



THE USE OF REQUEST EXPRESSIONS BY TURKISH LEARNERS OF JAPANESE

JAPONCA ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN
JAPONCA RİCA İFADELERİNİ KULLANIM ÖZELLİKLERİ

Barış KAHRAMAN¹
Derya AKKUŞ²

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the use of Japanese request expressions by Turkish learners of Japanese (TLJ). Data were collected through discourse completion test (DCT) making use of two different situations. 82 undergraduate students, studying at the Department of Japanese Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University and whose ages range from 18 to 27 years old, participated in the DCT. Since they consist of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year students, their Japanese proficiency can be characterized as lower intermediate to advanced. Error analysis was applied to analyze data. The incorrect and inappropriate expressions were classified as <L> lexical errors, <G> grammatical errors, <Sl>lexico semantic errors, <Sg> grammatical semantic errors and <P> pragmatic failures. As a result, it was found that although TLJ made some lexical and grammatical errors, they are capable of requesting from their teachers in Japanese. However, they are unable to request from their close friends appropriately due to pragmatic failure. In conclusion, it is argued that the results are closely related with learning contexts and textbook contents. Overall, this study puts forward some suggestions to enrich the use of Japanese request expressions by TLJ.

Keywords: Japanese, Turkish Japanese learners (TLJ), speech acts, request expressions, second language acquisition (SLA)

ÖZ

Bu çalışmada, Japonca öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin iki farklı bağlamdaki Japonca rica ifadelerini kullanım özellikleri incelenmektedir. Veriler, metin tamamlama testi (DCT) yöntemiyle, yaşları 18-27 arasında değişen, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Japon Dili Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı'nda öğrenim görmekte olan 82 öğrenciden toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya 1.sınıf, 2.sınıf, 3.sınıf ve 4.sınıf öğrencileri katıldığından dolayı, Japonca yeterlilik seviyeleri düşük orta seviyeden ileri seviyeye kadar değişiklik göstermektedir. Veriler, hata analizi yöntemiyle, sözcüksel hatalar <L>, dilbilgisel hatalar <G>, sözcüğe bağlı anlamsal hatalar <Sl>, dilbilgisine bağlı anlamsal hatalar <Sg> ve edimbilimsel başarısızlık <P> olarak beş bölümde incelenmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda, Japonca öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin(TLJ), sözcüksel ve dilbilgisel hatalara karşı öğretmenlerinden uygun biçimde ricada bulunabilirken, edimbilimsel başarısızlık nedeniyle yakın arkadaşlarına karşı uygun rica ifadelerini kullanamadıkları gözlemlenmiştir. Tartışma bölümünde elde edilen sonuçların, öğrenme ortamı ve ders kitabıyla ilişkili olabileceği görüşü ileri sürülmüş, öneriler bölümünde ise, Japonca öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin farklı durumlardaki Japonca rica ifadelerini kullanımlarını geliştirmek için somut öneriler getirilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Japonca, Japonca öğrenen Türk öğrenciler (TLJ), söz eylemler, rica ifadeleri, ikinci dil edinimi(SLA)

¹ Research Assistant in Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. Affiliation: Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University, Japan. E-Mail: heiwaiyu@gmail.com

² Research Assistant in Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. Affiliation: Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University, Japan. E-Mail: derya@nagoya-u.jp

INTRODUCTION

Speech acts are often used when communicating verbally in either the first language (L1) or a second language (L2). In other words, a very important part of pragmatics in any language consists of speech acts. To put it briefly, speech acts are “doing things by words” such as asking, thanking, apologizing, ordering, promising, requesting, warning, challenging, threatening, and so on (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). When speakers perform utterances, they simultaneously realize some acts, as stated above.

So far, in the fields of both first language acquisition and second language acquisition (SLA), many studies focusing on speech acts from different perspectives have been carried out (Cohen, 1996; Kasper and Rose, 1999). Most of these studies have focused on *request expressions* (e.g. Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Takahashi and DuFon, 1989; Trosborg, 1995; Kubota, 1996; Mizuno, 1996; Hill, 1997; Nakahama, 1998, 1999; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Hassall, 2001; Achiba, 2003) and the reasons for such a focus are as follows:

- a. Requesting is close to being the prototype case of a social transaction (Bruner et al., 1982).
- b. In L1, we first acquire and perform request expressions (Bialystok, 1993).
- c. Requests are useful and occur frequently, especially among learners of a new language. (Achiba, 2003).
- d. Requests are face-threatening acts (FTA). Face refers to respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that self-esteem in public or private situations. FTA is a universal aspect of language use which infringes on the hearers’ need to maintain his/her self-esteem, and be respected (Brown and Levinson, 1987).
- e. Requests are realized by a variety of linguistic forms like imperatives, declaratives, or interrogatives (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

As stated above, it can be said that requests occur between at least two or more people (a.). In both L1 and L2, we start language use by performing request expressions (b., c.). While performing these expressions, we use many linguistic forms (e.) in order to avoid embarrassing the hearers or making them feel uncomfortable (d.). The request expressions which Kahraman (2006) defines as, “asking a hearer to do or to quit doing something for a speaker or someone else who stands in relation to the speaker, hence the hearer will physically or psychologically have made efforts and the speaker will have gained benefits,” provide very fruitful insights into different aspects of both learners’ and children’s language development, such as pragmatic and grammatical acquisition. For these reasons, it can be said that requests have been one of the most appealing topics in both L1 and L2 studies or contrastive studies.

A number of studies have examined how learners produce request expressions in L2. The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) has been the most extensive one. Cross-

cultural comparisons in CCSARP have shown conventional indirectness to be the preferred request strategy in all languages examined (Australian English, Canadian French, Hebrew and Argentinian Spanish). The results of Trosborg's (1995) study which examined English-Danish native speakers with Danish learners of English are consistent with CCSARP, although the learners underused the conventionally indirect strategies. Takahashi and DuFon (1989) investigated the request strategies used by Japanese learners of English at beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels through role-play. They reported that as proficiency increases, learners proceed from a less direct level to a more direct level. Hill (1997) investigated Japanese learners of English as a foreign language at three levels of proficiency with the use of the discourse completing test (DCT). The results of the study showed that Japanese learners use more direct strategies and fewer hints than do native speakers. With the increase in proficiency, the use of direct strategies decreased. Hassall (2001) examined how Australian adult learners of Indonesian modify requests in daily situations compared to Indonesian native speakers, by using interactive role-plays. Results showed that the learners underuse internal modifiers such as the polite address term "father" in Indonesian, which functions to soften the negative force of a request. In Japanese as L2, Mizuno (1996) analyzed head act (main request) strategies used in role-play by twenty intermediate and twelve advanced Chinese learners of Japanese in comparison with twelve native speakers of Japanese. Mizuno's results showed that there is no obvious L1 transfer of requesting strategies. However, with an increase of proficiency, Chinese learners of Japanese use linguistic strategies which are non-existent socio-culturally in both Chinese and Japanese. Kubota's study (1996), provides empirical findings on how the speech style used in making requests differs among native speakers of Japanese and American learners of Japanese. Kubota (1996) indicates that cultural differences transferred when Americans spoke Japanese. In another study, Nakahama (1998, 1999) reports similar results to Kubota (1996), stating that "the Americans were found to transfer their L1 socio-pragmatic rules while making requests in Japanese."

L2 learners of any language seem to have difficulty in varying their requests appropriately. These studies indicate that L2 learners are unable to perform request expressions as effectively as native speakers. According to studies which investigated pragmatical acquisition in SLA (Nakamichi & Doi, 1995; Trosborg, 1995; Koike, 1996; Kasper and Schmidt, 1996; Cohen, 1996; Takahashi, 1996; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Barron, 2002), the fact that L2 learners are unable to perform requests in effective ways could be attributable to the negative transfer of L1, grammatical competence, learning context, learners' aptitude, motivation, learning strategies, age, pedagogical features (training transfer) such as instruction and materials, and the like.

In spite of the fact that the use of request expressions in L2 has been investigated in many languages, very few studies have investigated Turkish

learners' performance in a foreign language. To the best of our knowledge, Dikilitaş's master's thesis is one of them (2004). Dikilitaş (2004) investigated the use of request expressions by twenty-one upper intermediate and thirty-one advanced Turkish learners of English through DCT. Dikilitaş's study revealed that the Turkish learners of English tend to use conventional indirect speech acts (e.g., "Could you give me the book?") rather than direct (e.g., "Give me the book.") and non-conventional speech acts (e.g., "It would be nice to read a book."). He also found that upper intermediate learners employed more modifiers than advanced learners to mitigate their utterances. Another finding is that native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English perceive politeness in quite different ways. It can be said that Dikilitaş's findings seem consistent with previous studies in other languages.

Japanese is a considerably newer field of study in Turkey as compared to English. Although the number of Turkish learners of Japanese (TLJ) and contrastive linguistic studies between Turkish and Japanese have recently been increasing (Baykara, 2002; Tekmen & Takano, 2005; Kahraman, 2006), little is known about TLJ's acquisition of Japanese. Akkuş's master's thesis (2005) can be cited as an acquisition study of TLJ. By story telling tasks and a grammar judgment test, Akkuş (2005) investigated the TLJ's acquisition of "juju" (benefactive auxiliary verbs (BAV)) (give-receive) verbs, which is considered one of the hardest expressions to acquire for learners of Japanese. Participants were twenty-six 2nd year students and nineteen 4th year students studying Japanese as a major at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University in Turkey. Control groups consisted of eighteen Turkish native speakers and twenty Japanese native speakers. Results showed that although TLJ acquire and perform the form [*V-te kureru*] (doing or giving something for me or somebody who is of close relation to me) and [*V-te ageru*] (doing or giving something to-for somebody except me), they can not acquire and use the form [*V-te morau*] (receiving a thing or an action from somebody wherein the receiver benefits from it) as easily the other forms. These results indicate the acquisition order of "juju" verbs among TLJ.

These "juju" (BAV) also play a very important role in making requests in Japanese. From the findings of Akkuş (2005), it can be assumed that while TLJ are using request expressions in Japanese they would prefer the auxiliary verb as linguistic form [*V-te kureru*] and [*V-te kudasaru*] (polite form of *kureru*) rather than [*V-te morau*] and [*V-te itadaku*] (polite form of *morau*). To the best of our knowledge, no study has reported the use of request expressions in Japanese by TLJ. This study attempts to analyze how TLJ perform requests in Japanese in different situations.

THE STUDY

Purpose of the study: In the light of previous studies, it is hoped that this study will act as the developing tool for future studies in Turkey in the

field of *Japanese language teaching* (JLT) and SLA. The present study aims to:

- 1) Find out the state of TLJ in using Japanese request expressions by looking into the features of linguistic forms used in different situations.
- 2) Explain factors possibly attributable to the difficulty of using request expressions in Japanese.
- 3) Make suggestions to enrich the use of Japanese request expressions by TLJ.

METHODOLOGY

Participants: Participants comprised of eighty-two 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year undergraduate students of the Department of Japanese Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, and whose ages ranged from 18 to 27 years old. Participants consisted of twenty-three 1st year students, twenty-one 2nd and 3rd year students and seventeen 4th year students. Even though a language proficiency test was not conducted, their Japanese proficiency can be characterized as lower intermediate to advanced, since all participants started their undergraduate program after completing a one year preparation program.

Material: The data were collected by a discourse completion test (task) (DCT) which is frequently employed in empirical studies of SLA and/or comparative pragmatics (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Okamoto, 2000; Sato, 1997). Upon conducting the DCT, situations were given to participants in written form and responses were collected in written form as well. The two situations used in the study were as follows:

1. Asking the teacher to extend the deadline of the homework
2. Borrowing money from a close friend to buy some cola.

Both situations were given in the participants' mother tongue (L1) Turkish (see Appendix A), and they were asked to write their answers in Japanese.

Coding: Some previous studies which investigated the use of request expressions in Japanese have focused on the semantic formula of requests such as alerters, head acts, supportive moves and grounders (Sato, 1997; Kabaya et al., 1993), and some have focused on main request sentences (Okamoto 1986, 1990, 2000). This study focuses on the correct usage of expressions as well as appropriateness in main request sentences (head acts). Although Ellis (1997) distinguishes "errors" and "mistakes", in this study, the term "incorrect" is used here without any distinction. The cooperation of three native speakers of Japanese was sought for a judgement on correctness and appropriateness of usage. The incorrect and inappropriate answers which were underlined by the Japanese native speakers were classified into five groups as shown below.

I. Lexical errors <L> which are non-existent in Japanese, or do exist but the

sentence does not have any meaning semantically due to the choice of words.

II. Grammatical errors <G> refers to those that do not have any meaning as a result of choosing different or wrong grammatical forms.

III. Lexico semantical errors <Sl> refers to sentences that gain a different meaning in context due to lexical choices.

IV. Grammatical errors <Sg> refers to those which are different from <G>. In this case, the choice or avoidance of particular grammatical forms most likely gave the sentence a semantically different meaning.

V. Pragmatical failure <P> does not refer to errors but the choice or avoidance of auxiliary verbs and politeness markers which are generally situated at the end of a sentence. These sentences are grammatically and lexically correct. However, when the contextual and situational facts are considered, the use of these expressions is inappropriate.

RESULTS

In situation1, seventy-six of eighty-two participants' answers were valid. They wrote forty different main request sentences in total. In situation2, eighty of eighty-two participants' answers were valid which consisted of twenty-nine different sentences. Table 1 presents the numbers of correct, incorrect and inappropriate answers.

Table 1: Number of Correct, Incorrect, and Inappropriate Answers

Class	<C>		<L>		<G>		<Sl>		<Sg>		<P>	
	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2
1	10	0	7	1	6	4	1	3	0	8	0	23
2	1	5	16	0	1	1	1	3	2	6	1	12
3	6	2	9	0	5	2	0	4	1	5	3	14
4	12	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	13
Total	29	11	34	1	14	7	2	10	4	20	4	62
	38%	14%	59%	1%	24%	7%	4%	10%	7%	20%	7%	62%

<C> = Correct answer, <L> = Lexical error, <G> = Grammatical error, <Sl> = Lexico semantic error, <Sg> = Grammtical semantic error, <P> = Inappropriate use (pragmatic failure), <S1> = Situation1, <S2> = Situation2

As seen in Table 1, in situation1, twenty-seven of seventy-six participants (38%) answered correctly. The other forty-seven participants (62%) made fifty-eight errors (including <P> inappropriate use) in total which means some participants made more than one. In situation 2, only eleven of eighty participants (14%) answered correctly and the other sixty-nine participants (86%) made 100 errors in total.

In situation1, the 4th year students were the participants who gave the most correct answers (12 students). Then, the 1st year students were the second participants who answered correctly (10 students). The 3rd year students who answered correctly were six participants, and among the 2nd year students only

one participant. In total, twelve participants used the expression “*Shukudai no teishutsubi o nobashite itadakemasen ka?*” (Could you extend the deadline of homework?). Nine of them were 4th year students, two participants were 3rd year students, and one participant was a 1st year student.

1. [Shukudai no teishutsubi o nobashite itadakemasen ka?]
Shukudai-no teishutsubi-o nobashi-te itadak- e mas-en-ka]
Homework-GEN deadline –ACC extend-te receive(HON) POT polite-NEG-Q
Meaning: Could you extend the deadline of homework?
[by P6, P45, P65, P66, P67, P68, P69, P72, P73, P78,P79, P81]

[P1-P23: 1st year students, P24-P44: 2nd year, P45-P65: 3rd year, P66-P82: 4th year]

The second most-used expression was “*Shukudai o ato de dashitemo ii desu ka?*” (Is it all right if I submit the homework later?) by 6 participants; by five 1st year students and one 2nd year student.

2. [Shukudai o ato de dahitemo ii desu ka?]
[Shukudai-o ato-de dashi-temo ii desu ka]
Homework-ACC after-TIME submit-PERM good COP-Q
Is it all right if I submit the homework later? [P1, P2, P8, P10, P21, P25]

Other sentence end forms which were used in situation1 correctly by participants are stated below.

3. [V-te kudasai-mas-en-ka]
[V-te please-polite-NEG-Q] = [Wouldn't you please...]
4. [V-temo yoroshii-deshoo-ka]
[V-PERM good(polite)-COP uncertainty- Q] = [Would it be alright, if I...]
5. [- hoshii-n desu-ga]
[-want-NOM COP-but] = [I want to...]
6. [V-te itadak-e-mas-en deshoo-ka]
[V-te receiveHON-POT-polite-NEG COP uncertainty- Q] = [Couldn't you do...for me?]

In situation2, only eleven of eighty participants used request expressions correctly. The participants who used request expressions correctly and appropriately were five 2nd year students, four 4th year and two 3rd year students. No 1st year student used these expressions correctly. Ten participants used the variation form <V-te kure...> which is consistent with Akkuş (2005). Only one participant used the direct imperative form <V-te>.

7.	[Okane o kashite kureru?]
Okane-o	kashi-te kure-ru?
Money-ACC	lend-te give-INF
Will you lend me money? [P24, P72, P74, P82]	
8.	[Okane o kashite kurenai no?]
Okane-o	kashi-te kure-nai-no
Money-ACC	lend-te give-NEG-NOM(Q)
Won't you lend me money? [P35, P52, P63]	
9.	[Okane kashite!]
Okane	kashi-te
Money	lend-te
Lend me money! [P31]	

Features of correct and appropriate request expressions in Japanese by TLJ are as stated above. Table 2 presents the percentage of each incorrect and inappropriate use of Japanese request expressions by TLJ in the two given situations.

Table 2: Percentages of Incorrect and Inappropriate Answers in situation1 and situation2

Class	S1(%)					S2(%)				
	<L>	<G>	<SI>	<Sg>	<P>	<L>	<G>	<SI>	<Sg>	<P>
1	12	10	2	0	0	1	4	3	8	23
2	28	2	2	3	2	0	1	3	6	12
3	16	9	0	2	5	0	2	4	5	14
4	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	13
Total	59%	24%	4%	7%	7%	1%	7%	10%	20%	62%

As seen in Table 2, in situation1 a great deal of errors are lexical (59%). Grammatical errors follow the lexical errors with 24%. Pragmatic failure and grammatical semantic errors share the same result of 7%. In this situation, lexico semantic errors are the lowest, only 4%. Contrary to situation1, in situation2, pragmatic failures, 62%, are the highest. Grammatical semantic errors are the second highest, at 20%. Thirdly, lexico semantic errors are 10% and, grammatical errors are 7%. Lastly, lexical errors, at 1%, are the lowest error rate in situation2.

I.Lexical errors <L>: In both situations, the most remarkable lexical error is the expression [*nagaku suru*] (make long) which seems to be used instead of [*nobasu*], [*enchoo suru*] (extend). Secondly, instead of “deadline” (*teishutsubi*, *kigen*), words such as [*dasuhi*], [*debi*], [*watasuhi*] which are non-existent in

Japanese were mostly used

10. *[Shukudai no teishutsubi o chotto nagaku shite itadakemasenka.]
Shukudai-no teishutsubi-o chotto nagaku-shi-te itadak- e mas-en-ka
H.work-GEN deadline-ACC little long-make-te receive (HON) POT polite-NEG-Q
*Could you make the deadline of homework long?
[P22, P24, P24, P28, P30, P31, P51, P53]

II. Grammatical errors <G>: As for grammatical errors, confusion of the transitive and intransitive verbs [**-o kawaru*] (change), [**-o nobiru*] (extend) (intransitive verbs are used with accusative case marker “o”) are observed frequently. In addition, some misuse of case markers [*de*], [*ni*], [*ga*] and misconjugation of verbs were also observed.

11. *[Teishutsubi o nobite kudasaimasenka?]
Teishutsubi-o nobi-te kudasai-mas-en-ka
Deadline-ACC extend(intransitive)-te please-polite-NEG-Q
*Does the deadline extend please? [P49, P70]
12. *[Okane ga karitemo ii desu ka?]
Okane-ga kari-temo ii desu-ka
Money-NOM borrow-PERM good COP-Q
* Is it ok if the money borrows? [P4]
13. *[Shukudai o hokano hi ni dasarete itadakemasen ka?]
Shukudai-o hoka-no hi-ni da-sare-te itadake-mas-en-ka
H.work-ACC other-GEN day-TIME submit-PASS-te rec(HON)-polite-NEG-Q
*Would the homework be submitted another day for me? [P26]

III. Lexico semantic errors <Sl>: As for lexico semantic errors, confusion of the verb [*kariru-kasu*] (borrow-lend) and misuse of [*ageru*] (give) were significant.

14. [Jikan o agete kudasai]
Jikan-o age-te kudasai
Time-ACC give-te please
Please give time (to another person) [P34]
15. [Okane o karite kudasai]
Okane-o kari-te kudasai
Money-ACC borrow-te please
Please borrow money from me! [P20, P59]

IV. Grammatical semantic errors <Sg>: As for grammatical semantic errors, non-use of auxiliary verbs which play a very important role in requesting in Japanese, and

some misconjugation of those auxiliary verbs, were also observed.

16. [Okane o kashitemo ii?]
Okane-o kashi-temo ii?
Money-ACC lend-PERM good
Can I lend (you) money? [P39, P47, P50]

17. [Okane o kashitara ii desu ka?]
Okane-o kashi-tara ii desu-ka?
Money-ACC lend-COND good COP- Q
Is it ok if I (you) lend you (somebody) money? [P32]

V. Pragmatic failures <P>: As for pragmatic failures, especially in situation2, the use of polite form [*masu*] was remarkably high. In situation1, contrary to situation2, the use of [V-te *kuremasenka*] (V-te *do for me*), which the native speakers of Japanese judged as: “this usage towards a teacher is inappropriate” were also observed.

18. [Okane o kashite kuremasen ka?]
Okane-o kashi-te kure-mas-en-ka
Money-ACC lend-te give-polite-NEG-Q
Would you lend me money? (In Japanese the polite form[-*masu*]’ generally is not used to good friends) [P3, P13, P28, P51, P57, P66, P67, P68, P69 P71, P72]

19. *[Jikan o dashite kuremasenka?]
Jikan-o dashi-te kure-mas-en-ka
Time-ACC send-te give-polite-NEG-Q
*Won’t you send time for me? [P58]

From these results, it can be said that although, in general, TLJ are capable of requesting from their teachers in Japanese, they are unable to request from their friends appropriately. Although they made some lexical and grammatical errors in situation1, this appears not to hinder much expressing their intentions to the teachers. On the other hand, in situation2, according to pragmatic failures depending on the use of polite forms [*masu*], [V-te *kuremasenka*], [V-te *kudasai*], they cannot express their intentions to their friends. While TLJ can ask their teachers to extend the homework’s deadline appropriately, it is quite puzzling why they are unable to ask good friends to lend them some money to buy some cola appropriately.

Nakamichi & Doi (1995) analyzed ten Japanese language textbooks to examine how request expressions are taught. Their study shows that in the

beginning level, [V-kudasai] (performative) is taught in all textbooks. Although this expression is polite, it is too direct when used as a request. By looking through the main text book (Minna no Nihongo Shokyuu Honsatsu I-II), which TLJ had already studied in their 1st year preparation class, it can be seen that only polite request forms are being taught. Table 3 presents the frequencies of those forms which are taken in the conversation part of the said textbook.

**Table 3: Frequencies of Request Expression in
“Minna no Nihongo Honsatsu I-II”**

Form	Meaning	Frequency
[Onegai shimasu]	[I wish you will do]	7
[V-te kudasai]	[please, do....]	7
[V-te itadakemasen ka]	[couldn't you do...for me]	5
[-wa doko desu ka]	[where is the...]	2
[THING-o kudasai]	[please, give the...]	1
[-wa arimasen ka]	[don't you have the...]	1
[V-te kuremasen ka]	[won't you do...please]	1
[V-te itadakitain desu ga]	[I'd like you to do...]	1

As seen in Table 3, although there is little difference in the politeness level, all of the request forms which are included in the conversation part of the textbook consist of polite forms ([desu] [masu]), whereas the expressions which are used between close friends like [V-te], [V-te kureru] variations (except [V-te kuremasen ka]) or [V-te moraeru] variations without the form [masu],[desu] are not dealt with. Moreover, the textbook seems to be prepared for people who live in Japan, and most of the situations take place in a company setting and characters are employees of that company. Thus, it can be said that the results of this study could strongly be related to the use of limited and polite request expressions in the textbook.

As another possibility, the fact that most of the TLJ who participated in this study have never been to Japan can also be considered. Though they are learning Japanese from native speakers, the only opportunity to use their Japanese for communicating is with their teachers, and therefore politely. On the other hand, the participants do not have the chance to use their Japanese with young native speakers in their daily life. Hence, the students lack the habit of using polite expressions in Japanese on a regular basis. Furthermore, in Turkey the chance of coming into contact with Japanese or the Japanese language in daily life for TLJ is very limited, unlike English (TV channels, movies, etc.).

So far, many studies have explained the factors which may affect second language acquisition (e.g. Selinker, 1969; Krashen, 1988; Odlin, 1989; Ellis, 1997; Sakoda, 2002). According to these studies, L1 transfer (positive or negative), similarity (distance) between L1 and L2, learning context, learners'

aptitude, motivation, learning strategies, age, pedagogical features (training transfer), such as instruction, materials, have an effect on learning L2. On the other hand, some studies have focused on the pragmatic acquisition in SLA (Trosborg, 1995; Koike, 1996; Kasper and Schmidt, 1996; Cohen, 1996; Takahashi, 1996; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Barron, 2002). These studies also show that similar factors and grammatical competence can have effects on pragmatic acquisition. According to the studies which focused on pragmatic acquisition in SLA, grammatical acquisition is necessary for pragmatic acquisition, but not a sufficient condition.

As can be seen from the written answers of our TLJ in the two situations, although there is no positive transfer from Turkish, it can be said that there is also no negative effect of Turkish as L1 on Japanese in general. As shown in the results, in situation1, after the 4th year students, the 1st year students gave the most right answers. And in situation2, the 2nd year students gave the highest number of correct answers. Hence, it can be said that grammatical competence seems to have no significant influence on the use of Japanese request expressions by TLJ.

Taken together, it can be said that while TLJ can use Japanese appropriately when requesting from their teachers, they cannot use it appropriately with their close friends. One reason behind this is the *textbook* used, and the other is the *learning context*, as stated above.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the state of TLJ's use of request expressions in Japanese. As a result, the following can be concluded.

1. Although TLJ made some *lexical* and *grammatical errors*, they are capable of requesting from their teachers in Japanese. However, they are unable to request from their close friends appropriately due to *pragmatic failure*.
2. This could be closely related with the *textbook* and *learning context* as stated in previous studies.

Upon providing the implications below, we considered what could be done to enrich TLJ's Japanese usage for requests made to different persons in different situations.

IMPLICATIONS

In the light of the results of the present study, the following suggestions can be put forward to enrich the use of request expressions by TLJ in different contexts.

1. In addition to the main textbook, different request styles in different situations which are expressed by different linguistic forms can be provided as an input to TLJ in the classes. To achieve this, Japanese movies, TV programs, novels and the like may be useful.
2. Auxiliary verbs such as [V-te kureru], [V-te morau], [V-te kudasaru], [V-te

itadaku] play a very important role in making requests in Japanese. According to Akkuş (2005), although TLJ acquire the form [V-te kureru], they cannot acquire the form [V-te morau] as easily as the other forms. Due to this, after introducing [V-te kureru], the form [V-te morau] can be introduced in the context of appropriate situations with explanations of “trying to make hearer to do or to quit doing something for the speaker”, together with differences in other forms, as stated in Akkuş (2005).

3. Neither a negative nor a positive transfer effect was found in this study. However, via explanations of similarities and differences between Turkish and Japanese, L1 can be utilized for making TLJ aware of the differences. For example, these examples can be given in Turkish and Japanese

Examples:

20. [Pencereyi aç!]

Pencere-yi aç
Window-ACC open

Open the window!

21. [Pencereyi açarmısın?]

Pencere-yi aç-ar-mı-sın
Window-ACC open-AOR-Q-2ndSP

Will you open the window

22. [Mado o akete!]

Mado-o ake-te
Window-ACC open-te

Open the window!

23. [Mado o akete kureru?]

Mado-o ake-te kure-ru
Window-ACC open-te give-INF

Will you open the window?

As seen in the examples, it can be explained to TLJ that as a similarity between the two languages, the politeness level of request sentences is determined by the sentences' end forms. However, as a difference, it can be explained that in Turkish it is determined by the use of person suffix and tense, whereas in Japanese it is determined by the use of auxiliary verbs.

4. The properties of incorrect, inappropriate and correct uses can also be introduced in addition to an explanation of the expressions which native speakers of Japanese prefer in the same situations.

To investigate the use of Japanese request expressions by TLJ, this study focused only on the linguistic forms in main request sentences which were collected from written answers of learners in two different situations.

According to these written data, it is impossible to judge the effect of learners' aptitude, motivation or learning strategies. The necessity to investigate the learners' aptitude, motivation or learning strategies and requesting strategies, semantic formulas such as alerters, supportive moves, grounders and so on, still remains in order to further this study. To achieve this, not only written answers but also spoken data from both native speakers and learners in other possible situations are necessary. Also, statistical analysis must be carried out to provide more reliable results.

REFERENCES

- Achiba, M. (2003). Learning to request in a second language: a study of child **Interlanguage Pragmatics**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Akkuş, D. (2005). **Juju hojo dooshi no shuutoku -Torukogo bogowasha no taai**-[The acquisition of "juju" auxiliary verbs - case of Turkish learners of Japanese-], Unpublished MA thesis. Nagoya University, Undergraduate School of International Culture and Language. Nagoya: Japan.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). **How To Do Things with Words**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barron, A. (2003). **Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baykara, O. (2002). **Japonca'dan Türkçe'ye Yolculuk: Sözcüklerin Serüveni**. Ankara: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. Gabriele Kasper and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.), **In Pragmatic Interlanguage**. New York: Oxford University Press. 43-57.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., and Kasper, G. (eds.) (1989). **Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Request and Apologies**. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987) **Politeness: Some universals in language usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J., Roy, C., and Ratner, N. (1982). The beginnings of request. K.E. Nelson (Ed.), **Children's language**. New York: Garden Press. 91-135.
- Cohen, A.D. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**. (18): 253-267.
- Dikilitaş, K. (2004). **A Comparative study into acquisition of politeness in English as a foreign language**. Unpublished MA thesis Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Institute of Social Sciences. Çanakkale: Turkey.
- Ellis, R. (1997). **Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hassall, T. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. **International Review of Applied Linguistics**. (39): 259-283.
- Hill, T. (1997). **The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context**. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Temple University, Tokyo: Japan.
- Kabaya, H., Kawaguchi, Y., and Sakamoto, M. (1993). Description and analysis of strategies of making a request : toward their applications to teaching politeness system. **Waseda University Bulletin of Center for Japanese Language**. (5): 52-69.
- Kahraman, B. (2006). Japonca rica ifadelerinin biçimsel özellikleri. **Asya-Pasifik Çalışmaları Türkiye Yılığ**. (1): 178-199.
- Kasper, G. and Rose, K. (1999). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**. (19): 81-104.
- Kasper, G. and Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental Issues in Interlanguage Pragmatics. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**. (18): 149-169.
- Koike, D.A. (1996). Transfer of pragmatic competence suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning. S. M. Gass and J. Neu (eds.), **Speech acts across cultures**. Berlin: Mouten de Gruyder. 257-281.
- Krashen, S. (1988). **Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning**. London: Prentice Hall.
- Kubota, M. (1996). Acquaintance or fiancée: Pragmatic differences in requests between Japanese and Americans. **Working Papers in Educational Linguistic**. 12 (1): 23-38.
- Mizuno, K. (1996). Interlanguage pragmatics in requests (2): Focusing on directness and perspective. **Papers on Language and Culture**. 18 (1): 57-71.
- Nakahama, Y. (1998). Differing perceptions of politeness between Japanese and American learners of Japanese. **Southeast Review of Asian Studies**. (20): 61-80.
- Nakahama, Y. (1999). Requests in L1/L2 Japanese and American English: a crosscultural investigation of politeness. In L. Bouton (Ed.), **Pragmatics and Language Learning**. (9): 1-29. Urbana, IL: Division of English as an International Language.
- Nakamichi, M. and Doi, M. (1995). Nihongo kyooiku ni okeri irai no atsukai. [Teaching of requests in Japanese language education]. **Nihongogaku**. (14): 84-93.
- Odlin, T. (1989). **Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Okamoto, S. (1986). Linguistic Styles of Requests. **The Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology**. (26): 47-56.
- Okamoto, S. (1990). Linguistic expressions of requests and suggestions. **Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities of Aichigakuin University**. (20): 45-55.

- Okamoto, S. (2000). **Kotoba no Shakai Shinrigaku**. Kyoto: Nakanishiya.
- Sakoda, K. (2002). **Nihongo Kyooiku ni Ikasu Dainigengo Shuutoku Kenkyuu**. Tokyo: ALC.
- Sato, K. (1997). A Gender Difference of Request Realization in Pragmatic Strategies: The Case of Japanese Speakers. **Journal of Nagoya Women's University**. (43): 225-232.
- Searle, J. (1969). **Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. **General Linguistic**. 9 (2): 67-92.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**. (18): 189-223.
- Takahashi, S. and DuFon, M.A. (1989). Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers. [ERIC Document Reproduction, No. ED 370 439].
- Tekmen, A.N. and Takano, A. (2005). **Japonca Dilbilgisi**. Ankara: Engin
- Trosborg, A. (1995). **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies**. Berlin: Mouten de Gruyder.
- Textbooks:
- Minna no Nihongo Honsatsu I** (1998). 3A Corporation (Ed), Tokyo: 3A
- Minna no Nihongo Honsatsu II** (1998). 3A Corporation (Ed), Tokyo: 3A

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Request situations(in Turkish)

Situation1: Ders arasında kola içmek için kantine gidiyorsunuz. Ancak, paranızı sınıfta unutmuşsunuz ve o anda yanınızda bulunan yakın bir arkadaşınızdan borç para isteyebileceğinizi düşünüyorsunuz. **Bu isteğinizi Japoncada nasıl dile getirirsiniz.**

Situation2: Öğretmeninize belli bir tarihe kadar teslim etmeniz gereken bir ödeviniz var. Ama ödev yetişmeyecek gibi görünüyor. Öğretmeninizden ödevin teslim tarihini uzamasını istiyorsunuz. **Bu isteğinizi Japoncada nasıl ifade edersiniz.**

Appendix B: Key to symbols and abbreviations:

*	incorrect sentence
2ndSP	second singular person
ACC	accusative
AOR	aurist
COND	conditional
COP	copula
DAT	dative
GEN	genetive
HON	honorofic auxilary verb

INF	infinitive
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative
PASS	passive
PERM	permission
POT	potential
Q	question
TIME	time