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ABSTRACT

Permana Putri, Regita. 2014. *An Analysis of Politeness in Spoken Requests Provided by the Eighth Semester English Education Students of Sanata Dharma University*. Yogyakarta: English Language Education Study Program. Department of Language and Arts Education. Faculty of Teachers Training and Education. Sanata Dharma University.

This study analyzes the strategies of request which are provided by the eighth semester English Language Education Study Program students in Sanata Dharma University. There are two types of request to analyze. The first request is a request to a lecturer, which has higher power and social status than the participants. The second request is a request to a fellow student, which has the same power and social status as the participants have.

This study has two aims. The first aim is to seek for the type of deixis of the requests provided by the participants. The second aim is to seek for the most used categories of requests provided by the participants. (1) What person deixis do the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program mostly use in expressing requests? (2) What request statements do the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program tend to use?

This study is a pragmatics study. In this study, the researcher used a discourse completion test to get the data from participants.

The research found out that most of the eighth semester English Language Education Study Program students of *Sanata Dharma* University used first person deixis in the request to a person with the same power and social status. On the contrary, they mostly used the second person deixis in request to a person with higher power and social status. This research also found out that the participants used the type of conventionally indirect request strategy in their requests both to a friend and to a lecturer. They query preparatory strategy, which was categorized into conventionally indirect request strategy, was used almost in all of the requests.

**Keywords:** politeness, deixis, request, indirectness
ABSTRAK

Permana Putri, Regita. 2014. *An Analysis of Politeness in Spoken Requests Provided by the Eighth Semester English Education Students of Sanata Dharma University*. Yogyakarta: English Language Education Study Program. Department of Language and Arts Education. Faculty of Teachers Training and Education. Sanata Dharma University.


Studi ini memiliki dua objektif. Objektif yang pertama adalah untuk mencari tipe penggunaan sudut pandang dalam menggautarakan permintaan. Objektif yang kedua adalah untuk mencaritahu jenis permintaan yang paling banyak digunakan oleh partisipan. (1) Apakah jenis sudut pandang orang yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa semester delapan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Sanata Dharma dalam menggautarakan permintaan? (2) Kategori apa yang paling banyak digunakan oleh partisipan dalam menggautarakan permintaan?

Studi ini merupakan jenis studi linguistik, lebih spesifiknya merupakan jenis studi pragmatik. Dalam studi ini, peneliti menggunakan discourse completion test untuk mendapatkan data dari partisipan.

Dalam penelitian ini, sebagian besar mahasiswa semester delapan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Sanata Dharma menggunakan sudut pandang orang pertama dalam melakukan permintaan kepada orang dengan kekuatan dan status social yang sama. Di sisi lain, partisipan banyak menggunakan sudut pandang orang kedua dalam melakukan permintaan kepada orang dengan kekuatan dan status social yang lebih tinggi. Penelitian ini juga menemukan bahwa hamper semua partisipan menggunakan strategi conventionally indirect request dalam menggautarakan permintaan baik kepada dosen maupun teman. Mereka menggunakan strategi query preparatory, yang termasuk dalam conventionally indirect request.

*Kata kunci*: politeness, deixis, request, indirectness
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of six sections. The first section is the research background. In this section, the researcher discusses the background of the research, which contains the reason why the researcher chose this topic and provides a brief introduction about the theories of request and politeness. The second section is the research problems, which contains some questions to answer in this study. The third section is the problem limitation. In this section, the researcher discusses the scope limit of the study. The fourth section is the research objectives, which explains the purpose of this study. The fifth section is the research benefits, which discusses the advantages of this study. The last section is the definition of terms, which contains brief explanation of terms used in this study to make better understanding for the readers about this study.

A. Research Background

Nowadays, interaction and communication become one of the important aspects in human daily lives. People interact and communicate for many reasons and purposes. It happens because they need help, want to express their feeling, ask for something, give some compliments, and so on. People interact and communicate each other in various ways. It could be direct or indirect. As stated by Petersen and Green (2009: 1), communication is direct if the person spoken to is the person for whom the message is intended. In contrast, communication is
indirect if the message is not directed to the person for whom it is intended. Interaction and communication can be done with or without tools such as telephone, mobile phone, or email. When people are interacting, they cannot be separated with direct interaction without communication tools. In a face-to-face interaction, a lot of speech events happen. Because speech events regularly include both a speaker-writer and a listener-reader, it is not surprising that language is particularly sensitive, in the rules for speech use, to the relations between two parties (Spolsky, 1998). When we speak, we must constantly make choices of many different kinds: what we want to say, how we want to say it, and the specific sentence types, words, and sounds that best unite the what with the how (Wardhaugh, 1992). These reasons show that interacting and communicating in the appropriate way, especially orally, are not always easily done in our daily lives.

In speaking, politeness is highly considered, especially when people talk about behavior in acting and talking to others. As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness shows concern for people’s face: the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. Politeness becomes a sensitive aspect for people in their interaction and communication process. We often do not appreciate just how complicated it is, because we tend to think of politeness simply as matter of saying please and thank you in the right places. In fact, it involves a great deal more than the superficial politeness routines that parents explicitly teach their children (Holmes, 2008). Such things like diction, tone, and grammar should be highly considered when we talk to others.
The English Language Education Study Program eighth semester students of Sanata Dharma University are the students who are being prepared to graduate and survive in the work field or higher level of education. In order to be ready in the work field, they should know about the appropriate interaction manners, words choices, and types of appropriate statements in speech to avoid some unwanted responses or negative impressions from their interlocutors. That is why this research is going to analyze how the participants make request sentences in their daily lives, especially when they talk to people with older age and higher social status and to people with the same power and the same social status, because later on these students will meet a lot of new people outside the school life. By doing this research, the researcher will get information about the request statements which are provided by the participants, specifically the person deixis and the categories based on the nine categories of request provided by Blum-Kulka (1987).

B. Research Problems

Based on the background explained in the previous section, the research problems to answer are:

1. What person deixis do the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program mostly use in expressing requests?
2. What request statements do the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program tend to use?
C. Problem Limitation

This research focuses on the analysis of politeness in the speech act, especially in terms of sentence choices which are provided by the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program Sanata Dharma University. Specifically, it is going to be an analysis of politeness in spoken requests. The requests will be request to a person with a higher power and social status and also requests to a person with the same power and social status. The researcher will only analyze the head acts of the requests provided by the participants.

D. Research Objectives

This research has some objectives:

1. To analyze the type of person deixis which the eighth semester students of English Language Education Study Program mostly use in uttering requests.

2. To analyze the types of polite requests that the eighth semester students of English Language Education Study Program tend to use.

E. Research Benefits

The researcher expects this research to give contribution for others. Specifically, there are three main parties, that is the English lecturers, the English students, and the future researchers.
1. The English lecturers

This research will motivate the lecturers in the English Language Education Study Program to put the material about politeness in practical cases, especially in linguistics and structure subjects. This research will also give the English lecturers more knowledge about the use of polite statements in request. Moreover, it will also give information to the lecturers about how the ELESP students produce request statements.

2. The English learners

This research will give information about the polite words and sentences used in the students’ daily interaction, so that they can apply it successfully in their daily interaction. This research also gives students some references of theories about sociolinguistics and pragmatics, especially about speech acts. The researcher also expects that the students will have more various styles of request in their speaking or writing.

3. The future researchers

This research can be used as an academic reference by other researchers to conduct further studies dealing with politeness or request statements. This research will also contribute more knowledge and references of linguistics theories for the future researchers.
F. Definition of Terms

The following definitions might help readers to comprehend the contents of this study:

1. Deixis

According to Levinson (1983), the most obvious way in which the relationship between language and context is reflected in the structures of languages themselves is through the phenomenon of deixis. The word “deixis” comes from Greek word for pointing or indicating, and has prototypical or focal exemplars the use of demonstratives, first and second person pronouns, tenses, specific time and place adverbs like now and here, and a variety of other grammatical features tied directly to the circumstances of utterance. In this research, the researcher is going to focus on the person deixis, which deals with the first, second, or third person orientation in the requests.

2. Politeness

Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985) state that the term politeness is used to refer the way certain language expresses the social distance between the speakers and their different role relationship. In this research, the term politeness refers to the polite sentences in producing requests toward other people. Politeness in request is related to the use of certain words and the sentence composition.
3. Indirectness

Searle (1975) defines indirectness as those cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by ways of performing another. In this research, the term *indirectness* is the indirect way of people when they ask for request. It means that people do not ask for request with obvious sentences showing that they are asking and giving less option to the interlocutor to complete the requests.

4. Directness

Tawableh and Al-Oqaily (2012: 1) state that directness is interpreted as an expression of affiliation, closeness and group-connectedness rather than impoliteness. In this research, the term directness is understood as an obvious way in request, when the speakers usually use imperative sentences, which do not give a chance to the interlocutors to choose if they want to complete the requests.

5. Request

Request consists of an illocutionary act in which the speaker asks the hearer to perform an action which is for the benefit of the speaker (Trosborg, 1995; Sifianou, 1999). In this research, the term *request* specifically refers to an act which the speakers, that is the students, ask the hearers to do something for the speakers.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section is the theoretical description. This part comprises discussions about the theory of speech acts, politeness and request. The second part is the theoretical framework. It discusses the framework for identifying and analyzing the indirectness in request provided by the English Language Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University.

A. Theoretical Description

This section is divided into three main parts. The first part is speech acts. Speech acts are discussed because this research is closely related by speaking and conversation. The second part is the theories of politeness. In this part, the types of politeness and its meaning would be discussed by the researcher. It includes the theories of direct and indirect politeness. The third part contains some relevant theories about requests. Those parts would be used to establish the framework of identifying and analyzing the politeness in spoken requests provided by the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program Sanata Dharma University.
1. **Speech Act**

This section consists of the discussion, explanation, and theories of speech acts. This section is divided into two parts, that is the definition of speech act and illocutionary acts.

a. **Definition of Speech Act**

In attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, but they also perform actions via those utterances. Speech acts performed via utterances are generally called as speech acts and, in English, are commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request (Cutting, 2003). When we speak we can do all sorts of things, from aspirating a consonant, to constructing a relative clause, to insulting a guest, to starting a war. These are all, pre-theoretically, speech acts – acts done in the process of speaking (Horn & Ward, 2007). Searle (1979) states that there are three names which are assigned under the general heading of speech acts:

1) Uttering words (morphemes, sentences) = performing utterance acts.

2) Referring and predicating = performing propositional acts.

3) Stating, questioning, commanding, promising, etc. = performing illocutionary acts.

Speech act is under pragmatics field, which is sometimes misled to semantics. Since pragmatics studies meaning in relation to speech situation, Leech (1983) describes some aspects of the speech situation that will be criterion in this field. The first aspect is addressers or addressees. Following the practice of Searle and
others, Leech refers to addressers and addressees, as a matter of convenience, as $s$ (‘speaker’) and $h$ (‘hearer’). These will be a short hand for ‘speaker(s)/writer(s)’ and ‘hearer(s)/reader(s)’. The second aspect is the context of an utterance. Context is any background knowledge assumed to be shared by $s$ and $h$ and which contributes to $h$’s interpretation of what $s$ means by a given utterance. The third aspect is the goal(s) of an utterance. The forth aspect is the utterance as a form of act or activity: a speech act. This aspect deals with verbal acts or performances which take place in particular situations, in time. This respect deals with language at a more concrete level than grammar. The last aspect is the utterance as a product of a verbal act. In this aspect, there is another sense in which the word ‘utterance’ can be used in pragmatics: it can refer to the product of a verbal act, rather than to the verbal act itself. From the above-mentioned aspects, we can compose a notion of a speech situation (pp. 14-15).

b. Illocutionary Act

In the speech acts, we have some common verbs with its different functions. As stated by Leech (1983), a good way to begin the study of speech acts verb is with the distinction between three kinds of speech act made by Austin. Those are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act performs the act of saying something, illocutionary act performs an act in saying something, and perlocutionary act performs an act by saying something (p. 199). These terms show that the acts of speaking, or we what we call as speech acts, are categorized into some rules to create their tendency and characteristics.
Out of those three kinds of speech act, request, which is going to be discussed in this research, is the part of illocutionary act. Yule (1996) states that the most obvious device for indicating the illocutionary force is an expression of the type “I (Vp) you that...” where there is a slot for a verb that explicitly names the illocutionary act being performed. Such a verb can be called a performative verb (Vp). Searle (1979) states that there are five general ways of using language in the five general categories of illocutionary acts. We tell people how things are (assertives), we try to get them to do things (directives), we commit ourselves to doing things (commissives), we express our feelings and attitudes (expressives), and we bring about changes in the world through our utterances (declarations). Verschueren (1998) supports these five general categories of actions by giving them examples and more explanation for each category, as listed in the table 2.1. Holmes (2008) divides the categories into six. The first category is expressive, whose utterances express the speaker’s feeling, e.g. I’m feeling great today. The second category is directive, whose utterances attempt to get someone to do something, e.g. Clear the table. The third category is referential, whose utterances provide information, e.g. At the third stroke it will be three precisely. The forth category is metalinguistic, whose utterances comment on language itself, e.g. ‘Hegemony’ is not a common word. The fifth category is poetic category, whose utterances focus on aesthetic feature of language, e.g. a poem, an earcatching motto, a rhyme, Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled peppers. The last category is phatic, whose utterances express solidarity and empathy with
Table 2.1: Five general categories of actions (Verschueren, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertives</td>
<td><em>We went down to Como.</em></td>
<td>Expressing a belief, making words fit the world, and committing the speaker to the truth of what is asserted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td><em>Go down to como tomorrow!</em></td>
<td>Expressing a wish, making the world fit the words, counting as an attempt to get the hearer to do something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td><em>I promise to go to Como.</em></td>
<td>Expressing an intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td><em>We greatly appreciate what you did for us.</em></td>
<td>Expressing a variety of psychological states, having no direction of fit between words and world, and simply counting as expressions of a psychological state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td><em>I baptize this ship the Lago di Como.</em></td>
<td>Not expressing any psychological state, making both the words fit the world and the world fit the words, and the point of which is to bring about a change in (institutional) reality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

others, e.g. *Hi, how are you, lovely day isn’t it?* Request, the main topic in this study, is included in the directives category. Although the categorization claimed by Searle and Verschueren has some differences with the categorization claimed by Holmes, they have the same idea about the concept of directives category.

2. Politeness

This section discusses the theories of politeness and indirectness. Moreover, this section is divided into two parts, that is the definition of politeness and types of politeness.
a. Definition of Politeness

The term *politeness* is common in people daily lives, especially when people talk about manner and behavior. Politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom we may call *self* and *other* (Leech, 1983). Politeness is a complex linguistic means used to maintain good interactions with other people (Axia & Baroni, 2013: 918). Many linguists have discussed this term, includes Brown & Levinson (1987), who state that politeness is related to the psychological state, something that is emotionally invested and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction. Beside the linguists Brown and Levinson, Kadar and Mills (2011) also discuss the politeness. They state that people use politeness every day when they interact with other people. Yet, politeness is an impressively complex linguistic process. Through a deep study, it can tell us many things about the social and cultural values of social groups or even a whole society. It also helps us to understand how humans ‘encode’ states of mind in their words.

b. Types of Politeness

Holmes (2008) claims that politeness has two different types. The first type is positive politeness. Positive politeness is solidarity oriented. It emphasis shared attitudes and value. When the boss suggests that a subordinate should use first name (FN) to her, this is a positive politeness move, expressing solidarity and minimizing status differences. By contrast, negative politeness pays people respect and avoids intruding on them. Negative politeness involves expressing
oneself appropriately in terms of social distance and respecting status differences. Using title + last name (TLN) to your superiors, and to older people that you do not know well, are further example of the expression of negative politeness.

Laver (1981: 297) states there are some factors constraining the polite choice of address terms in British English. It can be seen in the figure 2.1. As stated by Holmes (2008), who reproduces the diagram, the diagram assumes the speaker knows the addressee’s name and the first box takes account of whether the addressee is a child or an adult. Where the line between adult and child is drawn differs between communities and even within communities for different purpose.

3. Requests

This part discusses some theories about requests. There are two main parts which are discussed in this section. The first part is the theories of person deixis, the second part is the theory indirectness related to politeness.

a. Person Deixis

Levinson (1983) claims that the most obvious way in which the relationship between language and context is reflected in the structures of languages themselves is through the phenomenon of deixis. The term is borrowed from Greek word for pointing or indicating, and has as prototypical or focal exemplars the use of demonstratives, first and second person pronouns, tense, specific time and place adverbs like now and here, and a variety of other grammatical features tied directly to the circumstances of utterance. Fillmore (1975) adds that the
Figure 2.1: Factors constraining the polite choice of address terms in British English (Laver, 1981: 297)
The importance of deixis for the interpretation of utterances is illustrated by what happens when such information is lacking, for example:

1) *I’ll be back in an hour.*

2) *Meet me here a week from now with a stick about this big.*

The information in the first example is lacking because we do not know when it was written and when the writer will return. The second example, we do not know who to meet, where or when to meet, and how big the stick to bring is.

Deixis belongs within the domain of pragmatics, because it directly concerns the relationship between the structure of languages and the contexts in which they are used. Levinson (1983) proposes five types of deixis which could be analyzed in a utterance. They are person deixis, time deixis, place deixis, discourse deixis, and social deixis. Person deixis is reflected directly in the grammatical categories of person. However, it may be argued that we need to develop an independent pragmatic framework of possible participant-roles, so that we can see how, and to what extent, these roles are grammaticalized in different languages. Verschueren (1998) adds that person deixis, which is in the face-to-face communication involves a number of social actors whose roles underlies the basic three-fold distinction between the first person, second person or addressee, and third person. Perez (2003) gave some examples:

1) “I missed the last lesson. Could I possibly borrow your notes?”

2) “I need a few chapters from a book you have. Could you please lend it to me?”
3) “Would it be all possible to use your telephone? I know it’s rude but it’s urgent.”

From the given examples above, the speaker oriented or first person oriented is adopted in the request (1) by the use of I in the head act. The hearer oriented or second person oriented is used in the request (2) because the speaker uses you in the head act. Request (3) has neither speaker nor hearer oriented, which is called as impersonal perspective.

b. Indirectness Related to Politeness

In their explanation about “The Message Model,” Akmajiman, Demers, Farmer, and Harnish (2001) state that we sometimes speak indirectly; that is, we sometimes intend to perform one communicative act by means of performing another communicative act. One example is when we say “My car has a flat tire.” to a gas station attendant, with the intention that he repairs the tire. In this case, we are requesting the hearer to do something. In the opposite, direct strategy enables the hearer to infer from what he hears the speaker utter to what the speaker is directly communicating (pp. 372-373). The use of direct and indirect sentences will give different sense of the hearer when the speaker utters a speech act. Eisenberg and Garvey (1981) classify subjects' first requests into two categories, that is impolite and polite. Impolite requests are very direct requests, such as imperatives. Polite requests are less direct and mitigated requests, such as interrogative or conditional sentences. Brown and Levinson (1987) posit the following politeness constraints on indirect request in English: [felicity condition
+ question + subjunctive + possibility operator + “please”). This schema predicts
the distribution between polite and rude indirect requests for English where \( r = \)
rude, \( p = \) polite, and \( * = \) non-grammatical. As claimed by Mills (1991: 68), the
following sets are offered in support of this premise:

1) \( p \) Can you pass the salt?
2) \( p \) Could you pass the salt?
3) \( p \) Could you possibly pass the salt (please)?
4) \( r \) Couldn’t you (possibly) pass the salt?
5) \( * \) Couldn’t you (possibly) pass the salt, could you?

A different approach to distinguishing types of speech acts can be made on
the basis of structure. Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure
and a function, we have a direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect
relationship between a structure and a function, we have an indirect speech act
(Yule, 1996). Moreover, Yule (1996) gives some examples of indirect speech act
used in request. In the case where the speaker wants the addressee not to stand in
front of TV, the speaker can say “Move out that way!” which is an example of a
direct request, or he can say “You’re standing in front of the TV,” which is an
example of indirect request.

Zhang (2012: 1) states some ideas of indirectness in relation to politeness.
Indirectness is a way to show politeness to others and it is used in many speech
acts, such as request and invitation in case the possible rejection or conflict
occurs, for example: “Could you possibly lend me your bike this afternoon?”
When one wants to borrow something from others, the conventional indirectness
of a question form is usually used. The speaker is technically asking permission to make a request. By being indirect, the speaker is making it less obvious that he expects the hearer to comply. On the surface, at least, this provides greater freedom for the hearer to refuse. Even if the hearer refuses, he will use polite language so as not to cause embarrassment of the requester, such as “Sorry, I will use it this afternoon”. However, it is another case if the requester asks in a direct and usually rude manner, such as: “Lend me your bike this afternoon!” With the imperative form, the speaker actually issues an order. It sounds rather impolite, abrupt and even insolent. What is more, it may cause antipathy in the requestee towards to speaker. As a result, the requestee will not be friendly to the requester either by showing him an indifferent face, or just says: “No, I do not want to lend it to you.” On hearing this, the requester will certainly get embarrassed and feel his face lost. So, indirectness is important for self-protection (pp. 2-3).

Talking deeper about politeness and indirectness, Leech (1983) explains a way of obtaining a scale of politeness by using a more and more indirect kind of illocution. Indirect illocutions tend to be more polite because they increase the degree of optionality, and the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be. This explanation is shown on the table 2.2.

Table 2.2 shows request statements about $s$ who expects $h$ to do what $s$ said. The more indirect the statement is, the more polite it will be. Searle (1979) states that in the field of indirect illocutionary acts, the area of directives is the most useful area to study because ordinary conversational requirements of politeness normally make it awkward to issue flat imperative sentences
Table 2.2: Scale of Politeness & Indirectness (Leech, 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirectness</th>
<th>Less Polite</th>
<th>More Polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer the phone.</td>
<td>I want you to answer the phone.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you answer the phone?</td>
<td>Can you answer the phone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you mind answering the phone?</td>
<td>Could you possibly answer the phone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e.g. "Leave the room!") or explicit performatives (e.g. "I order you to leave the room"), and we therefore seek to find indirect means to our illocutionary ends (e.g. "I wonder if you would mind leaving the room"). In directives, politeness is the chief motivation for indirectness.

Moreover, Blum-Kulka (1987: 133) adapts the previous classifications of request strategies on scales of indirectness from Searle (1975), Ervin-Tripp (1976), House and Kasper (1981), Blum-Kulka (1982), Blum-Kulka, Danet and Gerson (1985), who give some examples of request categories as listed in the table 2.3.


1. Mood Derivable

Mood derivable is utterance in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force. Mood derivable is the most transparent utterance in conveying the requesting force. It is commonly in a form of imperative
patterns. Levinson (1987) used the example “Clean up the kitchen!” as the example of mood derivable request, because it was un-hedged and direct.

2. Explicit Performative

Explicit Performative is utterance in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named. Explicit performative are characterized by verbs in the first person singular present indicative active (Austin 1962: 56).

3. Hedged Performative

Hedged Performative is utterance in which the naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions. This term refers to performative verbs which are mitigated by the use of a modal verb which attenuates them. Wang (2009) states that hedged performative is a modified performative in which the illocutionary verb denoting the request intent is mitigated. He gives example with the statement “I want to ask you to write a reference letters.” The adding of the hedge want to soften the bluntness of I ask you to write.

4. Obligation Statement

Obligation Statement is utterance which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act. This type of request deals with the obligation of the hearer. In this type of request, the speaker reminds the hearer about his or her obligation to comply with the request.

5. Want Statement

Want Statement is utterance which state the speaker’s desire that the hearer carries out the act. Wang (2011) explains that this strategy type denotes the speaker’s desire, will, or plans in relation to the request. The example of this
type of request is “I’d like a cup of coffee,” which states the speaker’s desire to have coffee.

6. Suggestory Formulae

Suggestory Formulae is utterance which contains a suggestion to do something. This utterance is formed using common suggestion-giving expressions, and the strategy is conventional as well as indirect in nature, for example “How about to perform a short segment?” “Maybe you could act that out for us all?”

7. Query Preparatory

Query Preparatory is utterance containing reference to preparatory conditions as conventionalized in any specific language. Hasall (1999) adds that query preparatory contains of two main elements, that is ability and permission. Request with query preparatory strategy may be in a form of asking about someone’s ability to do something, but it can also in a form of asking for someone’s permission to do something.

8. Strong Hint

Strong hint is utterance containing partial reference to object of element needed for the implementation of the act with no explicit statement of request. Strong hint tends to obscure the illocutionary force.

9. Mild Hint

Mild hint is utterance that makes no reference to the request proper but is interpretable as request by context. Mild hint has less indication of the intention of requesting than the strong hint.
Table 2.3 Request Types in Descending of Directness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT</th>
<th>i. Mood Derivable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Explicit Performative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Hedged Performative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Obligation Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Want Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONALLY INDIRECT</td>
<td>vi. Suggestory Formulae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Query Preparatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CONVENTIONALLY INDIRECT</td>
<td>viii. Strong Hints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. Mild Hints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Request categories (Blum-Kulka, 1987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mood Derivable</td>
<td>Clean up the kitchen. Move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explicit Performative</td>
<td>I’m asking you to move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hedged Performative</td>
<td>I would like to ask you to move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obligation Statement</td>
<td>You’ll have to move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Want Statement</td>
<td>I would like you to clean the kitchen. I want you to move your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Suggestory Formulae</td>
<td>How about cleaning up? Why don’t you come and clean up the mess you made last night?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Query Preparatory</td>
<td>Could you clean up the mess in the kitchen? Would you mind moving your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strong Hint</td>
<td>You’ve left the kitchen in a right mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mild Hint</td>
<td>We don’t want any crowding (as a request to move the car)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blum-Kulka (1989b) used strategy-typology to scheme and to investigate the level of indirectness. It was also supported by Tim Hassall (1999) that there were three main types of request: direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect. The distribution of the request types were listed in the table 2.3, and the example of each type is given in the able 2.4. The request using imperative, explicit performative, hedged performative, goal statement, and want statement were included in the direct request. Suggestory formulae and query
preparatory were considered as conventionally indirect. The last type was non-conventionally indirect which contained of strong hints and mild hints.

According to Blum-Kulka (1987), the request patterns considered as the most direct or transparent are the ones in which requestive force is either masked syntactically, or indicated explicitly, as in Mood Derivable (imperatives) (1) and Performatives (2). The least direct patterns are considered to be those in which requestive force is not indicated by any conventional verbal means and hence has to be inferred, as in hints (8) as (9). In between these two extremes are patterns that derive their relative transparency either from conventions in the wording of the speech act, such as Hedged Performatives (3), or from conventions regarding the semantic contents which, by social convention, count as potential request, such as Obligation and Want Statement (4) and (5) and Suggestory Formulae (6).

4. Review of Previous Studies

This section consists of some previous studies related to politeness in request and the use of indirectness in request. There are three studies, which were done by Codreanu & Debu (2011) and Jasone Cenoz Iragui (1996).

a. Codreanu & Debu (2011)

Starting from the theoretical background of Blum-Kulka’s theories about indirectness and politeness as discussed in the literature review, Codreanu & Debu tried to find out whether Romanians associate politeness with conventional indirectness, as Blum Kulka asserts, or they consider non-conventional indirectness as more polite. Moreover, they tried to identify it and try to analyze if
there are any similarities between the answers of the Romanian respondents and those of Blum Kulka’s respondents. In order to attain these objectives, they used the method called the discourse completion test (DCT). This method basically consists in creating a certain situation, where respondents are asked to engage in a conversation about a certain ordinary problem. The researcher gives the participants the first part of the conversation along with a description of the situation and asks the informant to complete this situation by supplying a continuation. The results were as out of the eight utterances, four were pointed out as the most preferred, namely those belonging to the query preparatory category (chosen by seven respondents), to the want statement category (by two respondents) and to the hedged performatives and hint by one respondent.


A total of 96 native and non-native university students participated in this study. The native speakers group consisted of 34 students who were studying Basque and Spanish at the University Studies Abroad Consortium. The non-native speakers group consisted of 62 students of English Philology at the University of the Basque Country. The instrument which was used to elicit data was a discourse-completion test (DCT) based on Blum-Kulka (1982). The test was administered in English and included eight socially differentiated situations, four of which elicited requests and the others apologies. The subjects were asked to write the utterances that they would produce in these situations in which the social distance between the participants and the addressee's gender and status
were specified. In this research, the researcher found out that most of the non-native speakers used syntactic downgrades in request. Syntactic downgrades are the type of requests using interrogative, negotiation, past tense, and embedded ‘if’ clause.

B. Theoretical Framework

This study mainly aims to analyze the request statements provided by the participants, who are the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program. Specifically, the researcher wants to look for the types of request statement that they use in uttering request, and whether they choose the right indirect statements for request. The theory of speech acts is used since this study is a pragmatics study. The request statements which are going to be analyzed are the part of illocutionary acts in the theory of speech acts. Specifically, it is the part of directive category.

The theory of deixis by Levinson will be used to answer the first research problem. The theory of politeness and indirectness by Leech and the arrangement of politeness statements by Blum-Kulka, which contains nine types of polite request statements, are used to analyze the data provided by the participants. This is to answer the second research problem. Based on Leech’s and Blum-Kulka’s theories, request which is more indirect shows more politeness. From the participants’ answers in the questionnaires, the researcher will conclude the types of request statements used by the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains of six sections, namely the research method, the research setting, the research participants, the instruments and data gathering technique, the data analysis and the research procedure. The research method contains of the description of method which the researcher used in this study. The research setting contains the description of the places where this study was conducted and the setting of time. The description of the participants will be discussed in the next section, which is the research participants. Moreover, there will be also the instruments and data gathering technique where the type of instrument and the details of data gathering procedure are discussed. The next section is the data analysis, which discusses about the way the researcher analyzed the data. At the end, there will be the research procedure, which describes the researcher’s procedure of this study from the beginning up to the end.

A. Research Method

The method used by the researcher in this research was qualitative research. As stated by Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, and Razavieh (2010), a qualitative research focuses on understanding social phenomena from the perspective of the human participants in natural settings (p. 22). Moreover, this research is a discourse analysis research.
B. Research Setting

This research was conducted in March and April 2013. The data collecting was done twice. It was because the researcher needed 95 participants to fulfill the questionnaires for this research. The first data collecting was carried out on the 13th March 2013 at 10 a.m. in the Kadarman Room of Sanata Dharma University. It was after the Service Program Design class, when half of the eighth semester English Language Education Study Program students gathered after they finished their class. There were 75 students participating in this research. It took around 30 minutes for the researcher and the participants to conduct this process.

The second data gathering was on the 14th April 2013 in the student hall of Sanata Dharma University. The researcher started to distribute the questionnaires at 8 a.m. and finished at 12 p.m. There were 20 students participating in the second data gathering. After that, the researcher selected the sufficient data provided by the participants. Some of the data were not used because the participants either fulfilled it incompletely or had out of context answer. At the end, there were 80 questionnaires chosen to be analyzed in this research.

C. Research Participants

The participants for this research were the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program in Sanata Dharma University on the academic year 2013/2014. There were 95 participants in this research who were asked to fulfill the questionnaires given by the researcher. The reason why the
researcher chose 95 participants was to provide additional data, from the target number 80 participants, just in case if there were incomplete questionnaires which could not be counted. The eighth semester students were chosen because they represented the English Language Education Study Program students who were being prepared to graduate and were almost ready to face the real world of work fields or higher level of education. Since they would be fresh-graduate bachelors from English department, later on, these students have big chances to deal with English in their work fields. Dealing with English in their daily lives or works needs strong wide knowledge about English, included how to request in English. This particular linguistic group was also chosen because of their availability and advanced level of the target language, that is English.

D. Instruments and Data Gathering Technique

The researcher used questionnaire as the instrument. Richards, Platt and Platt (1992) define questionnaire as a set of questions on a topic or group of topics designed to be answered by a respondent. Specifically, the type of questionnaire was open form questionnaire, where the participants do not have limited choices in giving the answers. Cohen et al (2000) state that the larger the size of the sample, the more structured, close and numerical the questionnaire may have to be. Specifically, the questionnaires were developed adapting the discourse completion test by Blum-Kulka (1982). The use of written questionnaires for the collection of the data does not only present practical advantages from a methodological point of
view, but also theoretical advantages, since it allows us to obtain more stereotypical answers, the prototype of the variants which may occur in an individual’s actual speech, as pointed out by Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki and Ogino (1986: 353). Moreover, it is undoubtedly useful to investigate what type of language people consciously generate in their minds, that is, what the informants’ linguistic attitudes are. The discourse completion test offers the opportunity in an accurate way. The researcher agreed with Eisentenstein and Bodman (1986: 169) about their statement that learners were not able to provide native-like responses in a relatively unpressured situation such as this, it would be unlikely that they would be able to function more effectively in face-to-face interactions with their accompanying pressures and constraints. For all these reasons, the instrument employed to collect the data has been a discourse completion test (DCT).

The 90 participants were chosen as the sample for this research. The researcher used purposeful random sampling technique. As stated by Lodico, Spaulding, and Voegtle (2006), purposeful sampling is a procedure where the researcher identifies key informants: people who have some specific knowledge about the topic being investigated, while the purposeful random sampling is the type of purposeful sampling which is followed by a randomization procedure (pp. 140-141). In this research, the researcher chose 95 students out of 180 students in the English Language Education Study Program students Sanata Dharma University. Those participants were the people who understood about politeness and request statements because they had already learned linguistics and structure. The participants were the eighth semester students in the English Language
Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University. The researcher asked them to fulfill the questionnaires in around 20 minutes and collected the questionnaires back.

E. Data Analysis

The questionnaires were the type of discourse completion test (DCT) questionnaires. Adapted in 1982 by Blum-Kulka for the purpose of investigating speech acts, the discourse completion test (DCT) is a questionnaire containing a set of very briefly described situations designed to elicit a particular speech act. The discourse completion test which was used in this study was composed in two socially differentiated situations which vary depending on the interlocutors’ relationship, that is, on the dimensions of dominance or social power, and social distance or familiarity. Therefore, it has allowed us to investigate also the effect of social factors on those realization patterns. The situations (S) were as follows:

S1 You will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?

S2 You will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the
materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?

The variable of social power had two possible values: hearer’s dominance or equal power between the speaker and the hearer. Hearer’s dominance occurred because the hearer has higher power and social status than the speaker. Equality occurs between the participant and a friend, because they have the same power and social status. Following Bonikowska (1988), Trosborg (1995) and Sasaki (1998), the situations had been designed in such way that the participants would have found them familiar. The first analysis was done in order to answer the first research problem. In this process, the researcher classified the participants’ answers into a table illustrated in table 3.1 and 3.2. After that, the researcher counted the numbers of first person deixis and second person deixis which appeared using tally technique. The theory of politeness and indirectness by Leech and the arrangement of politeness statements by Blum-Kulka, which contains nine types of polite request statements, were used to analyze the data provided by the participants. This was to answer the second research problem. Based on Leech’s and Blum-Kulka’s theories, request which is more indirect shows the more politeness. From the participants’ answers in the questionnaires, the researcher grouped the answers into those nine types of requests. At last, the researcher concluded the types of request statements used by the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University.
F. Research Procedure

This research had several steps to conduct. Ary et al. (2002, pp. 29-30) state that there are seven stages in research. Those stages are selecting the research problem, reviewing the literature, designing the research, collecting the data, analyzing the data, interpreting the finding and stating conclusions, and reporting results as figured in the figure 3.1.

1. Selecting the Research Problems

This step was at the very beginning of the research. Based on the researcher’s curiosity and daily life activities especially in campus, the researcher came up with two research problems as stated in the first chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests’ Sentence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can I............</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I............</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will.....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you...........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you.........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you mind....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It came up because the researcher found it interesting that people make sentences in different ways even though they have the same utterance. The researcher also felt interested in linguistics, especially about spoken language. Those reasons were the bases why the research problems were chosen.
Figure 3.1: The Research Procedure

- Selecting the Research Problems
  (Two research problems)
- Reviewing Literature
  (Main and Supporting Theories)
- Collecting the Data
  (Questionnaires distribution)
- Designing the Research
  (Discourse analysis using discourse completion test)
- Interpreting the Findings and Stating Conclusions
  (Interpreting the data based on the reviewed literature)
- Analyzing the Data
  (Doing recapitulation of the data)
- Reporting Results
  (Thesis Defense and Thesis Publication)
2. Reviewing the Literature

In this step, the researcher reviewed some linguistics books, especially pragmatics books. Some theories were selected and used as the guide in doing the next steps. The theories which were reviewed were not only about the theories of pragmatics, but also the theories about the research technique itself, including the method of collecting data. There were some main and supporting theories which were used and recited by the researcher as the guide for the next steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests’ Sentence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can I........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will.......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you.......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you mind.......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Designing the Research

Based on the research problems and the reviewed literature, the researcher designed the research. The field in this research was under pragmatics linguistics. The research was discourse analysis using discourse completion test to gather the data. Speech acts about request would also be analyzed based on the data.
4. Collecting the Data

Labov (1972: 209) states that ideally, the data in linguistics research should be obtained from the language used in natural condition. However, in this research, the researcher needed to compile wide samples of a specific speech act produced in the same contexts. In this case, the use of written questionnaires presented the obvious advantage of allowing the collection of a great quantity of data extracted from a large number of informants. In this process, the researcher did two steps:

a. Consultation about the questionnaires

In this step, the researcher asked for suggestion and revision about the questionnaires from the academic professor and other lecturers in the English Language Education Study Program Sanata Dharma University. The main purpose was to make sure that the questionnaire presented the minimum requirements to be a discourse analysis questionnaire. Then, the researcher also asked for suggestion about the form of questionnaire from fellow students. The main purpose was to make sure that there was no ambiguous sentence, and the sentences were easy to understand.

b. Distributing the questionnaires

In this step, the researcher asked for permission from the captain of Service Program Design class to distribute the
questionnaires to the students of Service Program Design class. After distributing the questionnaires, the researcher gave 20 minutes time allocation for the participants to fulfill the questionnaires and 10 minutes process to collect the questionnaires back. That was the first step of distributing the questionnaires.

Since the Service Program Design class had only 75 students, the researcher did the second questionnaires distribution. It was in the student hall Sanata Dharma University. The researcher made appointment with some students and also picked some random students from the eighth semester in the English Language Education Study Program on the academic year 2013/2014 who were there at that time.

5. Analyzing the data

In this step, the researcher analyzed the answer of the questionnaires provided by the participants according to the theories from the reviewed literature. At first, the researcher analyzed the person deixis of the request sentences provided by the participants and classified it into a table. After that, the researcher analyzed the second research problem, which was about the types of request sentences based on Blum-Kulka’s categories.
6. Interpreting the Finding and Stating Conclusions

This step needed the researcher’s critical thinking because it dealt with the results of the research. In this step, the researcher interpreted the data based on the reviewed literature. The data classification was presented in the form of table, however, the researcher made deep explanation about the findings in the form of essay. After interpreting the data, the researcher made conclusions about the findings.

7. Reporting Results

The researcher interpreted the data and the results of the research in the oral examination or thesis defense in front of some lecturers of English Language Education Study Program. This was done for the sake of responsibility of what the researcher had written and to get input from the experts. After that, the researcher published this thesis.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section is the discussion about person deixis. It answers the first research problem. The second section is the discussion about request indirectness, which answers the second research problem. This chapter provides the findings based on the data gathered by the researcher.

A. Person Deixis

This part discusses the person deixis which is mostly used by the participants. This discussion aims to answer the first research problem. Based on the categories of illocutionary act, request is included in the directives category, whose utterance attempt to get someone to do something (Holmes, 2008). One aspect which is considered in analyzing the request sentences is the perspective adopted by the speaker in carrying out the request. As stated by Levinson (1983), person deixis concerns the encoding of the role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered. There are three main categories: first person (speaker oriented), second person (hearer oriented), and impersonal (none of speaker or hearer oriented). Based on the data which were gathered in this study, three types of perspective had been found: speaker oriented request, hearer oriented request, and impersonal request. When the requester produces sentences to make request, they might emphasize the role of the hearer as the
agent of action, the role of the speaker as the recipient of the action, or they might avoid those two emphases by having impersonal form. It is possible to have the fourth orientation, which is the combination of both speaker and hearer oriented. The examples presented below show the using of those three perspectives provided by the participants:

1) May I ask for the handouts, please?
2) Excuse me, Sir. Could I borrow the notes?
3) Could I get some information related to the materials for previous meeting?
4) Would you mind sending the two previous meetings to my email?
5) Would you kindly give me a copy of the last materials?
6) Could you give me some notes?
7) Is it possible to get the notes for the past 2 meetings?

In the examples, number (1), (2), and (3) show the use of speaker perspective, or what is called as speaker oriented request. It is also called by the first person deixis. Number (4), (5), and (6) show the use of hearer perspective, or what is called as hearer oriented. It is also called as the second person deixis. Number (7) shows the use of impersonal perspective, when there is neither speaker nor hearer orientation in the sentence produced by the speaker. In producing requests of the type appearing in (1), (2), or (3), the speaker avoids referring directly to the hearer as the agent who has to carry out the requested action. By contrast, the speaker emphasizes his or her own role as recipient or beneficiary of the action or object being requested.
According to Brown and Levinson (1978), those requests are acts which threaten the hearer’s negative face, by means of the requests oriented towards the speaker, the coercive level of the request is reduced and the risk of potential threat to the hearer’s negative face is minimized. This explanation as completed by Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1987: 158) that the terms could you emphasizing the role of the hearer, whereas could I shifts the emphasis to the role of the speaker. Requests usually threaten the hearer’s face. To avoid naming the hearer as the performer of the requested act is to minimize the imposition.

In this research, the researcher provided the same case, which was about borrowing a note from the previous meetings materials. The two types of situation (S) given by the researcher to participants were:

S1 You will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?

S2 You will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?

The researcher derived this case into two different situations. The first was asking for a note to a person with the same social status, who was a friend. The other case
was asking for a note to a person with different social status, who was a lecturer. The table 4.1 shows the person deixis indication in the request sentences provided by the participants which were gathered by the researcher:

Table 4.1: Request Sentences to a Friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests’ Sentence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can I........</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I........</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to........</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need.......</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you........</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you........</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you mind........</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you mind........</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the requests which were provided by the participants, the type of speaker oriented requests was found with the percentage 70%. Four types of request sentences were found in the requests with speaker oriented provided by the participants:

i. May I……

The modal *may* which was followed by *I* as the indicator of first person deixis type mostly appeared the most in the requests provided by the participants, e.g. “May I borrow the previous handouts?” “May I copy the materials for the last two weeks?”
ii. Can I……

Being followed by subject pronoun I, can also often appeared in the requests, e.g. “Can I borrow your notes?” “Can I have two previous meetings material?”

iii. I would like ……

The sentences using I would like to which was followed by pronoun or verb appeared in only some requests, e.g. “I would like you to give me your notes.” “I would like to get a copy.”

iv. I need……

An unexpected request was also provided by the participants, I need which was followed by verb appeared in one request, “I need your note.”

Those were four types of requests to a person whose social status and power were the same as the participants. The researcher could only find those four patterns, even though the researcher expected more various patterns. The phrases may I and can I were dominant in the data.

The type of hearer oriented requests, which was indicated by the appearing of the second person pronoun you, was found 30% in the requests which were uttered by the participants. Several patterns were found in the requests by the participants:
i. Can you……

*Can you* which was followed by verb appeared mostly in the requests with the second person orientation, e.g. “Can you please lend me your notes?” “Can you lend me your notes, please?”

ii. Could you……

Being followed by a verb, *could you* appeared quite often in some of the requests provided by the participants, almost the same number as *can you*, e.g. “Could you give your notes from two previous meetings?”

iii. Will you……

The phrase *will you* which was followed by verb appeared only in one request, that is “Will you let me copy your notes?”

iv. Would you mind……

Some requests using the phrase *would you mind* which were followed by verb-ing appeared in some of the data, e.g. ”Would you mind lending me the notes?”

v. Do you mind……

Few numbers of participants used *do you mind* as their starter of the head act requests. It appeared altogether with verb, e.g. “Do you mind
showing me the notes from previous two days materials?” “Do you mind lending me the notes?”

vi. Would you……

The researcher also found that most of the participants used *would* in their requests, e.g. “Would you give me the materials from two previous meetings?” “Would you lend me your note?”

Based on the data gathered by the researcher, the modal *could* and the auxiliary verb *would* were preferred by the participants. Leech (1983) claims that by replacing *will* and *can* with *would* and *could*, the speaker gives the hearer another excuse for not complying with the request: the past-tense modals signify a hypothetical action by the hearer, and so in reply, the hearer can give a positive reply to the question without committing himself to anything in the real world. The table 4.2 shows the person deixis indication in the request sentences provided by the participants which were gathered by the researcher.

The type of speaker oriented requests was found 43.75% in the requests which were uttered by the participants to a person with the higher social status. In this type of requests, there were some modals used by the participants in the head act of their requests:
i. Can I……

The requests using *can I* which was followed by verb appeared for only several times. The participants used this phrase in their requests, e.g. “Can I have two previous meetings materials?” “Can I copy the presentation file?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests’ Sentence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can I………</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I………</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to………</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could I………</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you………</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you………</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you mind………</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you mind………</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you………</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it possible………</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. May I……

*May I* was mostly found in the requests provided by the participants, e.g. “May I borrow your notes?” “May I get the materials from you?”

iii. I would like to……

One participant provided the request not in a form of question, but in the form of statement instead. The phrase *I would like to* which was followed by verb appeared in this form, “I would like to copy the handout for the last meeting.”
iv. Could I……

*Could I* appeared in some of the requests provided by the participants, e.g. “Could I borrow your note?” “Could I have some notes from the previous meetings?”

From the data provided by the participants, the modals *could, may,* and *can* appeared as questions in the head acts of the requests, while *would* was more as statement to show the participants’ willingness. The type of hearer oriented requests was found with the percentage 55% in the requests uttered by the participants. Compared to the requests with the speaker oriented style, there were less types of modal used by the participants in uttering their requests:

i. Can you……

*Can* appeared in only one request based on the data provided by the participant, e.g. “Can you teach me about the last meeting’s lesson?”

ii. Could you……

The researcher found *could* quite often in the requests which were made by the participants, e.g. “Could you please give me your notes?” “Could you lend me the notes, please?”

iii. Would you mind……

Besides *can* and *could,* the researcher also found *would* in the head act used by the participants. *Would* appeared as the most used word in the
requests provided by the participants, e.g. “Would you mind lending me the handouts from the last two meetings?” “Would you kindly give me a copy of the last materials?”

iv. Do you mind……

Several participants used the phrase *do you mind* which was followed by conditional phrase, e.g. “Do you mind if I borrow your last two previous meetings notes?” “Do you mind if I borrow the notes from you?” Some others used the phrase *do you mind* which was followed by verb-ing, e.g. “Do you mind showing me the notes from previous two days meeting?” “Do you mind lending me your notes?”

v. Would you ……

*Would you* was used in several requests. Most of the participants who used *would you* put additional word *like* or *please* in their requests, e.g. “Would you like to give me the notes because I had missed the class twice?” “Would you please give me the materials for those previous meeting?”

vi. Is it possible……

The type of impersonal request was also found in the requests which were uttered by the participants. This type occupied 1.25%. The request which was found stated “Is it possible to get the notes for the past
two meetings?” In this request, the requester used neither hearer nor speaker oriented.

These results may be interpreted that the strategy in English requests towards a person with the same power and status, that is to a friend, which were used by the eighth semester English Language Education Study Program students was more towards the speaker’s negative face. The type of the first person deixis was mostly used. On the contrary, the strategy in English requests towards a person with higher power and social status, that is to a lecturer, which were used by the English Language Education Study Program students was more towards the hearer’s negative face. It meant that the type of the second person deixis were mostly used in the requests to a person with higher power and social status.

B. Request Indirectness

This part discusses the type of requests provided by the participants, which aims to answer the second research problem. Blum-Kulka (1987) divides request strategies into nine categories: mood derivable, performative, hedged performative, obligation statement, want statement, suggestory formulae, query preparatory, strong hints, and mild hints. In this research, the researcher classified the participants’ requests into nine types of categories listed above. Based on the data findings during the data collecting step, the researcher derived the requests which were provided by the eighth semester students of English Language Education Study Program as listed in the table 4.4 and 4.5. This part is divided
into three main discussions, that is the direct strategy, conventionally indirect strategy, and non-conventionally indirect strategy.

1. Direct Strategy

Direct strategy was found in only few numbers of requests. In the request to a person with the same power and social status, the type of hedged performative request was found in accounting for 2.5% or 2 out of 80 participants. In this type, the participants used the same form of request statements. Both of the requests began with I would like to ask you to then added by performative verb. Direct strategy was found even fewer in the requests to a person with higher power and social status. It was found with the percentage 1.25% or 1 out of 80 participants. In this case, the participant used want statement in uttering the request. Direct strategy especially imperative might not be used a lot because it was considered as impolite (Eisenberg and Garvey, 1981). In uttering a request, people consider the degree of politeness to maintain the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Polite requests are less direct and mitigated requests, such as interrogative or conditional sentences.

2. Conventionally Indirect Strategy

Conventionally indirect strategy was found with the largest frequency in requests both to a person with the same power and social status and to a person with higher power and social status. The type of query preparatory requests both ability and permission appeared in 96.25% requests to a friend and 98.75%
requests to a lecturer. The examples written in the table 4.3 show the use of query preparatory request asking for ability:

Table 4.3: Proportion of Different Types Used in the Requests to a Friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Sub-strategy</th>
<th>Numbers of Requests</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit Performative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedged Performative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligation Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventionally Indirect</td>
<td>Suggestory Formulae</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Query Preparatory</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conventionally Indirect</td>
<td>Strong Hints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mild Hints</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Proportion of Different Types Used in the Requests to a Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Sub-strategy</th>
<th>Numbers of Requests</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit Performative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedged Performative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligation Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventionally Indirect</td>
<td>Suggestory Formulae</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Query Preparatory</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conventionally Indirect</td>
<td>Strong Hints</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mild Hints</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
i) “Can you lend me the notes?”

ii) “Could you give me the notes of the two previous meetings?”

iii) Would you mind giving me the notes from the two last meetings?

Requests with query preparatory asking for permission also appeared a lot in the data, here are the examples:

(iv) “Can I borrow the handouts for the previous meetings?”

(v) “Could I copy the materials from the two previous meetings?”

(vi) “Can I have the notes from the last two meetings, please?”

In this type of requests, the participants mostly used modals verb in uttering their requests. Conventionally indirect requests occurred oftenly to show politeness in requests. As Zhang (2012: 1) states, indirectness is a way to show politeness to others and it is used in many, speech acts, such as request and invitation in case the possible rejection or conflict occurs. When one wants to borrow something from others, the conventional indirectness of a question form is usually used. The speaker is technically asking permission to make a request. By being indirect, the speaker is making it less obvious that he expects the hearer to comply. On the surface, at least, this provides greater freedom for the hearer to refuse.

3. Non-conventionally Indirect Strategy

The type of non-conventionally indirect was found in 1.25% of the requests both to a friend, and none of the request to a lecturer used this type. In
this type, the participant used strong hint in the statement “I need a note.” Hints were not commonly used by the participants, even though hints were the most indirect types of requests which show more polite requests.

The findings have answered the research problems. The first research problem wants to seek for the person deixis which is used by the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program in expressing requests. The findings show that the participants tend to use the first person deixis when they make requests to a friend, who has the same power and social status. On the contrary, the participants tend to use the second person deixis when they make requests to a person with higher power and social status, that is to a lecturer. The second research problem looks for the request statement categories which are used by the participants. Both in the request to a friend and to a lecturer, the participants used conventionally indirect request. Query preparatory, which is one of the conventionally indirect request types, is mostly used by the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program in expressing requests.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

This part consists of three main sections, that is the conclusions, implications, and suggestions of the research. Conclusions deal with the summary and brief answers on the research problems of the research. Implications deal with the relation of this research to the study of English education. The last part, suggestions, deals with some suggestions and recommendations from the researcher for the future researcher in their future researches, the English lecturer or teacher, and the language learners in studying English.

A. Conclusions

This research has two objectives. The first objective is to look for the type of person deixis which is used by the participants in making requests both to the person with the same power and social status and to the person with higher power and social status. The findings state that the eighth semester students in the English Language Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University batch 2013/2014 tend to use the first person deixis in uttering request to a person with the same power and social status, that is to a friend. This might happen because the participants felt it would be fine to give less option to the hearers to complete the participants’ requests. On the contrary, they tend to use the second person deixis in their requests toward a person with a higher level and social status, that is to a lecturer. This might happen because the participants felt that they needed to
give more option to the hearers whether they wanted to complete the requests or not.

The second aim of this research is to look for the type of requests which are used by the eighth semester students of the English Language Education Study Program. The research found that most of the students tend to use conventionally indirect strategy in their requests. In this strategy, they tend to use query preparatory in uttering the requests both to a person with the same power and social status and to a person with higher power and social status. The numbers of this type of requests are absolute. 96.25% requests to a friend were found, and there is only little difference percentage from the number in the request to a lecturer, which is 97.5%.

B. Implications

Request is one small part of speech acts which is done in almost every place. Even though it happens only in seconds and usually gets fast response from the hearer, request deals with a lot of things, especially with politeness. People can make request successfully when they are able to perform request with correct grammar and strategy. Uttering request to a friend is surely different from uttering request to a boss, lecturer, or stranger. In this case, the knowledge of pragmatics is actually needed.

The knowledge about speech acts, especially request as the part of directives speech acts, can actually be inserted in almost all of the English skills subjects. Teacher can give information about the various types of request and its difference
in writing, speaking, listening, or reading class. Writing class might be the weakest class to teach this knowledge. However, the teacher can manage it by giving some knowledge when the students have got a chance to write a narrative. In the listening and reading materials, the teacher can discuss the types and strategies of request every time request is listened or read in the class materials. Meaning to say that the teachers can include request in the listening or reading materials. Speaking class is actually the most effective class to teach the students about the types and strategies of politeness. In the speaking class, students get explanation, knowledge, sometimes role model in their speaking activity, and then they practice or apply it directly. To make it more effective, the types and various strategies of requests can be applied in the daily activities. In the simple situation, the researcher might remind the student who is failed in uttering the polite request. Using imperative to a teacher or lecturer is commonly considered as impolite. In this case, the teacher may revise and tell the student about this knowledge.

C. Suggestions

After finishing this research, the researcher has some suggestions for the future researchers, the English lecturers or teachers, and the English learners. The suggestions are shared for better study and English teaching learning process.

1. Future Researchers

The researcher expects that this research will be inspiration for the future researchers in conducting a research about pragmatics. However, the researcher suggests that the future researchers conduct deeper research with wider
participants for the sample. Deeper research would be very helpful to analyze the tendency of the English learner in their speech acts. The deixis which is analyzed could be more various, or the future researchers could probably analyze not only request but also apologize, suggestion, and so on. Wider participants would include more data and more accurate analysis about the issues which are discussed.

2. English Lecturers or Teachers

The researcher suggests the English lecturers or teachers explain deeper about pragmatics to the students, especially in the English Language Education Study Program because later on the students will become teachers. Giving the explanation about some various types of requests would be really helpful for the students’ knowledge, especially in their speaking ability. The lecturer or teacher can also teach the politeness to the students more detail to make the students able to be successful in uttering their speech acts with the right grammar and polite way.

3. Language Learners

The researcher suggests the language learners understand or learn about the theory of pragmatics deeper. It might only a few parts of our daily communication, however, it deals with the learner’s relation to the person whom he speaks to. Understanding and learning deeper about this issue will help the
learner to have successful communication and avoid misunderstanding when talking to other people.
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PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer:
   May I borrow your notes?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer:
   Excuse me, could you give me your notes, please?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer:
   
   Can you lend me your notes, please?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer:
   I'm sorry.
   Excuse me, miss. I skipped two previous meetings. Would you mind giving me some notes of the materials?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer: 

   **Excuse me, can I borrow your notes?**

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
Answer: 

   **Excuse me from last meeting. I did not come because I was sick. May I ask the material in the previous meeting?**
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer:
_Excuse me, sir. I’ve skipped two previous meetings and I need the notes. So, may I get the materials from you?
PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer: Hello, dude, can I have the latest materials from the previous meetings? I missed the class for a reason, please?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer: Excuse me, sir/waigu, may I have the latest materials from the previous meetings? Because I didn’t come to the last meeting because of certain reason.
QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer:
"Hello, John, sorry for disturbing you. May I borrow your notes of Research Method? I really need it and I have to learn it for the exam next week."

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
Answer:
"Good morning, Miss. I’m sorry for disturbing you. I also say sorry since I didn’t attend the two previous meetings due to a certain subject. May I borrow the notes of the materials in two previous meetings. I will give it back to you soon. Thank you."
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer: Can I borrow your notes?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer: Excuse me, Miss. Could I borrow your notes?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days' materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer: I will survive. I need your notes, please.

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days' materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
Answer: Sir, can I borrow or get materials?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer:
   "Sue, can I borrow your notes of structure? I will copy it since last two meetings I didn’t come."

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer:
   "Good morning, Miss. Would you mind before giving me handout for last two meeting materials. I did not come in these two meetings since I was hospitalized."
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   
   Answer: 
   
   I skipped two me
   
   May I borrow your notes?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   
   Answer: 
   
   Would you mind giving me your notes?
QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?

Answer:

I don’t have the two previous meetings' notes. May I borrow your notes?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?

Answer:

Excuse me sir, would you like to give me the two previous meetings' notes?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer:
   "Hey buddy, I’ve missed two last meetings. Can you please lend me the notes?"

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer:
   "Excuse me, sir. It was my fault that I missed two last meetings. Would you like to give me any notes?"
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer: Hi bro, can you lend me the previous materials?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer: Good morning sir, would you like to give me the previous handouts?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer: 
Hey, I didn’t come to the last two meetings and I also do not have the materials. May I copy your notes of the last two meetings?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
Answer: 
Excuse me, I unfortunately couldn’t come to the last two meetings, so I haven’t got the materials. Do you mind if I ask for the materials from those two meetings?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer:
   Can I borrow your handouts? I need to copy it so I can learn for the exam. Thank you.

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer:
   I am sorry, sir because I couldn’t attend your class for 2 meetings. Would you like to lend me the handout?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?

   Answer:
   
   \[ \text{Could you give some information about the materials from the previous meeting, please?} \]

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?

   Answer:
   
   \[ \text{(Could I get some information related to the materials from the previous meeting, please?)} \]
   
   Because \[ \text{(the reason)} \]
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days' materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer:
Could you give your notes, please? I haven't notes for this exam.

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days' materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
Answer:
I'm sorry sir, I didn't have a note. Could you give me some note, so I can learn for the exam?
PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer: I skipped two previous meetings... Would you lend me your notes?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer: I skipped two previous meetings, sir... Would you mind giving me the materials?
QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
   Answer:  
   Can you please lend me your notes?  

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
   Answer:  
   Would you mind if I asked for some materials to you?
QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?
Answer:
Hello, I would like to ask you to give me your notes because I just missed my two previous meetings. Do you mind?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?
Answer:
Hello sir, sorry for skipping the 2 previous meetings. But I would like to ask the materials in that 2 meetings. Could I have it?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?

   Answer:
   Hey, Book Rey, May I borrow your previous handout or note? I need to catch up.

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?

   Answer:
   Excuse me, Mom. May I have any information about the previous material?
This questionnaire aims to find the data about an analysis of request provided by the English Language Education Study Program. Provide your answer based on the case below!

1. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days' materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your friend. What do you say?

Answer:
I was absent last 2 weeks, may I copy the materials for last 2 weeks meetings?

2. Imagine you will have a final examination next week. You skipped two previous meetings for a certain subject. You do not have the notes of those days’ materials now. You need those notes to catch up the materials, so you try to get them from your lecturer. What do you say?

Answer:
I'm sorry sir, I couldn't attend to your course because I got very sick. May I get the materials on last 2 weeks meeting?