THE ANALYSIS OF A TEXTBOOK ACTIVITY ON SUGGESTIONS ACCORDING TO SPEAKING FRAMEWORK BY HYMES AND ITS ADAPTATION

ÖNERİ KONULU BİR DERS KİTABI ETKİNLİĞİNİN HYMES'IN SPEAKING ÇERÇEVESİNE GÖRE İNCELENMESİ VE UYARLANMASI

Ezgi KIYANÇİÇEK
ezgi.icli@istanbul.edu.tr
İstanbul Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu
ORCID: 0000-0002-1865-0023

Çiğdem KARATEPE
ozlem1@uludag.edu.tr
Uludağ Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
ORCID: 0000-0002-2902-6656

ABSTRACT

Teaching speech acts and designing activities for this purpose have gained massive attention recently. It is realized that they play an essential role in language use and consequently in language teaching. The current study investigates if a specific material designed to teach suggestions in Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017) level book is well-designed according to the SPEAKING framework proposed by Hymes in 1974. This framework focuses on the inclusion of pragmatic elements, which are the speech components that underlie a speech event in language teaching materials. To this end, after the detailed analysis of the material in the light of the SPEAKING framework, it was found that the course book material lacks certain pragmatic elements such as setting, participants, genre, and language use. Therefore, the material was further adapted, and the material adaptation was checked by two native speaker English language instructors and five non-native English language instructors. Based on the feedback from the instructors, the material was further modified and finalized.

ÖZET

Söz edimlerini öğretmek ve bu amaçla etkinlikler tasarlamak son yıllarda büyük ilgi görmektedir. Bu yapıların dil kullanımında ve dolayısıyla dil öğretiminde önemli bir rol oynadıkları anlaşılmıştır. Mevcut çalışma, Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017) seviyesindeki kitaptaki tavsiye verme için tasarlanmış belirli bir materyalin, 1974'te Hymes tarafından önerilen SPEAKING çerçevesine göre iyi tasarlanmış olup olmadığını araştırmaktadır. Bu çerçeve, bir konuşma olayının altında yatan konuşma bileşenleri olan edim bilimsel unsurların dil öğretim materyallerine dahil edilmesine odaklanmaktadır. Bu amaçla, SPEAKING çerçevesi ışığında materyalin detaylı analizinden sonra, ders kitabı materyalinin ortam, katılımcılar, tür ve dil kullanımı gibi belirli edim bilimsel unsurlardan yoksun olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, materyal uyarlaması yapıldı ve bu materyal uyarlaması, anadili İngilizce olan iki İngilizce eğitmeni ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan beş İngilizce eğitmeni tarafından kontrol edilmiştir. Eğitmenlerden gelen geri bildirimlere dayanarak, materyal daha da değiştirilmiş ve sonlandırılmıştır.

Introduction

Almost three decades ago Kasper (1997) asked whether pragmatics could be taught, this question has not been answered by teachers confidently (Karatepe & Civelek 2021; Korkmaz & Karatepe 2022). Pragmatic competence was included in the definition of communicative competence by Bachman (1990). Blum-Kulka et al (1989) assert that even highly proficient learners need to receive instruction on pragmatics as they frequently fail to interpret the illocutionary meaning of speech acts or use speech acts appropriately. CEFR (2001) described functional competence which partially included pragmatic competence. Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor (2003) claimed that learners required support when learning features of pragmatics because of their multi-layered functions. The first available aid for learners and teachers in this process that one can think of is the English coursebooks, which are supposed to represent the target language in many respects. However, decades later many studies in the field of EFL report that pragmatics has not found its deserved place and enough emphasis in English coursebooks (Harwood, 2014; Karatepe, 1998; Kasper, 1997; Taguchi, 2015; Vallenga 2004; Cohen & Ishihara 2013). Sadly, representing features of pragmatics appears to be regarded as an optional task (Harwood, 2014, Korkmaz & Karatepe 2022; Karatepe & Civelek 2021).

Recent research in the discourse analysis literature highlights that EFL learners may face some difficulties when communicating in various social contexts due to several factors such as lack of knowledge related to language function and cultural knowledge, and therefore, it is crucial to teach language learners how to formulate speech acts to achieve successful real-life communication (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Hu, 2014; Li, Suleiman, & Sazalie, 2015; Nguyen, 2011; Ortaçtepe, 2012). When they are not, their lack of pragmatic competence can lead to pragmatic failure (House, 19983) This realization highlights the importance of teaching pragmatic norms in EFL classrooms. Moreover, pragmatic failure is regarded as a serious issue since it is likely to lead to some interactional breakdowns (Karatepe, 2016; Kıyançiçek, 2023; Li, Suleiman, & Sazalie, 2015).

Therefore, it is vitally important to analyse the course book contents as much as the literature focus on pragmatic competence and its development in language learners. However, the number of studies focusing on course book analysis from a pragmatic perspective is still limited (Cortazzi & Jin, 2018). Moreover, the studies on coursebooks tend to focus on the course book evaluation by analyzing the multimedia use, technology integration, grammar content, and layout (Bruton, 1997; Hismanoğlu, 2011; Koral & Mirici, 2021; Si, 2020; Şahin, 2020; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007; Tok, 2010).

The present study argues that studies focusing on pragmatics in coursebooks should have a theoretical background which was proposed specifically for the evaluation of the features of pragmatics. For this purpose, authors adapted the theoretical framework SPEAKING which was proposed by Hymes (1974) to describe how we create meaning from a more pragmatic perspective, which can be implemented into analysing teaching materials from a similar point of view to foster pragmatic competence. The theory has hardly been used in ELT research. That is, the current research is designed to fill this research gap by analysing a unit from a course book which was designed to teach the speech act of *suggestion*. The researcher based their study on the theory proposed by Hymes (1974) and provided some alternative language learning activities and tasks.

Literature Review

Speech Acts in Coursebooks

Speech acts can be defined as the utterance or the expression of interaction that serves a purpose. Bardovi-Harlig (2010, p. 219) states that "the dominant area of investigation within interlanguage pragmatics has been the "speech act" and the researchers have studied speech acts for years (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Blum-Kulka, 1991; Flores Salgado, 2011; Göy, Zeyrek & Otcu, 2012; Karatepe 1998, 2001, 2016). Yule (1996) defines speech acts as the actions which are performed via utterances. In many cases, we need speech "to perform an action" (Austin, 1975, p. 375).

It is well-accepted that coursebooks are the primary language sources in EFL classrooms, making them an inevitable part of the language learning process (Garton & Graves, 2014). Therefore, a significant amount of attention has been paid to developing course materials or coursebooks to teach pragmatics (Crandall & Baştürkmen, 2004; Hillard, 2017; Ishihara, 2010; Siegel, 2016; Siegel et al., 2019; Tatsuki, 2019). However, many studies have scrutinized the effectiveness of coursebooks and the extent to which they present EFL learners with the required information to develop their pragmatic competence. The studies on the extent to which coursebooks represent real-life conversation have shown that EFL coursebooks seldom provide satisfactory examples of real-life English conversation (Berry 2000; Grant & Starks, 2001; McConnachy 2009; McConnachy & Hata 2013). Therefore, it is important to investigate coursebooks to what extent they represent real language.

Another important point to consider in teaching pragmatic components in the classroom is the amount of pragmatic input language learners can have access to. The studies evaluating the extent to which the features of pragmatics and speech acts are represented in coursebooks have shown that they fall short of providing satisfying language samples (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; McConnachy & Hata, 2013; Vellenga, 2004). One of the earlier studies conducted to analyse ELT coursebooks with regard to pragmatic content was conducted by Bardovi-Harlig et al. in 1991. The researchers examined 20 ELT coursebooks in terms of conversation-closing strategies. Their findings showed that only twelve of the coursebooks contained appropriate examples of closings. Similarly, Boxer and Pickering (1995) also analysed the presentation of complaints in seven coursebooks and reported that only direct complaints were covered, but indirect complaints were not represented. However, studies in the field show that indirect complaint strategies are usually more common than direct complaints in natural conversation (Karatepe 2001 & 2016).

Recent studies have reported similar findings. For example, Alcón and Tricker (2000) examined how some English coursebooks presented the discourse marker *well* and compared its frequency of occurrence in American films. Their findings demonstrated that ELT coursebooks analysed in the study did not provide interactive characteristics of the discourse marker *well*. Due to the nature of features of pragmatics, coursebooks need to provide explicit information about their uses as learners may not be able to deduce this from the input (Karatepe 1998). The study by Vellenga (2004) also included a qualitative and quantitative analysis of eight coursebooks to identify the use of metalanguage, explicit representation of speech acts, and metapragmatic information. The results demonstrated that none of these coursebooks examined provided explicit pragmatic information. Some studies focused on the number of different speech acts included in coursebooks. For example, Nguyen (2011) analysed three Vietnamese high school coursebooks and their workbooks for the involvement of 27 speech acts. The coursebooks were examined in terms of speech act instruction, presentation of speech acts, and pragmatic information inclusion. Nguyen (2011) found that the number of speech acts addressed in the coursebooks decreased throughout the series as the proficiency level increased. Nevertheless, some speech acts were observed across all levels, such as sharing opinions and showing agreement and disagreement, allowing for more practice. However, the overall organization of the speech acts demonstrated that they were not deliberately placed across levels but rather randomly. Nguyen (2011) concluded that the coursebooks did not contain satisfying pragmatic information, and the study highlighted the need to provide further support for learners. Therefore, language learners tend to use a few strategies and forms in any context or conversation (Wyner & Cohen, 2015). Equally, the scarcity of pragmatic items available to be used in the repertoire of language learners might trigger the transfer of L1 norms and forms (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Hilliard 2017).

However, other researchers also provide insights into how language teaching materials should be designed to guide learners to become communicatively competent. Tomlinson (2010) explains that language teaching materials are expected to expose the learners to authentic language use, and they "should provide the learners with the opportunities to use the target language to achieve the communicative purpose" (p. 15). Besides, teaching materials should draw the learners' attention to particular language items so that they can notice different usages (ibid. p.13). When learners do not notice a particular linguistic feature, they will most probably not learn it (see also Schmidt, 1990).

Teachers and learners need contextual information to understand how situational variables influence the choice of lexical and grammatical forms (McConnachy, 2009). Otherwise, they are left to their own devices and transferred from their mother tongue, which may lead to misunderstandings and miscommunication. By presenting speech acts without context, coursebooks deprive learners of a valuable source of information (Tomlinson 2008). Learners need to adopt a more analytical view so that they can grasp the illocutionary force of speech acts. In order for EFL teachers to facilitate learners' understanding of the illocutionary meaning of language forms, they need a framework model by means of which they can enrich the classroom activities to assist learners. For this purpose, McConnachy (2009) suggested the SPEAKING framework proposed by Hymes (1974). The following part will present how this framework could be used to give situational information to facilitate learning in EFL classrooms.

Hymes' SPEAKING framework

It is known that speaking a language well requires more than just knowing the syntax; it also requires an intuitive grasp of certain social norms. The act of speaking alone does not fully convey the meaning to us; rather, the context in which those words are delivered has a significant impact on how we interpret them. This idea was theorised by a well-known anthropologist Dell Hymes. Therefore, he further remarked that there were cultural differences in the ways speakers use the language.

Hymes (1974) developed an analysis of what he terms "speech components." He proposed the framework of SPEAKING, which focuses on the pragmatic aspects of language and can be used to analyse language in context. As McConachy (2009) states that 'SPEAKING' is a mnemonic, and each letter of SPEAKING stands for an aspect of context that is thought to influence the creation and interpretation of meaning- S for Situation; P for Participation; E for Ends; A for Act sequence; K for Key; I for Instrumentalities; N for Norms and G for Genres.

The first letter S stands for *situation*, which contains the scene and the setting. That is, it refers to where the activities take place. In any conversational situation, there is a scene which includes specific acts or activities, and it tends to be the first thing noticed when a speech situation is analysed (Reyaz & Tripathi, 2016). Therefore, setting plays an important role in language use. In an EFL setting, language learners should be informed about the importance of the setting when a new linguistic item is presented. This helps learners develop awareness towards its influence on what is said and what is not said (McConachy, 2009).

The second letter P refers to the *participants in the conversation*, their roles, and the relationship they have. Individuals who play a role in the speech event are the participants. They are not identified by name, but rather by position, status, or power. Their roles, among other things, explain culturally pertinent individuals, particularly for the speech event so that it will be clear in the rules of interaction how they should behave in the event (Kiesling, 2012). This information on the participants will help increase awareness of the interpersonal aspect of language use (McConachy, 2009). Additionally, the letter E represents the *ends* or the *goals of communication*. McConachy (2009) defines it as the element that provides awareness of the purpose. These are the objectives and results that are wanted from a certain discourse. The tone of the speech is extremely important, in addition to the sentences uttered on a surface level.

The following letter A represents the acts or *speech acts and their illocutionary meaning*. It refers to the particular words used, how they are employed, and the relationship between all selected phrases. It also refers to the actual format and content of the message. It has to do with how the message changes and how the sociocultural context of speech in a particular speech community affects both the form and content of the message. The order of the acts impacts how the message is received. Regarding both the form and the content of the interaction, the receiver should comprehend the message and convert it into useful information (Tawakol Gaber El-Zaghal, 2021).

The fourth letter K refers to the *tone of the speech*, and how the speech is delivered in a conversation. The Key is related to the manner. The key determines whether the setting is formal, semi-formal or informal and whether

the participants are content or not. The letter I stands for the *instrumentality* or the channel through which communication flows. It is about the register and socio-linguistic variation in language choice (McConachy, 2009). The term "instrumentalities" refers to the mode of communication, such as writing, speaking on the phone, or simply speaking face-to-face. Questions to emphasize the instrumentalities of the language may focus on the formality or informality, politeness level of the language, etc.

The letter N denotes *norms* and rules for interaction, which create awareness of culture's effect on communication and rules behind politeness strategies (McConachy, 2009). Norms affect communication patterns and determine whether gaps exist or should be avoided. Even the intonation patterns are included under the heading of norms (Kiesling, 2012). The last letter G stands for the *genre*, addressing the types of communicative sequences in a specific discourse such as written, spoken, telephone, and so on (McConachy, 2009). We can mainly observe three different types of communication genres: spoken, written communication, and body language communication (Tawakol Gaber El-Zaghal, 2021).

In short, each letter refers to an issue which can play an important role to enable individuals to have successful communication in real life. It also provides a guide for researchers to investigate to what extent course book activities represent real-life language use.

Suggestions in Coursebooks

In the current study, the main focus will be on the speech act of *suggestion* as it is one of the most commonly observed in EFL coursebooks. The speech act *suggestion* is among the directive category where the speaker aims at getting the hearer to do some action accordingly (Searle, 1976). Rintell (1979) states 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).

Although we can claim that the majority of the language coursebooks in the market include how to give *suggestions* as part of their linguistic content, Schmidt et al. (1996) state that *suggestions* as part of speech acts in L2 pragmatics have gained less coverage in the literature, unlike the speech act of request (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Loutfi, 2016). There might be various reasons underlying the scarcity of content in the literature. According to Santos and Silva (2008), one reason why suggestions have attracted comparatively less interest could be the challenge in identifying *suggestions*.

Although it is claimed to be difficult to detect *suggestions* in communication, it is observed that there have been some studies analysing the language performance of *suggestions* in learners' written or spoken performance. In her research, Toprak (2020) follows a qualitative design to explore how Turkish EFL adult learners make *suggestions* in English in writing form. The data were collected through a scenario-based task that promoted how the participants made *suggestions* and what linguistic strategies and forms they used. The findings of the qualitative content analysis show that the most frequently used *suggestion* category was "conventionalized" while "direct strategies" remained rare. Overall, the results demonstrate that the participant students aimed at delivering less face-threatening *suggestions*. Another study conducted by Banerjee and Carrell (1988) investigated *suggestions* by 28 native Chinese or Malay speakers and 12 native American learners to discover whether adult native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) of English preferred different ways when formulating *suggestions*. Another study designed by Martinez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) analysed the effect of explicit and implicit pragmatic teaching on *suggestions* that adult Spanish learners of English formulated. However, it can be concluded from the low numbers of studies in the literature, there is still a need for further investigation on the speech act of *suggestion*.

It is also possible to find some studies analysing coursebooks in terms of representation and presentation of the speech act of *suggestion*. Ekin (2013) analysed ten pre-intermediate and intermediate-level coursebooks in terms of *suggestion* strategies. The researcher also compared the coursebooks to see whether they include authentic-like materials to present *suggestions* to promote pragmatic competence. She highlighted the importance of appropriate input regarding the speech act of *suggestion* strategies for learners. She reported that these coursebooks presented

some conventionalised forms of speech acts. However, there was not enough emphasis on direct and indirect *suggesting* strategies.

In another study, Jiang (2006) conducted a comparative study focusing on the forms needed to perform *suggestions* in both real-life settings and coursebooks. The researcher compared the forms used in real-life settings including professor–student conversation during office hours and student–student study groups to the forms represented in six coursebooks, three of which were old and the others more recent. She aimed at assessing how much coursebooks represented real language use. She concluded that the context and the register defined the forms used to make *suggestions* in real-life conversations, and more recent coursebooks included more linguistic forms for *suggestions* compared to the old-generation coursebooks. However, she also observed some differences between real language use and the forms represented in the coursebooks. She proposed that coursebooks should provide background and situational information rather than focusing on lists of de-contextualised language structures. She also recommended that coursebooks should provide some real-life-like tasks to raise learners' awareness of the role of contextual information.

Briefly, the scarcity of studies focusing on the speech act of *suggestion* and considering all the shortcomings of the textbooks in terms of teaching speech acts, there is still a gap in the related research field. Therefore, this study aims at analysing an activity that focuses on *suggestions* in the Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017) level in light of Hymes' framework of SPEAKING. Then the researchers propose an adapted version of an activity based on the principles of the framework. Therefore, the research questions of the study are:
   a. To what extent does activity in Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017, p.112) meet or fulfil the framework of SPEAKING proposed by Dell Hymes?
   b. To what extent can the material be adapted to meet the principles of the framework?

Methodology

The current research follows a qualitative research design which is mainly based on the analysis of a course book material designed to teach speech act of *suggestion* at a pre-intermediate level based on the SPEAKING framework (Hymes 1974). The study, which embraces a constructivist point, has used a qualitative design to unearth new ideas and views while also achieving an in-depth understanding of the issue (Creswell, 2009). The course book analysed in the study is Cutting Edge Pre-intermediate by Cunningham et al. (2017). The course book is purposefully chosen since it has been used as a language teaching material in the university context in which one of the researchers has been working. Therefore, the researcher has a comprehensive knowledge of the course book design, content and layout, which might guide the analysis process. Additionally, although there have been studies focusing on the analysis of the Cutting Edge series in terms of various points such as tasks(Nitta & Gardner, 2005), appropriateness of the material for the purpose of the learners (Alshabeb et al., 2017), real language representation (Abalı, 2006) and teachers' perspective regarding the material (Alshehri, 2016), to the researchers' knowledge there has been no study focusing on its pragmatic content, namely speech act of *suggestion* in pre-intermediate level.

For the current study, the data collection process was done in two stages. In the first stage, an activity that focuses on teaching *how to make suggestions* in Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017, p. 112) was chosen as a target language material to be evaluated. The researchers initially analysed the course book activity from the perspective of the 'SPEAKING' framework. In the meantime, ethics committee approval from Bursa Uludağ University Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee was obtained for this study. In the second stage, the researchers proposed an adaptation of the material to make it more effective. This adaptation was further sent to several language instructors, who have been working with the course book. The participants were informed about the aims of the study and asked to sign a consent form before data collection. The participants were also informed that they could leave the research for any reason after it started. The researcher provided the participants with a detailed summary of the SPEAKING framework and the comparative study of the materials. The participants were first asked to grasp the idea behind the framework by studying the

summary, and then they were invited to analyse course book the course book material and its adaptation. The following questions were also provided to the participants.

- Do you think the course book material will help language teachers to promote pragmatic competence?
- Do you think the course book adaption and the modified activity will help language teachers promote pragmatic competence?
- Do you think the modified material attached will create an appropriate context for learners to gain pragmatic competence and internalize the speech act of suggesting?
- How do you think the modified activity can be designed better to promote real language learning?

In light of the framework and the feedback, the researchers came up with the final adaptation to be implemented in the classroom for further studies.

Instructional context

The current study took place in a higher education setting in which the course book was chosen by the institution and has been used to teach English as a foreign language in a preparatory program at a state university in Istanbul. The preparatory program is designed around general English courses. The students are registered in this obligatory general English course before they start their specialised field studies in their relevant departments. The program's overall design is based on communicative outcomes and productive skills, and a formal assessment. However, what little pragmatics elements exist in the course book in question have not been highlighted and sadly even omitted (Karatepe & Civelek 2021; Korkmaz & Karatepe 2023). In this respect, the present study will contribute to making up for a vital missing element in instruction. Therefore, it is in line with the program's aims, contributing to the student's communicative skills.

Participants

The current study is based on the analysis of course book material and its adaptation process by the researchers. However, to increase the efficacy of the adapted material and to prevent potential problems, the researchers asked for feedback from several language instructors from various language teaching backgrounds and experiences. Therefore, seven volunteering English language teachers and instructors who analysed the course book activity and its modified version took part in the study. All the participants have more than ten years of teaching experience in English Language Teaching (ELT). Besides, two of the participants are native English speakers who have CELTA and MA degrees in ELT, and one of whom holds DELTA. One of these native English teachers is also a teacher trainer in one of the prestigious teacher training institutes in İstanbul. The other three participants have been teaching English in an EFL setting for more than ten years and are doing their MA studies in ELT. Additionally, another participant is a former education faculty member who taught pre-service English teachers and who has a PhD in ELT. Finally, the last participant is an instructor with a PhD degree at one of the prominent state universities and teaches pre-service English teachers currently. Therefore, the feedback provided by these seven language instructors provided the researchers with a clear perspective of the material proposed. The participants will not be referred with their real names but with a pseudo name as follows: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7.

Data analysis

The present study is designed around two main research questions and processes followed to answer these questions. Firstly, the researchers chose one of the course book materials designed to teach a pragmatic item: how to make *suggestions*. The researchers constructed a detailed analysis of the activity in the light of the framework on which the current study is based. After all the possible shortcomings and limitations of the material were detected, the researchers designed and proposed an adapted language material, which was based on the same course book content. Following the adaptation process, the researchers contacted some language instructors and teachers to evaluate and give feedback on the material adaptation. Finally, the material was re-designed and finalised in accordance with the feedback to be implemented in classroom practice.

Findings

In this section, the research findings for the research questions are presented. The first research question aimed to determine to what extent the specific activity in cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (p.112) was appropriate in light of the SPEAKING framework. When the course book activity was analysed, it was realised that the material lacked the elements that activate socio-cultural aspects related to the speech act. Some of these missing elements were the focus on participants of the dialogue, the language used for a specific speech act, and situational information to facilitate the interpretation of the form and function relationship, etc.

Multimedia plays a vital role in the course book design. Visuals are intended to help language learners to have an image of the setting and the content. Therefore, visuals should be related to the topic in the language material. However, the course book material did not have appropriate visual support to create the setting for learners, which is the first element of the SPEAKING framework. The visual used in the course book was found not directly related to the topic of discussion in the video (See Visual 1).

Visual 1
The Image Used in the Coursebook

Note: Taken from Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (p.112)

In addition, the researchers and the participants found the warm-up activity in the course book material not appropriate for all age groups since it could not motivate the learners to create a natural dialogue with partners. According to the study conducted by Hansen and Liu (2005), warm-up activities should have "supportive roles" (p.33) in the language classroom to build an atmosphere in which students feel more relaxed to participate in the negotiation of meaning and presenting linguistic content to each other.

Apart from the visual representation and deficiencies of the warm-up activity, the researchers decided that the course book material lacked the appropriate activities. Besides, there was no information about the participants and the setting of the dialogues to support learners' comprehension. However, according to the SPEAKING framework, the setting and the participants are fundamental components of the language presented and they play a vital role in spoken discourse. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the material in the Cutting Edge Pre-intermediate course book misses the details related to the setting and the participants of the conversation from the very beginning. Equally, our participant teachers (P1, P2, P4, P5, P7) pointed out that the language item in the course book material mainly lacks contextual elements and language is presented in a decontextualized way.

Another problem related to the course book material was the lack of questions and activities designed for the unit video to help learners to focus on certain language features. In Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate, there are

usually comprehension questions following the dialogues that students answer while listening/watching some conversations or videos. However, unfortunately, these questions also indicate that the course book limits the focus to comprehension only, which fails to promote pragmatic competence (Table 1).

Table 1
Comprehension Check Questions

Coursebook Material
2. Watch the video and answer the questions.
1. What does the woman want to buy?
2. How many people give her suggestions?

Table 1 shows that the main focus is on finding the correct answer to the questions. Besides, these questions fail to highlight the interpersonal function of language. The students are not directed or guided to realise the goal of the conversation or the acts achieved through certain language use. This means that they cannot become aware of the conversational moves and illocutionary meaning of the language, which are highlighted in Hymes' framework.

In addition, the *suggestion* speech act in this material represents informal language use. Although the material included video-recorded dialogues at home and a phone shop, only the informal use of the speech act of *suggestion* was presented, and the tone of the language which was represented as KEY in the framework and was disregarded in the original material. Learners are not informed about the role of the formality level of the language. It is also seen that the course book material does not provide sufficient information for the production stage. It was found that it failed to present formal and informal language use of *suggestions*.

Similarly, the researchers also realised that there are no activities or questions to take students' attention to the instrumentality component though the students are exposed to the language through a video, and they can hear a dialogue in different settings. They are not provided with the details of the conversations which are all face-to-face dialogues between different parties. Finally, the course book material lacks information regarding the norms affecting the specific language choice in specific speech situations and genres.

The researchers also found that the lack of variety in questions is another drawback of the material. Therefore, the course book material was also analysed in terms of the four question types proposed by McConachy (2009), which he proposed to make Hymes' framework more applicable in language classrooms. One example of these questions is "function-based questions" (McConachy, 2009, p.221) which focus attention on the function of the form. Unfortunately, in the course book, the only activity focusing on the functions of the forms is the pronunciation activity. The learners are asked to group the phrases into the '*Making Suggestion, Agreeing, and Disagreeing'* categories while focusing on the pronunciation (Visual 2). However, McConachy (2009) emphasises that the learners' attention should be driven to the specific forms to create an awareness in terms of form and function relationship, and he claims that these question types utilize the metalanguage to analyse the conversational or social function of a saying or utterance within the dialogue. They are beneficial as they encourage learners to notice the social and communicative function first and then the form itself (ibid.).

Visual 2
Form-function Activity

PRONUNCIATION

1 ▶ Watch and listen to the key phrases for making and responding to suggestions.

2 Practise saying them. Add the phrases to the groups below.

Making suggestions	Agreeing	Disagreeing
What about ... ?	All right.	I don't think so. No, I'd prefer to ...

Note: Taken from Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (p.112)

It was also found that the course book activity lacked "general speculative questions" (McConachy, 2009, p. 122). That is, these are the questions that encourage learners to share their interpretation or understanding of the conversation, not looking for the correct answer within the material. The final type of question "comparative question" (*ibid.*, 122). He argues that these questions help learners compare a social, cultural, or interactional aspect of an interaction between the target language's culture and their own culture. These questions may facilitate an atmosphere in which attention can be paid to the intercultural differences within the language classroom. Briefly, it is observed in the course book material that it lacks the fundamental components of the SPEAKING framework and possible question types that might foster learners' pragmatics awareness.

The second research question attempted to find ways to develop the material so that it can provide the learners with better learning opportunities Therefore, all these issues have been looked into closely in order to improve the existing material by adding components and by enriching the content. In this regard, the researchers first offered to change the visual used in the original material as it provided information about the context of the situation. Because the researchers did not find the visual in the material directly related to the topic of discussion in the video (See Visual 1), it was eliminated in the adaptation process.

Moreover, the researchers and the participating instructors and teachers highlighted the need for a change in the warm-up activity as it failed to inspire students to engage in open-ended conversations with partners. Moreover, four of the participants (P1, P2, P5, P7) pointed out the need for focusing on questions which can potentially trigger active learner participation by relating the topic to their own lives. As a result, the researchers proposed a modified material which started with a warm-up activity to activate learners' previous knowledge and to promote their participation (Table 2).

Table 2
Warm-up Questions Suggested

Instruction	A. Work with a partner and discuss.
Questions	1. Do you like shopping? Why / Why not? 2. Do you ask for suggestions or advice before you buy something new? If yes, who do you usually ask? 3. What affects your decision when you buy an item? i.e. price, brand, colour, etc.?

The course book material, unfortunately, lacked information about the setting and the participants. Because of this, the researchers targeted to help learners gather some ideas with the help of some visuals (see Visual 2) taken from the unit's video, in which the target language is introduced, and some guiding questions. With the help of visuals and questions given in the modified material, learners can be encouraged to share ideas about the people and the setting. The literature is rich with studies reporting the benefits of presenting language items within a context that supports meaningful learning experiences, and thus visuals can be used for this purpose

(Karatepe & Yılmaz 2018; Novawan, 2020). Visuals also help teachers turn the learning process into a more effective, enjoyable, and inspirational experience for learners.

Visual 3
Alternative Visuals from the Video

Work with a partner and discuss the questions below.
1. Who are the people in the photos? What do you think their relationship is?
2. Where are they?
3. What do you think they are talking about?

Another problem related to the course book material was the lack of questions and activities designed for the unit video to analyse the language. In Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate, there are usually questions following the dialogues that students can answer by listening to or watching some conversations or videos. However, unfortunately, these questions also reveal that the course book limits the focus to comprehension only, which is not enough to promote pragmatic competence. Table 1 below shows a comparison of the course book material and some question examples from the modified material.

Another problem that stood out in the teaching material was the type of activities designed to get the learners' attention to the target linguistic and pragmatic elements. As the existing material was only used for questions to check comprehension, the researchers offered more questions to attract the attention of the learners to the participants, setting and language used in these settings and with the characters in the dialogue (Table 3). Therefore, it is aimed to guide learners to realize possible changes in the language in different settings.

Table 3
Comparison of Coursebook Material and Modified Material

Coursebook Material	Modified Material

2. Watch the video and answer the questions.
   3. What does the woman want to buy?
   4. How many people give her suggestions?
	C. Watch the video and answer the questions for each category.
	At home
	   1. What is the relationship between these two people?
	   2. Do you think the woman really wants help? Why / Why not?
	   3. How many different suggestions did the man make?
	
	In a mobile phone shop
	   1. Who are the people in the video?
	   2. Do you think the woman really wants help? Why / Why not?
	   3. How many different suggestions did the shop assistant make?

The main emphasis, as seen in Table 3, is on determining the correct response to the questions. Additionally, the course book's questions do not emphasize how the interpersonal dynamics of the conversation were elaborated and could lead to changes in the language. This may constrain learners' understanding of the relationship between speakers and other social factors. Therefore, in line with the framework and the data gathered from the participants, the researchers proposed some comprehension check questions involving the major pragmatic elements. Therefore, the modified activity aimed to present questions that focus more attention on the participants, context, and some socio-pragmatic elements and share ideas rather than solely finding the correct answer.

The language presented in the material is found to be limited in terms of variety and authenticity depending on the conversational situation or the situation in which the dialogue takes place. This means that almost all the language used in the course book material exemplifies informal interaction situations, which is only one aspect of the key component of the framework. Additionally, the learners are not informed that it was a face-to-face conversation sample involving body language and gestures. Moreover, participant instructors also highlighted the need for additional language exposure in which learners could explore formal or semiformal contexts and language forms used to achieve certain linguistic functions (Five participants: P2, P3, P5, P6, P7). Therefore, the learners are provided with an extra dialogue to work as a reading practice to get exposed to different forms to make *suggestions* in a more formal setting. Also, the data from the participants indicated that activities and questions in the modified activity would encourage learners to realize how they can use various forms in different settings.

It can also be observed that the course book's content is insufficient for the production stage. Given that all of the conversation scenarios in the production activity are informal (two participants: P2, P3), there is a lack of variance in the context's formality and informality. Additionally, a few participants stated that the roles in the role-plays should be clearly provided to the students to help them in the production stage (P2, P3, P7). Therefore, the activity was redesigned, and the roles of the speakers were provided for learners. Also, a flow chart was prepared for the learners to guide them through dialogue production as scaffolding plays a vital role in language learning as it supports learners.

The researchers also discovered that the material's lack of variety in the questions is a weakness. In order to make Hymes' framework more practical in language classes, McConachy (2009) presents four different question types, which were also used to analyse the material in the current study. Firstly, the researchers realized the scarcity of "function-based questions" (McConachy, 2009, p.221), which are based on the function of the form. That is, these question types make use of the metalanguage to examine the conversational or social function of a saying or utterance within the dialogue (*ibid*). The learners' attention should be drawn to the specific forms to develop an awareness of the relationship between form and function. They are helpful because they stimulate students to focus first on the social and communicative purpose before the form itself (*ibid*). However, unfortunately, the pronunciation exercise is the only activity in the book that specifically addresses the functions of the forms - 'Making Suggestion, Agreeing, and Disagreeing'. However, these kinds of function-based activities should be specifically designed to guide learners to direct their attention to the function rather than focusing on how to pronounce them. The pronunciation exercise was, therefore, replaced with an alternative which emphasises the speech acts of suggesting, agreeing, and disagreeing (see Tables 2 & 4).

Table 4

Comparison of Coursebook Material and Modified Material

Coursebook Material	Modified Material
	Look at the script and find the expressions used for Making suggestions, Agreeing and Disagreeing. Put the expressions into the correct categories below. | Making Suggestions	Agreeing	Disagreeing | |---|---|---|
What about….?	All right.	I don't think so. No, I'd prefer to …..	

Function-based questions are not the only missing question category that can be utilized to attract attention to the pragmatic elements. It was also discovered that the course book exercises lacked "general speculative questions" (McConachy, 2009, p. 122). McConachy (2009) defines these questions as the ones that can encourage students to share their views or understanding of the conversation rather than seek the right answer within the course material. As a result, researchers provided some additional activities and questions to meet this need. Some examples of these questions included in the modified material are as follows:

e.g., Was the conversation with the shop assistant formal or informal? Why do you think so?
Do you think the woman really wants help? Why / Why not?

The "comparative questions" were the last category of questions that were added to the changed content (McConachy, 2009, 122). According to him, these types of questions enable students to compare cultural, social or interactional features of their own and of the target language in a conversational situation. These kinds of questions might help create an environment in which cultural differences can be the emphasis or some part of the language instruction. Based on this perspective, the following activity was planned accordingly to facilitate the emphasis on comparing different languages:

e.g., Look at the dialogues above. How would you make the same *suggestion* in your language? Would it be more direct or indirect, polite or impolite, formal or informal? Why?

Briefly, material adaptation has always been part of language teaching as coursebooks may lack certain linguistic and pragmatic elements that might benefit language learners in real-life contexts. A similar finding has been reached in the current study. Therefore, we can state that after analysing the original book unit and the modified version, both the researchers and the participant instructors and language teachers reported that the adaptation of the activity could be more beneficial for the learners to learn *suggestions*. Another issue that emerged from the data was related to the order of the activities (i.e., from simple to difficult ones) and the question types included (i.e., comprehension check questions before the short reading activity). Also, including more details related to the social context of the role-plays and providing variety in formal and informal language use were recommended by the participants.

Discussion and Conclusion

It is well-accepted that coursebooks provide the language input necessary for language teaching and learning. However, this does not mean that they always deliver what the language learners need. In fact, it has been proven that coursebooks lack some pragmatic and socio-linguistic aspects of the language within them (Bardovi-Harlig 2001; Nguyen 2011). EFL teachers are now required to make adaptations to the language material in

order to give students effective pragmatics instruction since EFL course books. For teaching pragmatics, a number of exercises to raise pragmatic awareness have been provided for both language instructors and book writers and designers. However, it is still very common to observe a lack of pragmatic elements in the language materials.

Course books are regarded as an essential source of language input in language classrooms; however, language teachers are expected to take roles in material development and adaptation rather than simply using the course book (Tatsuki, 2019). Furthermore, Howard and Major (2004) claim that material development by teachers has four benefits. It helps contextualise the language input and creates a clear relation between the context and the material. It guides the teacher to realize the learners' individual needs and address the diversity in the classroom. Next, it enables the teacher to have a personal touch on the material, which may increase learners' active participation and appreciation. Finally, it creates opportunities for the teacher to include local and global events and promotes the relevance of the language lesson to real life (Howard and Major, 2004). Tatsuki (2019) proposes two steps that are important in material development: "identify the material development target and plan the components." (p. 324). In the first stage, it is suggested to research the learners and their pragmatic needs. In the second step, it is time to integrate the needs analysis with a principled approach to material development which focuses on the implementation of language acquisition theories, principles of language teaching, up-to-date knowledge of target language use, and conclusions fetched from close examination and assessment of materials in use (Tomlinson, 2010). Therefore, the material design or adaptation process should be based on a solid theory representing natural language use. Real-life communication should be represented in the classroom to teach pragmatic competence (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Briefly, the current study was designed around two main research questions based on the material to teach suggestions in Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (p.112). The first research question attempted to determine the extent to which the activity mentioned earlier fulfils the requirements of the framework proposed by Hymes (1974). The analysis of the course book material indicated that the activities in the material were not designed in accordance with the components of the framework. The main elements that the material lacked were, in fact, the clear presentation of contextual elements, such as place, participants, the relationship between the participants, etc. Knowledge about these elements can support both the quality of comprehension and the appropriateness of speech production (Hadley 2003; Karatepe & Yılmaz 2018; Opp-Beckman & Klinghammer, 2006). With the guidance of the framework, the researchers aimed to design a more effective course material by adapting a course book activity to create some opportunities for learners to promote their pragmatic competence and metapragmatic knowledge. The new version of the material was adapted to include some activities to create a clear context for learners, to focus on the specific language used for the speech act of *suggestion*, and to increase the impact of the material in terms of pragmatic elements, including speculation questions and comparative questions where L1 and L2 are analysed and compared.

The study also aimed at eliciting the opinions of seven volunteering language instructors and professors in the field of language teaching on material adaptation to create a better learning environment to teach pragmatic elements in the classroom. The participants in the current study also expressed their positive attitude towards the enriched material. They all agreed that contextualisation of the course book unit was necessary (Karatepe & Civelek 2021). The presentation of the contextual clues and pragmatic details provided in the modified version was deemed more effective for teaching pragmatics. They agreed that language learners would be able to observe the use of *suggestion* speech acts and create more authentic dialogues according to the contextual details. In addition, guiding learners by using a flowchart to create a dialogue was thought to be effective, especially in lower language proficiency levels where they need more scaffolding. Moreover, comparing pragmatic strategies in their mother tongue and English was praised by the participant teachers. This way, the learners can develop a more critical perspective of cultural differences and raise their pragmatic awareness (*cf.* Crandall & Baştürkmen, 2004; Ishihara, 2010; Karatepe & Civelek, 2021; McConachy, 2003; Siegel et al., 2018).

The use of Hymes' framework guides the adaptation process as it provides essential components of elements in interaction. Instead of based on their hunch, teachers are advised to follow a framework for guidelines in the process of material adaptation. Similarly, the question types defined by McConnachy (2009) can certainly facilitate the activity. Researchers and teachers are recommended to use a framework and a guide for adapting and developing course materials to avoid relying on their hunch. Even native-speaker teachers certainly need a framework model as leverage. This can make them feel more confident to adapt materials to their learners' unique needs.

Additionally, language teachers need to develop a more critical perspective to improve the marketed course books, but their teaching should not be limited to the book. To avoid this, teachers should be able to improve the activities in course books for specific purposes (Karatepe & Civelek 2021). Similarly, Ishihara and Cohen (2010) suggest teachers not depend on the marketed course books alone for teaching pragmatics. They also advise that teachers look for helpful resources to familiarise themselves with the features of pragmatics. Internet sources can be very helpful. They may also be encouraged to use creativity and to support or replace current materials with more authentic and varied examples where necessary (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Recommendations

Although the current study provides a detailed analysis of course book material and the adaptation of the material, there is still the need to observe the actual practice of modified material in a language classroom. Therefore, for future research, the researchers are to implement the modified version of the course book material to evaluate the efficacy of material adaptation to teach pragmatics in the language classroom.

Furthermore, the researchers believe that programs such as English Language Teaching departments of the universities, which are designed to train future teachers, should revise their course contents and include more courses on how to teach pragmatics. The material evaluation and adaptation courses need to focus on how to adapt materials for teaching pragmatics as well as other language topics.

References

Abalı, Z. E. (2006). *Analysis of Contextual Genuineness of The Dialogues in The Coursebooks Headway, Cutting Edge and Opportunities.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University.

Alcón, E., & Tricker, D. (2000). Teaching discourse competence in the classroom: An example based on the discourse marker well in EFL materials. In Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference of AEDEAN: Lleida. 17th-19th December 1998 (pp. 61-65). Universitat de Lleida.

Alcón, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? System, 33, 417–435.

Alshabeb, A., Alsubaie, F. H., & Albasheer, A. Z. (2017). English for Specific Purposes: A Study Investigating the Mismatch between the'Cutting Edge'Course Book and the Needs of Prince Sultan Air Base Students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 8*(3), 376-391.

Alshehri, A. (2016). Textbook evaluation: teachers' perspectives on cutting edge. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *4*(2), 91-106.

Banerjee, J. & Carrell, P.L. (1988). Tuck in your shirt, you squid: Suggestions in ESL. Language Learning, 38, 313-364.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig K., & R. Mahan-Taylor (2003). *Teaching pragmatics.* U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B.A.S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D. W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. ELT Journal, 45, 4-15.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2010). Exploring the pragmatics of interlanguage pragmatics: Definition by design. Pragmatics across languages and cultures, 7, 219-259.

Berry, R. (2000). "You-see" friendly metalanguage: What effect does it have on learners of English? International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 38, 195-211.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? Journal of Pragmatics, 11, 131–46.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8, 165-179.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), Foreign/second language pedagogy research (pp. 255-272). Multilingual Matters.

Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. ELT Journal, 49, 44-58.

Bruton, A. (1997). In what ways do we want EFL coursebooks to differ? *System*, *25*(2), 275-284.

Chang, Y. F. (2010). 'I no say you say is boring': the development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. *Language Sciences*, *32*(3), 408-424.

Cohen, A. D. & Ishihara, N. (2013). Pragmatics. In Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) Applied Linguistics and Materials Development. Bloomsbury.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (2018). Socio-cultural perspectives on coursebook evaluation. In M. Azarnoosh, M. Zeraatpishe, A. Faravani & H.R. Kargozari (eds.), *Issues in coursebook evaluation*, Eds. (pp. 66-83). Brill.

Crandall, E., & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. ELT Journal, 58, 38–49.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed). Sage Publications.

Ekin, M. T. Y. (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.

Flores Salgado, E. (2011). The pragmatics of requests and apologies: Developmental patterns of Mexican students. John Benjamins.

Garton, S. & Graves, K. (2014). International Perspectives on Materials in ELT. Palgrave Macmillan.

Göy, E., Zeyrek, D. & Otcu, B. (2012). Developmental patterns in internal modification of requests: a quantitative study on Turkish learners of English. In M. Economidou Kogetsidis, & H. Woodfield (Eds.), Interlanguage request modification. (pp. 51-6). John Benjamins.

Grant, L., & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap operas. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 39, 39-50.

Hadley, A.O. (2003). Teaching Language in Context. (3rd Ed.). Boston: Heinle&Heinle.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. ELT Journal, 59(1), 31-38.

Hilliard, A. (2017). Spoken grammar and its role in the English language classroom. English Teaching Forum. Vol. 4: 2-13.

Howard, J., & Major, J. (2004). Guidelines for designing effective English language teaching materials. *The TESOLANZ Journal*, *12*(10), 50-58.

Hu, Z. (2014). Study on developing Chinese college EFL learners' pragmatic competence in relation to language proficiency and overseas experience. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(2), 391–398. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.391-398.

Hymes, D. (1974). Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ishihara, N. (2010). Adapting textbooks for teaching pragmatics. In N. Ishihara & A. D. Cohen (Ed.), Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet (pp. 145-166). Edinburg: Pearson Education.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet. Pearson Education.

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

Karatepe, Ç. (1998). *Teaching pragmalinguistics in Teacher Training. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Liverpool University.*

Karatepe, Ç. (2001). Pragmalinguistic Awareness in EFL Teacher Training. *Language Awareness, 2*(3), 178-188.

Karatepe, Ç. (2016). Indirectness in requests in complaint letters to the higher institution by Turkish EFL students. Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences, 232, 354-361. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.050

Karatepe, Ç. & Civelek, M. (2021). A case study on EFL teachers' views on material adaptation for teaching pragmatics. RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 23, 894-910. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.953259

Karatepe, Ç., & Yılmaz, D. (2018). Promoting structured reflectivity in teacher education: An innovative approach. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators, 7*(1), 57-74.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught?. *http://www. nflrc. hawaii. edu/NetWorks/NW06/*.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K.R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Kıyançiçek, E. (2023). *The relationship between motivation and pragmatic awareness: A case study of Turkish EFL learners.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. *Bursa Uludağ University.*

Kiesling, S. F. (2012). Ethnography of speaking. *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication*, 77-89.

Koral, M. A., & Mirici, İ. H. (2021). Analysis of speaking skills in high school English language curricula and coursebooks in Turkey. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science*, *1*(3), 61-77.

Korkmaz, S., & Karatepe, Ç. (2022) Exploring the Pragmatic Awareness and Competence of EFL Instructors at Tertiary Level. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, *13*(1), 34-55.

Levkina, M. (2018). Developing pragmatic competence through tasks in EFL contexts. *Task-based approaches to teaching and assessing pragmatics*, 137-158.

Loutfi, A. (2016). Pragmatic transfer in Moroccan EFL learners' requests. Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning (AJEEL) 4 (4), 15-24.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Fukuya, Y. J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. System, 33(3), 463–480.

McConachy, T. (2009). Raising sociocultural awareness through contextual analysis: Some tools for teachers. ELT Journal, 63(2), 116-125.

McConachy, T. & Hata, K (2013). Addressing textbook representations of pragmatics and culture. ELT Journal, 67(3), 294-301.

Nitta, R., & Gardner, S. (2005). Consciousness-raising and practice in ELT coursebooks. *ELT journal*, *59*(1), 3-13.

Novawan, A. (2020). The use of visual aids in ELT materials. In H. Puji Widodo & L. Savova (Eds.), The Lincom guide to materials design in ELT (pp. 39-54). LINCOM Publishers.

Nguyen, M.T.T. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? RELC Journal, 42, 17-30.

Opp-Beckman, L., & Klinghammer, S. J. (2006). Shaping the way we teach English: Successful practices the world. Publication Office of English Language Programs, Department of State.

Ortactape, D. (2012). The development of conceptual socialization in international students: A language socialization perspective on conceptual fluency and social identity (advances in pragmatics and discourse analysis). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

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

Santos, D., & Silva, G. V. (2008). Making suggestions in the workplace: Insights from the learner and native speaker discourses. Hispania, 651–664.

Schmidt, R., Akihiko, S., Zhigang. W., & Hy-Sook, J. (1996). Suggestions to buy: Television commercials from the U.S., Japan, China, and Korea. In S. M. Gass and J. Neu (Eds.), Speech acts across cultures (pp. 285-316). Mouton de Gruyter.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied linguistics, 11(2), 129-158.

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

Siegel, J. (2018) Pragmatic activities for the speaking classroom. English Teaching Forum, pp.12- 19. Retrieved from http://www.americanenglish.state.gov/english-teaching-forum

Siegel, J., Broadbridge, J., & Firth, M. (2019). Saying it 'just right': teaching for pragmatic success in ELT. ELT Journal, 73(1), 31-40.

Şahin, S. (2020). Developing a checklist for English language teaching course book analysis. *International Journal of Education and Research*, *8*(1), 107-120.

Tatsuki, D. (2019). Instructional material development in L2 pragmatics. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), The Routledge handbook of SLA and pragmatics (pp. 322–337). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351164085-21.

Tawakol Gaber El-Zaghal, F. (2021). Fields of Text Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Study in light of applying Dell Hymes Speaking Model to Joe Biden's speech on the Middle East (2021). *International Journal of Humanities and Language Research*, *4*(1), 1-39.

Tekir, S., & Arıkan, A. (2007). An Analysis of English Language Teaching Coursebooks by Turkish Writers:" Let's Speak English 7" Example. *Online Submission*, *4*(2), 1-18.

Tok, H. (2010). TEFL textbook evaluation: From teachers' perspectives. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *5*(9), 508-517.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (2008). Language acquisition and language learning materials. In Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) English language learning materials: A critical review (pp. 3-13). Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles for effective materials development. In N. Harwood (Ed.), English language teaching materials: Theory and practice (pp. 81–109). Cambridge University Press.

Toprak, T. E. (2020). A Study on the Use of Suggestion Strategies among Turkish EFL Learners. Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 11(1), 36-55.

Vellenga H (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language-Electronic Journal 8, 1–18.

Wong, J. (2002). "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 40, 37-60.

Wyner, L., & Cohen, A. D. (2015). Second language pragmatic ability: Individual differences according to environment. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 5(4), 519-556.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

The Coursebook Analysed

Cunningham S, Moor, P & Cosgrove, A. (2017). Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate. Pearson.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Kültürlerarası normları öğrenmek ve dili uygun şekilde kullanmak, özellikle yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenme bağlamında, öğrencilerin etkili iletişim kurmalarına yardımcı olmak için bir gereklilik haline gelmiştir. Söylem analizi literatüründeki son araştırmalar, gerçek hayatta başarılı bir şekilde iletişim kurabilmek için öğrencilere söz eylemleri nasıl formüle edeceklerini öğretmenin önemini vurgulamaktadır (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Nguyen, 2011).

Ders kitaplarının İngilizce sınıflarında birincil dil kaynakları arasında yer alması, onları dil öğrenme sürecinin kaçınılmaz bir parçası haline getirmiştir (Garton & Graves, 2014). Bu nedenle, edim bilimsel öğeleri ve söz eylem yapılarını öğretmek için ders materyalleri veya ders kitaplarının geliştirilmesine önem verilmiştir (Tatsuki, 2019). Literatürde yer alan birçok çalışma ders kitaplarının etkililiğini ve öğrencilerin edim bilimsel yeterliklerini geliştirmelerini sağlamak için İngilizce öğrenenlere gerekli ve uygun bilgileri ne ölçüde sunduklarını incelemiştir. Ders kitaplarının gerçek hayattaki konuşmaları ne ölçüde temsil ettiği üzerine yapılan araştırmalar, İngilizce ders kitaplarının nadiren gerçek hayattaki İngilizce konuşmaları sunduğunu ve anlaşılır örnekleri sağladığını göstermiştir (Berry 2000; Grant & Starks, 2001; McConnachy 2009; McConnachy & Hata 2013). Dahası, zaman içerisinde ders kitaplarında dilin özgünlüğü açısından çok az gelişme olmuştur.

Ancak, edim bilim ve söz eylemlerin özelliklerinin ders kitaplarında ne ölçüde temsil edildiğini değerlendiren çalışmalar, ders kitaplarının dil örnekleri sağlamada yetersiz kaldıklarını göstermiştir. Tomlinson (2010), dil öğretim materyallerinin öğrenicileri otantik dil kullanımına maruz bırakmasının beklendiğini ve öğrencilere iletişimsel amaca ulaşmak için hedef dili kullanma fırsatları sağlaması gerektiğini belirtmiştir. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin bunları fark edebilmeleri için ders materyalinin öğrencilerin dikkatini belirli dil öğelerine çekmelidirler. Söz eylemlerin dil öğreniminde hayati bir rol oynadığı iyi bilinmesine rağmen, ders kitabı analizi üzerine yapılan araştırmalar, önerilen söylem teorisi ile ders kitabı içerikleri arasında önemli bir boşluk olduğunu göstermektedir (Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004; Grant & Starks, 2001; Wong, 2002).

Bu çalışma kapsamında incelenen bir başka nokta ise Hymes'ın (1974) dilin edim bilimsel yönlerine odaklanan ve bağlam içinde dili analiz etmek için kullanılabilen SPEAKING çerçevesidir. McConachy (2009), 'SPEAKING'in bir kısaltma olduğunu ve SPEAKING'in her harfinin, anlamın yaratılmasını ve yorumlanmasını etkilediği düşünülen bağlamın bir yönünü temsil ettiğini belirtmiştir. İlk harf olan S (Situation) sahneyi ya da ortamı içeren durumu ve olayların nerede gerçekleştiğini ifade eder. Sahne ya da ortam, öğrencilerin, ortamın söylenenler ve söylenmeyenler üzerindeki etkisi konusunda farkındalık geliştirmelerine yardımcı olur (McConachy, 2009). İkinci harf P (Participant), konuşmadaki katılımcıları, rollerini ve sahip oldukları ilişkiyi ifade eder. Katılımcılara ilişkin bilgiler, dilin kişilerarası yönü hakkında farkındalık yaratmaya yarar. Üçüncü harf E (Ends), iletişimin amacını veya amaçlarını temsil eder. McConachy (2009) bu öğeyi iletişimin amacının farkındalığını sağlayan unsur olarak tanımlamaktadır. A (Acts/Speech Acts) eylemleri veya söz eylemleri ve bunların edimsel anlamını temsil eder. Dördüncü harf K (Key), konuşmanın tonunu, konuşmada nasıl yapıldığını ifade eder. I (Instrumentality) harfi, iletişimin gerçekleştiği aracı veya kanalı temsil eder. Dil seçimindeki sosyal ve dilsel çeşitlilik ile ilgilidir. N (Norms) harfi, kültürün iletişim üzerindeki etkisi ve nezaket stratejilerinin ardındaki kurallar konusunda farkındalık yaratan etkileşim normlarını ve kurallarını belirtir. Son olarak G (Genre) harfi yazılı, sözlü, telefon vb. gibi belirli bir söylemdeki iletişimsel dizilerin türlerini ele alan türü temsil eder (McConachy, 2009).

Schmidt vd. (1996), ikinci dil edim biliminde söz eylemlerin bir parçası olarak öneri söz eylemlerinin, istek söz eylemlerinden farklı olarak literatürde daha az yer aldığını belirtmektedirler (Blum-Kulka 1987, 1991; Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Latif, 2001; Loutfi, 2016). Santos ve Silva (2008), öneri söz eylemlerinin neden nispeten daha az ilgi gördüğünü bulmaya çalışmış ve buna önerilerin belirlenmesindeki zorluğun neden olabileceğini öne sürmüşlerdir. Bu nedenle, ders kitaplarının söz eylemlerin öğretimi açısından tüm eksiklikleri göz önünde bulundurularak bu çalışma, Hymes'in SPEAKING çerçevesi ışığında, Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017) düzeyinde öneri söz eylemlerine odaklanan bir etkinliği incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ardından, adı geçen ders

kitabı etkinliğinin SPEAKING çerçevesinin ilkelerini karşılayacak şekilde uyarlanmasını önerir. Bu nedenle çalışmanın araştırma soruları şu şekildedir:

- Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017, s.112) kitabında yer alan öneri etkinliği, Dell Hymes tarafından önerilen SPEAKING çerçevesine ne ölçüde uymaktadır?
- Söz konusu ders materyali, SPEAKING çerçevesinin ilkelerini karşılamak için ne ölçüde uyarlanabilir?

Mevcut çalışma için veri toplama süreci iki aşamadan oluşmaktadır. İlk aşamada Pearson Yayıncılık tarafından hazırlanan Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017, s. 112) ders kitabında yer alan öneride bulunma etkinliği seçilmiştir. Araştırmacılar, ders kitabı etkinliğini ilk olarak Hymes'ın (1974) 'SPEAKING' çerçevesi açısından incelemişler ve edim bilimsel unsurlar açısından yetersiz bulunmuştur. Bu nedenle ders kitabı materyali ayrıntılı olarak analiz edilmiş ve uyarlanmıştır.

Araştırmanın ikinci aşamasında, birçok öğretim elemanı ve öğretim görevlisi çalışmaya katılmaları için davet edilmiş ve bunlardan yedisi gönüllü olarak çalışmada yer almışlardır. Araştırmacı, katılımcılara SPEAKING çerçevesinin ayrıntılı bir özetini ve materyallerin karşılaştırmalı çalışmasını sunmuştur. Katılımcılardan önce özeti inceleyerek çerçevenin arkasındaki fikri kavramaları istenmiş ve ardından ders kitabı uyarlamasını incelemeleri istenmiştir. Ayrıca katılımcılara aşağıdaki sorular yöneltilmiştir:

- Ders kitabı materyali, dil öğretmenlerine edim bilimsel öğelerin geliştirmesine yönelik yardımcı olacağın düşünüyor musunuz?
- Ders kitabı uyarlamasının ve değiştirilmiş etkinliğin dil öğretmenlerinin edim bilimsel yeterliliği geliştirmesine yardımcı olacağını düşünüyor musunuz?
- Değiştirilmiş materyalin, öğrencilerin edim bilimsel yeterlilik kazanmaları ve öneride bulunma konuşma eylemini içselleştirmeleri için uygun bir bağlam yaratacağını düşünüyor musunuz?
- Değiştirilen aktivitenin gerçek dil öğrenimini teşvik etmek için nasıl daha iyi tasarlanabileceğini düşünüyorsunuz?

Daha sonra, katılımcılardan ders kitabı materyalini ve değiştirilmiş materyali analiz etmeleri ve sınıf içi kullanımlarındaki olası etkilerini karşılaştırmaları istenmiştir. Çalışmada yer alan tüm katılımcılar, ders kitabı etkinliğinin uyarlanmasının öğrencilerin edim bilimsel bileşenlere ve söz eylemlere hâkim olmaları açısından daha faydalı olacağını belirtmişlerdir. Ek olarak, katılımcılar etkinliklerin sıralamasını ve içerdiği soru türlerini yorumlamışlardır. Ayrıca, rol oyunlarının sosyal bağlamıyla ilgili daha fazla ayrıntıya yer verilmesi ve resmi ve resmi olmayan dil kullanımında çeşitlilik sağlanması katılımcılar tarafından önerilmiştir. Verilen geri bildirimler ışığında materyal yeniden uyarlanarak son haline getirilmiştir.

Araştırmacılar, Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (2017, s.112) kitabında yer alan belirli bir öneride bulunma etkinliğinin Dell Hymes (1974) tarafından önerilen SPEAKING çerçevesindeki kriterleri ne ölçüde karşıladığını analiz etmeyi hedeflemişlerdir ve söz konusu ders kitabı materyali incelendiğinde, materyalin söz edimiyle ilişkili sosyo-kültürel unsurları tetikleyen unsurlardan yoksun olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Örneğin, araştırmacılar, iletişimde yer alan katılımcılara odaklanmanın, belirli bir söz eylemin gerçekleştirmesi için kullanılan dil, biçim ve işlev ilişkisinin yorumlanmasını kolaylaştırmak için bağlamsal veya arka plan bilgisinin ders kitabı etkinliğindeki ana eksik unsurlar olduğunu bulmuşlardır.

Öncelikle, ders kitabında, SPEAKING çerçevesinin ilk öğesi olan öğrenciler için ortamı oluşturmak için uygun görsel desteğin bulunmadığı fark edilmiştir. Ders kitabında kullanılan görselin videodaki tartışma konusu ile doğrudan ilgili olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu nedenle materyalin düzenlenme sürecinde çıkarılmıştır.

Ek olarak, araştırmacılar ve katılımcılar, ders kitabında yer alan giriş/ısınma etkinliğini, öğrencilerin birbirleriyle doğal bir diyalog oluşturmaya motive edemediğinden tüm yaş grupları için uygun bulmamışlardır. Ders kitabı materyali ile ilgili diğer bir sorun diyaloglarda yer alan konuşmacıları ya da katılımcıları öğrencilere tanıtmak için uygun etkinliklerin veya talimatların olmamasıdır. Ancak SPEAKING çerçevesine göre, ortam ve katılımcılar sunulan dilin temel bileşenleridir (Hymes, 1974). Bu nedenle ünite içerisinde öğretilmesi hedeflenen dilin tanıtıldığı videodan alınan görseller ve yönlendirici sorular yardımıyla öğrencilerin konuyla ilgili fikir edinmesi hedeflenmiştir. Değiştirilen materyalde yer alan görseller ve sorular yardımıyla öğrenciler, insanlar ve ortam

hakkında fikirlerini paylaşmaya teşvik edilebilir. Böylece öğretmen de hedef dil öğelerinin öğretileceği bir bağlam oluşturabilir.

Ek olarak, ders kitabı materyalinin, ünite videosu kapsamında dili analiz etmek için tasarlanmış sorular ve etkinliklerden yoksun olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate kitabında genellikle dinleme etkinliklerinin ardından öğrencilerin sadece dinleyerek veya videoları izleyerek cevaplayabilecekleri sorular yer almaktadır. Ancak ne yazık ki bu sorular ders kitabının sadece kavramaya odaklandığını ve sınırlı kaldığını ve bu durumun da edim bilimsel yetkinliği geliştirmek için yeterli olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır.

Bununla birlikte, ders kitabı materyali, önerileri kullanmak için yalnızca resmi olmayan bir bağlam oluşturmuştur. Materyal kapsamında evde ve telefon dükkanında geçen diyaloglar bulunmaktadır. Her ne kadar diyalogların ortamları değişse de kullanılan dilde büyük bir değişiklik gözlemlenmemektedir. Ayrıca, araçsallık bileşenine öğrencilerin dikkatini çekecek herhangi bir etkinlik veya soru bulunmamaktadır. Bu nedenle, adapte edilmiş materyal kapsamında öğrencilere daha resmi bir ortamda önerilerde bulunmak için farklı kullanımlara maruz kalmaları için bir okuma pratiği olarak çalışacakları ekstra bir diyalog sunulmuştur.

Ayrıca ders kitabı materyalinin üretim aşaması için yeterli bilgi sağlamadığı da görülmektedir. Öğrenciye sunulan tüm durumlar resmi olmayan durumlar içerdiğinden, bağlamın formalitesi ve gayri resmiliği açısından çeşitlilikten yoksundur. Ayrıca birkaç katılımcı rol yapma oyunlarındaki rollerin öğrencilere yapım aşamasında yardımcı olması için net bir şekilde verilmesi gerektiğini ifade etmiştir.

Kısacası, bu çalışma kapsamında Cutting Edge Pre-Intermediate (p.112) kitabında yer alan öneride bulunma materyali incelenmiştir. İlk araştırma sorusunda, daha önce bahsedilen etkinliğin Hymes (1974) tarafından önerilen SPEAKING çerçevesinin gerekliliklerini ne ölçüde karşıladığını belirlemeye çalışılmıştır. Materyalin içerik analizine göre materyaldeki etkinliklerin çoğunluğunun Hymes'ın (1974) kriterlerinden yoksun olduğu fark edilmiştir. Söz konusu materyalin dil için yetersiz bağlam temsil ettiği, edim bilimsel bileşenlere çok az vurgu yaptığı ve farklı araştırmacıların analiz ettiği diğer birçok ders kitabında olduğu gibi edim bilimsel unsurlardan yoksun olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, ders kitabı materyali ikinci araştırma sorusunu yanıtlayacak şekilde uyarlanmıştır. Buna göre uyarlanan materyal, öğrenciler için açık bir bağlam oluşturmak, öneride bulunma söz eyleminin edimi için belirli dil kullanımına odaklanma, ana dilde ve İngilizcede yer alan farklı kullanımların analiz edilip karşılaştırıldığı karşılaştırmalı sorular ve spekülasyon soruları da dahil olmak üzere edim bilimsel unsurlar açısından yeniden tasarlanmıştır.