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ABSTRACT

The cross-linguistic study of speech acts has been an active area of research. The speech act of requests, for example, has been closely investigated by many researchers. However, there has not been a lot of work done on speech acts by Korean speakers of English, particularly in comparison to native speakers of English.

In this study, I compare Korean students' request forms and American English speakers' request forms according to the relationships between speakers and hearers, and levels of imposition of a particular request.

The data are collected from a group of 20 native speakers of English and 20 Korean speakers by using the Discourse Completion Test (DCT). The 12 scenarios are developed to elicit the speech act of requests. The collected data is analyzed in terms of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. The results show that the Korean subjects prefer to use negative politeness throughout the situations, and Americans use positive politeness more than Koreans do. Also, this study indicates that Koreans may tend to transfer the norms of their native language and culture into English when making requests.
This study may be significant in three ways. First, it reveals certain aspects of the Korean culture that has not been recognized clearly in the field of speech acts. Second, it offers an explanation for miscommunication between Korean speakers of English and native speakers of English. Third, this study provides empirical information about how Korean students use request forms, and how Koreans' politeness strategies differ from Americans' politeness strategies. Therefore, this information may be useful for ESL material developers and teachers to help students achieve their pragmatic competence.
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CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Research in speech acts has become one of the most important areas in sociolinguistics and pragmalinguistics, since Austin (1962) and Searle’s (1965) pioneering works. According to Searle’s definition, in a speech situation, speakers perform various acts by their utterances such as referring to someone, making statements, asking questions, issuing commands, or giving reports. Searle refers these language functions as "Speech acts" (p.115), whereas Austin called them as "illocutionary acts". Simply put, in a speech situation, speakers use some expressions in order to perform a variety of language functions such as apologies, requests, complaints, compliments, offers, and others.

Owing to its valuable theoretical rareness, the speech act theory is regarded as one of the most convincing notions in the study of language use (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Rose, 1992). Since every language has developed its own routinized and conventionalized patterns to perform a variety of speech acts, numerous empirical studies regarding diverse cross-cultural speech acts have been
conducted (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cohen, Olstain & Rosentein, 1986; Wolfson, 1989). Even though in many previous studies, researchers conclude that speech acts are tremendously influenced by the cultural and linguistic differences, conventions, and other factors, there are still undiscovered, interesting territories in the field of cross-cultural empirical research in speech act realization patterns.

One of the most frequently studied speech act realization patterns is request because requests are conveyed through a wide variety of strategies, and they reflect linguistic, social and cross-cultural differences (Blum-Kulka, 1989; Koike, 1989; Fukushima, 1996). However, from the point of view of the second language acquisition process, it is not easy for learners to master these kinds of conventionalized, high strategy-involved request realization patterns. When speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from non-native speakers’ first languages to target languages, they are often misinterpreted as rude or overpolite and communication failure will happen regardless of grammatical correctness. For Korean learners of English, for example, it would be quite hard to perform the appropriate request realization
forms because Korean is quite different from English linguistically. For example, Shinn (1990) points out that "the Korean language has a complex, sophisticated and independent honorific system which is an obligatory, conventional norm in Korean society" (p.12-13). Shinn further explains that there may be big discrepancies in sociocultural perceptions with regard to power, such as age, social status and gender, between the two societies. These discrepancies may be caused by the fact that Koreans value "vertical and hierarchical society" (p.13) systems affected by the above mentioned powers more than Americans do. Therefore, because of overemphasis on social power, when Koreans make requests in English, they sometimes choose inappropriate politeness strategies which are not generally accepted in American sociocultural norms.

Since the ambitious project on requests-CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns)-conducted by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), a large number of cross-cultural speech act studies have been done by many researchers (e.g., Christiansan, 1994; Fukushima, 1996; Kitao, 1990; Kim, 1993; Pair le Rob, 1996). However, there are still a few gaps that need to be filled in speech act research. First, only a few studies have been done about
non-western languages including Korean, but, according to many researchers, there might be significant linguistic and cultural differences in the forms of requests between American English and Korean ESL students' English in terms of politeness (Bell, 1998; Kitao, 1990; Kim, 1995).

Second, most of the studies on Korean language group have focused on how factors in the relationships between speakers and listeners, such as familiarity and social power, affect request realization forms crossculturally. However, the degree of imposition of request as a speech act, which is considered to be an important factor in determining politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson 1978; 79), has been largely ignored.

The purpose of this study is to compare Korean students' request forms and American English speakers' request forms according to the relationships between speakers and hearers, and imposition levels. The differences will be analyzed in terms of Brown and Levison's politeness theory, which has been well known as one of the most compelling politeness theories. Brown and Levinson claim that people use politeness in the "face threatening situations" in order to save faces. Brown and Levinson (1987) define "face" as "the public self-image
that every member wants to claim for himself" (p.61).

According to them, there are two types of face: "positive face and negative face". Positive face refers to the desire to be liked and appreciated, and negative face is the desire to act freely without any imposition by others.

This notion of face is related to the speech act of requests. Making a request means that the speaker is asking the hearer to do something. In other words, the hearers' freedom is constrained by the speakers' imposition, therefore requests are considered as "face threatening acts" (FTAs, Brown and Levinson, 1987). In this kind of "face threatening acts" situation, the hearers' negative face and the speakers' positive face might be damaged. In order to avoid and mitigate the imposition, speakers often use various politeness strategies. By doing this, speakers try to accomplish two goals at the same time: saving face and obtaining his/her original intention.

Brown and Levinson discuss five politeness super-strategies that speakers can choose in their face threatening speech act realization, and those strategies vary in their degree of politeness: "bald on record", "positive politeness", "negative politeness", "off record" and "withhold the FTA".
Based on Brown and Levinson's theoretical framework, I search for specific differences between the Korean ESL speakers' utterance patterns in English and Americans' utterance patterns, and why these differences are produced in actual discourse. This empirical information about typical sociolinguistic usages of Korean ESL students' request forms and their different politeness strategies may be useful for material developers and ESL language teachers.

In the rest of this first chapter, I briefly explain the theoretical framework of speech acts, requests, and previous research regarding the speech act of requests. After that, I examine the importance of speech acts of request in terms of the second language acquisition process. At the end of chapter one, I present previous researchers' findings about politeness theories.

In chapter two, the methodology and data analysis of this study are presented. I analyze the obtained data according to the five parameters of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies. I assume that the Brown and Levinson's theory will enable me to capture and explain the differences between the two groups.
In the final chapter, I discuss the findings and explain the possible causes for the differences between Korean ESL students’ politeness strategies and Americans’ (politeness strategies). In the last part of this chapter, I discuss the implications of this study for improving the Korean ESL learners’ pragmatic competence in request realization. Also, I discuss the implications of my findings for cross-cultural speech act research, second language acquisition and teaching.

Speech Act and Request

Austin (1962) is one of the first scholars who introduced the notion of speech acts. Austin declares that speakers use some sentences in order to actively make what they intend to happen. In other words, they perform specific language functions, instead of just perusing true or false statements in a speech situation.

Searle (1965) also sets up a notable theoretical framework of speech act theory. In the article, "What Is a Speech Act?", Searle says that:

"speech acts are characteristically performed in the utterance of sounds or the making or marks... the sounds or marks one makes in the performance of a speech act are characteristically said to have meaning, and a second related difference is that one is characteristically said to mean something by those sounds or marks" (p.119).
Explaining the concepts of “meaning” and “intention,” Searle says that in a speech situation involving speakers and hearers, the speakers produce some utterances in an effort to communicate to hearers by getting hearers to recognize the speakers’ original intentions.

Leech (1983) also derives almost the same definition of speech acts as Searle’s, saying that speech act is the use of language in a goal-oriented speech situation in which the speaker is using language in order to produce a particular effect in the mind of hearer. Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) describe the speech act as “one of the most compelling notions in the study of language use” (p.24). In a speech situation, the speakers use their languages to perform a variety of functions such as refusals, requests, apologies, compliments, complaints, and others.

Among the many speech acts, the speech act of request has been paid special attention to by many researchers. Making a request means that a speaker is asking a hearer to do something for the benefit of the speaker. Brown and Levinson (1978) define the speech act of request as “face-threatening” act. According to them, in this speech act
situation, the hearer’s "freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (p.61) could be constrained by the speaker. Besides, the speaker’s desire to be liked or loved also might be damaged. Therefore, a variety of ways for making requests is developed in all languages for speakers to minimize the possible "face threatening" imposition. Also speakers use numerous mitigating devices to soften the possible threatening acts.

Since the notion of imposition is regarded as one of the important elements in the theory of politeness and act of requests, it is necessary to review what has been said about the imposition by previous researchers. Scollon and Scollon (1983) divide imposition in the speech act of request into two parts. First, "absolute imposition" is the actual size of the request. For example, borrowing a single dollar has a lower degree of absolute imposition than borrowing a hundred dollars because the size or importance of the request is smaller. However, "relative imposition" is influenced by different outside factors such as familiarity, social status, and other cultural factors in addition to actual request action itself. In other words, borrowing a book from one’s brother is relatively easier compared to borrowing a book from a professor who is not
close to the speaker. So, even though the actual request action itself is the same in both situations, the relative impositions that may be weighed upon speakers and hearers are different.

Another interesting theory regarding imposition involving request is proposed by Sifianou (1992). Sifianou states that there are two categories of requests, which are “requests for information and requests for action” (p.121-122). For example, asking someone to close a window and inquiring about the time are different in terms of imposition. According to Sifianou, a higher degree of imposition is involved in “request for action”, e.g., asking someone to close a window, than in “request for information”, e.g., inquiring about the time.

Brown and Levinson (1987) note the importance of cultural values with regard to the weight of imposition, saying that cultural differences may exist when the interactants consider the seriousness of imposition of FTAs. This claim has been widely accepted by many researchers, and may give one of the motivations of why cross-cultural research on the speech act of requests should be done.
Because of social, cultural, and linguistical motivation to minimize the absolute or relative imposition involved in the act, a variety of request realization patterns are available to speakers in all languages. Therefore, various empirical studies comparing request realization patterns among different languages and cultures have been conducted by many researchers (e.g. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Eslamirasekh, 1993; Fukushima, 1996; Kim, 1995; Pair, 1996). Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) are credited for the first and one of the broadest empirical studies on the request speech act. In their study (CCSARP: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns), they establish the similarities and differences of speakers' realization patterns with respect to requests and apologies in terms of "situational variability, cross-cultural variability and individual, native versus non-native variability" (p.197). Data were collected from eight different languages including Australian, American and British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian. In order to analyze the collected data of requests, they set up unique systematic coding schemes such as "strategy types," "point of view operation," and "internal and external modifications" (pp.200-205). These
Coding schemes are frequently used in many different empirical studies of request to analyze data. In their findings, Blum-Kulka (1989) concludes that "the CCSARP data revealed the prominence of conventional indirectness as a highly favored requesting option exploited by all the languages studies" (p.68). Blum-Kulka & Olshtain find that non-native speakers use diverse kinds of strategy-types of request, and the quantity of external modification varies by situation. Furthermore, significant influence of non-native speakers' first language use was detected when they made requests in their second languages.

One of the shortcomings of the CCSARP is the lack of non-western languages and cultures in the study of speech acts. A few studies have included a non-Western contrastive study of requests. Eslamirasekh (1993), for example, examines the similarities and differences in the realization patterns of the speech act of requesting between Persian speaking students and American speakers of English relative to the same social constraints. Based on the data analysis of CCSARP coding scheme, the researcher concludes that Persian speakers are considerably more direct, and use more external and internal modifications, such as hedges, downtoners, intensifiers, grounders,
sweeteners and cost minimizers, compared to American speakers. The author further explains that "these differences may cause some cross-cultural communication problems for speakers of these languages" (p.85). This is because the ways of minimizing and recognizing the degree of the possible imposition involved in requestive speech act relative to the social constraints are significantly different between American cultures and Persian cultures.

Kim (1993) explores the differences of request realization patterns between adult Korean ESL learners and Americans. Her specific question addressed in the study was: What kind of differences exist between Korean learners of English and Americans in the forms of request realizations patterns, in terms of the directness levels and external modifications? Also, she questioned whether there are any negative language transfers from Korean to English when Korean ESL learners make a request in English in authentic situations. Kim concludes that "request realizations are significantly determined by the sociopragmatic features of the situational context" (p.67). In other words, the speakers and hearers' relationship, such as familiarity and social power, play an important role in determining the proper request realization...
patterns. Also, Kim finds that the norms of Korean ESL learners are different from the norms of native English speakers in some situations because of the effect of the pragmatic rules of Korean. Therefore, sometimes Korean ESL learners may confront the problems of inappropriate transfer of sociolinguistic or sociopragmatic rules.

Another cross-cultural study concerning request realization patterns was conducted by Fukushima (1996). In this study, she investigates how or what kind of differences and similarities exist between the request strategies of British subjects and those of Japanese subjects, in the two situations where the degree of imposition is different, and the other factors were set as equal. Fukushima concludes that when the degree of imposition increased, both groups produced more elaborate supportive moves with more external modifications. The difference between the two groups is that the British subjects used more mitigating supportive moves and more conventional forms than the Japanese subjects. On the other hand, the Japanese subjects used more direct forms and less supportive moves compare to the British subjects. Also, when it comes to the Head act types, Japanese subjects preferred to use "Stating Speaker's
desire (e.g. "Kashite", Lend)," and "Questioning Hearer's doing action (e.g."tomete kurenai kashira", "I wonder if you could ...) (p.683).

Pair (1996) studies the speech production of Spanish and Dutch speakers of Spanish. This study shows that native Spanish speakers use more direct strategies than Dutch non-native speakers of Spanish. It also shows that the conventional indirect strategy of request is used in different ways by those two groups. In the conclusion, Pair describes one of the reasons for these differences as "cross-linguistic differences between Spanish and Dutch" (p.651).

These previous studies on request behavior represent significant groundwork, showing that participants in speech estimate relative importance of requisitive act by their cultural values. The estimation of social power, social distance, situational setting and the degree of imposition might be different from one culture to another. Therefore, according to their own measurement of the above mentioned factors, participants in speech choose culture-specific strategies and linguistic forms in speech situations.

Based on previous researchers' important findings, it has been confirmed that there are various cross-cultural
differences when it comes to the speech act of request. However, how imposition level affects the use of politeness strategies in request has not been systematically studied. Therefore, in this study I investigate and compare politeness strategies by native speakers of American English and Korean ESL speakers of English used in requests of varying levels of imposition. In the next part, I discuss the second language acquisition process, the concept of pragmatic failure and the possible reasons why learners have difficulties when they perform speech acts in their second languages.

Second Language Acquisition and Pragmatic Failure

Learning a language requires obtaining various kinds of knowledge of that language, such as knowledge of the lexicon, syntax, semantics, intonation, phonology, pragmatics and other features. Thomas (1983) notes that there are two "linguistic competences" that speakers need to acquire in order to be linguistically capable members of a language group, which are "grammatical competence" and "pragmatic competence" (p.92). According to Thomas, grammatical competence is the knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, and syntax that are needed to form grammatical
sentences in a language. On the other hand, pragmatic competence is described as “the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context” (p.92).

Richards & Sukwiwat (1983) use different terms, “conversational competence”, to explain the same concept as pragmatic competence. They claim that “conversational competence refers to the speaker’s knowledge of how speech acts are used in social situations.” (p.113).

Koike (1989) is another researcher who points out the importance of pragmatic competence in actual speech situations. Koike declares the connections between pragmatic competence and speech acts, saying that “Pragmatic competence is the speaker’s knowledge and the use of rules of appropriateness and politeness which dictate the way the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts” (p.279).

However, when it comes to the second language learning process, mastering those two abilities is not an easy task. Beginners of second languages might frequently make grammatical mistakes in the learning process. In contrast, advanced learners may not make many errors with the vocabulary and grammar of their target languages, but they
may have trouble with using the target language appropriately in certain situations where they need to produce speech acts. Blum-Kulka (1983) states:

I would like to argue that the nature of interdependence among pragmatic, linguistic, and social factors that determine speech-act realization varies from one language to another, and that as a result, L2 learners often fail to realize their speech acts in the target language both in terms of effectiveness and in terms of social appropriateness. (p. 38)

Seran & Sibel (1997) find results similar to the ones in Blum-Kulka’s study. Their study shows that pragmatic knowledge does not develop alongside linguistic competence in most cases. In other words, even advanced learners may not be able to perform proper speech acts, or to understand desired politeness values of the target language society.

Learners’ communication failures often lead to serious problems when learners speak to native speakers of the target languages. For instance, some learners, who are already grammatically competent, may make pragmatic mistakes, which may be regarded as overpolite, sarcastic, unfriendly, or rude by native speakers.

Researchers have offered a few reasons why second languages learners have often confronted difficulties in speech act realization situations. Seran & Sibels (1997)
say that one of the reasons why learners fail to convey or to understand the intended message is because of their lack of linguistic proficiency to convey the necessary act.

More important and serious reasons are proposed by Koike (1989). Koike argues that learners may attempt to find equivalent grammatical means and pragmatic rules like politeness rules to their first languages in the L2, but their usages often deviate from the target language rules. This is because they do not know when their first language’s concepts of politeness and linguistic strategies to convey differences in illocutionary force can transfer to the target languages. Also, they are not able to use those concepts appropriately when they converse with native speakers.

In order to produce appropriate speech acts, second language learners’ pragmatic competence of their target language is especially essential. In other words, simply knowing how to combine words or phrases might not be enough to create actual language forms used to realize the speech acts (e.g., offering, requesting, thanking or apologizing, etc).

Thomas (1983) captures these second language learners’ problems by proposing the term, “pragmatic failure” (p.99).
Pragmatics, according to Thomas’ definition, is “the place where a speaker’s knowledge of grammar comes into contact with his/her knowledge of the world” (p.99). In her further explanation, in order to understand ‘what speakers mean by what they say’, speakers and hearers should share the same beliefs about language and the world to which they belong. When breakdowns or conflicts happen in understanding of ‘what is meant by what is said’ between speakers and hearers, “pragmatic failure” occurs. These communication breakdowns or conflicts are caused by the learner’s lack of awareness of pragmatic or linguistic aspects of the target languages.

Thomas proposes two different fundamental types of pragmatic failure: “Pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure” (p.99). Pragmalinguistic failure may be caused by two different factors. First, Thomas says that when learners transfer utterances from the mother tongue to the target language, they may fail to convey the proper pragmatic force in the target language because of the “interpretive bias” (p.101) of the learners. This is almost the same as previous researchers’ arguments (e.g., Seran & Sibel, 1997; Koike, 1989). For instance, a highly routinized polite request form, “Can you pass the salt?”,
might not be able to convey the speaker's original intention. Instead, this question may cause the simple answer "No, I can't". This is because hearers may think this is a question about their ability.

The second factor that causes pragmalinguistic failure is learners' inappropriate transfer of strategies such as politeness strategies from their first languages to the target languages.

In contrast to pragmalinguistic failure, sociopragmatic failure is caused by the lack of awareness of the sociocultural norms of the target languages and communities. In other words, the learners' system of values and beliefs about certain concepts such as "size of imposition", "taboos", or "assessment of relative power or social distance" (p.104-105), may be different from those of the target language communities. Therefore, learners confront some problems in communication with native speakers of target languages. For example, in Korea, inquiring about someone's age is fairly acceptable as a common practice because age is one of the most important factors to decide interlocutors' relative social powers or positions. However, this norm is not as common in other countries.
In this chapter, I identified second languages learners' specific communication failure types and possible reasons that have been proposed by many researchers for these failures. As Thomas claims, if second language learners' communication competence depends on their pragmatic knowledge of the target language, it is important for researchers in the second language teaching field to find specific differences and similarities of intercultural communication.

More specifically, since pragmatic knowledge of politeness plays an important role in communicative competence, in order to realize appropriate speech act patterns of request, mastering of politeness strategies of the target language is crucial for second language learners. In the next chapter, I examine politeness theory, which is related to the speech act of request.

Politeness

As Jenny & Arndt (1993) put it, in order to be a normal member of a culture, one needs to learn and to adjust themselves to the way of thinking, perceiving, or behaving of other members in the culture. In this sense, Kasper (1990) explains that "Competent adult members"
(p.193) are expected to know where politeness is expected and where it is not in their communication.

In an effort to answer why people want to be polite in speech act situations, many researchers have found interesting theories. In most current theories, politeness is a linguistic strategy the speaker uses for various pragmatic purposes. For instance, researchers assume that interlocutors use politeness strategies in order to avoid the possible conflict that might happen in speech situations (Lakoff, 1973; Leech, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987). That means, one of the most important reasons for being polite is to help maintain and even enhance relationships among people.

Some other researchers focused on what kind of requirements should be met in order to perform polite communications in certain language groups. For instance, Kwarciaiak (1993) claims that polite communication depends on a vast knowledge about language that the interlocutors use. First of all, Kwarciaiak explains that interlocutors should mutually understand the fundamental concept of “conventional formulas and expressions,” “applicable grammatical markers,” and “pragmatic strategies” (p.62) of the language that they use. Secondly, interlocutors also
should have a keen knowledge about not only the relation among the devices listed, but also about socially acceptable violations of this rule.

Since Goffman’s (1967) ground work, politeness theory has been one of the most fruitful areas of language use in research. Goffman (1981) suggests that politeness has a function of neutralizing “the potentially offensive consequences of encroaching” on another’s “territoriality” with a demand of action (p.16).

This theory is more developed by Lakoff (1972, 1973b). She explains that the more politeness increases, the more imposition decreases. Lakoff's rule of politeness explains to the people how to act toward the hearer. For example, in order to be polite, speakers try not to impose, to give options to hearers, or to make the hearers feel good. She also points out different syntactic and lexical strategies that are related to the degree of politeness, such as mood, tense and kinds of modals, negation, and tags, all of which can clearly define the level of politeness.

Leech (1983) sets up another politeness theory. According to Leech, the role of the principle of politeness is “to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly
relationships which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place” (p.82). Also, Leech claims that politeness results from the minimization of cost and the maximization of benefit to the requestee.

When it comes to the speech act of request, Leech claims that since making a request itself is already impolite, politeness is unavoidable. According to Fukushima (1996), requests involve the exercise of politeness strategies. Therefore, “the more threatening the act is to the hearer’s of speaker’s face or self-image, the more linguistic skills is required.” Kitao (1987) defines the politeness in request as “communication strategies a speaker used to achieve goals and, in a continuing relationship, to help preserve the relationship” (p.179). She also claims that a particular politeness strategy that the speaker may choose depends on the relative imposition that the interlocutors might feel.

The best-known politeness theory is Brown and Levinson’s (1987), which is based on the concept of “face”. Deriving from the Goffman’s (1967) notion of “face,” Brown and Levinson explain that face is “the public self image that every member wants to claim for himself” (p.61).
According to them, there are two types of face: positive face and negative face. Positive face is "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' claimed by interactants" (p.61). Simply, this is "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (p.62). On the other hands, negative face is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction - i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (p.61). In other words, negative face means "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his action be unimpeded by others" (p.62).

Brown and Levinson also claim that in people's interaction, maintaining each other's face is in their best interest, since face can be easily damaged or lost. However, in certain speech acts, such as requests, a speakers' negative face and hearers' positive face can be threatened (Face Threatening Act: FTA). Therefore, interactants want to use politeness strategies in order to minimize the possible imposition of their request acts.

Brown and Levinson suggest five super strategies of politeness, in a hierarchical order: "Bald on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off Record and Don't do the FTA" (p.69). The most threatening strategy is
the "Bald on Record (e.g., "Close the door!")) without redress. The least threatening strategy is "Don't do the FTA (e.g., Do not say anything.)" followed by "Off Record (e.g., "It's kind of chilly here.")." Between "Positive Politeness" and "Negative Politeness," "Negative Politeness (e.g., "Could you possibly close the door?")" is considered as the less threatening strategy than "Positive Politeness (e.g., "Think you could close the door, honey?")." "Positive Politeness" is used to maximize hearers' positive face. That is, speakers use this strategy in order to claim solidarity with the hearers, or to satisfy the hearers' desire to be liked. "Negative Politeness" is used to satisfy the hearers' negative face. Simple put, the speakers use this strategy in order to minimize the possible imposition of FTA, and thereby the hearers can avoid the impingement.

When it comes to the question of how the speakers determine the 'weightiness of a FTA', Brown and Levinson suggest three variables that the speakers may consider: "Social Distance, Relative Power and Absolute Ranking of Imposition" (p.74). Also Brown and Levinson admit that there may be cross-cultural variation in how much importance will be weighted in each variable by the
speakers when they do face threatening acts. For example, Brown and Levinson illustrate that the need for efficiency or the expression of power may be more important than face-saving in some cultures. In Korea, for instance, in the situation where the speakers' social status are relatively higher than the hearers', the speakers may not consider the value of the social distance or the imposition level of the face threatening acts to be as high as it should be. Therefore, the speakers may pay attention to the efficiency of their speech acts instead of saving hearers' face. However this may not true in other cultures.

In the next chapter, I discuss data my method based of using Brown & Levinson's politeness theory to study the differences between Americans' politeness strategies and Koreans' politeness strategies in requests.


CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The data were collected from a group of 20 native speakers of English (7 female and 13 male), and 20 Korean speakers of English (10 female and 10 male), all of whom were currently enrolled in undergraduate or graduate school of California State University, San Bernardino. The Korean subjects had studied English as a foreign language in Korea. Their length of stay in the United States ranged from 2 years to 3 years and their English proficiency was at an advanced level with a mean score of 550 or higher on the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language). The subjects’ age ranged from 19 to 30 years old. One great advantage of choosing university-level students as the subjects across all groups was that the researcher was able to attain a high level of homogeneity in such variables as educational background, occupation, and age (Blum Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989). However, a disadvantage was that college-level students may not completely represent the entire population of each language group (Suh, 1999).
Data Collection

When it comes to collecting data, it would have been ideal to collect them from natural conditions, but this would be almost impossible due to the limitation of getting a large sample of one specific speech act used in the same contexts. In this study, therefore, the Discourse Completion Test (DCT), which was used in CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989), was chosen as a data collection method.

A DCT is an open-ended, written questionnaire to elicit speech acts. The DCT consists of scripted situations, which represent social distance or level of intimacy between the participants, and the situational setting in which the communication takes place.

Even though it has been said that subjects' responses to DCTs do not adequately reflect actual speech behaviors occurring in natural conversation, many researchers claim that there are a few advantages of choosing DCT as a data collection method. Eisenstein & Bodman (1986) assert that this method provides non-native speakers with a comfortable atmosphere and an opportunity to respond well without any mistakes that they may make in a face-to-face conversation. Also, since there is no time pressure, subjects can have time to plan and make their best response to show their
linguistic and pragmatic knowledge fully in such situations.

In addition, DCTs allow researchers to look into stereotypical semantic formulas and strategies for a given speech act (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Beebe & Takahashi, 1989). Therefore, the DCT was thought to be an appropriate measure of participants' best knowledge.

A questionnaire was developed in which 12 scenarios were described. Among the 12 scenarios, 10 of them were adapted from various researchers (Eslamirasekh, 1993; Rose, 1992; Rose and Ono, 1995; Spees, 1994; Suh, 1999), with some modifications. As Seran & Kamisli (1997) state, the validity of previous researchers' scenarios is already proven because they were already tested across speech communities. Therefore, the situations were not specific to a particular culture.

The entire 12 scenarios are included in appendix A. The scenarios represent different situations that the subjects may encounter on a daily basis where they need to make a request. These situations vary in three aspects: social dominance, familiarity, and imposition level. Each question presents a short description of the situation,
specifying the setting, the familiarity, and social power between speakers and hearers. In the 12 scenarios, the familiarity between speakers and listeners is divided into high (Question #4, #5, #6, #10, #11, and #12) and low (Question #1, #2, #3, #7, #8, and #9). The social power is divided into three parts: speakers’ position is higher than the hearers’ (Question #1, #7, #4, and #10), lower (Question #3, #9, #6, and #12), or at the same level (Question #2, #8, #5, and #11). Each question was named according to its situation. The names of 12 questions are:

1. Library noise
2. Loud music
3. Professor’s soft voice
4. Cold wind
5. Borrowing CD
6. Borrowing a book
7. Computer frozen
8. Ride
9. Recommendation letter
10. Business hour extension
11. Borrowing $1
12. Special day off
As an illustration, one scenario (#3: Professor's soft voice) was as follows: "You are taking a class with a new professor. Today is the first day. You can barely hear him/her because the professor speaks with a soft voice, and the classroom is rather large. So, you want to ask him/her to speak loud. What would you say?" In this situation, the familiarity between the speaker and the hearer was set as low since the professor was new to the hearer. Also, the hearer's (professor) social power was higher than the speaker's (student).

Not only were the respondents asked to indicate how they would make the request, they were also asked to rate how hesitant they would be to make such a request. They rated their hesitance on a scale of 1-5 as follows: 1= Extremely hesitant, 2= Very hesitant, 3= Somewhat, 4= A little, 5= Not at all. This scale was used to measure how much of an imposition the respondents thought their requests caused. The American students' answers are in appendix B and Korean students' answers are in appendix C.

Analysis Unit

In order to analyze written data obtained from the DCT, it is necessary to determine specific units that
should be analyzed. In this study, I adapted CCSARP's
definition of unit for analysis (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986). According to this study, the utterances provided by
the subjects can be divided into two or three parts, such as "Address Terms, Head Act, and Adjunct to Head act"
(p.200). According to Blum-Kulka et al., a head act for request is the minimal unit which can realize a request; it
is the core of the request sequence (p.275). For example, in the sentence, "Hey, brother! I feel pretty chilly. Would
you mind closing the window?", "Hey, brother" is an address term and "I feel pretty chilly" is an adjunct to head act.
The essential part for realizing the request is head act, "Would you mind close the window?" In this study, all three
parts are analyzed in terms of Brown and Levinson’s politeness strategy coding scheme. Specific coding schemes
that are used in this study will be explained with examples in the following section.

Coding Schemes and Examples

In order to analyze the obtained data, Brown and Levinson’s five super-strategies were used: Bald on Record,
Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off Record. According to Brown and Levinson, there are also different
kinds of sub-strategies in each super-strategy that the speakers can choose, and which are described below. In this chapter, the examples of requests are presented exactly the same way as the subjects wrote them in the questionnaires, without any grammatical corrections. The Korean subjects' answers and American subjects' answers are identified by "NNS" (non-native speaker) and "NS" (native speaker). The detailed definitions of sub-strategies based on Brown & Levinson's explanations (1987, pp.47-217), and examples that were found in this study follow.

**Bald on Record**

First, in general, a speaker uses the "Bald on Record" strategy whenever s/he seeks maximum efficiency more than maintaining face or satisfying the hearer's face. In this case, the speaker is more powerful than the hearer, or does not fear the bad consequences that may be caused by the direct act, or the hearer's face that needs to be satisfied is relatively small.

Example (1): Quiet down now! (NNS)

Example (2): Turn the music down. You are bothering my studying. (NNS)
As in examples (1) and (2), speakers choose direct imperative forms such as "Quiet down" and "Turn the music down" in order to maximize the efficiency of their request. Both cases were found in the situation in which speakers' positions are relatively higher than the hearers'.

**Positive Politeness**

Positive politeness strategies have fifteen sub-strategies. In this study, nine sub-strategies were found in American students' and Korean students' answers:

1. Notice, attention to Hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods)
2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer),
3. Use in-group identity markers,
4. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground,
5. Assert to presuppose speaker's knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants,
6. Offer, Promise
7. Be Optimistic
8. Give (or ask for) reasons
9. Give gifts to hearer

The first strategy is called "Notice, attention to hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods)." Speakers may
take special notice of hearers’ conditions. Noticeable appearance changes, remarkable possessions, or special interest that hearers would want to be noticed and approved of by the speaker are good examples.

Example (3): Do you like this song? I can’t believe it!

This song is also my favorite song. I’m crazy about the singer. Would you record it for me?

I really appreciate it if you do it for me. (NNS)

In Example (3), the speaker notices the hearer’s musical preference and approves it by saying “Do you like this song? I can’t believe it! This song is also my favorite song.” By saying this, the speaker indicates the imminent request based on a mutual taste in music between her and the hearer.

The second strategy is “Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H ).” Exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodics, as well as intensifying modifiers such as “fantastic,” “marvelous,” “extraordinary,” or “incredible” are used in this strategy.

Example (4): Oh my God! This is incredible. You have got to record that for me! (NS)
Although it is hard to detect what kind of intonations or gestures would be used in this remark, the speaker uses an exclamation mark indicating exaggerative intonation and an intensifying modifier “incredible” in order to exaggerate her/his interest about the hearer’s CD. This remark gives the hearer the impression that the speaker and the hearer have a common ground. Therefore the imposition of the following request is reduced.

The third is “Use in-group identity markers.” Speakers can claim a common ground with the hearer by using in-group usages of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis.

Example (5): Bro, Please close the window. (NS)
Example (6): I heard you’re good at fixing computer. This piece of crap isn’t working. Think you could look at it? (NS)
Example (7): Burn that CD for me? (NNS)

In example (5), the speaker uses an address form, “bro” to convey in-group membership and intimacy between the speaker and hearer. In example (6), the speaker uses the elliptical form “Think you could look at it?” instead of “Do you think you could look at it?” By using this form, the speaker signifies in-group shared knowledge. In example
(7), the speaker claims common ground with the hearer by using in-group jargon "Burn that CD." All of these forms were used in an effort to mitigate the possible imposition of requests.

The next strategy is called "Presuppose or raise or assert common ground." In this strategy, the speakers spend some time with the hearers on talking about unrelated topics as a mark of friendship. Also, the speakers assert that their value in certain aspect is as the same as the hearers'. Another way is that s/he presupposes that something is mutually understood between the speakers and hearers even though actually that is not true. For example, a speaker can use the expression "You know" in the middle of their remark even though it is impossible for the hearer to know what happened. By doing these, the speaker expects that her/his behavior will raise common ground with the hearer, and be helpful to redress the following FTA.

Example (8): Hi, how are you? I don't know if you remember me. I was in your xxx class. I just graduated and I've been looking for a position somewhere. It's been pretty good so far. I just need some recommendations and I was
wondering if you might be able to write one for me if you had the time. (NNS)

Example (9): Hi, uhm, would you mind turning down your music a bit? You know, these walls are paper thin. (NS)

Example (10): Look dude, I like music, I love music, I love the music you are playing, but NOT RIGHT NOW! (NS)

In example (8), the speaker raises common ground by making conversation with starting a small talk, which is somewhat not related to the main topic. In example (9), the speaker use the phrase, "you know", in order to claim that the speaker and the hearer have mutual understanding when it comes to the reason why the hearer has to be quiet. In the final example (10), the speaker asserts that s/he has same taste in music as the hearer likes. By doing this the speaker establishes the common ground between her/him and the hearer.

The fifth is "Assert or presuppose speaker’s knowledge of and concern for the hearer’s wants.” In this strategy, the speaker implies that she already knows the hearer’s wants, and asserts that she is willing to comply with the hearers’ intention. This gives the idea to the
hearer that s/he and the speaker are cooperators. As a result, the hearer feels pressured to cooperate with speaker.

Example (11): Excuse me, I know you are really enjoying that music, but I think you can turn it down a little. Can you do that? (NNS)

In example (11), the speaker asserts that s/he already acknowledges what the hearer’s wants by saying “I know you are really enjoying that music, but...” In this case, the bond between speaker and the hearer is already established, therefore the hearer may feel pressured to comply with the speaker’s request.

The next strategy is called “Offer, promise.” In order to redress the potential threat of some FTAs, the speaker may claim that whatever the hearer wants, the speaker also wants for him and will help him to obtain. Offer and promise are the outcome of choosing this strategy.

Example (12): I am wondering if you mind lending that book.

   I’ll return the book as soon as I finish. (NNS)

In example (12), the speaker directly promises that s/he will return the book as soon as s/he finishes. Therefore
the hearer’s wants will be satisfied by the speaker’s promise.

The next strategy is “Be optimistic.” The speakers presume that the hearers are willing to cooperate with the speaker because it will be in their mutual interest. That also means that the speaker will cooperate with the hearer’s wants.

Example (13): I’m sorry for the short notice, but it looks like you’ll be working with me for an extra two hours. (NNS)

In example (13), although the speaker does not directly ask the hearer to work for extra hours, s/he assumes that there is no doubt that the hearer will comply with the speaker’s wants.

The eighth strategy is called “Give (or ask for) reasons.” In this strategy, the speaker gives reasons as to why he wants what he wants. This also expressed by demanding reasons ‘why not?’ and assuming (via optimism) if there is no special reason why the hearer should not or cannot cooperate.

Example (14): Why don’t you go into a group study room? (NNS)
In example (14), the speaker uses indirect suggestions, which is conventionalized positive-politeness forms in English. This suggests that the speaker is optimistic about the hearer’s cooperation if there are no special reasons why the hearer cannot cooperate.

The last strategy that was found in this study is “Give gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation).” The speaker may satisfy the hearer’s positive-face by actually satisfying some of the hearer’s wants. Classic positive-politeness actions such as gift-giving, not only tangible gifts, but human-relations wants are examples.

Example (15): Hi. I’m your friend, xxx’s sister. I’ve heard you are a professional in computer science. I’m in trouble because my computer is dead without any reason. I don’t know why. I was typing a very important paper. Can you give me a hand? I’ll treat nice lunch tomorrow.

(NNS)

In example (15), the speaker offers a tangible gift, nice lunch, in order to satisfy the hearer’s wants. By this action, the hearer’s positive-face wants will be fulfilled and the imposition of the request may be reduced.
Negative Politeness

According to Brown and Levinson, there are ten sub-strategies in Negative Politeness strategy. In this study, one of the strategies, called "Nomialization," was not found in either the American students' answers or Koreans students' answers. The specific nine sub-strategies are as followed:

1. Be conventionally indirect
2. Question, hedge
3. Be pessimistic
4. Minimize the imposition
5. Give deference
6. Apology
7. Impersonalise Speakers and Hearers
8. State the FTA as a general rule
9. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting Hearers

The first strategy is "Be conventionally indirect." When speakers make a request, they do not want to impose on the hearer, and at the same time they want to accomplish their original goal. This dilemma is solved by using conventional indirect strategies. Speakers may use phrases and sentences that have meanings, which are different from
their literal meanings in order to indirectly say what they want. Since these conventional phrases and sentences already have been approved by the language group to which the speakers and hearers belong, the speakers’ utterance can go on record without direct damaging of hearer’s face. In this study, both American subjects and Korean subjects used the “Be conventionally indirect” strategy the most in their responses.

Example (16): Will you either be a little quieter or move to a group study room? (NS)

Example (17): Could I borrow your book, please? (NNS)

Example (18): Would you mind if I ask you to speak a little louder? (NNS)

Example (16), “Will you ...?” and example (17), “Could I borrow...?” are the examples of conventionalized indirect request forms. Also, in example (18), the expression “Would you mind if...?” is often used as an indirect request forms.

The second strategy is “Question and hedge.” This strategy helps the speakers to avoid assuming that the hearers desire the face threatening acts. Therefore, the speakers ask questions or make hedges about such assumptions. These are often expressed by the form of “tag questions,” or “if-clause.” Also, the speakers use some
clauses that give reasons why s/he makes the utterance. By doing this, the speakers partially apologize for their presumptions.

Example (19): Close that, would ya!! (NS)

Example (20): How was that book? If you aren’t using it, might I borrow it? (NS)

Example (21): I know you are enjoying your music, and if I weren’t studying, so would I. Since I am studying, please turn down the music. (NS)

In example (19), tag question, “would ya” is used by the speaker, and in example (20), the speaker uses an if-clause, “if you aren’t using it”, in order to show that s/he does not assume the hearer’s cooperation. In example (21), the speaker gives a reason why s/he makes request by using a clause “since I am studying...” These clauses are the types of hedges.

The next is “Be pessimistic.” This strategy gives the hearers the options not to comply with the FTA, which is about to be asked by the speakers. In other words, by explicitly expressing doubt, the speakers assume that the hearers are not likely to the act. The speakers often use the negative forms, the subjunctive, and the remote-possibility marker in order to express their doubt (e.g.,
‘You couldn’t possibly/by any chance give me a ride today’), and fulfill hearers’ negative face.

Example (22): You wouldn’t happen to have this book I need, would you? (NS)

In example (22), the speaker uses the negative form “wouldn’t” and the subjunctive form “happen to” in order to express his doubt. This offers the hearer more freedom of declining the requested act.

The next strategy, number four, is called “Minimize the imposition.” In order to diminish the seriousness of the FTA, speakers often indicate that the threat of imposition of the FTA is not in itself great. This is achieved by expressions that minimize the imposition, such as “a tiny little bit, a sip, a taste, a drop, a little, a bit, etc”.

Example (23): Would you mind turning it down a little? I’m studying. (NS)

In example (23), the phrase “a little” is used in order to minimize the severity of the request.

Strategy number five is “Give deference.” There are two different realizations of deference. First, the speaker uplifts the hearer by satisfying the hearer’s wants, which is the want to be liked. In other words, treat the hearer
as if s/he is superior to the speaker. By using referent honorifics about something associated with the hearer, the speakers show respect to the hearer.

Another way is that the speaker humbles himself. By behaving incompetently with hesitation or reluctance regardless of their social status, speakers may reduce the imposition of the FTA. For instance, the use of "uh" in English is an example of this strategy. In both cases what is conveyed is that the hearer is of higher social status than the speaker although it may not be true.

Example (24): Dr. xxx, if you are not using this book, can I borrow it? (NNS)

Example (25): Sir / Ma'am, I'm sorry, but could you please speak a little louder? I'm having trouble hearing you. (NS)

Example (26): Hi, uhm, would you mind turning down your music a bit? You know these walls are paper thin. (NS)

In examples (24) and (25), the speakers use honorifics forms, "Dr." and "Sir / Ma'am," in order to raise the hearers' position. Also, in example (26), the speaker shows her/ his hesitance by saying "uhm." By doing this, the
speaker not only minimizes the threat but also makes the hearer feel superior.

The sixth strategy is "Apology." Before doing an FTA, a speaker may apologize for doing an FTA. By apologies, the speaker expresses his unwillingness to impinge on the hearer's negative face. Therefore, the possible impingement on the hearer could be reduced. There are four different ways to express regret or reluctance to do FTAs: admit the impingement, indicate reluctance, give overwhelming reasons, and beg forgiveness.

First of all, the speaker can simply admit that s/he is impinging on hearer's face.

Example (27): I have a big favor to ask you. Could you fix the computer for me? (NNS)

In example (27), the speaker starts his utterance saying that the imminent request is "a big favor" to ask the hearer. By doing this, the speaker already admits the impingement of the FTA.

"Indicate reluctance" implies that speaker can attempt to show that he is reluctant to impinge on hearer.

Example (28): I hate to prove my ignorance, but my computer frozen up. Can you look at it for me? (NS)
In example (28), the speaker used the expression, "I hate to prove my ignorance, but...", in order to indicate his reluctance to make a request.

Speakers can also give hearers compelling reasons why they have to infringe on the hearers' negative face even though they do not want to do so under normal circumstances. In this case, the speaker claims his own incapacity as an excuse.

Example (29): Now, my computer is not working and I have to make a term paper with it. I don't know what to do. If you are not busy now, I wanna ask you to come to my house and see my computer. Can you? (NNS)

The speaker, in example (29), expresses the emergency of the situation and his incapability (as in "...my computer is not working and I have to make a term paper with it. I don't know what to do...") as a reason why he is attempting to violate the hearer's negative face.

The final way to express regret in this strategy is asking for forgiveness. The speaker may simply ask for the hearer's forgiveness by using some expressions such as "Excuse me, but...", "I'm sorry to bother you...", or "I beg your indulgence..."
Example (30): Excuse me, but I’m trying to study down the hall and I’d really appreciate it if you would turn down your radio. It’s sort of bothering me. (NS)

Example (30) is a typical case in which the speaker uses the asking for forgiveness method by using the expression “Excuse me, but…”

The next strategy is “Impersonalise speaker and hearer.” In this strategy, speakers describe the situation as if the person making the FTA were other than the speakers themselves, or at least not the speaker alone. This implies that the hearer and the speaker were not involved in the FTA, or there are also other people involved in this act. Therefore, the possible impingement of the FTA may be redressed. This results in a variety of ways of avoiding the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘you’. For instance, speakers use some standardized impersonal versions of pronouns or the plural ‘you’ or ‘we.’

Example (31): Hey, other people need quiet to study. (NNS)
Example (32): We can’t hear you back here! (NS)

In example (31), the speaker uses an impersonal noun phrase, “other people.” Also, in example (32), the speaker
uses the plural pronoun "we" in order to avoid first or second person singular pronouns.

Another way for the speakers to distance themselves from a particular infringement is "point-of-view distancing." This strategy gives speakers the option to manipulate the expression of tense. By doing this, he distances himself from the here and now. This is because if the tense is switched from present into past, the speaker moves as if into the future. Therefore, the speaker dissociates himself from the infringement of FTA.

Example (33): Prof. I was wondering if it would be possible for me to borrow the book from you. (NS)

In example (33), the speaker uses the past progressive tense "I was wondering..." instead of the present tense to distance himself from the present FTA act.

A speaker can also "delete agent," taking himself out of the requester's position. Therefore, the impingement of the FTA may partially be reduced.

Example (34): Sorry to bother you, but could you say a little loudly? I'm an international student. It's very hard to understand you. (NNS)
In example (34), the speaker deletes the agent by saying, "It's very hard (for me) to understand you." instead of saying, "I can't understand you."

The eighth strategy is "State the FTA as a general rule." In other words, it treats an FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation. Hence the speaker claims that he does not want to impinge; he is doing the FTA because of outside circumstances.

Example (35): I am sorry, here supposed to be quiet room.

(NNS)

In example (35), the speaker and the hearer are not mentioned in the FTA act. The speaker merely mentions the general rule of the library by saying "here supposed to be quiet room." Therefore, the possible threat of the FTA to the hearer and the speaker is diminished.

The last strategy is "Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebted Hearer." The speaker can redress an FTA by explicitly claiming his indebtedness to the hearer by means of expressions such as 'I'd be eternally grateful if you would...,' 'I'll never be able to repay you if you...' By using these expressions, the speaker admits that s/he is reluctant to impinge on the hearers' negative face.
Example (36): Could you please take a look at my computer? I owe you one. (NS)

In example (36), the speaker uses the expression “I owe you one” in order to claim the indebtedness to the hearer.

Off Record

In addition to Positive and Negative politeness strategies, a speaker may choose to use an “Off Record” strategy. If a speaker wants to do a face threatening act, but does not want to take responsibility for doing that, s/he may choose off record strategy instead of saying directly what her/his want is. In this case, the speaker gives a choice to the hearer how to interpret what the speaker says. Since the speaker does not want to be explicit about what s/he wants, s/he often chooses “hints” or “giving association clue” in her/his utterances.

Example (37): That’s kind of cold. (NS)

In example (37), even though the speaker does not directly say what he wants, which is “Close the window,” he gives a hint to the hearer what kind of action the speaker wants the hearer to do.

Do Not Do the Face Threatening Act

The final one is the speaker decides not to do the face-threatening act. This is because the consequences of
possible damage to the speakers and hearers are too severe to take a risk.

Example (38): Nothing. I would not ask. (NS)

In example (38), the speaker does not want to ask for a ride to the person that she is not close to because she thinks it would be a too big favor to ask.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

Data Analysis and Discussion

This chapter shows the differences and similarities between Korean and American subjects' politeness strategies by summarizing the contents of the five tables and four graphs. Each table illustrates the frequencies of Koreans' and Americans' politeness strategies in the questionnaires. Each graph shows the specific percentage of each figure in five different tables. The total amount of politeness strategies are divided by the number of individual strategy in order to calculate the specific percentages. Also, this chapter focuses on the possible explanations of the differences and similarities of between the two groups' politeness strategies.

Table 1 shows the frequencies of five different politeness strategies used by American group and Korean group. The total number of strategies used is broken down into percentages and divided among each of the five strategies.
Table 1. General Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>American%</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Korean%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bald on Record</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Record</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t FTA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PP: Positive Politeness, NP: Negative Politeness

Graph 1 shows that the most commonly used strategy in both groups was Negative Politeness. Koreans used this strategy in 65.1% of their politeness and Americans used it in 58.2%. This strategy accounted for more than half of both groups' politeness. The second most commonly used strategy was Positive Politeness. This was used in 21.7% of Koreans' politeness and 28.9% of Americans'. Bald on record was the next most commonly used strategy, accounting for 7.8% of Koreans' politeness and 8% of Americans'. Only 3.8% of Koreans' politeness was Off Record, which, similarly, accounted for only 3.1% of Americans' politeness. The strategy used the least was Don’t FTA, which makes up 1.6% of Koreans' politeness and 1.9% of Americans.
Graph 1. General Analysis
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* PP; Positive Politeness, NP; Negative Politeness

**Familiarity Low**

Table 2 presents the responses to low-familiarity situations. It shows the number of instances each of the five politeness strategies was used in low-familiarity situations where the speakers' position were: higher than the hearer (#1= Library noise, #7= Computer frozen) the same as the hearer (#2= Loud music, #8=Ride), and lower than the hearer (#3= Professor's soft voice, #9= Recommendation letter).
Table 2. Familiarity Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question / Speakers' Position</th>
<th>Bald on Record</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Off Record</th>
<th>Don't FTA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1, # 7 / High</td>
<td>11 A</td>
<td>10 K</td>
<td>21 A</td>
<td>10 K</td>
<td>33 A</td>
<td>47 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2, # 8 / Same</td>
<td>6 A</td>
<td>4 K</td>
<td>24 A</td>
<td>15 K</td>
<td>35 A</td>
<td>59 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3, # 9 / Low</td>
<td>0 A</td>
<td>1 K</td>
<td>9 A</td>
<td>13 K</td>
<td>69 A</td>
<td>61 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 A</td>
<td>15 K</td>
<td>54 A</td>
<td>38 K</td>
<td>137 A</td>
<td>167 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A ; American Student, K ; Korean Student
* PP; Positive Politeness, NP; Negative Politeness

Graph 2 shows that when familiarity is low between speakers and hearers, both groups prefer negative politeness over other strategies, with Koreans using even more negative politeness (70.2%) than Americans (60.9%). Although positive politeness was the second most common strategy for both groups, Americans use more positive politeness (24.0%) than Koreans (16.0%). This result may show that, in both groups, the more distance speakers feel between themselves and hearers, the higher level politeness strategies they tend to use in performing the speech act of request.

Even though both groups show almost similar trends across different situations in using politeness strategies, there are some specific differences and similarities.
between Korean subjects' politeness strategies and American subjects' politeness strategies. First, American subjects use negative politeness the most when the speakers' positions are lower than hearers' (82.1%). The reason for this may be that Americans use two negative politeness strategies more than Koreans: "Minimize the imposition Rx" and "Impersonalize speakers and Hearers". In situation #3 (Professor's soft voice), Americans use some expressions more than Koreans, such as "a little," or "a bit," to minimize the imposition. Also, a total of ten instances of the strategy "Impersonalise speakers and Hearers" were found in American subjects in both situations. For example, in situation #3, three American subjects used plural pronoun "we," instead of emphasizing the role of hearer in the speech event by using "you," in order to soften the impact of the possible imposition. However, none of Korean subjects used this strategy.

In situation #9 (Recommendation letter), Americans often used the somewhat routinized request expression, "I was wondering if...," whereas no Korean subject used this expression. The possible reason for this could be that there are certain idiomatic or routinized polite expressions in actual English conversation that Koreans are
unfamiliar with, even though these expressions are common ways of making requests in native English speakers' language groups. According to Tanaka & Kawade (1982), "the idiomatic nature and indirectness of request sentences are directly related to the pragmatic notion of politeness" (p. 22-23): therefore, Koreans may sometimes sound too forceful to native speakers because of their lack of knowledge about idiomatic request forms when the hearer is of a higher social position than the speaker.

On the other hand, Korean subjects used negative politeness significantly more (72.8%) than American subjects do (47.9%) when the speakers' positions are the same as the hearers'. Interestingly, in situation #2 (Loud music) and #8 (Ride), Koreans used the "Be conventionalized indirect" strategy more than Americans. For instance, in situation #2, Korean subjects used "Can you/Could you/Would you turn down the music?" request forms more than American subjects did. In situation #8, the most frequently used request forms by Korean subjects are "Can you/ Could you give me a ride?" The reason could be that those two situations may be the most common cases that Korean students encounter on a daily basis. Therefore, they are familiar with the expressions even though it might be the
somewhat highly conventionalized forms. This reason may support Rose's (1992) claim that nonnative speakers tend to perform almost perfect speech act forms, if the given situation happens to them all the time. This may suggest that nonnative speakers' perceptions of politeness and the ability to express politeness appropriately in English are somewhat related to the level of exposure to native-like English.

Also, in situation #8 (Ride), Koreans used the negative politeness strategies of "Question, hedges," and "apologies" sixteen times, but none of the Americans used these strategies. This means that in this case, Koreans' utterances are generally longer than Americans. According to Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1986), "the non-native speaker invests more verbal effort than the native speaker by elaborating the background, the preconditions, the reasons, and the justifications related to the context in which the act is embedded" (p.175). This may be because nonnative speakers are not confident enough to make precise and simple request forms by using less words.

Also, this finding suggests that Koreans sometimes unnecessarily apologize when they make a request, which might be different from native speakers' norm. This is
because since "modesty and humility have long been regarded as high virtues" (Hwang, 1990), Korean students not only feel overly sensitive to politeness, but also feel obligated to apologize for their speech acts. However, the Koreans' tendencies toward these negative politeness strategies in the situations where the status are equal between the speakers and the hearers may make native speakers feel distant to the speakers.

Secondly, in terms of positive politeness, American subjects (32.9%) used it more than Koreans (18.5%) when speakers' positions are the same as the hearers' (#2: Loud music and #8: Ride). One interesting finding is that Americans used "in-group identity markers" much more than Koreans did. In particular, Americans used address forms, such as "dude," "buddy" or "man" the most in those two situations. Also, they used jargon, slang or ellipsis forms that Koreans never used. According to Scarcella (1979), politeness features such as "sorry" or "please" are easily mastered in early stages of the second language acquisition process, but others, such as slang and ellipsis, are not. As Scarcella suggests, Korean subjects don't feel comfortable using these positive politeness address forms in order to get attention from the hearers.
before they start to make a request. In addition, in-group jargon or slang are not easy to master, even though they have been in America more than three years.

Finally, one distinctive similarity is that "bald on record" was used the most by both groups when the speakers' position is higher than the hearers. Americans used it in 7.6% of their strategies and Koreans use it in 6.3%.

Graph 2. Familiarity Low

* A; American Student, K; Korean Student
* PP; Positive Politeness, NP; Negative Politeness
Familiarity High

Table 3 presents responses to high familiarity situations. Similar to table 2, it also shows the number of instances each strategy was used when the speakers' positions were higher (#4=Cold wind, #10=Business hour extension), lower (#6=Borrowing a book, #12=Special day off), or the same as the hearers'(#5=Borrowing CD, #11=Borrowing $1).

Table 3. Familiarity High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question / Speakers' Position</th>
<th>Bald on Record</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Off Record</th>
<th>Don't FTA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A K</td>
<td>A K</td>
<td>A K</td>
<td>A K</td>
<td>A K</td>
<td>A K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4, # 10 / High</td>
<td>16 18</td>
<td>19 24</td>
<td>29 25</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>66 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5, # 11 / Same</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>35 24</td>
<td>36 52</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>73 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6, # 12/ Low</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>15 10</td>
<td>46 47</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>61 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 20</td>
<td>58 111 124</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>200 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A ; American Student, K ; Korean Student
* PP; Positive Politeness, NP; Negative Politeness

Graph 3 illustrates the situations in which the speakers and hearers relationship was close. In these situations, the findings show the same results as the cases when the familiarity was low. That is, both groups used more negative politeness than positive politeness, and
Koreans preferred negative politeness more than Americans, whereas Americans preferred positive politeness more than Koreans. However the percentages of both groups for negative politeness are lower than the case when familiarity was low. Koreans use negative politeness in 59.6% of their strategies, whereas Americans used it 55.5%. Both groups used positive politeness more in situation where the familiarity was high than in the situation where the familiarity was low. When the familiarity was high, Americans use it in 34.5% of their strategies and Koreans use it in 27.9%. When the familiarity was low, Americans used positive politeness in 24.0% and Koreans used it in 16.0%. These findings suggest that positive politeness is preferred by both groups when the speakers and hearers are close to each other.

In addition, there are a few interesting findings that need to be pointed out. One noticeable difference is that Americans used negative politeness (43.9%) more than Koreans (36.2%) when the speakers' positions were higher than hearers'. Specifically, Americans used more conventional indirect forms in situations #4 (Cold wind) and #10 (Business hour extension), than Koreans. Moreover, they frequently used past tense modals in their request forms,
such as "Could you...," or "Would you...," which were never used by Koreans in this situation.

Korean subjects, on the other hand, used positive politeness the most when the speakers’ positions were higher than the hearers’. Americans used positive politeness in 28.8%. Koreans used it in 34.8% of their strategies, and this percentage is almost as high as the negative politeness in the same situations. Specifically, in situation #10 (Business hour extensions), Koreans used strategies such as "Notice, attention to hearers", "Be optimistic" and "Give gift to hearers" more than Americans did. A total of seventeen instances were found in Korean subjects’ answers, whereas Americans used them only six times.

There are a few possible explanations for these findings. First, the Korean subjects may not have mastered the subtle differences between the present tense modal "can" or "will," and their requestive past tense forms "could" or "would". Since the past forms of modals are regarded as more polite, the most typical negative politeness strategies used by the English respondents included the modal verbs "could" and "would." However, the Korean subjects may have not acquired this.
This could also be due to the different social values between Koreans and Americans. Shinn (1990) notes that Korean society traditionally has valued "vertical hierarchical society with great emphasis placed on power (kinship, age, sex, rank, status) rather than on solidarity (in-groupness, intimacy, informality)" (p.13). Also, Hwang (1990) claims that in Korea, "peoples' relative positions in various hierarchical social dimensions are highly recognized, and its members are identified more readily by their relative positions in the social structure than by their individuality" (p.42). According to the perceptions of people's relative positions, Koreans employ several 'speech levels' to mark different degrees or levels of deference. Therefore in situations #4 (Cold wind), and #10 (Business hour extension), in which the speakers' positions are relatively high (e.g., older brother and a boss), the Korean subjects do not usually use overtly deferential speech forms. In other words, the speakers feel free to use direct forms or a lower level of politeness strategies. This first language norm may be transferred to English realization patterns when they make requests.

Another finding is that Americans distinctively preferred to use positive politeness the most (47.9%) when
the speakers' positions are the same as the hearers'. Similar to the above-mentioned cases, Americans frequently used in-group identity markers in these situations. In situation #11 (Borrowing $1), Koreans never used address forms, whereas Americans used it five times. Also, Americans use the "Offer, promise strategy" four times in situations #5 (Borrowing CD), but Koreans never used them.

On the other hand, Koreans used more negative politeness (66.7%) than Americans (49.3%) when the speakers' positions were the same as the hearers'. In situation #5 (Borrowing a CD) and situation #11 (Borrowing $1), Koreans used more conventionally indirect forms and hedges than Americans. In those two cases, since the relationship between speakers and hearers are close, and the social positions are the same, Americans value positive politeness more than negative politeness. Fukushima (1995) explains the importance of solidarity politeness. Fukushima claims that in some societies such as in Japanese society, "solidarity politeness is also as important as deference politeness, especially when we interact with people such as family members, close friends and close colleagues" (p.42). In other words, sometimes requests can also mean that the speakers feel close enough to ask a favor from hearers.
Hence, positive politeness is also important to continue a solid relationship between speakers and hearers. In the light of this argument, Koreans’ request forms to hearers of the same social position may sound too polite to Americans, and make American hearers feel distant to speakers.

Graph 3. Familiarity High

* A; American Student, K; Korean Student
* PP; Positive Politeness, NP; Negative Politeness

**Imposition Level**

Table 4 deals with the level of imposition that the subjects ranked each situation. As noted, the subjects were asked to rank each situation according to the level of
imposition (i.e., the hesitancy they felt in making the request), 1. being extremely hesitant and 5. being not at all hesitant. These numbers were totaled up from each student of both groups and used to rank all 12 questions in terms of degree of imposition. For example, situation #11 (Borrowing $1) received a total ranking of 81 points on the imposition scale by Americans, which makes it the 7th most imposing situation. However, the same situation #11 (Borrowing $1) received a total ranking of only 61 by Koreans, which makes it the 3rd most imposing situation to Koreans. In other words, the lower the total ranking number, the higher the level of imposition.

Even though both groups tend to agree on the level of imposition in each request act, there are some instances of disagreement, in which one group considered a certain situation to be higher than the other group. Therefore, in order to analyze the differences and similarities between American subjects and Korean subjects in terms of imposition, six situations, which were similarly ranked by both groups were chosen. Three situations were regarded as low imposition level (Situation #7-Computer Frozen, #5- Borrowing CD and #4-Cold wind ), and the other three
situations were regarded as high imposition level by both Korean and American groups (Situation #8-Ride, #9-Recommendation letter, and # 4-Cold wind).

Table 4. Imposition Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imposition Level</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Imposition Level</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HIGH</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 HIGH</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 LOW</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12 LOW</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 presents 6 of the 12 situations. What shown is the number and type of politeness strategy used by both groups, in high (#8, #9, and #6) and low imposition level-Situations (#7, #5, and #4).

Table 5. Imposition Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question / Imposition Level</th>
<th>Bald on Record</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Off Record</th>
<th>Don't FTA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#8, #9, #6 / High</td>
<td>A 1 K 0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75 90</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>104 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7, #5, #4 / Low</td>
<td>17 20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38 53</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>113 143</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>6 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A ; American Student, K ; Korean Student  
* PP; Positive Politeness, NP; Negative Politeness

Graph 5 indicates the differences and similarities between Korean subjects’ and American subjects’ politeness strategies in relation to imposition level. When the imposition level is high, this graph shows that both groups almost identically preferred to use negative politeness strategy. Koreans used negative politeness in 72.6% of their strategies, and Americans used it in 72.1%. Also Koreans used positive politeness in 21.8% of their strategies, and Americans used it in 22.1%.
However, when the imposition level was low, Americans preferred to use positive politeness strategy more than negative politeness. Americans used positive politeness in 43.1% of their strategies, and negative politeness in 37.3%. In situations #7 (Computer frozen), #5 (Borrowing CD) and #4 (Cold wind), Americans often used in-group markers. Especially in situation #5, they used "offer, promise" four times.

On the contrary, in the same situations, Korean subjects still used more negative politeness than positive politeness. They use negative politeness in 56.4% of their strategies, and positive politeness in 20.2%. In situation #7, Koreans used "hedges and apologies" more than Americans. Also, they use conventionally indirect forms more than Americans in situation #5.

These findings may suggest that the degree of imposition may not play an important role when it comes to choosing politeness level for Koreans. Instead, the relationship between the speakers and hearers is considered as an important factor. However, for Americans, the degree of imposition level is also one of the main factors to decide the level of politeness.
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Conclusion

This study shows that American subjects and Korean subjects generally prefer to use negative politeness strategies when they perform the speech act of a request. Beside this general finding, there are some interesting results that need to be discussed. First, according to the data, Koreans used more negative politeness than Americans, and Americans used more positive politeness than Koreans.
Second, this study also shows that both groups prefer to use positive politeness when the familiarity is high. On the contrary, when the familiarity is low, both groups prefer to use negative politeness.

Third, this study illustrates that Korean learners of English may not fully understand the norms of English politeness strategies; therefore they do not properly use politeness expressions or politeness strategies. For example, Americans differentiate the level and the expressions of politeness strategies according to the social status of their hearers. However, Korean subjects sometimes fail to produce the English-like politeness expressions. This is partially because they have not perfectly mastered some linguistic features such as "in-groups markers" or routinized indirect expressions that Americans normally use to show their "solidarity politeness" or to minimize the possible imposition.

Also, Koreans may tend to transfer the norms of their native language and culture into English. For instance, Korea is considered a hierarchical society organized by factors such as gender, age, and social status. This may have affected the Korean subjects' choice of politeness strategies. As a result, when talking to Americans, Koreans
may sound overly polite or rude even though they do not intend to be.

This result partially supports the previous researchers’ findings (e.g. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Eslamirasekh, 1993; Fukushima, 1996; Pair, 1996). They suggest that participants in speech acts estimate the relative importance of request acts by their cultural values. Also, since their measurements of social power, social distance, and the degree of imposition might be different from one culture to another, participants choose culture-specific strategies and linguistic forms in speech situations. Kim’s study (1993) also shows the same finding as this one, saying, “... nonnative speakers deviated from native English speaker norms in some situations due to the effect of the pragmatic rules of Korean.” (P. 79).

We also see that both groups tend to agree on the level of imposition in each request act. In some situations, however, there are some instances of disagreement, in which one group considered a certain situation to be higher than the other group.

In addition, when the imposition level was considered to be high, both groups preferred to use negative politeness. However, when the imposition level was low,
Americans distinctively use positive politeness strategies more than Koreans, whereas Koreans still prefer to use negative politeness. This finding suggests that, for Koreans, the level of imposition of request may not play an important role in choosing the politeness level when they perform speech acts in English. This may possibly be explained by the fact that, unlike the situations where Koreans can use their own language, when they perform the face threatening acts in English, they might be too sensitive about being polite to pay attention to the level of imposition. In other words, asking a favor in itself is a great burden no matter how small it may be.

These findings may be useful for ESL material developers and teachers. As pointed out earlier, since there are cross-cultural differences in speech act request realization patterns, it would be ideal for teachers in TESL to introduce to ESL students the different social norms of the target language societies as well as linguistically diverse ways of performing speech acts. For instance, as we can see in this study, when the Korean subjects produce the speech act of request in the situations where the speakers' social status are the same as the hearers', they display different norms of politeness
strategies from Americans' politeness strategies. In addition, Korean subjects may not have fully acquired the rules and proper usages of modals, certain idioms and slang, even though those features are frequently used by native speakers when they make a request. Therefore, in order to help students to achieve pragmatic competence even in the classroom, it would be necessary for Korean ESL teachers and material developers to introduce the native-like politeness expressions and the social norms to the students.
APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRE (TWELVE QUESTIONS)
Act of Requesting and Level of Imposition.

Please ANSWER the following questions and RANK how hesitant you are in the following situations.

EXAMPLE: Tomorrow is the due date of a final term paper. However, you are not able to turn it on time. You want to talk to the professor, whom you have known for a couple of years, and ask him/her to give you an extension. What would you say?

Your Answer: I have a problem. I can’t turn in a final term paper on time. Would you give me more time? I need more time because my computer isn’t working and my data is in hard disk in the computer.

1. Extremely hesitant  
2. Very hesitant

3. Somewhat  
4. A little  
5. Not at all

1. You are a librarian. You see a group of students talking noisily and disturbing other students. You want students to be quiet or move to a group study room. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant 
2. Very hesitant
2. You live in a dormitory. You are trying to study in your room and you hear loud music coming from another student’s room down the hall. You don’t know the student, but you decide to ask him/her to turn the music down. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant  2. Very hesitant

3. You are taking a class with a new professor. Today is the first day. You can barely hear him/her because the professor speaks with a soft voice, and the classroom is rather large. So, you want to ask him/her to speak loud. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant  2. Very hesitant
4. You are studying at home. Your younger brother opens the window and the cold wind blows right into your face and bothers you. You want to ask him to close it. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant
2. Very hesitant
3. Somewhat
4. A little
5. Not at all

5. You know that your friend has your favorite singer’s CD. If you asked her/him to record it for you, what would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant
2. Very hesitant
3. Somewhat
4. A little
5. Not at all

6. You want to borrow a book from your professor whom you have known for a year. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant
2. Very hesitant

7. You are typing a term paper on a computer. Suddenly, the computer is frozen. You know your younger brother’s friend is majoring in computer science, but you don’t know him/her very well. You need his/her help to fix your computer. What would you say?
Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant       2. Very hesitant

8. You need a ride home from school. You notice one student who lives down the street from you is also at school, but you haven’t spoken to this person before. You think he/she might have a car. What would you say?
Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant       2. Very hesitant

9. You want to apply for a company to get a job and need 3 recommendation letters. You already got 2 from your close
professor, but you need one more letter. You have to ask one of your professors that you are not very close to. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant   2. Very hesitant

10. You are the owner of a bookstore. Today is the first day of school, so you are very busy. You are planning to extend business hours for extra two hours, and want to ask a clerk whom you have gotten to know well to work with you for two hours. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant   2. Very hesitant

11. You are waiting at a bus stop. Finally, the bus comes and you realize that you only have a $20 bill for the bus fare of $1. You know that the bus driver does not carry any change. If you miss the bus, you will be late for an
important exam. At the moment you recognize a neighbor you see every morning. She/ he is also a student. You want to borrow $1 from him/her. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant  2. Very hesitant

12. You work in a company. Tomorrow you have to go some place for your family business. So, you have to ask your boss to give you a special day off. What would you say?

Your Answer:

1. Extremely hesitant  2. Very hesitant
APPENDIX B:

AMERICAN STUDENTS' ANSWERS
Question 1

1. Nothing I would gesture placing my first finger to my lips and stare at them until I got their attention.

2. Please be quiet! This is a library.

3. Hi guys, I need you to tone it down, or maybe take it to one of the study rooms, O.K.? Thanks.

4. Shh!

5. Would you please talk a little quieter? There are others here.

6. You are disturbing other patrons. Please quiet down or move to a study room.

7. You need to be quiet or move to a study room.

8. I would tell them that there is a study room if they'd like to go in there for privacy.

9. You are disrupting others. Please move to the group study room that has been provided for groups.

10. Could you please be quiet, this is a library.

11. Could you keep it down a little bit? You're driving me nutz!

12. I'd tell them the students they were being extremely rude either need to be quiet or move to a study room.

13. Shut up!
14. Will you either be a little quieter or move to a group study room?

15. Please keep the voice down.

16. Please move or be quiet

17. Would you please move to the study room?

18. Be quiet or move to a group study room.

19. Quiet down now!

20. Excuse me, if you guys want to talk with each other some more, you can use the group study room because it needs to be quiet out.
Question 2

1. Could you tune it down a little?
2. Would you mind turning it down a little? I'm studying.
3. Hi, uhm, would you mind turning down your music a bit? You know these walls are paper thin.
4. Eh, could you uhh.. turn that down a little?
5. Hey, would you mind turning it down?
6. I'm trying to study. Could you please lower the volume?
7. Hey, could you turn down your music?
8. Look dude, I like music, I love music, I love the music you are playing, but NOT RIGHT NOW.
9. I know you are enjoying your music, and if I weren't studying, so would I. Since I am studying, please turn down the music.
10. Hey, could you turn it down a bit?
11. I would say nothing, but I would blast my own tunes.
12. Excuse me, I'm trying to study down the hall and I'd really appreciate it if you would turn down your radio. It's sort of bothering me.
13. I'm trying to study, shut up!
14. Hey, other people need quiet to study.
15. Close my door.
16. Turn it down or shut it off.
17. Please turn the music down.

18. Please turn your music down.

19. Hey, could you turn it down?

20. Ay, man can you cut it down a bit for a while?
Question 3

2. Excuse me Dr.xxx, I can’t hear you too well. What did you say?
3. Uhm, excuse me, I’m having a hard time hearing you.
4. I'm sorry. I can't hear. Could you speak a little louder?
5. Would you mind speaking a little louder?
6. Excuse me, could you please a little louder?
7. We can’t hear you back here!
8. Every time he said something I would say “what?” Eventually he’d get tired of me and raised his voice.
9. We can’t hear you in the back.
10. Excuse me, professor? Could you speak up?
11. I don’t hear so well. Could you please speak up a little bit?
12. Sir/Mam, I’m sorry, but could you please speak a little louder? I’m having trouble hearing you.
13. Can you talk a little louder!
14. Will you please speak a little louder?
15. Could you speak louder please?
16. On behalf of all of us, I ask that you would speak louder.
17. Could you please speak up a little? I can't hear you.

18. Can you speak up?

19. Excuse me, I can’t hear you. Would you speak up?

20. I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
Question 4

1. Close the window, idiot. Were you born in a barn?

2. That's kind of cold.

3. What, were you born in a barn? Shut the window!

4. Hey! Shut the window!

5. Can you close that, please?

6. Please close the window. I'm studying!

7. Close the window!

8. Close the damn window!

9. It's cold with the window open. Close it, please.

10. Could you close it, please?

11. Close that, would ya!!

12. I'm trying to study. The cold wind is bothering me. Could you close the window?

13. Close that window!

14. Close the window please.

15. Close the window please.

16. Will you close the window? I have a fan you could use.

17. Bro, Please close the window.

18. Close the window.

19. Close the window.

Question 5

1. God, I Love that singer. Do you think you could make a copy for me?
2. Could you tape that for me? I’ve got a blank tape.
3. I love that song! Can I get you to record the album for me?
4. You wanna make a copy for me?
5. Would you record that for me?
6. I wouldn’t ask.
7. Can I borrow this CD, so I can burn a copy?
8. That’ a cool CD yo! You think if I gave you a tape, you could record it for me?
9. I love xxx music. Would you mind recording it if I bring the blank tape?
10. Oh my God, this is incredible you have got to record that for me!
11. Eh hook me up with a copy bro.?
12. If I bring you a tape, could you do me a favor and record your new CD for me?
13. Born me a copy of that?
14. Will you record that CD for me, please?
15. Do you think you can record that for me?
16. Hook me up with a copy.
17. Could you please record that for me?
18. Will you record that CD for me?
19. Hey, record this CD for me.
20. Ay, could you make a dub for me?
Question 6

1. You wouldn't happen to have this book I need, would you? (see if he offers it first)

2. Dr. XXX, would it be possible for me to borrow that book?

3. Do you mind if I borrow that book by ----?

4. Could I borrow your book?

5. Do you think it would be possible to borrow a book for a while?

6. Could I please borrow that book for a week?

7. Can I borrow this book?

8. Do you think it would be possible for me to borrow that book?

9. Do you loan books to students? If so, could I borrow it for my term paper?

10. Hey, "Claudia, can I borrow that?

11. Mike, could I borrow that book for a few days?

12. Prof. I was wondering if it would be possible for me to borrow the book from you.

13. Could I borrow your book, please?

14. Can I please borrow that book from you?

15. Do you think I can borrow that book from you?
16. How was that book? If you aren’t using it, might I borrow it?

17. Could I borrow that book to study?

18. Will lend me the book?

19. Hey, could I borrow this book?

20. I was wondering if I could borrow a book from you,
Question 7

1. Hey dude. You’re good at this stuff, huh? Could you help me?
2. (Very contingent on other relationships.)
3. I hate to prove my ignorance, but my computer froze up. Can you look at it for me?
4. Hey, you are majoring in computer science, right? Could you help me for a second!
5. Would you have time to help me fix my computer?
6. Could you please take a look at my computer? I owe you one.
7. My computer froze up. Is there something I can do to fix it or would you be willing to come to take a look at it?
8. I heard you’re good at fixing computer. This piece of crap isn’t working. Think you could look at it?
9. Would you call your friend and ask him what to do if your computer is doing xxx?
10. I need help. Please help me!
11. Hey, what’s wrong with this dang thing?
12. Hey, “brother’s friend”, you’re majoring in computer science, right? Could you please help me?
13. I would ask my brother if the computer guy is cool. Then I would ask them.

14. Hey, I need help with my computer. Will you help me?

15. My computer massed up. Could you help me out?

16. Will you help a friend?

17. Could you please come over and help me with my computer?

18. Will you fix my computer?

19. Hey, boddy, could you fix the computer for me?

20. Say, you think you could help me with my computer? I'm having a problem with it.
Question 8

1. Can I bum a ride just this once?

2. Hi? I live down the street from you and I’m stuck. Could I possibly bum a ride home?

3. Do you drive to school, or take the bus... Really? Do you think I could get a ride?

4. You think that I could hitch a ride?

5. Start with general conversation, Then " Do you think it would be possible to catch a ride home from school ?"


7. Do you think you could give me a ride home?

8. Nothing, I would not ask.

9. My name is xxx. I notice that you live down the street from me. My car is....


11. I would walk!

12. Hey, how are you getting home?

13. Nothing, I would walk home!

14. Hey, do you have a car and can I get a ride home with you?

15. I wouldn’t ask.

16. Don’t I live down the street from you?
17. Could you please give me a ride home?
18. Will you give me a ride?
19. Hey, take me home please.
20. Say, don't you live down my street? I've seen you around. Ay, can you give me a ride me up there?
Question 9

1. I need another recommendation letter. Do you know anyone that could help me?

2. Dr. XXX, I need three letters of recommendation for a job application. I already have two. Would you consider writing me one?

3. I know you don't know me very well, but I was wondering if you could do me a favor... would you mind?

4. I was wondering if you could write me a letter of recommendation?

5. I was wondering if you might give me a recommendation for a job?

6. Would you write a recommendation letter for me? I would really appreciate it.

7. Will you write me a letter of recommendation?

8. I am applying for this job. And I need a recommendation. I was wondering if you could write me one. I would really appreciate it.

9. Dr.xxx. I am applying for a job. I need one more recommendation letter. You don't know me well, but would you mind writing a letter for me? (difficult handwriting)

10. Hi, I was wondering if you could do me a favor?
11. Professor... May I please ask you to write a letter of recommendation to me?
12. I need a letter of recommendation. I was wondering if you have the time. Could you please write on for me?
13. I'd just ask him, if I got a good grade. Can you write a letter for me?
14. I need a recommendation letter. Can I get one from you?
15. How would you feel about giving me a letter of recommendation?
16. How would you feel about writing a letter of recommendation?
17. I need a huge favor.
18. Will you write me a letter of recommendation?
19. Hi, could you refer me to this company?
20. Hi, how are you? I don't know if you remember me. I was in your xxx class. I just graduated and I've been looking for a position somewhere. It's been pretty good so far. I just need some recommendations and I was wondering if you might be able to write one for me if you had the time.
Question 10

1. We might have to work late. What do you think?
2. Bob, I need you to work two hours overtime tonight. All right?
3. I want to stay open late. Can you stay an extra two hours? I’d really appreciate it.
4. Would you mind staying an extra two hours to calm these crowds?
5. Hey, can you work for 2 hours today?
6. Could you stay on an entire 2 hours and work with?
   Maybe we can go grab a to eat after.
7. Would you be willing to work for a couple more hours?
8. Work or you’re fired!
9. Because we’re so busy, we’re extending hours. Would you like the over-time?
10. Hey girlie. Could you do me a huge favor?
11. Is it possible for you to work a couple hours of overtime tonight?
12. I was wondering if you could stay and work with me for two more hours. If you can’t, I understand. But if you could, I’d really appreciate it.
13. I’d tell him he could stay and give him a reward. I would not force him.
14. I need help... Will you help me?

15. Would you mind staying a couple of extra hours?

16. Hey, are you willing to stay and make overtime?

17. Could you help me out?

18. Will you work for me for 2 hours?

19. Hey, I'm going to need some help.

20. Say... would you like to make some extra money? We're very busy and you could work a couple hours more. Actually, we really need you to help out.
Question 11

1. Got change for a twenty? No? Could you just loan me a buck till next time?

2. Hi xxx. Hey, I’ve got an appointment and I need to ride the bus, but I’ve only got a twenty. Do you have change for a twenty?

3. Oh, My god. Can you do me a huge favor? I need a dollar for the bus. I’ll pay you back tomorrow!

4. You got change for a $20?

5. Can I borrow a dollar?

6. Can I borrow a dollar from you for the bus? I can’t be late for this exam. I’ll pay you back this afternoon.

7. All I have is a $20 bill. Can I borrow a dollar and pay you as soon as I can break my $20.

8. Do you have change for a $20?

9. Hi... Here’s the bus and I’ve only get a $20. Do you have an extra dollar I would borrow until tomorrow?


11. Excuse me, I only have a $20 bill. Could I borrow a $1. I’ll pay you back tomorrow.

12. Could you please loan me a dollar for the bus. All I have is a $20 and I can’t miss this. I promise I’ll pay you back.
13. Let me borrow a buck. I will pay you back when we get home.

14. Do you happen to have a dollar I could borrow? I only have $20.

15. Hey, do you think I could borrow a dollar and I will pay you back. I only have a $20.

16. Help me out and lend me a dollar.

17. Could I borrow a dollar?

18. Will you lend me a dollar?

19. Hey, could I borrow a dollar for the bus?

20. How you doing? Say, I've only got this twenty and I need to take the bus. Could you lend me a dollar really quick and I'll get you back tomorrow when I see you.
Question 12

1. I was wondering. I need to take care of some personal family business tomorrow. Would it be possible for me to take the day off?

2. Boss, is there any chance I could get off tomorrow? Something’s come up in my family.

3. Do we have anything processing going on tomorrow? (no) Well, there’s this (thing). Would you mind if I take the day off and make it up Friday?

4. I have some things going on in the family, could I get tomorrow off?

5. Do you think it would be possible to get an extra day off?

6. I would explain the situation and say... I’ll make up any work I miss.

7. Can I have tomorrow off? I have a personal situation I need to take care of.

8. My cat died yesterday. Yeah, I’m really sad. And I need the day off.

9. I have some personal business demanding immediate attention. I need to be out tomorrow. (?) Is it possible
to get the day off? What would you like me to do today to keep things run something tomorrow?

10. I have an emergency. I really need this day off.

11. Hey, Jim. I have big plans tomorrow. Could I make the hours up another time?

12. Tomorrow my family is having a family event(?). I was wondering if it would be possible for me to have the day off.

13. (I’d call in sick, the same day.) Hello, I’m very sick. I can’t come in to work.

14. I have a family activity I need to go to. Can I get the day off?

15. Do you think I could get this day off?

16. Boss, I honestly need the day off.

17. Could I please have tomorrow off?

18. Will you give me a day off?

19. Hey, boss, I need tomorrow off.

20. I wanted to ask you: I have a really important trip to make for my family business and I was wondering if I could get someone to fill in for me.
APPENDIX C:

KOREAN STUDENTS' ANSWERS
Question 1

1. You are in the library. I think you better be quiet or move to a group study room.

2. Excuse me, Can you guys be a little quiet please?

3. Why don’t you go into a group study room?

4. Hey guys! This is not your playground. Why don’t you move to a group study room?

5. Nothing

6. Could be quiet?

7. Excuse me, I’m sorry, but here is library. Would you move to another place?

8. Excuse me. Tomorrow will be my final day. Please, I don’t want to be failed in my accounting class.

9. You are not allowed to talk in the library. Would you move to a group study room?

10. Please be quiet!

11. Please keep quiet. It’s not only for your room.

12. I am sorry, here supposed be quiet room.

13. This is for everyone. You must use a group study room if you are going to keep talking.

14. This is a public area. Please be quiet.

15. Would you mind if I ask you to go outside and talk?

16. If you need a discussion, use a group study room.
17. Be quiet, please.

18. Excuse me, would you be quiet, please?

19. You guys are being very loud. Could you move to a group study room, otherwise you have to be quiet.

20. Would you please go to a group study room?
Question 2

1. I don't want to disturb you, but it is too noisy for me to study in my room because of your loud music. Would you turn the music down a little bit?

2. Can you turn down the music, please? I am studying now.

3. Can you turn down the volume? I am studying.

4. Excuse me. I know you are really enjoying that music, but I think you can turn it down a little. Can you do that?

5. Would you mind turning it down?

6. Could you turn the music down?

7. Could you turn down the volume? I can't study.

8. Turn the music down. You are bothering my studying.

9. Hi, I am a student living in #xxx near to your room. I'm preparing for the test. I can't concentrate because of the loud music. Would you turn down the music?

10. Please be quiet!

11. Please turn off the music. That disturbs me.

12. It's too loud. My roommate is sick. Can you turn it down a little bit, please?

13. Please, somebody is trying to study here. Do you think it is a little bit loud?

14. Could you turn down?
15. I'm trying to study, so could you turn down the volume little bit?
16. I have an exam tomorrow, could you turn down little?
17. Can you turn the music a little? It's too loud.
18. Would you turn down the volume, please? It's too noisy.
19. Could you turn off that music?
20. Please turn the music down a little. I can't study.
Question 3

1. Professor, excuse me, would you mind if I ask you to speak a little louder?

2. Excuse me, professor, Could you speak a little louder, please? I can’t hear you.

3. I don’t hear what you say.

4. Excuse me, sir? I can’t hear you in here. Can you just speak up?

5. Please, Can you speak louder?

6. Could you please speak loudly?

7. Could you speak a little more loudly? Sir?

8. I can not hear you. I don’t know what you say.

9. Sorry to bother you, but could you say a little loudly? I’m an international student. It’s very hard to understand you.

10. Please speak loud.

11. Professor, would you speak louder?

12. I can barely hear you, professor. Can you speak little bit louder?

13. I can’t hear you back here.

14. I can’t hear your voice, sir.
15. I have a difficulty hearing your voice and I will appreciate if you speak louder.

16. Dr. xxx, I can’t hear you.

17. Please speak loudly.

18. Could you speak loudly, please?

19. I can’t hear you, sir.

20. Can you speak up a little?
Question 4

1. Close the window, please.
2. Can you close the window?
3. Can you close the window? I feel cold.
4. Hey brother! I feel pretty chilly. Would you mind close the window?
5. Close it!
6. Close the window!
7. Hey! Shut the window!
8. Close the window. If you want some air, get out of the house.
9. Close the door, please! I'm feeling cold. The wind also bothers me. I have to concentrate on studying.
10. Please close window.
11. Close the window, please.
12. Please shut the door. I'm cold.
13. Please close the door!
14. Close door!
15. Close the window!
16. Close the window!
17. Close the window!
18. Close the window, please.
19. Close the window, man.
20. Close the window! It's too windy outside.
Question 5

1. Do you record xx CD for me?
2. Can you make a copy of this CD for me?
3. I really love this music, but I couldn’t get it. Can you record it for me?
4. (If it is my friend) Can I borrow that CD for one day?
5. Can you record it for me?
6. If my favorite singer CD, I’ll buy it.
7. Would you mind recording your CD for me?
8. Can you copy your great CD for me? That music surprises me.
9. Do you like this song? I can’t believe it! This song is also my favorite song. I’m crazy about the singer. Would you record it for me? I really appreciate it if you do it for me.
10. Please record your CD.
11. Would you mind borrow your CD for record to me?
12. Can I borrow your CD or Can you record it for me?
13. Wow, You have my favorite CD. Would you mind lending me?
15. Can you record the singer’s CD for me?
16. Can you record it for me? I love his/ her song.

17. Could you record your CD for me?

18. I really like your that CD. Would you mind if you record the CD for me?

19. Burn that CD for me?

20. That's my favorite CD. Can you record it for me sometime?
Question 6

1. Could you lend me that book for a while?

2. Can I borrow this book?

3. I have had a really hard time with my research papers because I hardly found sources. Would you suggest any books or articles?

4. I've been interesting in that book. I just wonder that you already read it. If so I want to borrow it from you. Is it O.K?

5. Could you lend me the book?

6. Can I borrow a book?

7. May I borrow your book, please?

8. I am studying for C.P.A. For my purpose, a book from you might be helpful to me.

9. Can I borrow this book? I tried to by this book by dropping by a few bookstores, but I wouldn't. I promise I'll return after a few days. It contains many things I'm interested in. Would you?

10. Can I borrow your book for study?

11. Professor, would you borrow your book for a while?

12. I have problem with my project. I think this book might help me.
13. I am wondering if you mind lending that book. I’ll return the book as soon as I finish.

14. Can I borrow a book from you? That is really helpful for me.

15. Could I borrow one of your books?

16. Dr.xxx, if you are not using this book, can I borrow it?

17. Can I borrow your book?

18. Sir, I’m sorry to bother you, but I need one of your books. Can I borrow it?

19. Could I borrow that for a while?

20. I’m sorry to bother you, but can I borrow that book of yours, xxx?
Question 7

1. I know you are very busy. Do you mind if I ask you a favor? I need your help to fix my computer.

2. Would you mind taking a look at my computer to find what’s wrong?

3. I will ask my brother if his friend can help me.

4. Now, my computer is not working and I have to make a term paper with it. If you are not busy now, I wanna ask you to come to my house and see my computer. Can you?

5. Would you mind coming and fixing my computer?

6. Can you fix my computer?

7. Could you fix my computer? I’m sorry to bother you.

8. I have emergency situation. Please help me.

9. Hi. I’m your friend, xxx’s sister. I’ve heard you are a professional in computer science. I’m in trouble because my computer is dead without any reason. I don’t know why. I was typing a very important paper. Can you give me a hand? I’ll treat a nice lunch tomorrow.

10. Can you fix my P.C. I’m so busy.

11. Hey, I have a problem with my computer. Would you fix it for me?
12. Hey, brother, I have problem with my computer. Can you fix it?
13. I need your help!
15. I have a big favor to ask you. Could you fix the computer for me?
16. I have to finish my term paper today. Can you fix my computer, please?
17. My computer was broken. I heard you were good at computer science. Could you fix my computer?
18. Do you have time to fix my computer? I’m in trouble.
20. I’m in a real jam with a term paper. Can you come and take a look at my computer?
1. Do you mind if I ask you a favor to give me a ride? I live nearby your house.

2. I live near you home. I saw you several times. If you go home straight today, can you give me a ride?

3. I need a ride to go home, but I can’t reach with my friends. I have no idea what to do.

4. How’s it going? My name is xx. Hi? Do you come to school by your car? I’m looking for a ride from the school. Can you pick me up by your car? (I think I never make this situation. I don’t ask something to stranger.)

5. Could you drive to school with me?

6. I may take a bus.

7. Do you know me? I think you’re living near my house. I’m sorry, but today I don’t have ride. Could you give me a ride?

8. HI! My good neighbor. My car is broken. Could you give me a ride?

9. Hello, I’ve seen you many times. We are neighbors. Well, Could you do me a favor? I have to go home quickly because... Could you give me a ride home if it doesn’t bother you?
10. Can you pick me up to your home?
11. Excuse me, if I don’t bother you, could you give me a ride to home?
12. Nothing to say, I will work.
13. I’m sorry. Could you give me a ride?
14. Excuse me, I think you don’t know me well, but I live nearby your house. I got some problem now. Are you heading to home? I was wondering if you could give me a ride to home just today?
15. I need a ride home. Is this too much trouble to you if I ask you to give me a ride?
16. Hi, my name is xxx, and I think we go to same school, can you drive me school today? I need a ride.
17. Could you give me a ride?
18. I think you live near my home, don’t you? Today, I don’t have ride. So could you take me?
19. Hey, I noticed that you go to some school as I do. I need a ride to school. Can I chip in some money and get a ride from you?
20. Hey, I think you live down the street from me. Do you think you can give me a lift?
Question 9

1. I would really appreciate you, if you don't mind writing a recommendation letter for me.

2. I would not ask because she/he doesn't have anything to talk about me.

3. I am applying for a company that I really like to work. I need 3 letters and already got of them. Would you do it for me?

4. I've been taken your classes, and it was very impressive to me. That's why I'm gonna ask recommendation letter to you. I really wanna take your recommendation Is it possible?

5. Could you write a recommendation letter for me?

6. I am planning to apply for a company. I'd like to get you recommendation letter. Could you give me a recommendation letter?

7. Sir, would you mind if I ask you a favor? Could you please write a recommendation letter for me?

8. I got A in your class. And I love to listen your wonderful lecture. Would you write a recommendation letter for me?

9. Hi, I'm one of your students in xxx. Well. I need three recommendation letters for my new job. I've got two
already. Sorry to bother you, but could you spare some time for my recommendation letter? I really like this new job. I don’t want to lose it.

10. Can you give me a recommendation letter?

11. Sir, would you give some recommendation for me? I need this for get a job.

12. How are you sir? I am looking for a job these days. Do you mind if I ask you a favor? Can I have recommendation letter from you?

13. Professor. I really enjoyed your class. I would deeply appreciate if you give a recommendation letter.

14. Can you recommend me? I tool your class last quarter. I think you are the person who really helps me.

15. Would you write me a good recommendation letter?

16. I need a recommendation letter to apply for a company. Can I have one from you?

17. I need a recommendation to get a job. Could you write recommendation for me?

18. Excuse sir, I’m a student of your class. I know it’s very annoying, but I need recommendation of you.

19. Professor, I need a recommendation from you. If you can do that I will appreciate it.
20. I know you don’t know me all that well, but could you possibly write me a letter of recommendation?
Question 10

1. I know you are very busy, I want you to help me out today for an extra hours, because today was a very busy day. We have a lot of things to do.

2. Can you stay longer to help me today? You see, we have a busy day today.

3. It is really a good time for us to do business well. Don’t you think it’s a good idea to work for 3 hours more?

4. I have a plan to extend business hours, and I am gonna give you extra money for that. Is there problem with you?

5. Can you work two more hours?

6. Can you work for extra two hours?

7. Nothing.

8. If you work with me for extra two hours today, I will pay extra charge.

9. As you see, today is a very very busy day. Can you work a few hours more? Of course, I’ll pay for them.

10. Can you work extra two hours today?

11. Sorry guys. We need extra help after business hours. Will you take extra bonus?

12. I will pay for extra hours.
13. Hey, Here is a chance to get some extra money. Please help me! I’ll double pay you!

14. We are going to extend our business hours. Of course, I will pay you extra money.

15. Are you willing to work with me for extra two hours?

16. We need to extend business hours today and I need your help. I’m going to give your extra money. Can you help me?

17. I’m sorry for the short notice, but it looks like you’ll be working with me for an extra two hours each day.

18. Are you busy after your business time? I’m planning to extend two hours because today is so busy. Can you do this?

19. Hey, is it possible for you to cover my shift? Just two hours, please?

20. I’m deciding to extend business hours. So I would appreciate your cooperation--- working with me.
Question 11

1. Can I borrow a $1, because I don't have change for a bus fare right now. I will give it back tomorrow.

2. Do you have money to break $20? If no, Can I borrow a dollar? I don't have change right now, but I will pay back when I see you tomorrow morning.

3. I don't have any change for a bus fare. Can you lend me $1? I will give you something I have or leave my phone number or address.

4. I've been seeing you every morning. I think we live in same area. I got problem here, so I need help. I have just $20. I need one dollar for the bus fare. Can I borrow it from you?

5. I only have a $20 dollar bill. Could you have $1 for changing or just borrow one?

6. After I explain my situation, Can I borrow $1?

7. Do you have a change for $20? or May I borrow $1?

8. Can I borrow $1? Tomorrow I will give you back. Believe me. If you want, I can give you my I.D.

9. Hello, I have to get on this bus. If I miss. I'll surely late for my final exam. My big problem is I don't have one dollar bill. Can I borrow one dollar?
I’ll give you tomorrow morning or if you give me a phone number. I’ll drop by any time you are available.

10. Can I borrow one dollar bill?

11. Excuse me, I need some help. Would you borrow the money just $1? I need that to take the bus. Please I don’t want to miss the exam.

12. I have only large bill for bus fare. So, can I borrow one dollar from you? Or do you have change for $20?

13. Excuse me. DO you have any change for $20? If you don’t, please Can I borrow $1, because I have really important test in a minute.

14. Hi, excuse me, Can you recognize me? Can you borrow me a dollar? I will give you back next morning.

15. Could I borrow $1?

16. Do you have a change for $20? I have $20 only. Can you borrow me $1? I will give you back at the school.

17. I have no change for the bus fare. Could you lend me a dollar?

18. Hey, we see together every morning, right? I don’t have change, so can you borrow me? I’ll give you tomorrow.

19. I need to ride a bus and I got only 20 dollar bill. Can I borrow $1 from you and pay you back later?
20. I only have a twenty and I need to get to school on time for an exam. Can you lend me $1, and I’ll pay you back tomorrow morning.
Question 12

1. I would really appreciate if you give me a special day off tomorrow.

2. Sir / Mam, I would like to take day-off tomorrow. I have something to take care of at home.

3. My parents are going to go some place for their work tomorrow, but they don’t know how to get there. They need my help. Otherwise, they won’t do that. Would you let me take a day off tomorrow?

4. Tomorrow is a very important day to my family. I wonder you can give me a special day. If you can do it for me, I’ll be very happy for that.

5. I need to do something for my family tomorrow, So, Can I have a day off?

6. Can I have a special day off?

7. Would you give me a day off? I need to go to somewhere for my family business.

8. The most important thing in my life is family. You also have family. Please excuse me for just one day.

9. Could you give me a day off tomorrow? I have to go... For my family business. It’s very urgent.

10. I have a family emergency. Can I have a special day off tomorrow?
11. Hey, boss. Will you excuse me tomorrow? I have special family business.
12. Tomorrow, I have something very important thing for my family business. So, do you mind if I have a special day off, please?
13. Show some mercy. I have an important plan with my family.
14. Hi, boss. Tomorrow, I have a great meeting with my family. So can I get a chance day off? I will work one more day next week.
15. I have doctor's appointment I cannot miss tomorrow. So, could you give me a day off?
16. I have a family business tomorrow. Can I have a day off? I will make up my work the other day.
17. Can I take my sick leave tomorrow for an important matter?
18. I have some problem with my family, so I want a day off. Can I?
19. I've got some family business tomorrow. Can I get a day off tomorrow?
20. I need to make a really important appointment tomorrow. Can I take my sick leave then?
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