

THE REQUEST STRATEGY OF SUMATRAN INFORMANTS IN PERFORMING SPEECH ACTS REQUEST

¹Delti Yulita, ²Desta Gloria Siahaan

^{1,2}Universitas Timor

¹yulitadelti@ymail.com, ²destagloria9aan@gmail.com

Abstract

This present study was proposed to investigate the notion of request speech acts among native Sumatran. The informants took a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) consists of eight scenarios and respond it based on the situation given. The responses were analyzed by directness categories in scale designed by Blum-Kulka et al (1984) named Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). The result shows that Sumatran informants mostly use conventionally indirect request as a strategy in formulating request speech acts. The outcomes revealed that a high number of politeness marker is employed along with grounded as parts of external and internal modification in request performing.

Keywords: directness, indirect request, politeness, Sumatran

INTRODUCTION

Speech act is language as action that determine the successful of communication between speaker and interlocutor. Yule (1996) describes speech act as actions that are performed in the form of utterances. Thus, speech acts have function in communication not just for expressing thought but also asking people to do something. The speakers have intention by uttering the utterances and focus on the effect of those utterances towards the interlocutor. The effectiveness of the utterances depends on words selection and the context surrounds the conversation.

Studies of speech acts reveal the dominance of indirectness in performing request among speakers. Orders and request are considered as directive in which are attempts of speakers to get things done (Searle, 1976). The tendency is request is performed through indirect speech acts, for example rather than using imperative, the speakers choose to use the interrogative form “Could/Would you” or declarative form by giving statement. As stated by Yule (1996), indirect speech acts indicate the form and the function does not correspondence towards another. So, the speakers use the unrelated form and function such as interrogative in requesting.

The preferences of using indirect speech acts during performing request mostly affected by power relation and socio-cultural factors. The link between power and culture has been deliberated by several pragmatic studies with various cultural background. Language and the speakers’ culture cannot be separated as language does not exist in isolation (Phindane, 2017; Chao & Lee, 2016). However, cross-linguistics studies point the deficiency between linguistic

indirectness and politeness since there was insufficient evidence to validate the correlation between them (Upadhyay, 2003). The cross-linguistics studies suggest that some societies (such as the Chinese, Japanese, and Nepali) tend to force the normative and value system, while others (such as Western) put the politeness and the normative value system voluntarily.

Considering the pragmatic views and significant conclusion towards the relation between request, power, culture and indirectness in performing request speech acts, this study examines the request strategies and forms used by Sumatran, an island part of Indonesia that closely related to Malay culture. The aim is to find out the selection of the structural construction, form and function, syntactic and pragmatic choice, along with other moves by Sumatran origin in request processing by emphasizing the three main issues, those are request, power and indirectness.

The research questions to be answered in this study are;

1. What is the preference of Sumatran people in constructing request form? Is it more direct or indirect?
2. How do power relation and socio-cultural context affect the request strategies used by Sumatran people?

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Language as Action - Speech Acts

There are three important aspects in speech act: locution, illocution and perlocution. (a) Locution refer to the utterance which makes semantic meaning, (b) Illocution is intended meaning the speaker want to transfer, and (c) perlocution is the effect of the speaker want the hearer to have after hearing the utterance.

According to Searle (1976), to perform a speech act, there is some rules that should be followed and it must be suitable to type of act. From Austin felicity condition, Searle create 4 basic categories:

- (i) Propositional content, Correspondent between content and linguistic choice
- (ii) Preparatory condition, the person performing a speech act has authority to do so, the participant are in correct state to have that act performed on them
- (iii) Sincerity condition, the participant must have appropriate thoughts, feelings and intentions
- (iv) Essential condition, the speaker intention to carry out intention expressed

2. Request

Alemi and Khanlarzadeh (2016) define the speech acts of request as a directive because it focuses on speakers' intention to make the interlocutor/hearer to do or perform something. The request acts constitute a face-threatening acts (FTA) both in linguistic and culture (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Ivanovska et al, 2016). Therefore, the studies of request highly correlated to politeness, mostly relate to soften face-threatening acts, that determine the success of request. Thus, the degree of successful request varies across different culture and context. Most cross-

cultural studies (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989; Tabar and Malek, 2013; Khaleb and Tayeh, 2014; Gagne, 2018) signify the differences of speech acts request performance among difference culture or speech communities, specifically the level of directness and indirectness.

There are three major level of directness by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) expected in request strategies, those are;

- 1) The most direct which is in the explicit level. It is marked by the use of imperatives and other verbal means like performative (Austin, 1962) and hedged performatives (Fraser, 1975)
- 2) The conventionally indirect level which the speakers use the reference of precondition necessary and refer to indirect speech acts theory by Searle (1975)
- 3) Nonconventional indirect level which use the partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the acts. For example, by using contextual clues such as ‘It’s cold in here’

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) have developed a Cross Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) that is used to measure the speech acts being performed. This instrument is analyzing the sequence of request speech acts into segments, those are;

a. Point of view operation

The reference of speech acts involves the requestor (I, the speaker), the requestee (you, the hearer), and the action. The speaker chooses different ways of perspectives which divides into hearer oriented (you), speaker oriented (I), both speaker and hearer oriented (We), and impersonal (neutral agent or passive).

b. Request strategies

There are some attempts to construct the level of directness in request strategies. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) designed three major levels of directness for request with applicable cross-linguistically, those are: impositives, conventionally indirect requests, and non-conventionally indirect requests. Based on that three major level of directness, Blum-Kulka, Olshtain, and House (1984;1989) developed nine categories of directness, ranging from most direct to least direct, as a finer scale that use in Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP).

1	Mood derivative	Clean up the kitchen. The menu please
2	Explicit performative	I am asking you to move your car
3	Hedged performative	I must/have to ask you to clean the kitchen now
4	Locution derivable or obligation statement	Madam you’ll have to/should/must/ought to move your car
5	Want statement	I’d like to borrow your notes for a little while
6	Suggestory formula	How about cleaning up the kitchen?
7	Preparatory or conventionally indirect	Can I borrow your notes? I was wondering if you would give me a lift
8	Strong hint	(Intend: getting a lift) Will you be going home now?
9	Mild Hint	(Intend: getting the hearer to clean the kitchen) You have been busy here. Haven’t you?

Table 1. Type of Request Strategies

c. Syntactic Downgraders

Syntactic downgraders are strategies of request which employ some structure variations that are not included in strategies types. This indicates the pessimistic or uncertain feeling of the speakers regards to the outcomes of the request. This strategy helps the speaker to prepare for the rejection or complaint from the hearer. It is divided into some independent forms such as interrogative, negation, past tense, and embedded 'if' clause.

d. Pragma-linguistics downgraders

Aside from syntactic downgraders, pragma-linguistics downgraders are used linguistics elements that serve as pragmatic function in the discourse. The examples of these categories are consultative devices which is asking for hearer cooperation, understaters that minimizes parts of the preposition, hedges which speaker avoid specification in making a commitment, and downtoner which the speaker modulates the impact of their utterances.

e. Upgraders

While the downgraders is decreasing the impact of speech acts, upgraders are used to increase the force of the request. the speaker is aggravating the action to achieved hearer's agreement to perform the request. This element is categorized into intensifiers which the speakers are over-represent, expletives which the speaker employs negative attitudes, and repetition of request.

f. Supporting moves

It is a kind of external modification that used by the speaker to support the speech acts of request. it indirectly modifies the illocutionary force (Faerch and Kasper). The categories are checking on availability, getting a pre-commitment, grounder, sweetener, disarmer, and cost minimizer.

3. Power

The context of power in speech acts relate to the relationship between two interlocutors. According to Phindane (2017) and Akindele (2008), there are three types of power relationship, they are equal power, more power and less power. Equal power is a relationship among friends and colleagues, more power relationship is between boss, lecturer or teacher and less power is relationship with subordinate or younger person. The difference of relationship effects the use of strategies in performing request speech acts. As stated by Azin and Afghari (2015), the number of the strategies used in speech acts are getting higher as the face threat getting bigger, in case of distance, power, and imposition.

METHOD

The subjects of this study are 6 informants which is University students. The informants are native Sumatran considered as have been born and raised in Sumatra. They come from different part of Sumatra which are from Palembang, Aceh, Medan, Riau and Padang.

In this study a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) with eight scenarios is used as the instrument to collect the data. The questionnaire is modified to suit the informants background as University students in which some job-related situations are omitted. All the informants were requested to response to the situation given in the questionnaire that consist of eight scenarios. The responses were in direct sentences and the informants personally choose all kind of language they want to use depends on their own characteristics and situation.

S1 Book	Student-Lecturer Student asks lecturer to borrow a book
S2 Music	Student-student Students asks flat mate to turn down the music volume
S3 Test exam	Student-lecturer Student ask teacher to take the test some other time
S4 Library	Student-student Student ask another student to lend her a pen
S5 Home	The informant-Sister/brother The informant asks her sister/brother to get the TV remote
S6 Direction	Student-Friend Student asks her friend to ask the direction
S7 Move	Student-neighbor Student asks her neighbor for transportation
S8 Bus	The informant-stranger The informant asks stranger to change seat in bus

Table 2. Summary of request situation in DCT

The collected data is measured through YES and NO and transformed into code number, 1 for YES and 0 for NO. The requests are rated in terms of the coding category which are address term, request strategies, request point of view, syntactic downgraders, pragma-linguistic downgraders, upgraders, and supportive moves. The total number shows the tendency of request strategies and other elements used by the informants.

FINDINS AND DISCUSSION

The informants' responses of DCT questionnaire are shown in the table 3. The analysis and finding description are below.

Address term

Address terms are used to initiate contact and sometimes do not show the addressee's true relations (Braun, 1988). The Sumatran informants used notably more address term or alerts, specifically titles when addressing lecturer or older person. The titles used by informants were 'Pak/Mr', 'Bu/Mrs', and 'Kak/Sister' when addressing the older person. Meanwhile, based on scenario 6 and 4, communicating with friend, the informants do not use the title but directly calling first time or just directly asking. The title also been used when talking to older sister/brother in scenario 5, and when talking to stranger or people they are not close like in scenario 2, 7, and 8.

Coding category	Coding Subcategory	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
		Book	Music	Test	Library	Home	Direction	Move	Bus
Address term	Title	6	4	5	1	4	0	5	5
	First name	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0
	Attention getter	6	4	4	2	0	1	4	4
	Endearment Term	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	Total	12	8	9	6	7	3	9	9
Request Point of View	Hearer oriented	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
	Speaker oriented	5	1	5	0	0	0	4	4
	Speaker and Hearer Oriented	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Impersonal	1	5	0	6	6	3	1	1
Request Strategies	Mood derivable	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0
	Explicit Performative	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Want statement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Suggestory formula	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
	Preparatory/conventionally indirect	6	5	4	4	1	0	5	6
	Strong Hint	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mild Hint	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syntactic Downgraders	Interrogative	6	5	5	5	1	0	4	6
	Negation of preparatory condition	2	2	0	3	1	0	2	4
	Tense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Embedded 'if' clause	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	1
	Total	11	7	7	8	2	0	7	11
Pragma linguistics downgraders	Consultative devices	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	1
	Politeness marker	5	6	5	0	5	2	5	4
	Understarters	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	Downtoner	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
	Total	11	7	8	0	6	2	10	5
Upgraders	Intensifiers	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
	Expletives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Repetition of request	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Total	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	0
Supportive moves	Checking on availability	4	0	1	2	0	0	3	1
	Getting a pre-commitment	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0
	Grounder	4	5	4	2	0	0	3	5
	Sweetener	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Disarmer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Cost minimizer	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	Total	10	5	6	4	2	2	7	6
Sub Total	57	41	40	30	29	21	44	43	

Table 3. Summary of responses to the DCT by Sumatran Informants

Furthermore, the significance subcategory of address term is attention getter. In most scenarios, the informants use attention getter like “Maaf/Pardon” and “Permisi/Excuse me”, except in scenario 4 which the informants talk with their family member. And there is one informant that used attention getter in scenario 6, the informant asking friend to ask direction, by murmuring and saying;

“Eh, itu adapejalan kaki/Eh, there is a pedestrian!” (S6)

In term of endearment term, since it shows compactness and close relation, the informants barely use it when asking to relative and friend. In scenario 4 and 6, the informants are asking their sister/brother and friend, the endearment term used are ‘sis’ or ‘say’ that in Indonesian uses to call dearly sister or woman.

Generally, the Sumatran informants use title and attention getter when performing request to older or respective person and use to call by first name to close relative and friend. This element shows that the informants are aware of the politeness and face threatening act that could affect the way the hearer’s willingness to perform the request.

Request Point of View

The request perspective was dominated by using impersonal point of view in which the speaker treats the people/they/one as neutral agents or the use of passivation (Blum-Kulka, Olshtain). In this perspective, the speakers do not use any person (speaker or hearer) as the subjects. The examples of the utterances are;

*“Musiknyabisatolongdikecilkan? / Could the music volume be **turned down**?” (S2)*

*“Ambilkan remote itu / **Pass over** that TV remote, please” (S4)*

Since the impersonal point of view was employed when talking to close relative or colleague, it shows that the speakers have more superior or power in conversation.

Some informants employ speaker oriented which the informants mostly refer to themselves as speaking. Mostly the speaker dominance was shown when performing request to older and respective person. It shows the speaker dominance that made themselves as the subject of the conversation. The example is follow,

*“Bolehkahsayameminjambuku/May **I** borrow the book?” (S1)*

The hearer oriented was found in scenario 6 which there are two informants focus on the hearer as the subject by saying;

*“Cobakamutolongtanyaindiadeh/**You** can ask that person” (S6)*

The last perspective is speaker and hearer oriented which the speaker focuses on both perspectives in producing the utterance. It happened in scenario 6 in asking direction and the informant said;

*“**Kitatanyakansajarutenya yuk/Let’s we** ask the route” (S6)*

Request Strategies

The strategies used by Sumatran informants in performing request are mostly dominated by preparatory or conventionally indirect. This strategy is occurred frequently in all scenarios.

The conventionally indirect level is a strategy which refer contextual preconditions necessary for its performance. This strategy commonly indicates indirect speech acts as formulated by Searle in 1975. The utterances that represent this kind of strategy are “*Would you*” or “*Could you*”.

The tendency of employing conventionally indirect strategy by Sumatran informants has been done during talking to superior hearer such as lecturer and older person. It also appears when the level of request is high for example borrowing a car from neighbor and asking lecturer for rescheduling the exam. The example of the utterances are as follows;

“*Could I borrow the book? / Bolehkahsayapinjamini?*” (S1)

“*Could I take the exam in another day? / Bolehkahsayamengikutiujian di hari lain?*” (S3)

“*JikaBapakberkenan, bolehtidakkalausayapinjammobilbapakuntukpindahanbarang-barang? / If you don't mind, could I/couldn't I borrow your car to move the stuff?*” (S7)

“*Apakahbolehjikasayamemintabapakuntuktukaran seat dengansaya? / Could I asking you to change the seat with me?*” (S8)

During the conversation with close relative like sister or brother and friend, many informants use mood derivable as a strategy to perform request. Mood derivable consider as the most direct strategy as it has high explicit level by using grammatical mood of the verb in the utterance marks its illocutionary force. The example of mood derivable is the use of imperatives or other verbal means. The mood derivable mostly occurred in scenario 4 (library), scenario 5 (Home), and scenario 6 (direction) which the speaker communicates with sister/brother and friend. The examples of the utterances are;

“*Bang KI, ambilkan remote itusekalian / Bang Ki, bring that remote as you come here*” (S4)

“*Cobakautanyabapak/ibuitu? / Try to ask that person?*” (S6)

The least strategies used in performing request are explicit performative, and suggestory formula. They are occurred in scenario 2 and 6 when asking colleague and friend. The utterances of explicit performative are explicitly named the illocutionary force such as;

“*Sayamintatolonguntuksedikitmenurunkan volume musik? / I'm asking you to turn down the music volume a bit?*” (S2)

While the suggestory formula is used in scenario 6 (Direction) which the sentence contains suggestion or persuasion, the utterance is;

“*Kita tanyakansajayuk! / Let's we ask! / Let's asking!*” (S6)

Syntactic Downgraders

Syntactic downgraders are formulated by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain to count the language specific surface structure variation that different from the strategy type. The categories consist of interrogative, negation, tense and embedded ‘if’ clause.

The interrogative form is the common use in performing request. Most all the informants start their request by asking questions such as “*Could I*” or “*Would I*”. The examples of the utterances are;

“*Bolehpinjampulpen? / Could I borrow the pen?*” (S4)

“*Bisa kami duduk di kursiini? / Could we sit in this seat?*” (S8)

“Apakah bisajika saya ikuttes di hari yang lain? / Can I take the exam in another day?” (S3)

The other common syntactic downgrader used by the informants is negation of the preparatory condition. As stated by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) that negation indicates that the speaker is pessimistic with the outcome of the request. Some of informants use negation when facing the difficult request like asking neighbor to use his car, borrowing book from lecturer and asking permission to skip the exam from lecturer. The examples are;

*“Boleh **gaks** saya pinjembuk bapak/ibu?”* (S1)

*“sayabisapinjam **gak**, Pak?”* (S1)

*“Boleh **tidak** kalau saya pinjam mobil bapak untuk pindahan barang?”* (S7)

However, this justification could be elaborated not only to show pessimistic but also the characteristics of the informants. For example, informants 4 never use negation in her request performance. Regardless the inferior feeling that the request will be rejected, the informant 4 keep using affirmative or positive utterances.

Embedding the ‘if’ clause in the utterance was applied averagely of the informants. The use of ‘if’ clause being considered as hedging devices to avoid the disappointment of the request outcome. Some informants use it in their utterances, for examples;

*“Apakah boleh **jika** saya meminjam bapak untuk tukaran seat dengannya? Is it okay if I’m asking you to change the seat?”* (S8)

*“Apakah memungkinkan **jika** saya meminjam buk bapak? / Is it possible if I borrow your book, Sir”* (S1)

Pragma-linguistics Downgraders

The classification of pragma-linguistic was proposed to seize the pragmatic functions that displayed by various linguistics elements implied in the discourse. The most used of pragma-linguistics downgraders is the politeness marker. It is culturally tendency to use some key words in asking request such as “Tolong”, and “Mohon maaf”. Those words are used by informants when talking with lecturer, even with brother or sister.

Consultative devices are used by speakers to involve the hearer for his/her cooperation. The informants mostly used it when asking request to lecturer. The speakers directly ask lecturers’ permission and open discussion. The example is:

“Jika tidak keberatan, bolehkah jika saya meminjam buk bapak dalam 1-2 hari untuk menyelesaikan tugassaya, Pak?” (S1)

The other downgraders used is understaters which the speaker minimizes parts of the proposition or the action. This strategy created by the speakers to reduce of opportunity of rejection. The speakers emphasize the hearer that the request is not difficult and possible to be performed. The examples are;

*“Saya minta tolong **sedikit** menurunkan volume suaramusik / I am asking to tun down a bit the music”* (S2)

The last pragma-linguistics downgraders used is downtoner. Downtoner used to avoid the possibility of compliance from the hearer, so the speaker uses some key words such as ‘perhaps’ in order not to bother the hearer.

“Jikamemungkinkan, bolehkahjikasayameminjammobilbapaksekitar 1-2 jam” (S7)

Upgraders

Opposite from downgraders, the upgraders are used to force the hearer by aggravating the request. The types of upgraders are intensifiers, expletives, and repetition of request. Compare to the use of downgraders, the informants are rarely use upgraders in performing request. The informant only uses intensifiers and repetition of request. Intensifier is the speakers over-represent the reality by using some hyperboles. The example is

“Cobatanyaindia, kanakulaginyetir. Tar gasopankaloku yang nanya / Try to ask, I’m driving. It will be rude if I’am asking.” (S6)

Supportive Moves

The informants frequently use supportive moves, which is mostly grounded, to support the speech act. Grounded is a reason for doing speech acts and most of the informants use it in all scenarios. The informants rarely use it when requesting with brother/sister (S4) and with friends (S6). It can be inferred that the informants give reason for their speech acts when facing important request such as with lecturer and stranger. The example of grounded is;

“Maaf, musiknyabisadikecilkan? Soalnyasayadanteman-teman lain sedangbelajar / Excuse me, can you turn down the music volume? Because I and some other friends are studying” (S2)

Another supportive move used by the informants is checking on availability which the informants check the preconditions of the hearer. This move is used to predict any compliance from the hearer regarding the request. The informants use it frequently in scenario 1 and scenario 7. The statement is;

“Jikabapakberkenan, apakahbolehjikasayameminjammobilbapakuntukpindahanbarang-barang / If you don’t mind, is it possible to borrow your car to move the stuff, Sir?” (S7)

Next, the informants use pre-commitment as supporting move to obtain precommittal. Such words that represent this move are ‘Jikabapakberkenan’ and ‘Jikatidakkeberatan’.

The last supporting move is cost minimizer. It is merely used once by the informants in scenario 4 when asking request from brother or sister. The informant used word ‘sekalian’ when asking the TV remote as has been shown in this statement;

“Ambilkan remote TV sekalian” (S4)

Opting Out

The opting out response is covered by Marti (2006) as a framework to analyze speech acts. This response is also known as ‘no response’ as the speaker choose to avoid the situation or do not perform the request speech acts for some reasons. There are two informants who refuse to

perform the request in scenario 3 and scenario 7. The informants give reason that the situation is too difficult to deal with as it pushes them to ask to change the exam schedule from lecturer and ask to borrow neighbor car.

Pedagogical Implication

As it was shown that most of the Sumatran informants used 57 request strategies in scenario 1 when addressing to borrow lecturer's book. That is the highest number compared to the other scenarios. While, the lowest number of request strategies is at 21 on scenario 6 which the informants requesting to their friends. Those results answer the second research question and prove that power relationship and social distance affect the way the informants performing request as speech acts. The results support the previous research by Azin (2015) among Persian address term which found that found the bigger the face threat (power, social distance, and imposition) the higher of the number strategies to be used in speech acts. Apart from that, the results also show the Sumatran informants have overgeneralized the usage of "Boleh/Bolehkah" as starting point to perform the request. Direct translation of 'Boleh/Bolehkah?' is regarded as conventionally indirect strategy. Moreover, the findings reflect the culture of Sumatran to utilize politeness even with family member and friends by marking the use of politeness marker such as 'Tolong'. This relates with other research among Malayan students by Khalib and Tayeh (2013) that found the Malayan employ politeness and indirect strategies in performing request even among close friends. Since Sumatran and Malayan have close distance, relationship, and origin, it can be generalized that conventionally indirect strategies used is a form of politeness to save the face of the hearer and perform the request politely especially to the elder one. As for pedagogical implication, this study is useful for teacher in the classroom interaction and in teaching functional linguistics. The request strategies inform the learners on how to use the speech acts as a part of interpersonal and transaction communication.

CONCLUSION

There are high levels of indirectness in Sumatran cultures in performing request speech acts. Most of the Sumatran informants use conventionally indirect methods in request. This method is implying the reference of contextual preconditions necessary for the request performance. This strategy is referred to the literature of 'indirect speech acts' and the examples are using the utterances like 'Would you' or 'Could you'. Moreover, there is a high frequency of using grounder and politeness marker in performing request by Sumatran informants. It can be related to the politeness strategies which the speakers formulate the request utterances to save the hearer's face when face-threatening acts are inevitable. However, this study has some limitation that affects the result of analysis such the number of informants involved. It is suggestion for further study to get more informants to make the results generally approved. Moreover, it is better to make comparison to other cultures in regards of performing request acts. Some other variables such educational background, gender, and age also need to be considered in doing

further research. This elaboration is useful to get deep understanding on the hypothesis of cross-cultural speech acts.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things With Words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Azin, N. (2015). The study of Persian address term in young adult novels according to the politeness theory. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 581-601.
- Blum Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behavior. *Norwood*, 123-154.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Request and apologies: a cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 196-213.
- Davidse, K., & Vandelanotte, L. (2011). Tense use in direct and indirect speech in English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 236-250.
- Defibaugh, S. (2014). Management of care of management of face: Indirectness in Nurse practitioner/patient interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 61-71.
- Fraser, B. (1975). Hedged Performatives. In P. Cole, & S. Morgan, *Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gagne, C. (2018). Indirectness and entitlement in product request in British service encounter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1-14.
- Hiani, K. E. (2015). Performing Speech Acts among Morrocan EFL Advanced Learners. *Procedia* , 479-485.
- Ivanoska, B., Kusevka, M., & Daskalovska. (2016). The speech act of request and its expression in German interlanguage of Macedonian learners. *Knowledge: International Journal of Scientific Papers*, 371-377.
- Karatepe, C. (2016). Indirectness in Request in Complaint Letters to the Higher Institution by Turkish EFL Students. *Procedia*, 354-361.
- Khalib, F. M., & Tayeh, A. (2014). Indirectness in English request among Malay university students. *Procedia*, 44-52.
- Marti, L. (2006). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish-German bilingual and TYurkish monolingual requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1836-1869.

- Morgan, M. (2010). The presentation of indirectness and power in everyday life. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 283-291.
- Norrick, N. (2015). Narrative illocutionary acts direct and indirect. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Phindane, P. (2017). A comparative study of requests amongst second language speakers of English. *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 1-9.
- Pinto, D., & R, R. (2007). A comparison study of request in heritage speaker Spanish, L1 Spanish, and L2 Spanish. *International Journal of Bilingual*, 135-155.
- Ruytenbeek, N. e. (2017). Indirect request processing , sentence types and illocutionary forces. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46-62.
- Tabar, M. S., & Malek, L. (2013). Delving into speech act of request of Iranian Turkish informants. *Procedia*, 1724-1731.
- Upadhyay, S. R. (2003). Nepali requestive acts: Linguistic indirectness and politeness reconsidered. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1651-1677.