

## POLITENESS IN INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATICS OF REQUEST PERFORMED BY EFL LEARNERS

Wisma Wijayanti<sup>1</sup>, Agus Wijayanto<sup>2</sup>, and Sri Marmanto<sup>3</sup>

1&3 English Education Department, Universitas Sebelas Maret

2 English Education Department, FKIP-UMS

Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia

wismawijaya23@gmail.com

### Abstract

Without understanding the aspects of requestives, it would be difficult to make speech act production of request in the right way. It could be offensive and trigger the face threatening act (FTA) to the hearer if it is not conveyed politely. This study investigates Indonesian EFL learners's production of politeness in request speech act. It also examines the relationship between the use of politeness in requests and the social variables, such as power and social distance. The data were elicited from 10 Indonesian EFL learners through Discourse Completion Task (DCT). The result shows that not all types of request strategies proposed by Trosborg (1995) are employed by the EFL learners. Regarding to politeness, they apply all types of Brown and Levinson' politeness strategies (1987) in expressing requests, such as bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. The most dominant politeness strategy used by the EFL learners is negative politeness while the least one is off record. Social variables, such as power and social distance influence the way in which they express politeness expressions. The study of politeness in interlanguage pragmatics could provide positive knowledge of the learners' understanding of pragmatic competence and the application of politeness theories in classroom interaction, especially in EFL classroom interaction.

**Keywords:** politeness, interlanguage pragmatics, request, EFL learners, DCT

### INTRODUCTION

Politeness is an essential aspect in interlanguage pragmatics study. It is interpreted as an interpersonal relation system used to reduce friction in interaction (Yule, 1996). In other words, politeness is performed to build harmonious relationship among the people who engage in certain interaction. Hence, politeness is necessary to be implemented in communication, especially by the learners who are studying English as a foreign language. As the goal of the learners in learning a foreign language is to be able to communicate fluently and

comprehensively, politeness aspects within pragmatic competence could not be ignored in learning the foreign language. This is because without understanding pragmatic knowledge including politeness theory, it will cause misunderstanding even failures in communication.

Many linguists have proposed theory of politeness, the most influential ones are Brown and Levinson (1987) with their Face Saving Strategy. They develop a concept of politeness based on Geoffman's face theory as a foundation to explain polite human interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987)

---

examine politeness in the context of face-management and divide speech act into two forms; that are face threatening acts (FTA) and face saving acts (FSA). A face threatening act (FTA) happens when a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image. It is called as a face saving act (FSA) if it is given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another's face, but the speaker can say something to minimize the possible threat (Brown and Levinson, 1987). In communication, the speaker should avoid speech acts that can threaten the hearer's face, because it can make the hearer feel uncomfortable.

Request is one of speech acts that is commonly considered FTA. Request is categorized as a directive speech act that aims to get something done by the hearer in certain circumstances (Searle, 1969). Thus, request can be offensive and trigger the face threatening act (FTA) to the hearer if it is not conveyed properly. In foreign language learning, appropriate behavior in expressing request is required in order not to embarrass the other interlocutor. Blum-Kulka (1991) outlined that a good indicator of cultural literacy of language users can be seen from the use of appropriate and polished style of request.

In recent years, request has been one of the most widely examined speech act in both of interlanguage and cross-cultural pragmatic fields (Vilar & Martinez-Flor, 2004). Previous studies on the similar topic were conducted by Johns and Felix-Brasdefer (2015); Tongwanchai (2015); Hashemian and Farhang-Ju (2017); Khandani (2017);

Thuruvan and Yunus (2017); Sukarno (2018); and IMRJ Widanta et al (2018). They focused on the production of request speech act in various kinds of contexts.

Johns and Felix-Brasdefer (2015) examined linguistic politeness and pragmatics variation in the production of request among Senegalese speakers of French. Tongwanchai (2015) analyzed pragmatic competence in requests of Thai learners of Spanish by comparing pragmatic competence performed by Thai learners of Spanish and Spanish native speakers. Hashemian and Farhang-Ju (2017) investigated Iranian and Spanish intermediate nonnative English learners' request strategies to their faculty. Thuruvan and Yunus (2017) identified the types of request strategies employed by the participants in making request and the factors influencing their choice of strategies. Khandani (2017) looked into the perception of requestive by Persian native speakers to determine the socially appropriate request patterns in Persian. IMRJ Widanta et al (2018) delved into request modification produced by Indonesian English speakers. Last, Sukarno (2018) explored politeness strategies, linguistic markers, and social contexts commonly used to deliver requests in Javanese.

The short review above indicates that many studies of requests have been conducted under interlanguage pragmatics field, however, still few that focus on politeness in request expressions performed by Indonesian EFL learners. The present study observes how Indonesian EFL learners produce speech act of request with politeness strategies and looks at how social variables affect the use of the politeness. It is conducted in the different

context performed by the different participants in which the DCT situations in this article are designed in accordance with the situations that happen in a classroom setting by considering the aspects of social variables, such as power and social distance. The research questions are formulated as follows: (1) What types of request and politeness strategies are performed by EFL learners? (2) What is the relationship between the use of politeness in request and the collocutors' social power and distance?

## **METHOD**

### *Instrument of the research*

The researcher used Discourse Completion Task (DCT) to obtain the data for this study. Discourse Completion Task is a common procedure in interlanguage pragmatic research, especially in investigating the speech acts production. Kasper (2000) affirms that a Discourse Completion Task is the most prominent way of pragmalinguistic and linguistic data elicitation. Further, it is believed that this kind of data elicitation can be used to gain many data in short time.

DCT scenarios used in this research were adapted from Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1987). The DCT involved 6 situations in which each situation considered the aspects of power and social distance. The power referred to the social status of the requesters over the requestees. It comprised three levels, such as high, equal, and low power. The second variable was social distance relating to the degree of familiarity or intimacy between the interlocutors. It was divided into two levels, such as close distance relationship and not close distance relationship. The examples of DCT in this research are as follows:

*All situations below take place in the classroom interaction, so you act as a teacher and the students who come from different background, such as different age and occupation. You are required to imagine if you are in the following situations then what will you say.*

*Situation 1 (requesting to a higher power – close distance relationship)*

*“You are a student. In the class, you have recognized your teacher well since you were at the first semester. When your teacher are explaining about an important topic, you couldn't comprehend it, because it is too difficult for you. What will you say if you want to ask your teacher to explain more about the topic?”*

### *Participants of the research*

The participants of the research were 10 Indonesian university students consisting of 5 male and 5 female students who were selected randomly. They were non English department students studying in a university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. They learn English as a foreign language. The participants of the research were required to respond each DCT in the written form. Through the DCTs, they were given a short description of the situation involving setting, familiarity, and power relation between the participants. Then, they were asked to imagine and put themselves in each DCT situation. They gave responses to the DCTs according to the context of situation.

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

This section discusses the findings of the research. It comprises the answers of

research questions that consists of types of politeness strategies used by EFL learners in producing request expressions and the relationship between politeness in performing request and social variables, such as power and social distance. The data of this research were analyzed based on politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson's (1987) and the theory of request strategies suggested by Trosborg (1995).

### Situation 1

*"You are a student. In the class, you have recognized your teacher well since you were at the first semester. When your teacher is explaining about an important topic, you couldn't comprehend it, because it is too difficult for you. What will you say if you want to ask your teacher to explain more about the topic being discussed in the class in which you don't understand enough about that topic?"*

The first situation represents the speaker in lower power than the hearer and their relationship is close. The situation tells the speaker (the student) to request the hearer (the teacher) explain more about the topic being discussed in the class in which the speaker does not understand enough about that topic. The result of DCT shows that all EFL learners apply negative politeness strategy when they perform their request in this situation, for instances:

- (1) *I'm sorry, I didn't really understand about the discussion. Would you mind to explain it once again?*
- (2) *It's difficult to understand the topic. Can you explain more about the topic, sir?*

- (3) *If you're not busy, I hope you can help me to explain more about the topic you have explained in the class, because I don't understand.*
- (4) *Excuse me, would you explain more about the topic, because I don't understand enough.*
- (5) *I don't mean to interrupt you Mr. Bryan, but may I have more explanation regarding today's course? Because I haven't understood a single thing from the beginning of your class.*

### Situation 2

*"You have an important story that your close friend must know about it. You will come to him/her after the class. What will you say to your close friend if you want to ask him/her to have a seat together and have a small talk with you?"*

The second situation happens when the speaker (the student) has an equal power and close relationship with the hearer (the other student). This situation tells the speaker (the student) to ask the hearer (the other student) have a seat together and have a small talk. The result reveals that there are eight negative politeness strategies, one bald on record, and one positive politeness uttered by the learners in making request. The examples of politeness expressions in situation 2 are as follows:

- (1) *Jean, can you sit beside me? I have gossip that I need to tell you. (Negative Politeness)*
- (2) *Hi my bro, good morning! May I sit beside you? Because I want to talk to you. (Positive Politeness)*

- (3) *Rob, please sit next to me. I need to tell you the hottest news about your crush Britney. (Bald on record)*
- (4) *Can you have a seat beside of me because I want to discuss something important? (Negative Politeness)*
- (5) *If you want please take a seat beside of me because there are some information that we need to discuss. (Negative Politeness)*

### Situation 3

*“You are a teacher. You are teaching at the class where you have known your students very well. When you want to write something on the blackboard, you find the blackboard dirty. What will you say if you want to ask your student to clean the blackboard, because the blackboard is full of notes and you need to write down the materials on it?”*

The third situation is intended to the hearer in lower power and close distance relationship. This situation tells the speaker (the teacher) to ask the hearer (the student) clean the blackboard, because the blackboard is full of notes and the speaker (the teacher) needs to write down the materials on it. The result of DCT indicates that there are two learners who employ bald on record strategy, one learner who expresses positive politeness, and seven learners who convey negative politeness strategy. The utterances can be seen below:

- (1) *Guys... the blackboard is full of notes. I want you to clean the blackboard, please. (Positive Politeness)*
- (2) *Timmy, please be a good student and clean the mess on the board. Because I'm gonna teach all of you*

*about pronunciation. (Bald on record)*

- (3) *Would you do me a favor to clean the blackboard please? (Negative Politeness)*
- (4) *Can you help me to clean the board? (Negative Politeness)*
- (5) *Please clean the blackboard because I can't write in there. (Bald on record)*

### Situation 4

*“You are a student. You have a new teacher in your class. Your teacher said that he will give an exam in your class in order to know the ability of the students in your class. Unfortunately, you are not ready for the exam because of something difficult. What will you say if you want to ask your new teacher to help you get ready for the exam tomorrow?”*

Situation 4 is designed for the hearer (the teacher) who has higher power than the speaker (the student) in distant relationship. The situation tells the speaker (the student) to ask for help the hearer (the new teacher) to get ready for the exam. The result shows that there are nine negative politeness and one off record strategy applied by EFL learners in performing request in situation 4, such as:

- (1) *Sorry, I'll have an exam soon, but I haven't understood the topic well. Do you understand about it? (Off record)*
- (2) *Actually, I have an exam tomorrow, but I don't really understand the lesson. Could you please help me? (Negative Politeness)*
- (3) *Sorry for disturbing you, can you help me to explain about the last lesson because I don't understand*

*and I'm not ready for exam.  
(Negative Politeness)*

- (4)*Excuse me, are you busy right now?  
Can you help me with my lesson,  
because I must get ready for exam?  
(Negative Politeness)*
- (5)*Excuse me, Sir, can you help me to  
teach this topic? Because it's  
difficult to understand. (Negative  
Politeness)*

### Situation 5

*"You are a student. When your teacher is writing down the materials on the blackboard, you couldn't see that notes clearly. You need your friend (you are not close with him/her, because he/she came from the different class on previous semester) beside you to read aloud the teacher's notes on the blackboard for you, because you can't read the notes clearly. It is difficult to read. What will you say?"*

The fifth situation occurs when the speaker has equal power with the hearer in a distant relationship. In this situation, the speaker (the student) is required to ask the hearer (the other student) to read aloud the teacher's notes on the blackboard, because in this context, the speaker can't read the notes clearly. The result reports that all EFL learners convey negative politeness strategy when they perform the request expression in situation 5, for instances:

- (1)*Can you please read loud the notes on the blackboard because I can't read it clearly?*
- (2)*Excuse me, would you read the notes on the blackboard for me?*
- (3)*Hi... I can't read the teacher notes. May you read it for me?*

(4)*Her handwriting looks like a train rick, Dave can you help me to read it for me?*

(5)*Intan, can you read loud the teacher's notes on me?*

### Situation 6

*"You didn't attend the yesterday class. And today, you come to the class earlier, because you want to copy your friend's notes. At the class, there is only one friend whom you are not close with, because he is your junior who joins into your class. What will you say if you want to ask him to lend you some lecture notes?"*

Situation 6 is intended to the speaker (the student) who has distant relationship and higher power than the hearer. This situation explains the speaker (the student) to ask the hearer (the other student) to lend some lecture notes for the speaker. The result points out that there is only one politeness strategy used by the learners in expressing request; that is negative politeness strategy. Some examples of negative politeness expression performed in situation 6 can be seen below:

(1)*Morning Adam, can I borrow your lecture notes, please? Cos yesterday I didn't come to the class.*

(2)*Marco, may I borrow your notes? I couldn't attend the class yesterday, because I have to drive my mom to the hospital.*

(3)*Hi, are you busy? Can you lend me your notes from the last meeting?*

(4)*Sorry, I didn't attend yesterday's class. Can you lend me your notes?*

(5) *Would you mind lending me your notes? I missed the class due to my cat gave birth yesterday.*

To sum up the result of the research, the researcher classified the data into two tables; the first table relates to the frequency of

request expressions combined by the use of politeness strategies performed by EFL learners and the second table contains the frequency of politeness strategies in six different situations related to social variables. The frequency of the use of politeness strategies in request is presented in table 1.

**Table 1. Frequency of politeness strategies in request**

Request Strategies	Politeness Strategies				Total
	Bald on Record	Positive Politeness	Negative Politeness	Off Record	
Imperatives	3	-	-	-	3
Performatives	-	-	-	-	-
Obligation	-	-	-	-	-
Desires/needs	-	1	1	-	2
Wishes	-	-	3	-	3
Suggestory Formulae	-	-	-	-	-
Permission	-	1	7	-	8
Willingness	-	-	11	-	11
Ability	-	-	32	-	32
Hint	-	-	-	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>60</b>

Table 1 shows that there were totally 60 data containing politeness expressions performed by EFL learners in making request. It indicates that all politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) were applied by the learners when performing request. The EFL learners in this research frequently used negative politeness as their strategy to make their production of request politer whereas they infrequently conveyed off-record strategy. However, not all types of request proposed by Trosborg (1995) were employed by the participants of the research; only 7 types of request strategies were used by the learners including imperative, desire, wishes, permission, willingness, ability, and hint.

### Negative Politeness

There were 54 data of requests utterances involved into negative politeness strategy. It was the most dominant politeness strategy used by EFL learners in performing requests. This could be because negative politeness strategy could be used to indicate the existence of social distance between the speaker and the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987), there are 10 strategies of politeness that belong to negative politeness, such as: be conventionally indirect, question – hedge, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, impersonalize S and H, state the FTA as a general rule, nominalize, and go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebted H. The uses of politeness strategies within negative politeness can be seen from the examples:

- (1) *Excuse me, can you explain more about the topic please? (be conventionally indirect)*
- (2) *Pardon me Mr. Penowski, I don't mean to be rude, but would you mind to explain your course more? I found my self confused about it. (apologize)*
- (3) *Excuse me, would you explain more about the topic, because I don't understand enough. (be pessimistic)*
- (4) *Farah, can I talk with you? (question – hedge)*
- (5) *If you want please to take a seat beside of me because there are some information that we need to discuss. (minimize the imposition)*

Most EFL learners in the study applied negative politeness strategy in performing some types of request, such as request for desires, wishes, permission, willingness, and ability. These kinds of request were characterized by the use of can/could as the ability statement, will/would as the willingness statement, may as the permission expression, and want/need as the desire expression. The most dominant request strategy that involved negative politeness was request for ability. There were 32 expressions of request in the form of ability question. Some examples below show the use of negative politeness in request for ability, willingness, permission, wishes, and desire.

- (1) *"If you are not busy, I hope you can help me to explain more about the topic you have explained in the class, because I don't understand enough". (Wish)*
- (2) *"I'm sorry, I didn't really understand about the discussion. Would you mind to explain it once again?" (Willingness)*

- (3) *"Hi, are you busy? Can you lend me your notes from the last meeting?" (Ability)*
- (4) *"Hi, do you have time? May I sit here? I have some problem and I want to discuss it with you". (Permission)*
- (5) *"Hi, I want you to talk with me for a while. Can I sit here?" (Desire)*

### **Bald on Record**

Only 3 data of the study that involved bald on record strategy. It was often used by the learners in expressing request in imperative. The use of imperative form indicates the characteristic of bald on record that leads to direct strategy. Based on the politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), the main reason for bald on record usage may be stated simply in general, whenever the speaker wants to do FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy the hearer's face, especially when the speaker is in emergency situations.

The participants of the research used bald on record strategy to express their request in two situations. The first situation occurred when they conversed with someone who had equal power and close relationship. The second situation happened when they talked to someone with close relationship and lower power. The examples of utterances containing bald on record strategy in request can be seen below:

- (1) *"Rob, please sit next to me! I need to tell you the hottest news about your crush Britney".*
- (2) *"Timmy, please be a good student and clean the mess on the board!"*
- (3) *"Please clean the black board because I can't write in there!"*

In the first example, the speaker and the hearer had equal power and close relationship. Meanwhile, the second and third example, the requests were addressed to the hearer with lower power and close social distance. The data indicate that the speakers who had equal power and higher power in close relationship had an authority to perform the request by using bald on record strategy in direct way. However, since bald on record strategy is direct, it risks to threaten the hearer's face, so that it can make the hearers feel uncomfortable in complying the speaker's request.

### **Positive Politeness**

Positive politeness strategies were rarely used by EFL learners in performing request. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are 15 strategies within positive politeness, such as: notice – attend to H, exaggerate, intensify interest to H, use in-group identity markers, seek agreement, avoid disagreement, assert common ground, joke, presuppose S's knowledge and concern for H's wants, offer – promise, be optimistic, include both S and H in the activity, give reasons, assert reciprocity, and give gifts to H. However, there are only two politeness expressions that belong to the use of in-group identity markers. It includes the usages of address forms, such as “*my bro*” and “*guys*”. The two examples of positive politeness strategy can be seen below:

- (1) “*Hi my bro, good morning! May I sit beside you? Because I want to talk to you*”.
- (2) “*Guys... the blackboard is full of notes. I want you to clean the blackboard, please*”.

The types of request which were used together with positive politeness strategy was request for permission and request for desire. Each type of request expression was conveyed in two different situations, namely the situation in which the hearer had lower power and close social distance; and the situation in which the hearer had equal power and close social distance. In the first example, the speaker and the hearer had the same power and close social relationship. Meanwhile, in the second example, the hearer's power was lower than the speaker's and their relationship was close. Example 1 was a request for permission in which it was characterized by the use of the expression of permission “*may I sit beside you?...*”. Meanwhile, example 2 was a request for desire employed with positive politeness strategy. The words “*I want you....*” indicated the speaker's desire for the hearer to do something for the speaker's beneficial. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness strategy is used to reduce the imposition to the hearer's face. It is also used to indicate the closeness, intimacy, and good relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Hence, this strategy can produce the request politer rather than bald on record strategy.

### **Off Record**

The last strategy performed by the EFL learners was off record strategy. Off record is the most indirect strategy among the four strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Since off record belongs to indirect strategy, it implies the speaker's request. In this study, off record was the least strategy used by the learners in expressing requests. The reason why the learners rarely employ off record strategy might be because this kind

of strategy produces politeness expressions which are often difficult to understand and interpret by interlocutors. If the speaker says something by implying the message, and the interlocutor couldn't comprehend the message, it will lead to misunderstanding even failure in communication.

Only one request applied by the learners used off-record strategy; that is, strong hint. The example of off record strategy in strong hint request is in the italic sentence. *"I'll have an exam soon, but I haven't understood the topic well. Do you understand about it?"*. It is employed by the student (the speaker) to the teacher (the interlocutor) in which the speaker in this situation has lower power than the hearer in the distant relationship. The sentence above shows that the speaker delivers the request indirectly by saying *"Do you understand about it?"*. The real meaning of this question is that the speaker wants to request the hearer to explain more about the topic of examination.

Table 2 describes that EFL learners in this research applied all politeness strategies

proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. Most EFL learners applied negative politeness strategy along the situations where the situation happened such as when the speaker had lower, equal, or higher power than the hearer regardless the relationship among the speaker and the hearer.

Negative politeness was the most dominant politeness strategy used by the learners in all situations, because negative politeness probably was the easiest strategy to produce polite and understandable utterances. By means of negative politeness strategy, the hearer could comprehend the speaker's intention without misunderstanding. Further, negative politeness strategy could be used to indicate the existence of social distance between the speaker and the hearer, so that it could make the interlocutor comfortable in accomplishing the speaker's request without threatening the hearers' face. Therefore, this strategy could increase the probability of the hearer to perform the speakers' request.

**Table 2. Frequency of politeness strategies in each situation**

Politeness Strategies	Situations						Total
	Sit. 1	Sit. 2	Sit. 3	Sit. 4	Sit. 5	Sit. 6	
	Higher power – close	Equal power – close	Lower power – close	Higher power – not close	Equal power – not close	Lower power – not close	
Bald on Record	-	1	2	-	-	-	3
Positive Politeness	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Negative Politeness	10	8	7	9	10	10	<b>54</b>
Off Record	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60

All politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson can be used to express all types of request strategies proposed by Trosborg (1995). However, in fact, EFL learners did

not employed all types of request strategies. They only used some of request strategies, such as request for permission, willingness, ability, wishes, and desire that belong to

conventionally indirect; strong hint that belongs to indirect request, and imperative that belongs to direct request.

EFL learners employed those types of requests in line with the functions of each politeness strategy. Bald on record was applied to express the request in the type of imperative. Positive politeness was used to deliver request for desires. Negative politeness was conveyed to perform request for permission, willingness, ability, and wishes. Off record was employed in expressing hint request. The most dominant request strategy used by EFL learners was conventionally indirect strategies (56 data), followed by direct strategies (3 data), and indirect strategy (one datum). Meanwhile, the most dominant politeness strategy applied by EFL learners was negative politeness (54 data), followed by bald on record (3 data), positive politeness (2 data), and off record (one datum). The most frequently combination strategy used by EFL learners was negative politeness combined with request for ability.

In relation to the power and social distance, speakers with higher, equal, or lower power than the hearer could express politeness expressions directly and indirectly either it was intended to the hearer in close relationship or distant relationship. Further, collocutors with a higher power did not always utter the request directly, but sometimes, they also used an indirect way to employ the request, although their power was higher than the hearer. On the other hand, speakers who had lower power than the hearer did not merely use the indirect way when they talked to the hearers with the higher power. However, they also employed

a direct way to deliver the request in some occasion, despite the power possessed by the hearer was higher than that of the speaker. All in all, in line with Wijayanto, Laila, Prasetyarini, and Susiati, (2013), the EFL learners' strategies were much influenced by status level and social distance.

## CONCLUSIONS

The present study concluded that EFL learners apply all politeness strategies namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. Negative politeness is the most frequently strategy used by the learners to deliver their requests. Moreover, most EFL learners employ negative politeness strategy along the social situations, such as when the speaker is in lower, equal, or higher power than the hearer regardless the relationship among the speaker and the hearer. Power and social distance influence the way in which the speakers convey politeness expressions. However, sometimes, the situations of every conversation also determine the application of politeness.

In relation to pragmatic competence, it can be concluded that Indonesian EFL learners in this study are still influenced by the social and cultural norms of L1 when constructing the target language's pragmatic. In some occurrences, they often transfer their L1 to L2, so the meanings resulted in L2 seem like what Indonesian native speakers usually say. Thus, it produces improper meaning in L2. This study provides a better understanding of pragmatic competences regarding to politeness realization in request speech act for the learners who are studying English as foreign language. In addition to social

contexts, the use of politeness strategies in request might be different in the use of language in the other country. Consequently, EFL learners, especially in Indonesia, should be aware of it. Teaching L2 politeness to EFL learners could minimize aggressive interaction and provide better ability for the learners to acquire communicative competence in order to establish smoothness, harmonious, and effective communication. Future research on interlanguage pragmatics of request could possibly look at the aspects of impoliteness. It is necessary to get the deeper understanding on politeness in interlanguage pragmatic of request.

## REFERENCES

- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics II*, 131-146.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Olshtain, Elite. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSAR). *Applied Linguistics Journal*, 196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage Pragmatics: The Case of Requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Salinker, M., Sharwood-Smith, M. & Swain, M. (eds.). *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research*. Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 255–272.
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual; essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday.
- Hashernian, M., & Farhang-Ju, M. (2017). A pragmatic study of speech act by Iranian and Spanish nonnative English learners. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 8, 14-20.
- I M R J Widanta *et al.* (2018). Interlanguage request modification: A case in vocational college. *Journal of Physics: Conf. Ser.* 953 012095.
- Johns, A., & Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2015). Linguistic politeness and pragmatic variation in request production in Dakar and French. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 11(1), 131-164.
- Khandani, E. K. (2017). Requestive speech acts realization patterns: Observation from Persian. *RAJs Journal*.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). *Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13, pp 215-247.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer: *Second language research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G. (2000). *Data collection in pragmatics research*. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking* (pp. 316–341). London, New York: Continuum.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sukarno. (2018). Politeness strategies, linguistic markers, and social context in delivering request in Javanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7 (3), 659-667.

- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Thuruvan, P., & Yunus, M. M. (2017). The speech act of request in the ESL classroom. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 23 (4), 212-221.
- Tongwachai, F. (2015). Pragmatic competence of request of Thai learners of Spanish. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 23, 131-141.
- Trosborg, Anna. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics of request, complaints, and apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vilar Beltran, Elina & Martinez-Flor, Alicia. (2004). Analyzing English native speakers' use of request modification devices during a role-play activity. *International Journal*, 199-205.
- Wijayanto, Agus., Laila, Malikatul., Prasetyarini, Aryati., & Susiati, Susiati. (2013). Politeness in interlanguage pragmatics of complaint by Indonesian learners of English. *English Language Teaching*, 6(10), 188-201.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.