



## The Communicative Competence Elements in the Foreign Language Textbooks: A Descriptive Case Study on Turkish and English Textbooks

Mustafa CANER<sup>1</sup>, Aslihan ÇELİK<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkiye

<sup>2</sup> Learning Consultant, Pearson Turkiye

### Abstract

The textbooks used in teaching a foreign language are considered as essential tools since the more quality a textbook is, the better learning or teaching occurs. Therefore, the studies conducted on analyzing and evaluating the textbooks have contributed to the field of developing textbooks. Thus, we aim to analyze and compare the use of communicative competence components, namely pragmatic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence in the speaking activities of two textbooks used in teaching English and Turkish as a foreign language. We adopted a descriptive case study design within the qualitative research framework to serve the purpose of the study and analyzed the textbooks through the combination of the impressionistic, checklist, and in-depth-internal evaluation methods. The comparative evaluation of the textbooks revealed that although the pragmatic competence component is covered pleasingly, we found the discourse competence component is covered more effectually in the textbook used in teaching English as a foreign language. Additionally, we found that neither of the books is particularly weak in covering the strategic competence aspects in the speaking activities. Based on our findings, we suggest textbook writers and publishers consider these points to provide learners with more natural language use as well as more communication functions of the target language in designing textbooks for foreign language teaching.

Key words: Textbook evaluation, Communicative competence, Speaking activities in textbooks.

---

## Introduction

The textbook in foreign language teaching is accredited as a guiding material of teaching for teachers and of learning for learners. Defining the textbooks in foreign language teaching as “the route map” or “visible heart” of any English language teaching program, Sheldon (1988) placed the textbooks in the center of teaching procedures. The textbook is defined as a source of information for a formal study of a subject and an instrument for teaching and learning (Graves, 2000, p.175). Bearing this definition in mind, it can be claimed that foreign language textbooks are the focal instrument (Tomlinson, 2017), which plays an influential role in presenting the language structures, outlining the teaching methodologies and organizing the activities as an aid for the teachers. As Hutchinson and Torres (1994, p. 315) advocate, “no teaching-learning situation, it seems, is complete until it has its relevant textbook”. Highlighting their practicality, Garinger (2001) states that textbooks, which effectively provide ready-made activities and lessens the preparation time, are one of the supreme equipment to relieve some of the pressures put on teachers who need solid samples of classroom progress to satisfy the external stakeholders. Considering their central roles as an indispensable component of any course in teaching and learning a foreign language, choosing an appropriate textbook mainly depends on the analysis and evaluation of them, which has gained far more critical since the time the textbooks took place as supporting material in the language classroom. As McGrath (2001) stated, the textbook evaluation concerns the discovery of whether what you were looking for was there or not. Similarly, Cunningsworth (1995) emphasized that the textbook evaluation assists instructors in identifying particular strengths and weaknesses in textbooks already in use. That is, analysis and evaluations conducted on the textbooks can be regarded as the key to the success of teaching procedures since such studies illustrate the weaknesses and strengths in the textbooks in detail and provide some solutions to the problems. It should be noted here that although some researchers use the terms -analysis and evaluation- interchangeably, and though conceivably related, there is a distinction between analysis and evaluation of a textbook (McGrath, 2001). According

to McGrath (2001, p.22), while “analysis” is a process that leads to an objective, verifiable description, the “evaluation” involves the making of judgments concerning whether something exists in the textbook -and if it is, to put a value on it.

Plenty of textbooks can be found in the field of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) since it is regarded as a worldwide taught language, and for years the importance of teaching and learning English as a foreign language has gained tremendous significance. Similarly, when compared to the materials used in the teaching of languages worldwide, the field of English language teaching (ELT) is far richer in terms of textbooks. It can be assumed that the more textbooks there are to teach a foreign language, the more quality textbooks can be found. As a result of having far more alternatives, the studies conducted on evaluating or analyzing English textbooks are more accessible in the available literature. Moreover, almost every series of textbooks used in ELT has been analyzed or evaluated in various studies from varied perspectives. Consequently, such studies are prominently operative in teachers’ and textbook writers’ standpoint to lead them to produce and use well-prepared materials.

The textbooks in teaching Turkish as a foreign language (TTFL) are the other side of the coin and a field, which is in its infancy yet. Although increasing steadily and having reached popularity recently, Turkish as a foreign language does not have a vast teaching area as English does. However, the number of language schools where Turkish is taught as a foreign language and the textbooks via which Turkish is taught has significantly increased recently. Similar to the studies on evaluation of ELT textbook, several studies conducted on the evaluation of textbooks used in TTFL are seen in the available literature. The availability of such studies indicates that TTFL and the materials used in this field have gained importance as well. However, the review of related literature exposed that there are still some gaps to be considered and analyzed in the materials or textbooks used in the field of TTFL.

## **Theoretical Background**

Since the mid-twentieth century, when Chomsky’s (1965, p.3) proposal on the differences between competence and performance was publicized, language educators emphasized the performance besides the structural knowledge of the language. In a nutshell definition of the terms in a linguistic aspect is that while a person’s knowledge of the language is labeled as the *competence*, the use of the language

in a social context labeled as *performance*. Advocates of communicative approaches (e.g., Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Hymes, 1972; Savignon, 1972) in applied linguistics brought the sociolinguistic perspective into consideration in language use and proposed the notion of communicative competence. Hymes (1972), who is considered as the father of the notion (Bagarić & Mihaljević-Djigunović, 2007; Cazden, 1996) defined the communicative competence as “not only as an inherent grammatical competence but also as the ability to use grammatical competence in a variety of communicative situations”. According to Savignon (2002, p. 3), communicative competence indicates the ability of learners to interact with other speakers, to make meaning, as distinct from their ability to perform their grammatical knowledge on classroom activities. The communicative competence, additionally, covers the target language use and accomplishing communicative tasks with efficacy and fluency in a culturally appropriate manner to decode and encode messages in social, extended interactions (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). In other words, the communicative competence was defined as “knowing when and how to say what to whom” (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p.121).

Although various scholars (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Faerch, Haastrup & Phillipson, 1984; Hedge, 2000) classified the components of communicative competence, Canale’s (1983) classification is advocated in the ensuing studies. According to Canale (1983), communicative competence includes four competencies, including grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic and discourse competences. The grammatical competence –also known as linguistic competence- refers to the knowledge of the language, which includes the knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, semantics, and phonology. The Sociolinguistic competence refers to the socio-cultural aspects of language use, which comprise culturally appropriate use of wording, register, politeness and style in a given situation. The discourse competence refers to the “mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres” Canale (1983, p.6). Finally, the strategic competence relates to “the verbal and nonverbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication” (Canale and Swain, 1980, p. 40-41).

The communicative competence is one of the vital aspects of efficient target language use in real-life, which is the core aim of foreign language instruction. That is, to develop communication skills of language learners, to convey or exchange the message to others, the communicative competences of the

learners should be flourished. In the case of foreign language instruction, the learners need to practice and develop their communicative skills until they feel confident to use the target language, whether spoken or written. Thus, it is expected that foreign language learners' materials, mainly textbooks, should cover the components of communicative competence. Moreover, the textbooks, which are seen as the primary sources of foreign language classrooms, had better include the components of communicative competence in the activities. However, various scholars (Brazil, Coulthard, and Johns, 1980; Cathcart, 1989; Levis, 1999; Yule, Matthis & Hopkins, 1992) criticized those language models and dialogues presented in many textbooks are unnatural and inappropriate for communicative or cooperative language teaching, and they do not adequately prepare students for the types of language structures, idioms, vocabulary and conversational rules that they will have to use in the real world. Furthermore, as Tomlinson (2017, p.9) stated language learners who use commercial textbooks "spend a lot of time filling in blanks, transforming sentences and participating in controlled and guided practice, but they typically do not spend much time in using the target language to achieve communicative effects".

### **Literature Review**

As Tekir and Arıkan (2007) stated, the evaluation of instructional materials has become one of the significant issues of language teaching/learning instruction. Thus, the review of the available literature revealed that several studies examined foreign language textbooks, which is also the focus of the present study. For instance, in one of those studies, İraji (2007) examined the *New Interchange* series in terms of the principles of communicative features. The findings of the study revealed that the distributional pattern of communicative activities in the textbook was random and did not follow the principles of communicative approaches, as the authors of the book have claimed. Similarly, in another comprehensive study on the evaluation of *New Interchange* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) series with a focus on the communicative aspects of the materials, Sahragard, Rahimi and Zaremoayehdi (2010) found that generally the tasks in the textbook focus on grammatical structures or other points related to form marginally more than the amount they focus on communicative aspects.

Moreover, the activities in the textbook were not useful enough in preparing the students as communicatively competent learners although the authors of the textbook bring in the preface that the primary aim of the textbook is to improve the learners' speaking abilities and help them be

communicatively competent learners (Sahragard, Rahimi and Zaremoayehdi, 2010). In another study, Gómez-Rodríguez (2010) examined five commonly used English textbooks in Colombia in terms of their communicative tasks and the development of communicative competence. He found that mechanical practices such as substitution drills and repetition of model sentences account for a high proportion of the textbooks in which authentically communicative activities are not practiced often. Similarly, Soleimani and Dabbaghi, (2012) who examined *New Interchange* series in terms of the pragmatic input in the activities, found that the pragmatic input provided by the textbook is at the level of basic needs such as “requesting/accepting, requesting/refusing expressing attitudes and affirming”. As for the pragmatic competence aspect of the textbook in focus, Rezaee, Kouhpaeennejad and Mohammadi’s (2013) study revealed that although *New Interchange* series include the materials that focus on the four skills equally, the diversity of registers and accents was almost absent in most of the activities in the textbook.

Since English as a foreign language has been taught worldwide for years, there are various studies in the available literature conducted on the evaluation of textbooks used in EFL environments. However, TTFL has recently gained importance; thereby, the available literature on the textbook evaluation is somewhat limited. The review of related literature in Turkish context revealed that although there are several studies which examined the textbook in the focus of the present study, most of them focused on the examination of cultural elements or culture transmission dimensions (e.g., Sarkmaz & Tüm, 2012; Ülker, 2007; Yılmaz, 2012) as well as the examinations of writing (Tok, 2013), listening (Ak, 2011; Tuzcu-Eken, 2011;) and reading (Şahin, 2010;) skills from various aspects in the *Yeni Hitit* Series.

One of the available studies that focused on the communicative functions of a TTFL textbook was conducted by Yağız (2009), who examined the discourse features in four textbooks, namely *Elementary Turkish, Gökkusağı I, Let’s Learn Turkish* and *Hitit Turkish Language Teaching*. His findings revealed that although the textbooks introduce neat and tidy, seemingly perfect dialogues compared to authentic data, the real-life language has been poorly presented -as in most EFL/ESL textbooks. In another study, Karababa and Üstünsoy-Taşkın (2012) examined the activities in the *Yeni Hitit* series in terms of their compliance with the language skills and found in general that although the activities in the books mostly presented in an integrative approach, they do not cover activities related to the speaking skills adequately.

Moreover, they found that the activities are mainly based on mechanical grammar or reading oriented activities, which, in turn, were insufficient to develop learners' communication skills effectively.

In a study, Köse (2013) examined the activities in *Yeni Hitit 1* in terms of the communicative competence elements defined in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and found that although the textbook involves activities related to lexical, grammatical, semantical competences and fosters writing skills of the learners, it does not include activities related to phonological competence which has a vital role in promoting speaking skills of the learners. Moreover, Köse (2013) found that the activities that promote the lexical competence of the learners also do not cover real phrases that are used in daily conversations. Similarly, Ünlü (2015) comparatively examined two TTFL textbooks, namely *Hitit 1* and *Yeni Hitit 1*, in terms of their presentation of grammar and grammar exercises. She found that the activities in *Yeni Hitit 1* are more inclusive of communicative competence defined in the CEFR than the *Hitit 1*.

Another study that examined the activities in the *Yeni Hitit* series in terms of their compliance with language skills is conducted by Özbal (2019) as a doctorate dissertation. Özbal (2019) found that the activities in the series are mostly based on reading skills and grammar, whereas activities related to the speaking skills are in the last order in the continuum. Moreover, Özbal (2019) found that speaking activities do not lead to developing communication skills of the learners but are instead based on monologues and question and answer type activities. Similarly, Kalaycı and Durukan (2019), who examined the textbooks used in teaching Turkish and English to foreigners in terms of learning domains, found that reading and writing activities in the *Yeni Hitit* series overelaborated compared to the activities for narrative expression, listening and speaking skills.

### **Research Question**

The review of available literature revealed that although there are several studies on textbook evaluation, most of them focused on the evaluation of textbooks either prepared for teaching English or Turkish as a foreign language. Therefore, different from the other textbook evaluation studies in the field, we intend to conduct a contrastive evaluation focusing on the communicative competence components of the speaking activities in an ELT and a TTFL textbook. In other words, the main aim of our study is to examine the communicative competence components of the speaking activities and figure out the

similarities and differences as well as the weaknesses and strengths in two foreign language teaching textbooks. Consequently, we descriptively evaluated *New Interchange 3* in English and *Yeni Hitit 3* in Turkish, in terms of their coverage of communicative competence components in the speaking activities. Through our evaluation, we sought to find answers to the following questions:

To what extent does *New Interchange 3* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) cover the elements of communicative competence in speaking activities?

To what extent does *Yeni Hitit 3* cover the elements of communicative competence in speaking activities?

What are the similarities and differences between *New Interchange 3* and *Yeni Hitit 3* in terms of presenting activities in consort with communicative competence?

## Methodology

We adopted the descriptive design within the qualitative research framework and tailored a descriptive case study approach as the primary research design. That is, our study focused on “exploration of a phenomenon in detail within its context using a variety of data sources” (Baxter & Jack, 2008; 544) and describe a case in depth and detail, and holistically (Patton, 2002) to illustrate the shreds of evidence related to the case. The descriptive case study is a comprehensive description of an individual case through analysis of documents, interviews, direct observations, participant observations, and physical artifacts (Tobin, 2010). Thus, we define the case in the present study as the use of communicative competence components in the speaking activities of two foreign language teaching textbooks.

In order to scrutinize the case, we gathered the data through the evaluation of two textbooks used in teaching foreign languages. Depending on the purpose, various methods can be used for evaluating textbooks; however, impressionistic approach, checklist method, and in-depth method (Cunningsworth, 1995; McGrath, 2001) are the ones that stand out among others. The impressionistic approach is a brief external evaluation that gives an overview of the organizational foundation of the course book (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). The checklist method is somehow a rule-of-thumb activity; however, it is systematic in the way that the standards on the list are checked off in order. Whereas the in-depth or in-depth internal investigation of the textbook is the examination of the representative



features of particular language elements in the textbook in order “to see how far the materials in question match up to what the author claims as well as to the aims and objectives of a given teaching program” (McDonough and Shaw, 1993, p. 64). As for the evaluation approaches of the textbooks in the present study, we prefer a combination of the textbook evaluation techniques mentioned above to illustrate the case in detail. That is, after the initial impressionistic evaluation of the textbooks, we conducted an in-depth internal investigation by using a checklist developed by the researchers. Additionally, as for the position of the researchers in the textbook examinations, we preferred the combination of analyst and evaluator positions. That is, through an analysis, we tried to provide an accurate and verifiable description, and through evaluation, we tried to figure out whether communicative competence elements exist in the textbooks and if there is we tried to put a value of each presence.

In qualitative research, the researcher is one of the instruments of data collection (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2011), thus, to illustrate the standpoint of the researchers, it is worth to mention that the second researcher has taught *New Interchange 3* and *Yeni Hitit 3* for three years and worked as a learning consultant at Turkey divisions of well-known foreign language textbook publishing companies. The first researcher, on the other hand, acted out as an inter-rater or inter-observer who functioned as an expert to reach the final decision through his relatively experienced opinion.

We selected the textbooks by considering their mainstream use in foreign language teaching environments in Turkey. One of the textbooks was the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition of *New Interchange 3*, which is commonly used in teaching English as a foreign language, written by Richards, Hull and Proctor (2006). The interchange series, having for levels that cover CEFR range A1-B2, is written for adult learners. Thus the textbook analyzed in the current study is predominantly used in language schools with Turkish adult learners who join a course to improve their general English skills, in particular, to be better at communicating in English. Additionally, the textbook aims to meet the learning objectives described in B1 level of CEFR – the highest level of the series. As the authors claimed, the textbook includes high-interest topics, focus on both fluency and a multi-skills syllabus integrating themes, structures, functions, vocabulary, and pronunciation. The authors also claimed that the language skills, as well as vocabulary and grammatical structures, are presented through communicative and task-based activities in the textbook. Unlike the other skills such as reading, writing and listening, the speaking activities in the series

are not labeled as speaking directly; however, other labels such as “discussion”, “role play” or “pair work” are used to indicate the speaking activities.

The other textbook, *Yeni Hitit 3: Yabancılar için Türkçe ders kitabı*, is also one of the commonly preferred textbooks to teach Turkish as a foreign language, edited by Uzun (2010) and prepared by a team of authors. Having 3 levels, the Yeni Hitit series was developed to cover CEFR range A1 – C1. Level 3, which is analyzed in the current study, targets to take students from B2 and reach at C1 level. As in the Interchange series, Yeni Hitit is primarily used in language schools teaching Turkish to adult learners who are mostly learning Turkish because they have just moved in Turkey to work or study. The main aim of the learners is to develop their Turkish language to meet their daily needs and communicate with people. The units in the textbook generally focus on grammatical structures in Turkish as well as listening, speaking, reading and writing practices. Although foreign language teaching textbooks generally highlight the language skills directly, we noticed that the language skills in this textbook are not labeled explicitly. Accordingly, the speaking activities in the textbook are signposted as “Konuşalım (let’s talk)”, “Tartışalım (let’s discuss)” or “Anlatalım (let’s say)”.

These textbooks were selected for evaluation and comparison mainly because of their mainstream use in foreign language teaching to adults. Foreign language learners in Turkey are mostly among the ones who are Turkish and aim to learn English, or the ones coming from other countries and seek to learn Turkish. However, teaching Turkish as a foreign language does not have a long history as in English, and therefore, the number of resources developed to teach Turkish is limited. That is, the number of studies done on textbooks designed to teach Turkish is limited, too. English, being a globally taught language, textbooks developed to teach English are rich in number as well as the studies conducted in analyzing them. Being two significant languages taught as a foreign language in Turkey - English and Turkish – and being two commonly used textbooks – Interchange and Yeni Hitit - the current study focuses on an evaluation to nurture foreign language teaching in Turkey.

Through reviewing the related literature in the field of textbook evaluation and the elements of communicative competence comprehensively, we developed a checklist to evaluate the textbooks in the present study. The items in the checklist were classified to cover discourse competence (2 items), strategic competence (3 items) and pragmatic competence (3 items) in downward rows and the number of each

unit displayed on a vertical column. Subsequently, we examined the speaking activities in each unit in line with the items in the checklist and placed a tick (✓) for each positive consequence. As for the in-depth internal investigation of the textbooks concerning the elements of communicative competence, we evaluated each book independently by using the pre-prepared checklist and compared our preliminary findings to ensure the reliability of the results. Furthermore, while analyzing the data, we focused on to what extent the textbooks cover the elements of communicative competence -specifically, pragmatic, discourse and strategic competences- in their speaking activities. Thus, concerning the occurrences of the elements of communicative competence in the speaking activities, we filled in the checklist for each textbook separately and presented the findings as frequencies and percentages consistent with the number of the units in tables exclusively.

## Findings

Subsequent to the impressionistic evaluation, we run the in-depth internal investigation of all units in the textbooks in agreement with the elements of communicative competence. Although our research questions inquire about the aspects of communicative competence in each textbook independently, we presented the findings comparatively in proportion to each element of communicative competence in both.

As the initial phase, we figured out the frequency and percentages of pragmatic competence items covered in the speaking activities of *New Interchange 3* and illustrated the findings in Table 1.

Items	f
Does the activity give a function for the students to perform?	16
Does the activity give the role, relationship and speaker status?	12
Does the activity give structures for the function?	14

Table 1. Pragmatic competence uses in *New Interchange 3*

As seen in Table 1, *New Interchange 3* apparently covers pragmatic competence elements in the speaking activities in a great quantity ( $\bar{x}=88\%$ ), which can be regarded as a satisfactory amount for a foreign language textbook. When we examined the activities in detail, we found that the speaking activities generally meet the required components of pragmatic competence. For instance, in most of the role-play activities, the context, roles, relationships and speaker status were clearly illustrated to lead the learners to speak and foster communication. Additionally, we found that learners are provided with

sample dialogs, in which they are able to see how they can act and what kind of language they should use. Moreover, in grammar focus and word power activities, necessary language structures and essential vocabulary are introduced for the learners before they perform the speaking activity.

Likewise, based on our analysis, we summarized the frequency and percentages of pragmatic competence items covered in the speaking activities of *Yeni Hitit 3* in Table 2.

Items	f
Does the activity give a function for the students to perform?	10
Does the activity give the role, relationship and speaker status?	9
Does the activity give structures for the function?	10

Table 2. Pragmatic competence uses in *Yeni Hitit 3*

As seen in Table 2, *Yeni Hitit 3* also covers the pragmatic competence elements in the speaking activities in a remarkable quantity ( $\bar{x}$ =80.5%), which can be regarded as an acceptable amount for a foreign language textbook. However, when we compared the amount with the *New Interchange 3*, we see that the pragmatic competence elements in the speaking activities in *Yeni Hitit 3* are rather a smaller sum. Additional analysis of the occurrences of the pragmatic competence elements in the whole textbook revealed that while ten (83.3%) out of twelve units give a function for students to perform and provide structures for the function, nine units (75%) provide the role, relationship and speaker status in the speaking activities.

As for the use of discourse competence elements in the speaking activities, our in-depth internal investigation revealed that discourse competence elements are the second most used communicative competence in both of the textbooks. However, their use differs in each of the textbooks. We depicted the frequency and percentages of discourse competence items covered in the speaking activities of *New Interchange 3* in Table 3.

Items	f
Is it shown in the activity?	
• how to perform the turns	
• how to maintain the conversation	13
• how to develop the topic	
Does the sample dialog have cohesive devices and deixis (e.g., pronouns, conjunctions, synonyms, auxiliaries, etc.)?	12

Table 3. Discourse competence use in *New Interchange 3*

As it is seen in Table 3, the extent of discourse competence components use in the speaking activities of *New Interchange 3* is a notable amount ( $\bar{x}=78.12\%$ ). The in-depth analysis of the speaking activities in line with the discourse competence components revealed that the sample dialogs give examples of how to perform the turns, maintain the conversation and develop the topic in thirteen out of sixteen units. On the other hand, we found that in three units, the book does not give any sample dialog or gives the dialog but does not show how to perform the turns, maintain the conversation and develop the topic.

As for the use of cohesive devices and deixis such as pronouns, conjunctions, synonyms, ellipsis, substitution etc., in the sample dialogs, we found that while the cohesive devices and deixis, especially pronouns and conjunctions are used in twelve units for sufficient amounts, other discourse devices such as substitution or ellipsis are rather ignored. These findings indicate that, to some extent, the components of discourse competence are covered in the speaking activities; however, to simulate the natural context of languages, the activities should embody a variety of cohesive devices widely used in the daily life conversations.

The in-depth internal investigation of *Yeni Hitit 3* regarding discourse competence components exposed that the textbook covers them to some extent ( $\bar{x}=38.8\%$ ), although their use is in the second rank in the use of communicative competence components in general. We illustrated the frequency and percentages of discourse competence items covered in the speaking activities of *Yeni Hitit 3* in Table 4.

Items	f
Is it shown in the activity?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how to perform the turns</li> <li>• how to maintain the conversation</li> <li>• how to develop the topic</li> </ul>	5
Does the sample dialog have cohesive devices and deixis (e.g., pronouns, conjunctions, synonyms, auxiliaries, etc.)?	9

Table 4. Discourse competence use in *Yeni Hitit 3*

As illustrated in Table 4, out of twelve units of the textbook, five of them cover the discourse competence components concerning how to perform the turns, maintain the conversation and develop the topic in conversations. Similarly, we found that only nine units include the use of cohesive devices and deixis in the sample dialogs in speaking activities. Concerning these overt findings, we can claim that *Yeni Hitit 3* does not provide learners with the discourse competence elements sufficiently.

The other feature of the communicative competence components that the present study is focused on was the use of strategic competences in the speaking activities of the textbooks in question. Although strategic competence is quite an essential component of communicative competence, our analysis revealed that it is not commonly covered in either of the textbooks. The overall analysis revealed that the textbooks in focus do not cover the strategic competence elements in their speaking activities satisfactorily.

We presented findings concerning the strategic competence use in the speaking activities of *New Interchange 3* in Table 5 through the frequencies and percentages of their occurrences.

Items	f
Does the activity give interactional strategies (e.g., repetition request, clarification request, confirmation request, expression of non-understanding)?	0
Does the activity give time gaining strategies such as fillers, hesitation devices?	7
Does the sample dialog give strategies to define unknown words or use approximate words?	3

Table 5. Strategic competence uses in *New Interchange 3*

As summarized in Table 5, our findings revealed that the extent of strategic competence components use in the speaking activities of *New Interchange 3* is considerably limited. The in-depth internal analysis further revealed that none of the speaking activities in *New Interchange 3* covers the interactional strategies such as repetition request, clarification request, confirmation request or expression of non-understanding, which are the straightforward elements of strategic competence. Additionally, we found that the sample dialogs in the speaking activities rarely cover the time gaining strategies such as fillers and hesitation devices. The only time gaining strategy used in the sample dialogs is the use of “well” which is seen in the seven out of sixteen units in the textbook. Furthermore, we found that only three out of sixteen units in the textbook give place for the definition of unknown words or usage of approximate words in the speaking activities. However, we should acknowledge that although the authors did not explicitly use such strategies in the sample dialogs of the speaking activities, they gave the definition of the unknown words as pre-speaking activities in the textbook.

We found that the findings related to the use of strategic competence are far worse for *Yeni Hitit 3*. Our analysis evidently revealed that none of the speaking activities include any components of strategic competence. That is, we found that neither the interactional strategies such as repetition request, clarification request, confirmation request or expression of non-understanding nor the time gaining

strategies and word defining strategies are not covered in the sample dialogs or speaking activities of *Yeni Hitit 3*. Although the components of strategic competence are quite significantly used in daily life conversations, it is clear that the textbook writers did not pay attention to the use of such strategies in the speaking activities of *Yeni Hitit 3*. In a natural conversation, it is common to see that the speakers use various strategies related to the components of strategic competence. For instance, it is almost impossible to hear a natural conversation in which speakers can understand every word or topic mentioned. However, we found that the writers of *Yeni Hitit 3* did not give place to the components of strategic competence in the speaking activities.

## Discussion and Conclusion

The present study was an attempt to evaluate to what extent *New Interchange 3* (3rd edition) and *Yeni Hitit 3* cover the elements of discourse competence, pragmatic competence and strategic competence in the speaking activities. The findings based on the in-depth internal evaluation demonstrated that while the speaking activities in *New Interchange 3* covered the elements of pragmatic competence and discourse competence satisfactorily, the elements of strategic competence, especially interactional strategies such as repetition request, clarification request, confirmation request or expression of non-understanding did not take place in the speaking activities. Similarly, our findings revealed that although the speaking activities in *Yeni Hitit 3* covered the elements of pragmatic competence pleasingly, the discourse competence components covered to some extent. On the other hand, we found that the components of strategic competence did not find any place in any of the speaking activities of *Yeni Hitit 3*.

All in all, the findings of our study concerning the use of communicative competence elements in the speaking activities show similarities with the previous studies in the literature. For instance, we figured out that neither of the textbooks does cover natural language satisfactorily, which is similar to the findings of Gómez-Rodríguez (2010), who found that in a high proportion of the textbooks, the authentically communicative activities are not often practiced and Yağız (2009), who found that the real life language has been poorly presented in textbooks. Likewise, the findings of our study show similarities with Sahragard, Rahimi and Zaremoayehdi (2010), Karababa and Üstünsoy-Taşkın (2012), Köse (2013),

Özbal (2019) and Kalaycı and Durukan (2019) in terms of the inadequacy of speaking activities for fostering learners' communication skills that might be used in daily conversations effectively.

The aim of the foreign language textbooks is mostly believed to teach a foreign language communicatively in its natural context; however, we found that some of the components of communicative competence, especially the use of strategic competence, are mostly ignored by the book writers in neither of the textbooks in question. Thus, we particularly suggest that the foreign language textbook writers should consider this fact and should attempt to give more positions for strategic competence, which is, in fact, reasonably important in achieving the difficulties and maintaining the conversation in daily life. Similarly, while either speaking in native or a foreign language, people almost always need to apply some strategies to overcome the difficulties, misunderstandings, non-understandings or unknown words, however, we found that neither of the textbooks cover such components of communicative competence satisfactorily. Therefore, we extremely recommend the textbook writers and publishers to cover more natural conversations in the speaking activities in their textbooks.

As for the pedagogical implications of the findings of our study, we try to inform the teachers who teach a foreign language through similar textbooks be cautious about the use of natural language in the speaking activities, since most of the foreign language textbooks do not cover elements of the communicative competence which occurs every simple conversation in the daily life.

## References

- Ak, D. (2011). İkinci dil öğretim kaynaklarında yer alan anlama etkinliklerinin karşılaştırılması: Yeni Hitit ve New Headway örnekleme. (Unpublished MA thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Awasthi, J. R. (2006). Textbook and its evaluation. *Journal of NELTA*, 11(1-2), 1-10.
- Bagarić, V. & Mihaljević-Djigunović, J. (2007). Defining communicative competence. *Metodika*, 8(1), 84–93.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Brazil, D., M. Coulthard, & C. Johns. (1980). *Discourse intonation and language teaching*. Longman.
- Brock, M. N., & Nagasaka, Y. (2005). Teaching pragmatics in the EFL classroom? Sure you can!. *TESL Reporter*, 38(1), 17-26.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (Eds.) *Language and communication*. pp. 2-28. New York: Longman.



- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, pp.1-47.
- Cathcart, R. (1989). Authentic discourse and the survival English curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23.
- Cazden, C.B. (1996). Communicative competence, 1966-1996. Paper presented at the 18<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the American association for applied linguistics, Chicago, March 23-26.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z. & Thurrell, S. (1993). A pedagogical framework for communicative competence: Content specifications and guidelines for communicative language teaching. *Deseret Language and Linguistic Society Symposium*, 19 (1).
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and selecting EFL materials*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your course book*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1).
- Faradilla, A., & Rukmini, D. (2019). The communicative competence components analysis in using English through EIR. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 78-85.
- Garinger, D. (2010). Textbook selection for the ESL classroom. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0210garinger.html>.
- Garinger, D. (2001). Textbook evaluation. *TEFL Web Journal*: [www.teflweb-j.org/garinger.html](http://www.teflweb-j.org/garinger.html).
- Gómez-Rodríguez, L. F. (2010). English textbooks for teaching and learning English as a foreign language: Do they really help to develop communicative competence? *Educación y Educadores*, 13(3), 327-342.
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. K. Doehler (Eds.), *L2 Interactional competence and development* (pp. 1-18). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Hutchinson, T. & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, 48(4).
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293. Baltimore, USA: Penguin Education, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Iraji, A. (2007). *Pragmatic features of the New Interchange: How communicative and task-based is it?* (Unpublished master's thesis), Shiraz University, Iran.
- Kalaycı, D. & Durukan, E. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ve İngilizce öğretimi ders kitaplarının öğrenme alanları bakımından karşılaştırılması. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 8(4), 2162-2177.
- Karababa, Z. C. & Üstünsoy-Taşkın, S. (2012). An evaluation of the course books for teaching Turkish as a foreign language based on teacher opinions. *Dil Dergisi*, 157.
- Köse, D. (2013). İletişimsel dil edinci açısından Yeni Hitit Yabancılar İçin Türkçe. 6. Uluslararası Türkçenin Eğitimi-Öğretimi Kurultayı. 04-06 Temmuz 2013, Niğde.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levis, J. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1).

- McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A Teacher's guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Oxford: Blackwell.
- McGrath, I. (2001). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press,
- Özbal, B. (2019). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ders kitaplarında alıştırımların incelenmesi: A1-A2 düzeyi*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü: Ankara
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Rezaee, A. A., Kouhpaenejad, M. H., & Mohammadi, A. (2013). Iranian EFL learners' perspectives on New Interchange Series and Top-Notch Series: A comparative study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 827-840.
- Riasati, M. J., & Zare, P. (2010). Textbook evaluation: EFL teachers' perspectives on "New Interchange". *Studies in Literature & Language*, 1(8).
- Richards, J., Hull, J. & Proctor, S. (2006). *New interchange 3 Student's Book* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roshan, S. (2014). A critical comparative evaluation of English course books in EFL context. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 4(1).
- Şahin, A. (2010). *Avrupa dil gelişim dosyası bağlamında yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde okuma becerisini geliştirmeye yönelik malzeme oluşturma*. (Unpublished MA thesis), Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Sahragard, R., Rahimi, A., & Zaremoayehi, I. (2010). An in-depth evaluation of interchange series. *Porta Linguarum*, (12), pp.37-54.
- Sarkmaz, G., & G., & Tum, O. (2012). Yabancı dil Türkçe kitaplarında kültürel öğelerin yeri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (43), 448-459.
- Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), pp.237-46.
- Soleimani, H., & Dabbaghi, A. (2012). Textbook evaluation: A reflection on the New Interchange Series. *International Journal of research studies in language learning*, 1(2).
- Tekir, S. & Arıkan, A. (2007). An analysis of English language teaching course books by Turkish writers: "Let's speak English 7" example. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 4(2), 1-18.
- Tobin, R. (2010). Descriptive case study. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp.289-290). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tok, M. (2013). *Yabancılar Türkçe öğretimi ders kitaplarındaki yazma çalışmalarının değerlendirilmesi*. Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12.
- Tomlinson, B. (2017). Achieving a match between SLA theory and materials development. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *SLA research and materials development for language learning* (pp. 3–22). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tuzcu-Eken, D. (2011). *Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ve İngilizce öğretiminde temel düzey dinleme-anlama etkinliklerinin karşılaştırılması*. (Unpublished MA thesis), İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Uzun, E. (Ed). (2010). *Yeni Hitit 3: Yabancılar için Türkçe ders kitabı*. Ankara: TÖMER-Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Ülker, N. (2007). "Hitit ders kitapları" örneğinde yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde kültür aktarımı sürecine çözümleyici ve değerlendirci bir bakış. (Unpublished MA thesis), İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Ünlü, N. A. (2015). Comparison of the presentation of grammar and grammar exercises in Hitit 1 and Yeni Hitit 1. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (2), 137-150.
- Yağız, O. (2009). Turkish textbooks dialogues and comparable authentic conversations. *Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, 13(1).

Yılmaz, F. (2012). Cultural transmission through teaching Turkish as a foreign language course books. *Turkish Studies*, 7(3), pp.2751-2759.

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yule, G., Matthis, T. & Hopkins, M. (1992). On reporting what was said. *ELT Journal*, 46(3).