# An Analysis of the Speech Act of Request by University Students from Jakarta, Bangka-Belitung, and Pontianak

Murniati
Universitas Bunda Mulia
murniati@bundamulia.ac.id

## Abstract

The aim of this research is to find the request strategies and modifiers used by the students from Jakarta, Bangka-Belitung, and Pontianak while they are making requests. Those three places − Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung − are chosen since the majority of the students come from those three places. It is expected that by understanding students from different origins in making requests, misunderstanding can be avoided. The respondents are 45 students studying in an English Department in a university in Jakarta. 15 of them are from Jakarta, other 15 students are from Pontianak, and the other 15 students are from Bangka-Belitung. The data is collected by delivering a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) to the respondents. The DCT contains 6 scenarios which cover the different powers and social distances. The respondents have to produce a speech act of request of each scenario. The results of this research show that the students from Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung are applying the similar request strategies. Regarding the modifiers used, the students from Bangka - Belitung are using the most external downgraders, followed by the students from Pontianak. When the power is high, none of the students from Jakarta are using the external downgraders while the students from Pontianak and Bangka Belitung use them a lot.

**Keywords**: *speech act of request, modifier*

## 1. Introduction

University students studying in the universities in Jakarta come from different places in Indonesia. During the class, those students from different origins interact with each other. The utterance used to communicate is called as speech act, which is defined by Richards et al. (2002, p. 498) as "an utterance as a functional unit in communication." Speech act can be categorized into several types such as request, permission, complaints, and apologies. The most common speech act uttered in the class is perhaps the speech act of request.

While uttering the speech act of request, the students may use different strategies due to their different cultural backgrounds, even though they are learning the same language functions in the class. Misunderstanding may occur

due to the different application of the strategies of the speech act of request uttered among the students. The misunderstanding may also occur due to the different social distance and power between the speakers and the hearers. In order to avoid the misunderstanding, especially when the speakers are the students and the hearers are the teachers, the students are mapped in accordance to their origins. Therefore, the research question of this research is "How do the university English Department students from Jakarta, Bangka - Belitung, and Pontianak utter the English requests?" The research question is divided into two sub questions as follows:

1. What kinds of request strategies are most frequently used by students from Jakarta, Bangka-Belitung, and Pontianak?
2. What kind of modifications do the students use to soften their requests?

The objective of this research is to find the strategies and modifiers used by the students from different origins while they are making requests. It is expected that by understanding students from different origins in making requests, misunderstanding can be avoided.

The limitation of this research is that it is conducted in the English department in a university in Jakarta. The results cannot be generalized since only 45 students are taking part as the respondents in this study. The scope of this research is that the students are limited to those studying in the English Department of a university from Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung. Those three places – Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung – are chosen since the majority of the students come from those three places.

## 2. Literature Review

Richards et al. (2002, p. 498) define speech act as "an utterance as a functional unit in communication." Several types of speech act include apologies, promises, requests, orders, warnings, etc. The speech act strategies used by one person might be different from ones used by another person. One factor which may affect a person's production of speech act is culture. Ogiermann (2009, p. 23) argues that people who share the same culture may use similar strategies in the distribution of speech act In addition, she also argues that the most common

speech act uttered is request. A request, according to Trosborg (1995, p. 187), "is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker." Brown and Levinson (1992, p. 66) classify the speech act of request as an act that threatens the hearer's negative face want, or "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others". According to Brown and Levinson (1992, pp. 74-77), when doing FTAs, there are three social parameters: namely *social distance*, *power* and *rank of impositions*.

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989, as cited in Jalilifar et al., 2011, p. 791) have proposed a list of nine possible request strategies which consists of direct, conventionally indirect level, and non-conventional.

### a. Direct:

1. "Mood derivable: Utterances in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force" (e.g., *Turn off your cellphone.*).
2. "Performatives: Utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named" (e.g., *I order you to turn off your cellphone.*).
3. "Hedged performatives: Utterances in which naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions" (e.g., *I would like to ask you to turn off your cellphone.*).
4. "Obligation statements: Utterances which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act" (e.g., *You must submit your assignment tomorrow.*).
5. "Want statements: Utterances which state the speaker's desire that the hearer carries out the act" (e.g., *I want you to open the door for me.*).

### b. Conventionally indirect level:

6. "Suggestory formulae: Utterances which contain a suggestion to do something" (e.g., *Why don't you take out the garbage?*).
7. "Query-preparatory: Utterances containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g., ability, willingness) as conventionalized in any specific language" (e.g., *Could you turn off the AC?*).

**c.  Non-conventionally indirect level:**

8.  "Strong hints: Utterances containing partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act" (e.g., *This music is very loud.*).

9.  "Mild hints: Utterances that make no reference to the request proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as requests by context" (e.g., *I'm married* (in response to a man trying to flirt with a woman)).

Trosborg (1995, pp. 209-214) classifies internal downgraders into two main types. First is syntactic downgraders, and the second is the lexical/phrasal downgraders. The syntactic downgraders are classified into (1) questions, (2) past tense, (3) taq questions, (4) conditional clause, (5) embedding, (6) ing-form, and (7) modals. The lexical/phrasal downgraders are specified into (1) politeness markers, (2) consultative device, (3) downtoner, (4) understatement, (5) hedge, (6) hesitator, and (7) interpersonal marker.

Trosborg (1995, pp. 215-219) also divides the external modifications into (1) preparators, (2) disarmers, (3) sweeteners, (4) supportive reasons, (5) cost minimizing, and (6) promise of rewards.


## 3. Research Methodology
### 3.1. Data

The data is gained from questionnaires distributed to 45 university students studying in the English Department. The students have already learned different ways to express requests in English in the class. There are six scenarios included in the questionnaires with different power and social distance in each scenario. Basically, the questionnaire is in the form of a discourse completion test as suggested by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984, p. 198). It is hoped that with the different power and social distance between the speakers in each of the scenario, the students would complete the discourse completion test using different request strategies.

### 3.2. Data Collection Procedures

First, there is a mini survey in all classes in the English Department in the university. From more or less 250 active students, 29 students are from Bangka - Belitung and 15 of them are from Pontianak. Only 35 students are from other regions such as Medan (2 students), Bandung (1 student), Surabaya (2 students), Bogor (3 students), Tangerang (10 students), and Bekasi (11 students). The rest of the students are from Jakarta. For that reasons, it is decided that students which are going to take part in his study are from Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung. Only 15 students from each region should take part in this study. Those students whose origins are from Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung are being asked whether they are willing to take part as respondents in this research or not. All of them are willing to take part, then, the questionnaires are delivered to those 45 students. After that, all of the students write down how they would respond to each scenario. Finally, the data for this study is available.

### 3.3. Data Analysis

Once the questionnaires have already been ready, the questionnaires are being analyzed. First, the data is grouped based on the scenario. In each scenario, the request strategies are analyzed. Both the direct and indirect requests are analyzed. The results are presented in the form of tables. After all of the request strategies are found, the internal and external modifications are analyzed. The results are also presented in the form of tables by comparing the results of those three regions. Finally, the request strategies and modification can be analyzed.

### 4. Findings and Discussions

As mentioned earlier, there have been six scenarios in the questionnaires. The findings of the study are going to be presented by comparing the result from each region in each scenario. This section presents the results of DCT in each scenario, in terms of the request strategies and modifying devices used by the three groups of students. The analysis is also related to the social distance and power variables in relation to the production of the requests.

**4.1. Scenario 1**

Below is scenario 1 in the questionnaires:

"You are a college student. You forget to bring a pen. You want to borrow it from a close friend of yours".

As can be seen, the speaker and the hearer are both college students who know each other well. It means that the power in this scenario is **equal** and the social distance is **close**. The results of the request strategies used by the students from Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung can be seen in the tables below.

| | | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka-Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Direct level** | | | | |
| 1. | Mood derivable | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Want statements | 2 | - | 3 |
| **Total** | | **6** | **2** | **4** |
| **a) Conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 3. | Query-preparatory | 8 | 10 | 10 |
| **Total** | | **8** | **10** | **10** |
| **b) Non- conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 4. | Strong hints | 1 | - | 1 |
| 5. | Mild hints | - | 3 | 1 |
| **Total** | | **1** | **3** | **2** |

Table 1. Request strategies in scenario 1

As can be seen in the table, among 15 students, more than 50% are using the query –preparatory request strategies. The results are similar between the three regions. What makes it a bit different is that the students from Jakarta are using more direct strategies than students from Pontianak and Bangka - Belitung. On the other hands, students from Jakarta used less non-conventionally indirect strategies.

In order that the request strategies are softened, the students are using modifications. The results can be seen in the table below.

| | | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Syntactic Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Questions | 9 | 10 | 10 |
| 2. | Conditional clauses | - | - | 1 |

| Total | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Internal Downgraders: Lexical / phrasal downgraders:** | | | |
| 3. Politeness Markers | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4. Consultative device | 1 | - | 1 |
| 5. Understatement | 1 | - | 1 |
| 6. Interpersonal Markers | - | - | 5 |
| **Total** | **3** | **1** | **9** |
| **External Downgraders:** | | | |
| 7. Preparators | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 8. Disarmers | - | - | 1 |
| 9. Sweeteners | - | - | 3 |
| 10. Supportive reasons | - | 5 | 7 |
| **Total** | **1** | **10** | **15** |

Table 2. Modifications used in scenario 1

As can be seen in the table above, almost all of the students from all regions are using questions to 'lower down" the effect of the request. They use questions. What makes it different is the lexical / phrasal downgraders. When the students have equal position and the social distance is close, the students from Bangka and Belitung are using almost all of them. The numbers of the downgraders used are also higher than any other used in other regions.

### 4.2. Scenario 2

Below is scenario 2 from the questionnaire.

"You are a college student. You forget to bring a pen. You want to borrow the pen from another students sitting next to you. You don't really know that student well."

In scenario 2, the power is equal since the speaker and hearer are both students. Since they are sitting next to each other, it can be inferred that they are from the same class. The social distance is distant since they do not really know each other. The results of the request strategies used in scenario 2 can be seen in the table below.

|  | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka-Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Conventionally indirect level** | | | |
| 1. Query-preparatory | 15 | 12 | 14 |
| **Total** | **15** | **12** | **14** |
| **b) Non- conventionally indirect level** | | | |
| 2. Mild hints | - | 3 | 1 |
| **Total** | **0** | **3** | **1** |

Table 3. Request strategies in scenario 2

Unlike the previous number, in this scenario, almost all of the students are using indirect strategies. The difference is that the students from Pontianak use hints to make the request. It happens perhaps in the situation when the social distant is not really close, so they do not use direct strategies. The social distant might also contribute to the usage of modifications as can be seen in the table below.

|  | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Syntactic Downgraders:** | | | |
| 1 Questions | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| 4 Conditional clauses | - | 2 | 1 |
| **Total** | **12** | **14** | **12** |
| **Internal Downgraders: Lexical / phrasal downgraders:** | | | |
| 1 Politeness Markers | 4 | - | 2 |
| 2 Consultative device | 2 | - | 1 |
| 6 Hesitator | 1 | - | - |
| 7 Interpersonal Markers | 2 | - | 5 |
| **Total** | **9** | **0** | **8** |
| **External Downgraders:** | | | |
| 1 Preparators | - | 7 | 9 |
| 2 Disarmers | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 Sweeteners | - | - | 1 |
| 4 Supportive reasons | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| 5 Promise of rewards | - | - | 1 |
| **Total** | **3** | **15** | **20** |

Table 4. Modifications used in scenario 2

As summarized in the table above, the students from Jakarta use the most internal modifications, which contains of the syntactic and lexical downgraders, when the social distance is not close and the power is equal. The students from Pontianak, however, do not use the lexical / phrasal downgraders. Instead, they prefer to use

the external downgraders, not the internal ones. The students from Bangka apply the external downgraders a lot. They also use the internal downgraders.

### 4.3. Scenario 3

The situation in scenario 3 can be seen below.

"You are a student living with your parents. You want to ask some money from your mother, because you have no more money."

The power is low since the hearer is much older and the social distance is close since the relationship is between a parent and a child. The strategies used are summarized in the table below.

|  |  | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka-Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Direct level** | | | | |
| 1. | Mood derivable | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2. | Want statements | 3 | - | - |
| **Total** | | **4** | **1** | **2** |
| **b) Conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 3. | Query-preparatory | 10 | 12 | 10 |
| **Total** | | **10** | **12** | **10** |
| **c) Non- conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 5. | Strong hints | 1 | - | 1 |
| 6. | Mild hints | - | 2 | 2 |
| **Total** | | **1** | **2** | **3** |

Table 5. Request strategies in scenario 3

In Table 5 above, from 15 students, 4 students from Jakarta use direct strategies when the power is low and the social distance is close. Almost all of the students are using indirect request strategies. In short, almost all of the students apply the similar strategies. What make it different lay on the modification as can be seen in the table below.

|  |  | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Syntactic Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Questions | 12 | 12 | 9 |
| 4. | Conditional clauses | - | 1 | 1 |
| 5. | Embedding | - | - | 2 |

| Total | 12 | 13 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Internal Downgraders: Lexical / phrasal downgraders:** | | | |
| 1. Politeness Markers | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 2. Consultative device | 2 | - | 1 |
| 7. Interpersonal Markers | - | - | 5 |
| **Total** | **6** | **4** | **8** |
| **External Downgraders:** | | | |
| 1. Preparators | - | 3 | 3 |
| 2. Disarmers | 1 | - | 2 |
| 3. Sweeteners | - | - | 3 |
| 4. Supportive reasons | 5 | 10 | 6 |
| 5. Promise of rewards | - | - | 1 |
| **Total** | **6** | **13** | **15** |

Table 6. Modifications used in scenario 3

Regarding the syntactic downgraders, all of the students prefer to use the questions. In short, in relation to internal downgraders, they also use similar downgraders. However, when it comes to external downgraders, the modifications applied are quite different from one group of students to others. The students from Bangka use the most kind of modifications. They prepare for the "introduction" before making the request, such as, "are you busy?". They also apply the disarmers, such as "I am sorry to bother you…". The sweeteners are also used together with the supportive reasons and promise of rewards. It is interesting that 67% of the students from Pontianak use reasons to soften their request while the students from Jakarta and Bangka - Belitung have used reasons as well, but not too many as students from Pontianak use them.

### 4.4. Scenario 4

The scenario is as follows:

"You are a college student. You have to collect the assignment term paper. Unfortunately, the file has been corrupted. You ask for an extension on your paper to the lecturer".

The speaker is the students who cannot collect the paper. The power is low and the social distance is distance. The table below summarizes the request strategies used by the three groups of students.

| | | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka-Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Direct level** | | | | |
| 1. | Mood derivable | 1 | - | - |
| 2. | Hedged performatives | 2 | - | 1 |
| 3. | Want statements | - | 1 | - |
| **Total** | | **3** | **1** | **1** |
| **b) Conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 4. | Query-preparatory | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| **Total** | | **12** | **13** | **14** |
| **c) Non- conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 5. | Strong hints | - | - | - |
| 6. | Mild hints | - | 1 | - |
| **Total** | | **0** | **1** | **0** |

Table 7. Request strategies in scenario 4

The situation actually allow the students to use more indirect strategies since the speaker is kind of "making a mistake" to the hearer and the hearer is a respectful person. 20% of the students from Jakarta unfortunately are using the direct strategies while the group from Bangka - Belitung and Pontianak are not using the direct strategies too much, only 10 % of them. The rest are using the expected strategies, which is the indirect strategies. In general, they are applying the query preparatory strategy.

Those strategies are softened several times by the students from Bangka - Belitung. The results are summarized in the following table.

| | | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Syntactic Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Questions | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| 2. | Conditional clauses | - | 1 | - |
| 3. | Embedding | 1 | - | - |
| **Total** | | **12** | **13** | **10** |
| **Internal Downgraders: Lexical / phrasal downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Politeness Markers | 1 | - | - |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | Consultative device | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 3. | Downtoner | - | 2 | - |
| 4. | Understatement | 1 | - | 1 |
| 5. | Hedge | - | - | 1 |
| 6. | Hesitator | - | - | 1 |
| 7. | Interpersonal Markers | - | 1 | 1 |
| **Total** | | **4** | **4** | **6** |
| **External Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Preparators | - | 4 | 4 |
| 2. | Disarmers | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. | Sweeteners | - | - | 2 |
| 4. | Supportive reasons | 12 | 12 | 10 |
| 5. | Promise of rewards | - | - | 1 |
| **Total** | | **14** | **23** | **25** |

Table 8. modifications used in scenario 4

As can be seen, the students from Bangka - Belitung are using the most modifier devices. It ranges from the questions – the internal modifier which is used by the students from the three places – to other internal and external modifiers. The students from Jakarta do not use too many modifiers. One interesting thing is that almost all of the students from those three places use the supportive reasons to mitigate their request to their lecturers.

**4.5. Scenario 5**

The situation in scenario 5 is "You are a senior college student. One day during an important meeting with the freshmen about the students' activity, one of the freshman's mobile phone rings. You ask that freshman whom you know well to turn off the mobile phone." In this scenario, the power is high since the speaker is the senior and the hearer is the freshman. The social distance is close since both the speaker and hearer are students in a meeting. The request strategies can be seen in the table below.

| | | **Jakarta** | **Pontianak** | **Bangka-Belitung** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Direct level** | | | | |
| 1. | Mood derivable | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| 2. | Hedged performatives | 1 | - | - |

| Total | 10 | 7 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **b) Conventionally indirect level** | | | |
| 3. Query-preparatory | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| **Total** | **5** | **7** | **7** |
| **c) Non- conventionally indirect level** | | | |
| 4. Mild hints | - | 1 | 1 |
| **Total** | **0** | **1** | **1** |

Table 9. Request strategies in scenario 5

Unlike the previous strategies, this time, direct request strategy is preferably used. The students are using the mood derivative, such as "turn off your hand phone". It is followed by the query preparatory as the second mostly used strategy.

Similar to the previous scenario, the students from Bangka - Belitung is mitigating the request a lot by applying both internal and external modifiers. The students from Pontianak also soften the request while the students from Jakarta did not apply the modifier a lot. Due to the setting which is in a meeting, the three groups of students preferably use the politeness marker, such as "please". The overall results are summarized in the table below.

| | | **Jakarta** | **Pontianak** | **Bangka Belitung** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Syntactic Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1 | Questions | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| 2 | Conditional clauses | - | 2 | - |
| **Total** | | **9** | **10** | **7** |
| **b) Internal Downgraders: Lexical / phrasal downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1 | Politeness Markers | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| 2 | Consultative device | 2 | - | - |
| 3 | Understatement | - | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | Hesitator | - | - | 2 |
| 5 | Interpersonal Markers | - | 1 | 3 |
| **Total** | | **9** | **8** | **8** |
| **c) External Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1 | Preparators | - | 4 | 2 |
| 2 | Disarmers | - | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | Sweeteners | - | - | 1 |
| 4 | Supportive reasons | - | 4 | 3 |
| **Total** | | **0** | **9** | **8** |

Table 10. Modifications used in scenario 5

**4.6. Scenario 6**

Finally, below is the situation in scenario 6.

"You are a senior college student. One day during an important meeting with the freshmen about the students' activity, one of the freshman's mobile phone rings. You ask that freshman whom you do not know well to turn off the mobile phone".

The power is high since they do not know each other and the social distance is distant. The results of the request strategies can be seen in the table below.

| | | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka-Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **a) Direct level** | | | | |
| 1. | Mood derivable | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 2. | Hedged performatives | 2 | - | - |
| **Total** | | **5** | **5** | **5** |
| **b) Conventionally indirect level** | | | | |
| 3. | Query-preparatory | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| **Total** | | **10** | **10** | **10** |

Table 11. Request strategies in scenario 6

Similar to the previous scenario, this time the students are also using direct request strategies, although not as too many used as the previous scenario. The query preparatory is still preferably chosen. The results of the three groups of students are similar.

The following table presents the results of the modifiers used by the students when the power is high and the social distance is distant.

| | | Jakarta | Pontianak | Bangka Belitung |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Syntactic Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Questions | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| 2. | Conditional clauses | - | 1 | - |
| **Total** | | **10** | **10** | **10** |
| **Internal Downgraders: Lexical / phrasal downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Politeness Markers | 8 | 8 | 5 |
| 2. | Consultative device | 3 | 1 | - |
| 3. | Understatement | - | 1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Hesitator | - | - | 2 |
| 5. | Interpersonal Markers | - | 1 | 2 |
| **Total** | | **11** | **11** | **10** |
| **External Downgraders:** | | | | |
| 1. | Preparators | - | 4 | 2 |
| 2. | Disarmers | - | 2 | 3 |
| 3. | Supportive reasons | - | 7 | 4 |
| 4. | Promise of rewards | - | - | 1 |
| **Total** | | **0** | **13** | **10** |

Table 4.12. modifications used in scenario 6

To soften the request, almost all of the students prefer the internal downgraders of questions. What make it different is that the students from Pontianak and Bangka - Belitung are using many internal downgraders than the students from Jakarta.

## 5. Conclusion

To conclude, there are two aspects to compare between the three groups of students while making requests. First, almost of the students are using query preparatory which is an indirect strategy while making a request. They use a request such as "Can you help me?" Most of the students are using direct strategies when the social distance is close. In short, the students from Jakarta, Pontianak, and Bangka - Belitung are applying the similar request strategies. The second aspect to be compared is regarding the modifiers used. The students from Bangka - Belitung are using the most external downgraders, followed by the students from Pontianak. When the power is high, none of the students from Jakarta are using the external downgraders while the students from Pontianak and Bangka Belitung use them a lot. It must be noted that the results presented and the conclusion made are based on mini research conducted with 45 participants. Should the participants are bigger in number; the results of the research might be different from the ones presented here.

# References

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

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1992). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jalilifar, A. et al. (2011). A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' request strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research 2*(4), 790-803. Retrived from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/jltr/article/view/0204790803/3212>

Ogiermann, E., (2009)*. On apologising in negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Richards, J.C. et al. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

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