

REQUESTING STRATEGIES OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM STUDENTS AT JAMBI UNIVERSITY

Irfan Fikri

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University
(irfanfikri19@gmail.com)

Yulhenli Thabran

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University
(academic.matters@outlook.com)

Melati

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University
(melatijaya3108@gmail.com)

Abstract

Request is one type of speech act where the speaker asks for help towards the hearer. This research aimed to find out; (1) what request strategies are used by the participants and (2) what politeness markers are used by the participants. Six students were chosen based on their discourse analysis score in fifth semester. Intrinsic case study was chosen as research design and the data were collected from open role-play situation given to the participants. The result showed that all of the participants frequently employed conventional indirect request and they mostly used external request modifications rather than internal request modifications.

However, some of the participants did not use request properly and they were transferring their source language (L1) to target language (L2) while doing the role-play due to the lack of pragmatic competence. Therefore, the lecturer needs to teach more about pragmatic competence to the students so they can step up their pragmatic knowledge.

Key words: Speech act; Request; Politeness

1. INTRODUCTION

As a social being, people interact with others to fulfill their social need by using any kinds of communication every day. They can communicate with another person by directly talking to that person, making a phone call or video call, sending an e-mail, etc. While they are communicating with others, there is always a conversation happen on it. Sometimes people use non-verbal communication too, for expressing what they want. Regardless of how people are communicating with others, there are always speech acts occur in a conversation, such as requesting, greeting, promising, apologizing, etc. A certain situation is required to do a specific speech act. For example, you want to read a book in a bookstore, but you cannot reach it because it is on the top of the shelf, so you will call clerk and make a request to that clerk to take that book.

Making a request is one of the important acts in our daily life. People see it as a panel where they enhance their social relationship with others. There are three types of requests; direct, conventional indirect, and non-conventional indirect (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The speaker can choose one of these types depends on the speaker's social distance, power, and rank towards the hearer. However, the speaker needs to choose one of these types of requests properly, because it can affect the politeness degree of the speaker's utterance, means that it can be considered as polite or impolite by the hearer. According to Cruse (2006, p.131),

politeness is a matter of minimizing the negative effects of what one says on the feelings of others and maximizing the positive effects, which are known as negative politeness and positive politeness. Politeness deals with ideas like being tactful, modest and nice to other people which we have to consider someone's *face* (Yule, 2010).

This research aims on what request strategies are used by six students of English Education Study Program in Jambi University and what politeness markers are used by them in making requests.

1.1 Speech act of request

Searle (1979) put request as a directive speech act. Searle (*Ibid*, p.44) also points out four conditions of doing request; (i) preparatory condition, where the hearer is able to perform act that given from the speaker or A, (ii) sincerity condition, where the speaker wants the hearer to do A, (iii) propositional content condition, where the speaker predicates a future act A of the hearer, and (iv) essential condition, where it counts as an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer to do A.

Requests consist of two parts, which are the core request or head act and the peripheral elements. The core request is the main utterance of a request which has the function of requesting and it can stand by itself without any peripheral elements. However, in most cases, core requests are either followed and/or preceded by peripheral elements, such as hedges, boosters, and address forms (Reiter, 2000, p.36). These peripheral elements can be defined as external modification and internal modification in request strategies.

Based on Brown and Levinson's (1987, p.68-70) strategies for avoiding Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs), requests can be classified into three types; direct, conventional indirect, and non-conventional indirect request. The first type, direct request, the speaker makes request clearly, directly, unambiguously without any redressive action. The second type, which is conventional indirect request, the speaker requests the hearer indirectly to do a particular act by questioning the hearer's ability to do that act. And the last type, non-conventional indirect request, the speaker only gives a hint and let the hearer interprets it.

A number of sub-strategies of request are proposed by Blum-Kulka et al (1989) called the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). The sub-strategies of request are:

- 1) Mood derivable: where the grammatical mood of the locution conventionally determines its illocutionary force, e.g.,: the imperative.
- 2) Explicit performative: where the illocutionary intent is explicitly named by the speaker by using a relevant illocutionary verb, e.g.,: I am *asking* you to...
- 3) Hedged performative: where the illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified, e.g.,: I *must/have to ask* you to...
- 4) Locution derivable/Obligation statement: where the illocutionary intent is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the locution, e.g.,: You *will have to/should/must/ought to*...
- 5) Want statement: where the utterance expresses the speaker's desire that the event denoted in the proposition come about, e.g.,: I *would like* to...
- 6) Suggestory formula: the sentence contains a suggestion to the hearer, e.g.,: *how about/why don't* you cleaning up the kitchen?
- 7) Query preparatory: the utterance contains reference to a preparatory condition (ability, willingness, or the possibility of the act being performed) as conventionalized in a given language, e.g.,: *Can* I borrow your pen?

- 8) Strong hint: the utterance which the locution refers to relevant elements of the intended illocutionary act, e.g.,: Will you be going home now? (Intent: getting a lift home)
- 9) Mild hint: the utterance that make no reference to the request proper or any of its element but is interpretable through the context as request, e.g.,: I'm thirsty (Intent: the speaker wants the hearer to give a drink to him/her).

These coding scheme provide a suitable framework for this research and will be used to classify requests by subjects.

1.2 Politeness strategy

Of all the politeness theory proposed by a number of scholars, the politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) seems to be the most influential theories of politeness. They assume that all competent adult members in a society are concerned about their 'face', and it can be distinguished into two types of face wants; positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to an individual's desire to be accepted and valued by others, while negative face is an individual's desire to have the freedom to act without being unimpeded (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Brown and Levinson's key concept regarding face is Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), which means that "certain kinds of acts intrinsically threaten face, namely those acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p.65). They assume that people will try to minimize or avoid the Face Threatening Act (FTA), because a certain kind of speech act may damage the speaker's face, or the hearer's face, or maybe both. For example, requesting, along with ordering, threatening, suggesting and advising are examples of speech acts which represent the threat to 'negative face', because "the speaker will be putting some pressure to the addressee to do or refrain from doing a specific act" (Reiter, 2000, p.13)

In order to avoid or minimize such face-threatening activities, Brown and Levinson propose politeness strategies. Those strategies are evaluated from three social variables namely social distance of the speaker and the hearer (D), relative power of the speaker and the hearer (P), and the absolute ranking of imposition (R) (Fukushima, 2003). The strategies are:

- 1) *Bald-on record strategy*: This strategy happens when someone performed a FTA "in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible" (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p.68-69). (e.g., the imperative: Clean up this mess).
- 2) *Positive politeness strategy*: This strategy is used by the hearer to build a good relationship and please the hearer by giving compliments, using honorifics, informal words, and jokes.
- 3) *Negative politeness strategy*: This strategy is oriented mainly toward hearer's negative face, like using formal language and apologizing in order to respect the hearer.
- 4) *Off-record strategy*: This strategy uses indirect language (hints) by the speakers if the risk of losing 'face' is great.
- 5) *Don't do the FTA*: In this strategy, the speaker will not say anything because the risk of face loss is too great.

2. METHOD

2.1 Subject

The subject under this research are 6 students who were studying at English Education Study Program in Jambi University. These six students are divided into three groups based on their discourse analysis score from their third year (fifth semester):

- 1) Students who got A score in discourse analysis will be categorized as high discourse analysis (DA) score students (2 students). The students in this group will be categorized as S1 and S2.
- 2) Students who got B or B+ score in discourse analysis will be categorized as average DA score students (2 students). The students in this group will be categorized as S3 and S4.
- 3) Students who got C or C+ score in discourse analysis will be categorized as low DA score students (2 students). The students in this group will be categorized as S5 and S6.

Note that the names uttered by the participants in the dialogue is not the real name of the participants. Instead, it is the pseudonym used by them to protect their real names.

2.2 Method of data collection

The data were collected by means of open role-play. 6 situation were chosen and it was adapted from Hassall's (1999) and Reiter's (2000) research. The situations were classified according to three social variables proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), which are social distance of the speaker and the hearer (D), relative power of the speaker and the hearer (P), and the absolute ranking of imposition (R) (see Appendix B for a complete list of role-play situation). All role-plays were video recorded.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

33 requests strategies were yielded from six situations of open role-play and these six participants were mostly used conventionally indirect requests (45.45%) and direct requests (45.45%), followed by non-conventional indirect requests (9.09%), as outlined in Table 1.

Level of Directness	Strategies	Number (%)
Direct Request	Mood Derivable	3 (9.09%)
	Explicit Performative	1 (3.03%)
	Hedged Performative	1 (3.03%)
	Locution Derivable / Obligation Statement	3 (9.09%)
	Want Statement	7 (21.21%)
Conventional Indirect Request	Suggestory Formulae	1 (3.03%)
	Query Preparatory	14 (42.42%)
Non-conventional Indirect Request	Strong Hint	3 (9.09%)
	Mild Hint	-
Total		33

Table 1. Findings on request strategies

For the politeness markers, the participants employed various types of politeness markers or request modifications. Based on six situations given to them, the participants used 35 request modifications, which are 27 external modifications and 8 internal modifications, as illustrated in Table 2.

Request Modification	Name	Number
External Modification	Preparator	7
	Reason/Grounder	7
	Disarmer	1
	Promise	2
	IFID/Apology	10
Internal Modification	Downtoner	1
	Cajoler	2
	Politeness Marker	4
	Appealer	1
Total		35

Table 2. Findings on request modifications

3.1 Direct request

This strategy is the second most preferred strategy by the participants, with 15 out of 33 request strategies (45.45%) uttered by the participants. Each of the group participants (high, average, and low DA score students) employed this strategy 5 times. The participants strongly favor the direct sub-strategy called want statements (7 times), followed by mood derivable (3 times), obligation statements (3 times), explicit performative (1 time) and hedged performative (1 time).

The participants employed direct request strategy when the speaker has higher social status/social power than the hearer, like situation 5 (example 1) and situation 6 (example 2), and it is also shown that the participants employed this strategy when the speaker has equal social status with the hearer, like situation 2 (example 3) and situation 3 (example 4).

Example 1: Speaker is a parent, and s/he asks his/her child to buy something at grocery store

S6 : uhh Vina come here

S5 : yes mom?

S6 : uhh I want to () (.) to cook for our lunch
but uhh **I want you: to buy (.) something for me**

S5 : what ma'am?

In example 1, it is shown that S6 employed the direct sub-strategy hedged performative. S6 asked S5 to perform something, which is to buy something at the grocery store since S6 stated earlier that she wanted to cook something.

Example 2: Speaker bought a pair of shoes, but it's oversized and s/he asks the manager to allow him/her to exchange the shoes

S1 : uhh you just bought it from (.) our () from our

stands
S2 : yea:h
S1 : and you carefully see the prices and you see the sizes before you bought it
S2 : ((*inhales*)) yeah I see it carefully but I don't know
S1 : so what kind of problem ((*falsetto*)) do you have right now
S2 : I didn't know it () (.) happened (0,1)
S1 : no you just bought it and (.) it is not (.) the right now you can't (.) ()
S2 : ((*inhales*)) uhh () (.) **I'm standing here (0,1) to ask you a favor for a new (.) one (0,1) with my size**

In example 2, S2 used direct sub-strategy explicit performative towards S1. At first, S2 asked kindly to S1 if she could change her shoes she bought because it's oversized, but S1 refused it. Therefore, since the speaker in this situation has higher social power than the hearer, S2 asked to S1 explicitly to change the oversize shoes.

Example 3: Speaker asks bus passenger to turn down his/her smartphone's volume

S2 : sir sir excuse me sir
(.)
S1 : eh what's up?
S2 : can you please turn down the volume? Because it's uhh
S1 : oh (.) what volume? Volume of my (.) handphone?
S2 : yes it's annoy
S1 : but I really like this song I want to enjoy it so I (.) I: I turn up the volume
S2 : uhh you know (0,1) it's public place (.) you your music disturbing others so **please turn down**
S1 : uhh () it's my right uhh: it's my handphone

In example 3, S2 employed mood derivable strategy. Before S2 employed mood derivable strategy, she asked S1 to turn down his smartphone's volume by using query preparatory strategy (can you please turn down the volume) but S1 refused to turn down his smartphone's volume. Thus, S2 asked S1 more directly the second time by using mood derivable strategy.

Example 4: Speaker asks his/her friend to help his/her assignment

S3 : I haven't done my assignment and **you SHOULD help me**
S4 : heh that's your problem (.) no I don't wanna help you
S3 : WHY YOU SO MEAN? ((*falsetto*)) come on help me
S4 : no:::
(0,1)
S3 : fine
S4 : ((*laughs*)) oh no no no no I'm just kidding okay I'll help you
S3 : okay

In example 4, S3 used locution derivable/obligation statement strategy. Since the social power between interlocutors are same, S3 used obligation statement towards S4.

However, S4 refused it at first since S3 suddenly asked for a help directly, but later S4 helped S3 and she was joking not to help S3.

The participants, however, used this strategy in situation 4, where the speaker has lower social power than the hearer but the distance between the speaker and the hearer are close (example 5).

Example 5: Speaker asks his/her parent to buy him/her something

S4 : mo:::m (.) mom **I want a new mobile phone**
S3 : what's wrong with your old mobile?
S4 : THIS IS OLD and I want a new one:
S3 : it's a no:
S4 : oh please mom plea::se **please buy me one buy me new one**
S3 : not until you get to high school

It appears that the speaker believed that the hearer will go along with the speaker's request regardless the social power. Ervin-Tripp (1976, as cited in Reiter, 2000, p.104) stated that based on the result of her research, requests between family and friends tend to be more direct than those between strangers. Thus, the researcher pointed out that the use of direct request strategies by these participants is motivated by an interplay between social power and social status without any considerations for the degree of imposition.

3.2 Conventional indirect request

This is the most preferred request strategy by the 6 participants of this research, with 15 out of 33 request strategies (45.45%) employed by the participants. Although it has the same percentage with direct request, one of the conventional indirect request strategies, query preparatory, has been employed by the participants with enormous 14 times (42.42%), followed by suggestory formulae 1 time (3.03%). The following are some examples of conventional indirect request uttered by the participants:

Example 6: Student asks lecturer to borrow his/her book

S1 : () ma'am uhh () you before uhh about the books (.) uhh actually (.) I'm really sorry to buy you (.) to bother you (.) uhh second point I would like to borrow some kind of books that I think that you have because I want to use it for my projects (.) **would you like (0.1) to borrow it (.) for me?**
S2 : ooh oh so you're the one who text me yesterday (.) sure meet me: at 9 am (.) tomorrow in my office

Since the hearer, in the example above is S2, has higher power than S1, S1 employed query preparatory to ask whether or not S2 are willing to borrow her books to S1.

Example 7: Speaker asks bus passenger to turn down his/her smartphone's volume

S4 : sorry miss
S3 : yeah? what's up?
S4 : uhh **could you please turn down your mobile phone's (.) volume?** because (.) I found it disturbing ()
S3 : okay sure I'm sorry

Although S4 has equal social power with S3 in this situation, S4 preferred using query preparatory rather than direct strategy. It seems that S4 realized if she used direct request towards S3, it might damage S3's negative face, which is why S4 employed query preparatory strategy.

3.3 Non-conventional indirect request

This is the least frequently used strategy by the participants of this research, with only 3 out of 33 request strategies (9.09%) found by the researcher in form of strong hint strategies. The following are the examples of non-conventional indirect request employed by the participants:

Example 8: Speaker asks his/her parent to buy him/her something

S2 : dad (.) uhh: **I think I need (0,1) a pair of (.) a=**
 S1 : ()
 S2 : **=new pair of shoes**
 S1 : shoes?
 S2 : yea::h
 S1 : you mean a shoes?
 S2 : yeah my shoes (.) () broken

Example 9: Speaker asks his/her friend to help his/her assignment

S5 : Vina (.)
 S6 : yes?
 S5 : I can't do my assignment (.) **this is very difficult for me**
 S6 : uhh so: if (.) your assignment is difficult for you so what you what should you do?

Example 10: Speaker bought a pair of shoes, but it's oversized and s/he asks the manager to allow him/her to exchange the shoes

S5 : umm sorry miss
 S6 : yes?
 S5 : **I bought these shoes yesterday but it's (.) oversized for me**
 S6 : mm hmm (0,1) uhh so (.) you want to (.) change your size?

Those 3 examples have similar rank of impositions, which are high rank of impositions. It explained why high and low DA score used strong hint because they did not want to hurt the hearer's negative face and losing their own face since those situations have high rank of impositions. It was related with Brown and Levinson's (1987) face saving theories "off-record", where the speaker sends "hint" towards the hearer since the risks of losing face and hurting the hearer's face are high and thus let the hearer interprets it.

3.4 Discussions

The findings obtained in this research show that these six participants preferred using conventional indirect request than any other request strategies. The reason why the participants of this research preferred using this request strategy is because they wanted to balance clarity and non-coerciveness in their request, thus ensuring that their utterances will have the correct interpretation and the right impact towards the hearer.

The findings also show that these six participants employed direct request strategies not only when they were having the higher or equal social power than the hearer, but also when the distance between the speaker and the hearer were close (situation 4). It appears that the speaker committed to belief that the hearer will comply with the speaker's request since the distance between the interlocutors were close. These participants were also using request modifications, mostly external request modification, in every situation given to them to mitigate the request act.

As for the politeness markers, the participants mostly used negative politeness strategies. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), negative politeness strategies are intended by the speaker to avoid giving offense towards the hearer's negative face by showing deference. It can be seen from the findings that the participants preferred using query preparatory strategies, where the speaker asks the ability or willingness of the hearer first to perform the act given by the speaker. Another reason why the participants used negative politeness strategies is they employed external request modification IFID before or after the request act to mitigate the impact of the request act. It seems the participants realized that they might hurt the hearer's negative face, thus they used query preparatory and IFID to minimize the damage towards hearer's negative face.

Another politeness strategies employed by the participants are bald-on record, positive politeness and off-record strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that bald-on record happens when someone performed a FTA in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible. This strategy employed by high DA score students in situation 2, 4 and 6, while average DA score students employed it in situation 3, 4 and 5 and low DA score students employed this strategy in situation 4 and 5. It can be seen that the participants used bald-on record strategy when the speaker has more social power than the hearer (situation 5 and 6) or the speaker has equal social power with the hearer (situation 2 and 3) or when the interlocutors are known or closed with each other (situation 4).

Positive politeness strategies dealt with positive face of the hearer where the speaker uses compliments, honorifics, jokes, politeness marker *please* and informal words (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The participants employed this strategy by using honorifics (used by all of the participants in situation 1), politeness marker *please*, giving compliment (employed by high DA score students in situation 3) and making joke (employed by average DA score students in situation 3).

Meanwhile, off-record strategy employed by the speaker by giving a hint towards the hearer if the risk of losing 'face' is great (Brown and Levinson, *ibid*). This is the least politeness strategy used by participants, only high DA score students (situation 4) and low DA score students (situation 3 and situation 6) used this strategy by employing strong hints.

All of the participants, however, made a mistake while uttering a request in situation 1 (student asks lecturer to borrow his/her book). Low DA score students employed query preparatory strategy in this situation (example 11), but it is inappropriate since the student suddenly asked the lecturer to borrow her book without any supportive move/clause preceded or followed the request act employed by S5.

Example 11: Student asks lecturer to borrow his/her book

S5 : uhh excuse me ma'am
S6 : yes
S5 : uhh **can I borrow your book**
S6 : what kind of book that you want to borrow
S5 : uhh I want (.) to: borrow your book (.) discourse
analysis ma'am

Meanwhile, average DA score students made a mistake in their request utterance (example 12), where S3 (average DA score 1) said "I wanna borrow your book".

Example 12: Student asks lecturer to borrow his/her book

S3 : excuse me ma'am sorry for disturbing your time
S4 : okay what is it goin'
S3 : uhh (.) I need some references for my research
ma'am and (.) I found it hard to find (.) so **I wanna
borrow your (.) book** (.) can I
S4 : oh really umm (0,1) su:re meet me: (.) next (.) ye
(.) next week maybe

Although S3 used several request modification to mitigate the request act, it is still inappropriate to use casual/informal word *wanna* to the hearer, in this case is S4, which has more social power than S3.

On the other hand, high DA score students made a slight mistake when S1 (high DA score student 1) deployed his second request strategy (example 13). At first, S1 deployed the first request strategy, want statement (I would like to borrow) and then S1 deployed the second request strategy, query preparatory (would you like to borrow it for me?). S1 used the same infinitive between the first request and second request, which is to borrow. It is better if S1 used "to lend" rather than "to borrow" in his second request strategy.

Example 13: Student asks lecturer to borrow his/her book

H1 : () ma'am uhh () you before uhh about the
books (.) uhh actually (.) I'm really sorry to buy
you (.) to bother you (.) uhh second point **I would
like to borrow some kind of books** that I think that
you have because I want to use it for my projects
(.) **would you like (0.1) to borrow it (.) for me?**
H2 : ooh oh so you're the one who text me yesterday (.)
sure meet me: at 9 am (.) tomorrow in my office

In addition, some of the participants, particularly low DA score students, transferred their L1 (first language) to the utterance. For example, in situation 5, the students portrayed a role of a parent and his/her child, where the speaker is a parent and s/he asks his/her child to buy something at grocery store (example 14).

Example 14: Speaker is a parent, and s/he asks his/her child to buy something at grocery store

S6 : uhh Vina come here
S5 : yes mom
S6 : uhh I want to () (.) to cook for our lunch
but uhh I want you: to buy (.) something for me
S5 : what ma'am
S6 : ((inhales)) uhh:: can you buy a (.) noddles
S5 : noodles [°alright° where's the money
S6 : [uh huh
S6 : okay
(0,6)
S6 : **this**

When low DA score student 2 (S6) asked her daughter, low DA score student 1 (S5), to buy some noodles, S5 accepted the request and asked for money. However, while giving

some money to S5, S6 said "this" instead of "here you go" or "here". It seems that S6 did not know what phrase or word she should say when she gave something to other, so she transferred her L1 word "ini" to target language. This phenomenon called pragmatic transfer. Pragmatic transfer happens when L2 learners tend to transfer their L1 social and cultural norms into the target language, producing inappropriate linguistic behavior and leading to pragmatic failure (Bu, 2012).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

4.1 Conclusions

Having explained the findings obtained in this research, the researcher can conclude 2 major points. Firstly, the participants, which are students of English Education Study Program in Jambi University, frequently used conventional indirect request strategy in form of query preparatory, followed by direct request and non-conventional indirect request. Secondly, for the politeness marker/request modification, the participants mostly preferred negative politeness strategies, followed by bald-on record, positive politeness and off-record strategies.

As for request modification, the participants chose both external and internal request modification, but mostly they chose external request modification in form of IFID 10 times, followed by preparator 7 times, reason/grounder 7 times, promise 2 times and disarmer 1 time. For internal modification, the participants employed cajoler 2 times, downtoner 1 time, politeness marker 1 time and appealer 1 time.

4.2 Suggestions

Based on the findings of this research, the researcher finds out that the participants made several mistakes like transferring their L1 to L2 and employing request act inappropriately. It seems that the participants still lack of pragmatic competence knowledge and think that pragmatics between their L1 and L2 are same. Therefore, the researcher suggests to the lecturers that they need to teach their students more about pragmatic competence and explain the difference between east culture and west, like what to do/say and what not to do/say, so the students can step up their pragmatic competence and to avoid pragmatic transfer/pragmatic failure if the students want to continue their study abroad.

References

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bu, J. (2012). A study of relationships between L1 pragmatic transfer and L2 proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (1), 32-43.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fukushima, S. (2003). *Requests and culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Hassal, T. (1999). Request strategies in Indonesian. *Pragmatics*, 9 (4), 585-606.
- Reiter, R.M. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of*

requests and apologies. Philadelphia, P.A: John Benjamins.
 Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Yule, G. (2010). *The study of Language* (4th edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A. Key to symbols used in transcriptions

Symbol	Name	Use
[text]	Brackets	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Equal Sign	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single interrupted utterance.
(# of seconds)	Timed Pause	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	Micropause	A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.
ALL CAPS	Capitalized text	Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.
:::	Colon(s)	Indicates prolongation of an utterance.
(text)	Parentheses	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.
((italic text))	Double Parentheses	Annotation of non-verbal activity.

Appendix B. Open role-play situations

Situation	Social power	Social distance	Ranking of Imposition
1. Student asks lecturer to borrow his/her book	$S < H$	+SD	Low
2. Speaker asks bus passenger to turn down his/her smartphone's volume	$S = H$	+SD	Low
3. Speaker asks his/her friend to help his/her assignment	$S = H$	-SD	High

4. Speaker asks his/her parent to buy him/her something	$S < H$	-SD	High
5. Speaker is a parent, and s/he asks his/her child to buy something at grocery store	$S > H$	-SD	Low
6. Speaker bought a pair of shoes, but it's oversized and s/he asks the manager to allow him/her to exchange the shoes	$S > H$	+SD	High