmatic acquisition (Leech, 2014). In addition, as Leech (2014) states, there has been some discussion (Kasper and Rose 2002, Koike and Pearson 2005, Félix-Brasdefer 2008, as cited in Leech, 2014) concerning whether learners' L2 pragmatic competence, as well as "politeness competence" can be developed thorough explicit instruction or implicit instruction. These kind of questions have been explored in pedagogical component of ILP, i.e. *instructional pragmatics* (Ishihara, 2010). Vasquez and Sharpless (2009) define instructional pragmatics as "L2 teaching applications related to fostering pragmatic competence in language learners" (p. 17).

The investigations in instructional pragmatics have demonstrated that teaching pragmatics is effective and there are specialized approaches to teaching it (Bardovi-Harlig, 2019). For example, Rose's (2005) review of several empirical studies, has supported teachability of pragmatics, and effectiveness of instruction compared to no instruction. Additionally, Bardovi-Harlig's (2015) review of 81 studies focuses on how conversations are operationalized in the studies which explore the impact of instruction on L2 pragmatics. Nevertheless, teaching pragmatics is not void of difficulties. Sykes (2013), for instance, lists a number of challenges to teaching pragmatics in which the challenge of lack of authentic input in teaching materials occupies a high position in the list.

Of teaching materials, textbooks are easily accessible and widely available resources of input for language learners (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996). Nonetheless, scarcity of pragmatic input in second and foreign language textooks has been well documented in several studies (Eisenchlas, 2011; Cohen & Ishihara, 2013; Vellenga, 2004). In the same vein, Bardovi-Harlig (1996) contends that textbook conversations or dialogues are not adequate in terms of providing pragmatically accurate examples to language learners. As an illustration, Bardovi-Harlig (1996) refers to the review by Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, and Reynolds, (1991, as cited in Bardovi-Harlig, 1996) who examined the presentation of closings in 20 ESL textbooks. The survey concludes that of the analyzed textbooks, only 12 contained complete closings in no less than one of the dialogues; besides, very small number of them included closings systematically (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan & Reynolds, 1991, as cited in Bardovi-Harlig, 1996). Similarly, Timmis (2015) argues that textbook dialogues fall short in representing real interaction between interlocutors. Likewise, Bardovi-Harlig (1996) considers the use of textbooks and materials alone as insufficient in developing pragmatic competence of language learners, but she emphasizes that they are significant as a portion of positive

evidence which learners receive. Last but not least, discussing positive effects of teaching pragmatics on acquisition of pragmatic competence, Bardovi-Harlig (2020) states that "we have yet to see a corresponding increase in the teaching of pragmatics in second and foreign language classrooms or language textbooks" (p. 44).

1.2. Research questions

The present research is based on the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of speech situations used in the dialogues?
2. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of speech events used in the dialogues?
3. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of speech acts used in the dialogues?
4. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of vertical distance used in the dialogues?
5. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of horizontal distance used in the dialogues?
6. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of cost/benefit used in the dialogues?
7. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of representation of strength of socially defined rights and obligations in the dialogues?
8. Is there a significant difference between Turkish and Azerbaijani EFL textbooks regarding the frequency of representation of gender in the dialogues?

2. Method

2.1. Materials

The materials chosen for the study involve three Turkish and three Azerbaijani EFL textbooks meeting Common European Framework of Reference for Languages' (Council of Europe, 2001) Common Reference Levels of B1-B2.

The chosen Turkish EFL textbooks (TTs) which were designed for students studying at 10th, 11th and 12th grades of public schools are the following ones:

1. *Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10 Ders Kitabı*
2. *Silver Lining 11 Student's Book*
3. *Count Me In 12th Grade Student's Book*

The first textbook was approved by the Directorate of Committee of Instruction and Education of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) of the Republic of Turkey with the order 78 on May, 28, 2018 and was published to be used for 5 years. Similarly, the second and third textbooks was approved by the directorate with the article 12254648, on June, 25, 2018 as a pedagogical material.

The chosen Azerbaijani EFL textbooks (ATs) which were designed for students studying at 9th, 10th and 11th grades of public schools are listed below:

1. *English 9 Student's Book*

2. *English 10 Student's Book*

3. *English 11 Student's Book*

The first Azerbaijani textbook was approved by the decree №: 369 of the Ministry of Education (ME) of the Republic of Azerbaijan on June, 3, 2016. Likewise, the second and third Azerbaijani textbooks were produced in 2018, under the document numbers 2017-128, and 2018-171 of ME respectively.

The reason for choosing textbooks particularly on B1-B2 levels is that there is interdependence between pragmatics and grammatical development (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999, 2000; Kasper & Rose, 2002). Namely, some studies (Achiba, 2002; Ellis, 1992) revealed that language learners develop pragmatic competence in accordance with their improving level of syntactic complexity. Drawing on Achiba (2002) and Ellis (1992), Kasper and Rose (2002) also assert that without necessary L2 grammar, learners hardly develop aspects of pragmatics closely related to grammatical proficiency.

2.2. Instruments

To collect data, we have developed an assessment rubric (Appendix A) which consists of eight vertical sections i.e. (1) number and specific place of each dialogue in each textbook, (2) speech situation which also shows genders of interlocutors, (3) speech event, (4) speech act, (5), vertical distance, (6) horizontal distance, (7) cost/benefit, (8) strength of socially defined rights and obligations.

Sociopragmatic variables in the rubric are based on Leech's (2014) *sociopragmatic scales to assess appropriate degree of politeness* components of which are (i) vertical distance, (ii) horizontal distance, (iii) cost/benefit, (iv) strength of socially defined rights and obligations, (v) "self-territory" and "other-territory".

We did not include the (v) into the rubric, because, as Leech (2014) argues, it is significant in some non-Western cultures, such as Korean, Japanese, Chinese, etc. and thus, is not relevant to the analysis of dialogues in English.

To identify given speech acts in the textbooks, moreover, we made use of Searle's (1979) classification of speech act verbs. These are *assertives* which include speech acts of suggesting, putting forward, hypothesizing, stating, concluding, deducing, boasting, complaining, etc., *directives* which contain speech acts of advising, asking, begging, requesting, ordering, commanding, challenging, pleading, and so on, *commissives* which incorporate speech acts of promising, guaranteeing, volunteering, offering, and so forth, *expressives* which are comprised of the speech acts of thanking, apologizing, congratulating, condoling, deploring, welcoming, and the like, and *declarations* which are composed of speech acts, such as appointing someone chairman, nominating someone as candidate, declaring a state of war and performing the act of marrying (Searle, 1979).

Regarding speech events, on the other hand, we drew on Leech's (1983) categories of speech events divided by their illocutionary functions:

a. Competitive: The illocutionary goal competes with the social goal, e.g., ordering, asking, demanding, begging.

b. Convivial: The illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal, e.g., offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, congratulating.

c. Collaborative: The illocutionary goal is indifferent to the social goal, e.g., asserting, reporting, announcing, instructing.

d. Conflictive: The illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal, e.g., threatening, accusing, cursing, reprimanding (p. 104).

However, we did not include the last two categories into the assessment rubric, considering that, as Leech (2014) claims, (c) collaborative speech events do not need to involve politeness, because the illocutionary goals of the interlocutors participating in the dialogue neither compete nor contribute to the social goal; besides, (d) conflictive speech events do not normally (unless irony is intended) involve politeness, since in this speech event the aim is to cause offence.

Furthermore, we have checked speech situations in the textbooks, and labelled them according to social roles (e.g. customer - shop assistant or professor - student etc.) or relationships (e.g. mother - son, friend - friend, etc.) of participants in given contexts.

Last but not least, by focusing on gender pairs (male – male; male – female; female – female), we explored gender of participants in the dialogues as a variable influencing vertical distance. To this end we identified gender of each participant as *M* for males and *F* for females in front of their social role or relationship in the column of speech situations of the assessment rubric.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

The present research has been carried out in the following order. First of all, we took all the complete written dialogues, and transcribed all complete audio and video dialogues employed in the selected Turkish EFL textbooks, and those in the selected Azerbaijani EFL textbooks. Secondly, we developed an assessment rubric (Appendix A). Thirdly, using the rubric, we checked each dialogue in each textbook focusing on the above-mentioned variables. Overall, 664 turns in 57 (41 in TTs, and 16 in ATs) dialogues have been checked. Fourthly, we analyzed the collected data via "R-project" statistical software using two proportion tests for measuring the relationships between the variables which were inquired by each research question, considering the confidence level as 95 %. Finally, we presented the analyzed data in tables displaying the frequency values, percentages, test statistics and p values. The significance level has been taken as 0.05.

3. Results and Discussion

The results presented in Table 1 answer the 1st question of this study i.e. is there a significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of speech situations used in the dialogues?

Table 1 shows the ratio comparison test results for the speech situations employed in Turkish (TT) and Azerbaijani EFL textbook (AT) dialogues. According to the test results, there is no statistically significant difference between the textbooks in terms of the speech situation groups (p>0.05).

For the purpose of answering the first research question, we identified and categorized speech situations in the dialogues in TTs and ATs according to the interlocutors' social roles and relationships. As Table 1 displays, there are 14 different speech situations in TTs and 7 different speech situations in ATs. Table 1 also shows that speech situations of "Colleague - Colleague", "Customer - Ticket agent", "Guest - Receptionist", "Mother - Daughter", "Son - Father", "Son - Mother", "Uncle - Niece" and "Wife - Husband" do not exist in ATs, while "Sibling - Sibling" speech situation is not present in TTs. Although the results of the data analysis did not reveal any statistically significant differences between TTs and ATs, it is obvious that ATs seem not to offer a rich variety of speech situations, which, in its turn, constrain the use of the other variables explored in the present study. Moreover, Table 1 shows that the percentages of speech situations in both TTs and ATs have not been distributed proportionately. Namely, as Table 1 indicates, speech situation of "Friend - Friend" covers 35.90 % and speech situation

of "Interviewer - Interviewee" covers 25.64 % of the dialogues in TTs, whereas the other speech situations have been represented in small percentages, such as 5.13 % and 2.56 %. Similarly, in ATs 62.5 % of speech situations consist of "Friend - Friend" speech situation, while each of the remaining speech situations is represented only in 6.25 %. The percentages of speech situations employed in TTs and ATs leaves us with the impression that as if school-aged foreign language learners' everyday life mainly consists of interactions with their friends or of interviews, and surprisingly rarely of interactions in academic or service encounters.

Table 1. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Speech Situation Groups

Speech Situations	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
Colleague – Colleague	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Customer – Ticket agent	2	5.13	-	-	0.923	0.356
Friend – Friend	14	35.90	10	62.5	1.807	0.071
Guest – Receptionist	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Interviewer – Interviewee	10	25.64	1	6.25	1.633	0.102
Mother – Daughter	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Neighbor – Neighbor	1	2.56	1	6.25	0.663	0.507
Shop assistant – Customer	2	5.13	1	6.25	0.166	0.867
Son – Father	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Son – Mother	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Student – Student	2	5.13	1	6.25	0.166	0.867
Student – Teacher	1	2.56	1	6.25	0.663	0.507
Uncle – Niece	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Wife – Husband	1	2.56	-	-	0.646	0.518
Sibling – Sibling	-	-	1	6.25	1.576	0.115
Total	39	100	16	100		

The reason for investigating speech situations in the textbooks is that sociopragmatic knowledge, as Felix-Brasdefer (2010) argues, is related to appropriate use of social norms in specific situations i.e. knowing "when to speak and when to remain silent […] how one may talk to persons of different statuses and roles […] how to request, how to offer or how to decline assistance […]" (Saville-Troike, 1996, p. 363, as cited in Felix-Brasdefer, 2010). Stressing importance of speech situations, Wolfson (1981) asserts that it is necessary for speech act data to be collected "through [direct] observation and participation in a great variety of spontaneously occurring speech situations" (p. 9, as cited in Felix-Brasdefer, 2010). The studies in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics have revealed that speakers alter their speech acts differently on the basis of the situation (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, Roever, 2001, as cited in McAllister, 2015).

For example, speech situations were instrumental for CCSARP. In the project, to investigate realization of requests and apologies in different cultures, questionnaires called discourse completion tasks (DCT) were used, which included 16 situations to represent all the possible combinations of two variables: social distance and social dominance (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). Situations, as Rose

(1992) notes, mirror daily life of a student in a Western university. Some of the situations can be listed as follows (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984, p. 211-212):

1. A student asks his room-mate to clean up the kitchen which the other left in a mess.
2. A girl tries to get rid of a boy pestering her on the street.
3. A university professor promised to return the student's term paper that day but didn't finish reading it.
4. A student borrowed her professor's book, which she promised to return that day, but forgot to bring it.

As is shown, the above situations involve wide variety of roles which interlocutors play in the described contexts. This was the main motivation for labelling the situations according to the interlocutors' social roles and relationships identified in the textbooks. The above-presented situations also demonstrate how the choice of speech situations influence the choice of sociopragmatic variables.

The results indicated in Table 2, moreover, answer the 2nd research which inquires whether there is significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of speech events used in the dialogues.

Table 2. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Speech Event Groups

Speech Events	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
Convivial	245	52.80	62	52.99	0.036	0.970
Competitive	219	47.20	55	47.01	0.036	0.970
Total	464	100	117	100		

Table 2 indicates the ratio comparison test results for the speech events used in TT and AT dialogues. As Table 2 displays, there is no statistically significant difference between the textbooks concerning speech events ($p>0.05$).

Speech events used in the analysis to understand which type of politeness is used more in the textbooks. The results of the study, however, did not produce any statistically significant differences between TTs and ATs viz. percentages of both competitive and convivial speech events are virtually equal in both TTs and ATs. Table 2 also indicates that in both TTs and ATs percentages of convivial speech events are relatively higher than competitive speech events.

As we have already mentioned in previous chapters of this study, in Leech's (2014) politeness theory, the competitive speech events are subject to neg-politeness, since in these events illocutionary and social goals compete, and *S* tires to reconcile these competing goals (Leech, 2014). On the other hand, the convivial speech events are dependent on pos-politeness as the illocutionary and social goals are the same (Leech, 2014). Of these two types of politeness, neg-politeness, as Leech (2014) asserts, are more important one, because it functions to reduce potential instances of offence. Pos-politeness, on the other side, is about providing some positive value to one's interlocutor, e.g. by offers, invitations, compliments, and congratulations (Leech, 2014).

Given the fact that competitive speech events are subject to the neg-politeness, and neg-politeness is more important type of politeness (Leech, 2014), it would have been more adequate to add more competitive speech events into TTs and ATs, rather than the other way round.

The results presented in Table 3 answer the 3rd question of this study, "is there a significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of speech acts used in the dialogues?"

Table 3. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Speech Act Groups

Speech Acts	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
Accepting	78	11.75	12	6.70	1.939	0.052
Advising	13	1.96	2	1.12	0.755	0.450
Agreeing	1	0.15	-	-	0.520	0.603
Answering	149	22.44	38	21.23	0.346	0.729
Apologizing	7	1.05	-	-	1.379	0.167
Asking	9	1.36	2	1.12	0.249	0.803
Boasting	4	0.60	-	-	1.041	0.297
Command	1	0.15	-	-	0.520	0.603
Commiserating	2	0.30	2	1.12	1.410	0.158
Complaining	10	0.90	6	3.35	1.606	0.108
Complimenting	6	0.90	-	-	1.276	0.201
Complying	14	2.11	2	1.12	0.862	0.388
Confessing	1	0.15	-	-	0.520	0.603
Congratulating	3	0.45	-	-	0.901	0.367
Criticizing	4	0.60	-	-	1.041	0.297
Direction-giving	2	0.30	1	0.56	0.513	0.607
Disagreeing	1	0.15	1	0.56	0.996	0.319
Greeting	32	4.82	11	6.15	0.716	0.474
Imploring	2	0.30	-	-	0.735	0.462
Inviting	11	1.66	2	1.12	0.520	0.603
Lamenting	5	0.75	1	0.56	0.275	0.783
Leave-taking	12	1.81	6	3.35	1.269	0.204
Offering	12	1.81	7	3.91	1.683	0.092
Ordering	2	0.30	1	0.56	0.513	0.607
Praising	4	0.60	3	1.68	1.405	0.160
Promising	12	1.81	4	2.23	0.372	0.709
Proposing	10	1.51	1	0.56	0.991	0.321
Questioning	167	25.15	44	24.58	0.156	0.875
Refusing	23	3.46	7	3.91	0.286	0.774
Reminding	1	0.15	-	-	0.520	0.603
Requesting	22	3.31	5	2.79	1.526	0.127
Suggesting	8	1.20	9	5.03	3.229	**<0.001**
Thanking	29	4.37	12	6.70	1.290	0.197

Warning	5	0.75	-	-	1.164	0.244
Welcoming	2	0.30	-	-	0.735	0.462
Total	664	100	179	100		

Table 3 displays the ratio comparison test results for the speech acts used in TT and AT dialogues. According to the test results presented in Table 3, there is a statistically significant difference between the textbooks in terms of the speech act of suggesting. The ratio of the speech act of suggesting present in ATs is higher than TTs (p<0.05). Table 3 also indicates that speech act of suggesting is employed in 5.03 % of cases in ATs, while it is employed in 1.20 % of cases in TTs.

Speech acts play a significant role in pragmatics instruction. Therefore, we explored how they are represented in TTs and ATs and compared the results to answer the third research question of this study. Although the significant difference between TTs and ATs in terms of speech acts concerns only speech act of suggesting, there are not any significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the other speech.

The importance of speech acts can be explained by the fact that they are one of the most studied areas of pragmatics (Ishihara, 2010). They are also focal point of cross-linguistic and interlanguage pragmatics studies. In the cross-cultural pragmatics research, specifically, within the CCSARP, speech acts of requests and apologies have been studied throughout different languages to contrast realization patterns in them and determine differences between native and non-native speaker's realization patterns of these two speech acts (Blum-Kulka & Oshtain, 1984). On the other side, within the field of interlanguage pragmatics, speech acts are most extensively investigated object, which have been explored from large number of theoretical perspectives as well as research methodologies (Kasper, 2006). An early example of speech act development in institutional interaction within the field of interlanguage pragmatics is Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford's (1990, 1993, 1996, as cited in Kasper, 2006) studies on suggestions and rejections in academic advising sessions (Kasper, 2006). However, in contrast with the other speech acts e.g. requests, apologies, compliments, complaints, refusals, etc., speech act of suggesting has not been explored extensively in ILP research.

Suggesting is a member of the directive category of speech acts, as Searle (1976) proposes, whose illocutionary point is about the speaker's getting the hearer to perform some future action. The specific feature of suggestions is, according to Rintell (1979), that "in a suggestion, the speaker asks the hearer to take some action which the speaker believes will benefit the hearer, even one that the speaker should desire" (p. 99). Nevertheless, even though those who take benefit from suggestions are hearers, this speech act is considered as face threatening act (FTA), as Brown and Levinson (1987) argue, because by indicating to do something, the speaker (*S*) hinders the hearer's (*H*) freedom of action and thus, threatens his/her negative face needs. Moreover, as Martinez-Flor (2005) claims, for making suggestion a speaker should take some factors into consideration, such as the urgency of suggestion, social distance, social power, and so on. Therefore, in response to these factors the situation may be to greater or lesser extent face threatening which may lead the speaker to mitigate the speech act employing particular politeness strategies for decreasing the greatest degree possible the likely damage to the hearer's face (Martinez-Flor, 2005). Against this background, Martinez-Flor (2005) proposes a taxonomy of suggestions drawing on speech act theory and politeness theory, taking also Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford's (1993) "maxim of congruence" into consideration. The taxonomy involves direct, conventionalized and indirect strategies of suggestions each of which employs specific kinds of formulae for realization.

The results attained in the present study are in concordance with Yıldız Ekin's (2013) research, which draws on Martinez-Florz's (2004, as cited in Yıldız Ekin 2013) taxonomy of suggestions, and with

Jiang's (2006) study. Taking into consideration the use of speech act of suggesting in TTs (1.20 %) and ATs (5.03 %), as Table 3 indicates, it can be argued that similar with the results presented in Jiang (2006) and Yıldız Ekin (2013), the speech acts of suggesting are represented in a limited way. The limited representation of suggestions in the textbooks, as Jiang (2006) claims, may mislead second or foreign language learners in their development of pragmatic competence.

What has been stated about the limited representation of speech act of suggesting in the textbooks so far, can also be stated about the other speech acts which are particularly relevant to second or foreign language learners, especially the speech acts which are politeness-sensitive, such as requests, apologies, offers, invitations, promises, compliments, criticisms, thanks, agreement, disagreement, advice, congratulations, commiserations etc.

The results displayed in Table 4 respond the 4th research question which examines whether there is a significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of vertical distance used in the dialogues.

Table 4. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Vertical Distance Groups

Vertical Distance	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
S < H	187	28.26	22	12.29	4.364	**<0.001**
S = H	272	40.96	133	74.30	7.923	**<0.001**
S > H	205	30.87	24	13.41	4.662	**<0.001**
Total	664	100	179	100		

Table 4 demonstrates the ratio comparison test results for the vertical distance present in the TT and AT dialogues. According to the test results, there is a statistically significant difference between the textbooks in terms of vertical distance groups. The ratios of the groups "S < H" and "S > H" present in TTs are higher than those in AT (p<0.05). However, the ratio of the group "S = H" existing in ATs is higher than those in TTs (p<0.05).

As a social variable, vertical distance has been investigated largely in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics. This variable has been employed in DCTs for exploring requesting and apologizing patterns in different languages in CCSARP. Besides, vertical distance is a focus of attention of studies in interlanguage pragmatics. For instance, investigating effects of social variables on the choice of directness level in Hebrew, German and Argentinean speakers' requests, Blum-Kulka and House (1989, as cited in Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010) revealed that relative dominance of speakers is one of the most influential factors. In addition, a number of other studies supports the influence of vertical distance on speech act behavior and politeness (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990; Cansler & Stiles, 1981; Holtgraves et al., 1989; Lusting & King, 1980; Aeginitou, 1994; Fukushima, 2000; Trosborg, 1995; Kwong, 2004, as cited in Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010).

Given the importance of vertical distance in sociopragmatic competence of foreign language learners, we advanced the fourth research question, to identify whether there is a difference between TTs and ATs. The results demonstrated in the Table 4 reveal that there is a statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs in terms of all vertical distance variables, i.e. S < H, S = H, and S > H. According to Table 4, TTs include more vertically distant relationships between interlocutors, namely S < H used in 28.26 % of the cases in TTs, whereas it is used in 12.29 % of the cases in ATs. Similarly, 30.87 % of

TTs consists of S > H, while 13.41 % of ATs are composed of the same variable. However, as Table 4 shows, ATs are comprised of more vertically close relationships i.e. while S = H is used in 74.30 % of the cases in ATs, in TTs it is used in 40.96 % of the cases. The reason for the use of more vertically close relationships in ATs can be explained by the fact that in ATs, as Table 1 indicates, speech situation of "Friend - Friend", which is generally considered as a vertically close relationship (Rose, 1992), is employed more (62.5 %) than any other speech situation in ATs. Adding to this, sum total of percentages (18.75 %) of the other vertically close relationships represented in speech situations such as "Sibling - Sibling", "Neighbor - Neighbor" and "Student - Student", we get much higher percentage (81.25 %) of vertically close relationships, sum total of the percentages (48.71 %) of which is not the same in TTs. As a result, this disproportion in the choice of speech situations in ATs, shows itself in statistically significant differences with respect to vertical distance variables demonstrated in Table 4.

The results demonstrated in Table 5 answer the 5th research question of this study investigating whether there is a significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of horizontal distance used in the dialogues.

Table 5. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Horizontal Distance Groups

Horizontal Distance	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
S – H	24	60.00	11	78.57	1.252	0.210
S + H	16	40.00	3	21.43	1.252	0.210
Total	40	100.00	14	100.00		

Table 5 shows the ratio comparison test results for the horizontal distance present in the TT and AT dialogues. According to the test results presented in Table 5, there is no statistically significant difference between ATs and TTs in terms of the horizontal distance groups (p>0.05).

Similar to vertical distance, horizontal distance was also investigated largely in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics research. It has been examined together with vertical distance in DCTs of CCSARP. Moreover, several other studies revealed higher correlation between horizontal distance and level of indirectness or politeness (Felix-Brasdefer, 2005; Marquez Reiter 2000, 2002; Diaz Perez,1999, as cited in Ecomomidou-Kogetsidis, 2010).

Taking into consideration the importance of horizontal distance in pragmatics and particularly, in sociopragmatics, we explored possible differences between TTs and ATs with respect to this variable. Although the results of the data analysis displayed in Table 5 revealed no statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs in relation to representation of horizontal distance, the results found out that in both TTs and ATs the percentage of horizontally close relationships (i.e. S – H) is higher than that of horizontally distant relationships (i.e. S + H). This unequal proportion, as Table 5 shows, is more noticeable in ATs (78.57 %) than in TTs (60.00 %). The fact, however, can be accounted for by the speech situations employed both in TTs and in ATs. Specifically, as Table 1 indicates, sum total of the percentages of speech situations consisting of horizontally close relationships in TTs are higher (61.51%) than those of speech situations comprised of horizontally distant relationships (38.49 %). Likewise, as Table 1 shows, sum total of the percentages of speech situations composed of horizontally close relationships in ATs are higher (81.25 %) than those of speech situations involving horizontally distant relationships (18.75 %). Sum totals of speech situations composed of horizontally close

relationships also explains the reason why the percentage of horizontal distance variable S – H is relatively higher in ATs than that of S – H in TTs.

The results displayed in Table 6 answer the 6th research question of this study inquiring a possible significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of cost/benefit used in the dialogues.

Table 6. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Cost/Benefit Groups

Cost/Benefit	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
S < H	387	58.28	106	59.22	0.586	0.557
S > H	277	41.72	73	40.78	0.225	0.812
Total	664	100.00	179	100.00		

Table 6 indicates the ratio comparison test results for the cost/benefit groups present in TT and AT dialogues. According to the test results presented in Table 6, there is no statistically significant difference between ATs and TTs concerning the cost/benefit groups (p>0.05).

To reveal possible differences between TTs and ATs in relation to cost/benefit, we explored TTs and ATs employing two variables of cost/benefit viz. "S > H" when S receives benefit and H bears cost, and "S < H" when S bears cost and H gets benefit. The results of data analysis do not show any statistically significant differences between TTs and ATs, as is displayed in Table 6. However, the percentages of the variable of S < H is relatively higher in both TTs and ATs. This fact can be accounted for with the help of Table 2 where the percentages of speech events are displayed. As we have discussed above, convivial speech events are subject to pos-politeness whose purpose is to grant a high value on the hearer's values (Leech, 2014). In other words, convivial speech events are intrinsically courteous (Leech, 1983). Therefore, as Table 2 shows, due to high percentage of convivial speech events in both TTs (52.80 %) and ATs (52.99 %), the percentage of "S < H", indicating the benefit hearer receives, is also higher both in TTs (58.28 %) and ATs (59.22 %), as is indicated in Table 6.

Cost/benefit, (a.k.a. ranking of imposition, R factor, size of imposition, effect of imposition, weighting of imposition, etc.) has been investigated widely for revealing its effect on requesting strategies, and found to have a positive correlation with them (Trosborg, 1995; Fukushima, 2000). Likewise, there has been found a positive correlation between cost/benefit and managing failure events (McLaughlin, et al., 1983, as cited in Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010). Furthermore, Schauer (2007) identified a positive correlation between research participants' use of external modifications and the use of high imposition requests.

The results displayed in Table 7 answer the 7th research question of this study exploring a likely significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of representation of strength of socially defined rights and obligations used in the dialogues?

Table 7 demonstrates the ratio comparison test results for the rights/obligations groups present in the TT and AT dialogues. According to Table 7, there is a statistically significant difference between ATs and TTs with respect to the S < H and S > H groups (p<0.05). The ratio of the group "S < H" existing in ATs is higher than those in TTs. However, the ratio of the group "S > H" existing in ATs is lower than TTs. Furthermore, Table 7 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between TTs

and ATs concerning variable "–", representing "no socially defined rights and obligations" between interlocutors.

Table 7. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Rights/Obligations Groups

Rights/Obligations	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
–	73	10.99	13	7.26	1.464	0.143
S < H	424	63.86	148	82.68	4.786	**<0.001**
S > H	167	25.25	18	10.06	4.331	**<0.001**
Total	664	100.00	179	100.00		

According to Table 7, the variable "S < H", which expresses a speaker's obligation to a hearer, is found to be employed more in ATs (82.68 %) than in TTs (63.86 %). On the other hand, the variable "S > H", which indicates a hearer's obligation to a speaker, is employed more in TTs (25.25 %) than in ATs (10.06 %). These significant differences between TTs and ATs regarding strength of socially defined rights and obligations can be explained by the frequency of representations of speech situations demonstrated in Table 1. Since sum total of the percentages of speech situations, such as "Friend – Friend", in which interlocutors are mutually obliged to each other, is significantly higher in ATs (68.75 %) than TTs (38.46 %), the percentage of S < H is higher in ATs. On the other hand, as Table 1 displays, because sum total of the percentages of speech situations such as "Ticket agent – Customer", "Interviewer – Interviewee", "Mother – Daughter", "Father – Son" etc. in which one of the interlocutors is obliged to another is higher in TTs (51.26 %) than ATs (18.75 %), the percentage of S > H is significantly higher in TTs.

In his sociopragmatic scales, Leech (2007, 2014) exemplifies several socially defined obligations: a teacher's obligations to a student, a host's obligations to a guest, service providers' obligations to their clients or customers. One more type of social relationships is friendship (August & Rook. 2013). Friends, in addition, have obligations or duties to one another (Nelkin, 2015) and this belief is held nearly in every culture (Grunebaum, 1993). Besides, Ross (1930, as cited in Grunebaum, 1993) argues that not meeting one's obligations toward friends is more reprehensible than failing to satisfy an identical duty toward a non-friend.

The importance of strength of socially defined rights and obligations is well-documented in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics research. For instance, in their cross-cultural investigation of requests, Blum-Kulka and House (1989, as cited in Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010) found out several additional factors influencing requesting behavior of participants e.g. degree of obligation to perform the act, right to demand compliance, and estimated likelihood of compliance. In the same way, studying requesting strategies of Spaniards, Martin and Francisco (2001, as cited in Placencia & Reiter, 2005) and Martin (2002, as cited in Placencia & Reiter, 2005), found out that in the cases of social distance between interlocutors, speakers mitigated their requests when they decided that requesting something form the addressee was their right; also in the situations where speakers had more social power, they made use of mitigation when they knew that they had right to demand something from the addressee.

The results displayed in Table 8 answer the 8th research question of this study viz. is there a significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding the frequency of representation of gender used in the dialogues?

Table 8 shows the ratio comparison test results for the gender-pair groups employed in the TT and AT dialogues. In accordance with the test results presented in Table 8, there is no statistically significant difference between the textbooks in terms of the gender-pair groups (p>0.05).

Table 8. The Ratio Comparison Test Results for the Gender Groups

Gender	TTs		ATs		Z	p
	N	%	N	%		
Male – Male	7	17.95	-	-	1.560	0.118
Male – Female	27	69.23	11	73.33	1.937	0.052
Female – Female	3	7.69	-	-	0.329	0.975
Total	39	94.87	15	73.33		

As is already mentioned, it is identified that there is a difference in the interactional styles of different genders. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) unlike men, women use more negative politeness and it is due to vertical distance between them. In the DCTs used in CCSARP, gender of the participants also identified in the description of the situations (Rose, 1992).

Considering the effect of gender on vertical distance, we made use of it to compare TTs and ATs, and identified three gender pairs, "Male – Male", "Male – Female", and "Female – Female". The results of data analysis displayed in Table 8, revealed that although there is no statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs regarding gender pairs, the frequency of the use of "Male – Female" is relatively higher in ATs than TTs. Considering the above-mentioned correlation between vertical distance and gender, it can be argued that, as Table 4 and Table 8 indicate, since the percentage (74.30 %) of vertically close relationships (S = H) is higher in ATs, and since the percentage (73.33 %) the different gender pair (Male – Female) is also higher in ATs, males and females are represented more in vertically close relationships than in TTs. In other words, in ATs, males and females are more equal in terms of vertical distance. On the other hand, taking into consideration, as Table 4 indicates, the significantly higher frequency of high vertical distance (i.e. S > H, S < H) sum total of the percentages of which are 59. 13 %, and relatively high percentage (69.23 %) of "Male – Female" gender pair, as Table 8 shows, it can be argued that unlike ATs, in TTs males and females are represented in vertically distant relationships. In other terms, in TTs, males and female are more unequal in terms of vertical distance. Apart from that, while in TTs all three variables of gender pairs are present, in ATs, only "Male – Female" gender pair is employed. Lack of "Male – Male" and "Female – Female" gender pair is a major drawback for ATs, because it does not give the learners an opportunity to observe communication between the same genders, and thus it does not exemplify the effects of sociopragmatic variables on their communicative language use. In addition, although all the three gender-pair groups are represented in TTs, the relatively less use of the same-gender communicative interactions, decreases the chances for the learners to compare and contrast any communicative language use between the interlocutors of the same and the different gender.

4. Conclusions

Since foreign language learners are likely to make sociopragmatic failure, and since this kind of failure is harder to overcome, the development of the learners' sociopragmatic competence bears a

particular significance for second or foreign language teaching and learning. Although sociopragmagic failure is hard to deal with, the research has proven the effectiveness of instruction on learners' awareness of sociopragmatic aspects of language use. Since input is vital in teaching pragmatics, and since textbooks are prestigious source of input, we have compared Turkish and Azerbaijani B1-B2 EFL textbooks to see how well they addressed various sociopragmatic and related variables.

Regarding the first research question which explored the use of speech situations, a statistically significant difference has not been detected between TTs and ATs. Instead, it has been found that in both TTs and ATs relatively high percentages have been allocated to "Friend – Friend" speech situation, and in TTs relatively high percentage has been allocated to "Interviewer – Interviewee" speech situation, leaving the other speech situations less percentages. We believe that this way of representation of speech situations in the textbooks does not represent daily life and immediate interests of the students. Moreover, since the choice of speech situations influence the use of speech events, speech acts and sociopragmatic variables, their representation was also restricted by the mostly used speech situations of "Friend – Friend" and "Interviewer – Interviewee".

Speech events are the topic of the second question, based on which TTs and ATs have been compared. In relation to this research question, there have not been detected any statistically significant differences between TTs and ATs. What the results of data analysis demonstrates is that in both TTs and ATs convivial speech events have been represented relatively more than competitive speech events. Given the fact that convivial speech events are subject to pos-politeness, whereas competitive speech events are dependent on neg-politeness, and considering that neg-politeness is more important than pos-politeness, the textbooks should have employed more competitive speech events than convivial speech events.

The first statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs concerns the third question of the study i.e. whether there is a significant difference between TTs and ATs in terms of speech acts. It has been detected that the frequency of the use of speech act of suggesting is higher in ATs than TTs. Except from the speech act of suggesting, there are not any significant differences between TTs and ATs in relation to the other speech acts. Moreover, it has been revealed that in both TTs and ATs speech acts of questioning and answering have been employed relatively more than the other speech acts. The relatively high representation of these speech acts leaves us with the impression that as if in their daily life, students are mainly asking and answering questions, and occasionally make use of the other speech acts. This way of representation of speech acts does not reflect the immediate interests of students and leaves them with less chance to acquire the use of politeness-sensitive speech acts, especially those which concern neg-politeness.

The statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs was also revealed in the presentation of vertical distance, as a response to the fourth research question. It has been found that, the use of vertically close relationships (S = H) is significantly higher in ATs, whereas the frequency of vertically distant relationships (S < H; S > H) is significantly higher in TTs. These significant differences can be attributed to the representation of speech situations, such as "Friend – Friend" which involve participants having vertically close relationships in ATs. Since a relative predominance is given to such situations in ATs, the percentage of vertically close relationships are correspondingly higher which leaves less percentages to vertically distant relationships in ATs, and accordingly leading differences where the percentages of vertically distant relationships are higher in TTs, and those of vertically close relationships are higher in ATs. The allocation of more percentages to vertically close relationships in ATs, may result in failure to provide an opportunity for the learners to observe the alteration of strategies in the use of different speech acts, and thus may fall short in developing their sociopragmatic competence.

As a response to the fifth research question concerning horizontal distance, there has not been detected a statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs. Instead, the data analysis has identified that in both TTs and ATs, horizontally close relationships (S – H) have given preference over the horizontally distant relationships (S + H). This fact also can be attributed to the representations of speech situations composed of horizontally close relationships. However, this way of allocation of horizontal distance variables, which is more noticeable in ATs, may not let the learners have a clear picture of the use of both variables, and thus may not contribute the learners' development of sociopragmatic competence.

In relation to the representation of cost/benefit, the data analysis has revealed insignificant differences between TTs and ATs. Instead of differences, it has been found that in both TTs and ATs, the variable of hearer's receiving benefit (S < H) is used more. This fact can be explained by relatively higher use of convivial speech events and speech acts involved in these events. Since convivial speech events are subject to pos-politeness whose purpose is an enhancement of face, and since in these events by attributing value to *H*, *S* performs face-enhancing acts, such as complimenting, offering, etc., the frequency of representation of S < H is relatively higher in both TTs and ATs correspondingly.

Another statistically significant difference between TTs and ATs has been detected in the use of strength of socially defined rights and obligations. It has been detected that the variable of "S < H" i.e. *S's* obligation to *H* is represented significantly more in ATs than TTs. On the other hand, the use of the variable "S > H" i.e. *H's* obligation to *S* is significantly higher in TTs than ATs. The reason for these differences between ATs and TTs can be accounted for by looking at the use of the speech situations involving relationships in which either both of the interlocutors are obliged to each other or one of the interlocutors is obliged to the other. Accordingly, it has been found that, the representation of the former kind of speech situations are higher in AT, whereas the use of the latter kind of speech situations is higher in TTs. As a result, there are such significant differences between ATs and TTs regarding the variables (i.e. S < H and S > H) of strength of socially defined rights and obligations. Although there are differences between TTs and ATs regarding the above-mentioned variables of strength of socially defined rights and obligations, the data analysis has also revealed that the variable of S < H is represented relatively more both in TTs and ATs. This disproportion is more conspicuous in ATs. Presenting variables of strength of socially defined rights and obligations in this disproportionate way, leads to the representation of cost/benefit and its effect on the speech act realization mostly restricted by *S's* obligation to *H* and thus, may not give the learners opportunity to observe strategies employed in the speech act realization in which either *H* is obliged to *S*, or neither *S*, nor *H* is obliged to each other.

Finally, there have not been detected any statistically significant differences between TTs and ATs, as a response to the 8th research question concerning gender. Instead, it has been revealed that in both TTs and ATs, gender pair "male – female" is represented relatively more than the other gender pairs. In addition, it has been found that unlike TTs, the gender pairs "male – male" and "female – female" have been not represented in the analyzed dialogues in ATs at all. Preference to the different-gender pair, and less use or lack of the same-gender pairs may not provide the learners with an opportunity to clearly observe possible effects of gender differences on sociopragmatic variables, and thus may mislead or impede their development of sociopragmatic competence.

The reasons for the differences in TTs and ATs, as is already mentioned, can be attributed to the inadequate representation of speech situations and speech events. Since almost all the sociopragmatic variables are dependent on speech situations, they should have been chosen attentively to reflect daily life and immediate interests of school aged students for whom these textbooks are mainly written. Similarly, the choice of speech events influences the choices of speech acts and sociopragmatic variables. Since neg-politeness is more important and since competitive speech events are subject to neg-politeness, the preference was needed to be given to competitive speech events. Elimination of these

shortcomings may lead to creation of authentic dialogues and conversations for the textbooks which, in its turn, may contribute to the learners' development of sociopragmatic competence in specific, and pragmatic competence in general in foreign language classrooms.

5. Ethics Committee Approval

The author(s) confirm(s) that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country (Date of Confirmation: August 25, 2020).

References

Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language: A study of child interlanguage pragmatics*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Akdağ, E., Baydar Ertopcu, F., Kaya, T., Umur Özadalı, S., & Uyanık Bektaş, K. (2018). *Secondary education silver lining 11 student's book*. 1st edn. Edited by Kenan Dikilitaş. Ankara, Turkey: MEB.

Aslanova, G., Quliyeva, Q., & Rüstəmova, X. (2018). *English 11 student's book*. Edited by Nailə Bağırova. Baku, Azerbaijan: Kövsər.

August, K. J., & Rook, K. S. (2013). Social relationships. In M.D. Gellman & J.R. Turner (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of behavioral medicine* (pp. 1838-1842). New York, USA: Springer-Verlag New York Inc.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and Language Teaching: Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. In L.F. Bouton (Ed.), *Monograph Series: Vol. 7. Pragmatics and Language Learning* (pp. 21-39). Illinois: English as an International Language, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *49*, 677–713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. In R.B. Kaplan (Ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 182–192). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2015). Operationalizing conversation in studies of instructional effect in L2 pragmatics. *System*, *48*, 21-34.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2019). Teaching of Pragmatics. In J. I. Liontas & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-7). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2020). Pedagogical linguistics: A view from L2 pragmatics. *Pedagogical Linguistics*, *1*(1), 44-65.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*(3), 279-304.

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

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, *5*(3), 196-213.

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

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, *25*(3), 459-480.

Cenoz, J. (2008). The acquisition of pragmatic competence and multilingualism in foreign language contexts. In E. Alcon Soler & M. P. Safont Jorda (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 123-140). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Cohen, A. D., & Ishihara, N. (2013). Pragmatics. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and materials development* (pp. 113–126). London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.

Council of Europe. Council for Cultural Co-operation. Education Committee. Modern Languages Division. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Demir, E., Çimen, F., Çokçalışkan, A., Fındıkçı, G., & Taşkıran Tigin, B. (2018). *Secondary education student's book count me in 12th grade*. 1st edn. Edited by Şevki Kömür. Ankara, Turkey: MEB.

Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2010). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behaviour: Perceptions of social situations and strategic usage of request patterns. *Journal of pragmatics*, *42*(8), 2262-2281.

Eisenchlas, S. A. (2011). On-line interactions as a resource to raise pragmatic awareness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 51–61.

Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two language learners' requests. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *14*(1), 1-23.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2010). Data collection methods in speech act performance. *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues*, *26*, 41-56.

Fukushima, S. (2000). *Requests and culture: politeness in British English and Japanese*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Genç Karataş, Ç. (2018). *Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10 ders kitabı* [Secondary education English 10 textbook]. Ankara, Turkey: Gizem Yayıncılık.

Grunebaum, J. O. (1993). Friendship, morality, and special obligation. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, *30*(1), 51-61.

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

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, *269293*, 269-293.

Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *4*(10), 938-953.

Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *System*, *34*(1), 36-54.

Kasper, G. (2006). Speech acts in interaction: Towards discursive pragmatics. *Pragmatics and language learning*, *11*, 281-314.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *13*(2), 215-247.

Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Heinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 341-358). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 1-10). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Leech, G. N. (2007). Politeness: is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness research*, *3*(2), 167-206.

Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Martínez-Flor, A. (2005). A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards a taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses, 18*, 167-187.

McAllister, P. G. (2015). Speech acts: a synchronic perspective. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann (Eds.), *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook* (pp. 29-51). Cambdridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nelkin, D. K. (2015). Friendship, Freedom, and Special Obligations. In A. Buckareff, C. Moya & S. Rosell (Eds.). *Agency, Freedom, and Moral Responsibility* (pp. 226-250). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Placencia, M. E., & Reiter, R. M. (2005). *Spanish pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Quliyeva, Q., & Rüstəmova, X. (2016). *English 9 student's book*. Edited by Nailə Bağırova. Baku, Azerbaijan: Kövsər.

Quliyeva, Q., & Rüstəmova, X. (2018). *English 10 student's book*. Edited by Nailə Bağırova. Baku, Azerbaijan: Kövsər.

Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Rintell, E. (1979). Getting your speech act together: The pragmatic ability of second language learners. *Working Papers on Bilingualism Toronto*, *17*, 97-106.

Rose, K. R. (1992). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of pragmatics*, *17*(1), 49-62.

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, *33*(3), 385-399.

Rutherford, W. E. (1987). *Second language grammar: Learning and teaching.* New York, USA: Longman.

Schauer, G. A. (2007). Finding the right words in the study abroad context: The development of German learners' use of external modifiers in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *4*(2), 193-220.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in society*, *5*(1), 1-23.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Sykes, J. M. (2013). Multiuser virtual environments: Learner apologies in Spanish. In N. Taguchi & J. M. Sykes (Eds.), *Technology in interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching* (pp. 71–100). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

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

Timmis, I. (2015). Humanising coursebook dialogues. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(2), 144-153.

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

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2011). Developing second language sociopragmatic knowledge through concept-based instruction: A microgenetic case study. *Journal of pragmatics*, *43*(13), 3267-3283.

Vasquez, C., & Sharpless, D. (2009). The role of pragmatics in the master's TESOL curriculum: Findings from a nationwide survey. *Tesol Quarterly*, *43*(1), 5-28.

Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *Tesl-Ej*, *8*(2), 1-18.

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

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

Appendix A.

№:	Speech Situation	Speech Event	Speech Act	Vertical Distance	Horizontal Distance	Cost/Benefit	Rights/ Obligations

Türkiye ve Azerbaycan'da kullanılan B1-B2 düzeyinde yabancı dil olarak ingilizce öğretimindeki ders kitaplarında geçen karşılıklı konuşmaların toplumedimbilimsel karşılaştırmalı çözümlemesi

Öz

Farklı toplumlar toplumsal mesafeyi, toplumsal gücü, hak ve yükümlülükleri, ve söylem edimlerinin yükünün ağırlığını farklı şekilde ölçerler. Bu fark yabancı dil öğrenenleri toplumedimbilimsel yanlışlar yapmaya meyilli kılar. Bu tür yanlışların düzeltilmesi öğrenen bireylerin toplumsal (ya da siyasi, dini ve ahlaki) konularda haklı hassasiyetleri nedeniyle zordur. Ancak, yapılan araştırmalar, öğretimin öğrenenlerin dil kullanımının

toplumedimbilimsel yönlerinden farkındalığının yükseltilmesinde etkili olduğunu gösteriyor. Buna rağmen, toplumedimbilimsel öğelerin ikinci veya yabancı dil öğretimi kitaplarında nasıl ele alındığıyla ilgili neredeyse hiçbir araştırma bulunmamaktadır. Ders kitaplarının, dil öğrenenlere toplumedimbilimsel gelişim için girdi sağlamak açısından gerekliliğini dikkate alarak, biz Türkiye'de tasarlanmış ve devlet okullarında kullanılan yabancı dil olarak ingilizce kitaplarını, ve Azerbaycan'da tasarlanmış ve devlet okullarında kullanılan benzer kitapları bu kitaplardaki karşılıklı konuşmalarda toplumedimbilimsel ve onunla ilişkili öğelerin nasıl ele alındığını değerlendirmek amacıyla karşılaştırdık. Araştırmanın sonuçları Türkiye ve Azerbaycan ders kitapları arasında söylem edimleri, dikey uzaklık, ve toplumsal olarak belirlenmiş hak ve yükümlülüklerin ağırlığı açısından anlamlı farklılıkların olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu farklılıklar, diğer yandan, söylem durumlarının yetersiz şekilde sunulduğu ile açıklanabilir. Bu araştırmayla biz, ders kitabı yazarlarının dikkatini toplumedimbilimsel açıdan daha nitelikli ders kitaplarının hazırlanmasına yöneltmeyi, ve ikinci ve yabancı dil öğretenlere ve öğrenenlere, uygun dil kullanımının toplumedimbilimsel yetinin kazanılması ile gerçekleşebileceği inancını kazandırmayı amaçladık.

Anahtar sözcükler: ders kitapları; incelik; karşılaştırmalı kültür; dil yetisi; toplumedimbilim; yabancı dil olarak ingilizce

---

AUTHOR BIODATA

Isgandar BABABAYLI received his B.A. degree from the Department of Foreign (English) Language Teaching of the Faculty of Philology at Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, in Baku, Azerbaijan, and his M.A. degree from the Department of English Language Education in the Graduate School of Sciences at Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey. In addition to Azeri and Turkish, he speaks English and Russian.

Nalan KIZILTAN graduated from Ondokuz Mayıs University in Samsun. She received her M.A. and Ph.D. in the Department of English Linguistics from Hacettepe University in Ankara. Her doctoral dissertation is on 'Turkish Children's Literature from the linguistic perspective. Then she conducted her postdoctoral studies on Foreign Language Teacher Education at the Ohio State University in the United States of America between 1996-1997. She was awarded as a Professional Woman in America by 'Who is Who' in 2003. She was chosen for the International Board of Advisors in 2005. She has been working as Prof. Dr. for the Department of pre-service English Language Teacher Education at the Faculty of Education and she is the director of the School of Foreign Languages at Ondokuz Mayıs University. She was a visiting scholar to teach Turkish as a foreign language at the University of Salento, Lecce in Italy between 2008-1013 working for the Turkish Embassy to Rome. During the Academic years from 2009, 2010 and 2011, she also gave some CUM-EMUNI-CIRCEOS Master degree's courses on Tourism and Cultures at University of Bari and has been giving Master's degree courses on Cultures and Tourism in OMU-CMU collaboration programme. During the one hundred anniversary of the 19 May 1919, She was awarded as the best female scholar in linguistics of the Year and was included among the 100 prominent Turkish women from the foundation of The Republic of Turkey to the Present. Her articles are about children's literature first and second language acquisition, language development of children, applied linguistics, teacher education and foreign language teaching. She speaks English, French and Italian.