The Relationship between the Addressee's Social Dominance and Request Strategies Used by Iranian Teenage Students[1]

Abbas Ali Ahangar[2]
Seddigheh Zeynali Dastuyi[3]
Somayeh Mohaddes[4]

Abstract

The study of request speech act has been considered by many researchers in various cultures and communities. In line with the goals of these studies, the cuurent article aims to extract and categorize the request speech act strategies used by Iranian teenager students (ITS) based on Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) coding scheme proposed by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) with regard to the relationship between the social dominance (power) of the addressees on the type and number of request strategies. The data were collected via Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and role-play filled and performed by 100 Birjandi high school students of Persian (50 girls and 50 boys). The results of the Chi-square test and also the two data collection methods employed showed that there was a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the type and number of request strategies used by ITS. In addition,"Alerters", "preparatories" and "grounders" were the most employed strategies by the participants in both DCTs and role-plays. Besides, the lower social dominance of the speaker towards the addressee resulted in the application of complex strategies. So, it seems, with regard to politeness, Iranian cultural system to be

---

[2] Professor in General Linguistics, University of Sistan and Bauchestan, Zahedan, Iran (corresponding author); ahangar@english.usb.ac.ir; ORCID: 0000-0003-1288-1506
[3] Assistant professor in General linguistics, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran; seddighehzeynali@english.usb.ac.ir; ORCID: 0000-0002-3623-9676
[4] MA in General Linguistics, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran; somayeh.mohaddes@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-10095934

hierarchical. Moreover, regarding the use of the request strategies by ITS, the findings didn't show any difference between the two corpora, i.e., the data gathered via DCTs and role-plays.

Keywords: request, social dominance, type of request strategies, number of request strategies, Iranian teenage students[1]

1. Introduction

Pragmatics, according to Senft (2014), is a linguistics discipline that deals with actual language use. As Sneft (2014) states, language use is both dependent on linguistic (grammatical and lexical) knowledge, and on cultural, situative and interpersonal context and convention.

In addition, one of the central aims of pragmatics is to research how context and convention contribute to meaning and understanding. One of the most attractive areas of study in the domain of pragmatics is the study of speech acts. Based on the notions mentioned by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), as to the speech acts, considerable attention has been paid from two main perspectives: some researchers like Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1975) claimed that they operate by universal pragmatic principles; and those like Green (1975) and Wierzbicka (1985) believed that they vary in conceptualization and verbalization across cultures and languages. The latter perspective led Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) to initiate a project named Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) that worked on the applicability, similarities, and differences of two speech acts, i.e., request and apology across diverse cultures and languages. CCSARP started in 1982 for the first time. It opened up a new field of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic investigation focusing on the two speech acts of apology and request in eight language varieties of native and non-native speakers (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 11). The languages selected by them were Australian English, American

---

[1] abbreviations: 1SG, 1st person singular; 2SG, 2nd person singular; 3SG, 3rd person singular; 2PL, 2nd person plural; 3PL, 3rd person plural; ATTR, Attributive; EP, epenthesis; EZ, Ezafe particle; IMP, imperfect tense; IMPER, imperative; INDEF, indefinite article; INF, infinitive marker; ITS, Iranian teenage students; lit., literally; NEG, negative; OM, object marker; PAST, past stem; PP, past participle; PL, Plural; PRES, present stem; PRO.CLIT, pronominal clitic; REL, relativiser; SG, singular; SUBJ, subjunctive; SUPER, superlative, =, clitic boundary.

English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, Hebrew, and Russian. After that, the model was modified in 1989 by these researchers and again was employed in the mentioned languages, except for Russian. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) claimed that CCSARP follows three main objectives: the investigation of cultural variation, sociopragmatic variation, and interlanguage variation. Thus, they believed that CCSARP was to prepare the possibility of valid comparability in situational, cultural, native, and non-native directions (sociopragmatics).

Following CCSARP's objectives, including he universality of applying speech acts and their culture-specificity, this study deals with extracting and categorizing request strategies in Persian, based on Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) taxonomy. In addition, the study discusses the effect of the addressee's social dominance on the type and number of request strategies employed by Iranian teenage students (ITS) collected via the DCT and role-play. Correspondingly, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Is there any significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the type of request strategies employed by ITS in the DCT?

2. Is there any significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the number of request strategies employed by ITS in the DCT?

3. Is there any significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the type of request strategies employed by ITS via role-play?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the number of request strategies employed by ITS via role-play?

To evaluate the meaningful relationship between the type and the number of request strategies used, on the one hand, and the effect of the addressee's social dominance on the use of request strategies, on the other hand, the following null hypotheses are formulated:

1. There is not a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the type of request strategies employed by ITS in the

DCT.

2. There is not a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the number of request strategies employed by ITS in the DCT.

3. There is not a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the type of request strategies employed by ITS via role-play.

4. There is not a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the number of request strategies employed by ITS via role-play.

As to the theoretical significance of the present study, its findings can contribute to the notion of universality of the request strategies claimed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) in different languages and cultures. In addition, regarding the empirical significance of the study, the research results signifies that being unfamailliar with linguistic pragmatic principles in different cultures and languages may lead to problems while establishing verbal communication among the speakers of different languages. Therefore, investigating these pragmatic principles and using them correctly can prevent misunderstandings and cross-cultural communicative problems in different situations.

This paper includes the following sections: the introduction, a review of the related literature, the research methodology (introducing the participants of the study, instrument and procedure, coding scheme), data analysis, the results of the study, the discussion, and the conclusion which locates at the end of this paper as the last main section.

2. Review of the related literature

In a study of the speech act of request, Al-Tayeb Umar (2004) began a socio-linguistic investigation considering the request strategies used by advanced Arab learners of English as compared to those strategies used by native speakers of English based on Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) while applying a DCT. The two groups employed similar strategies while addressing their request to equals or people in higher positions and relied heavily on

conventionally indirect strategies. However, concerning those requests addressed to people in lower position, the Arabic sample showed a marked tendency towards using more direct strategies than the British sample. In addition, the results indicated some significant differences between the two groups in the way they modified their request strategies; i.e., the native speakers of English used more semantic and syntactic modifiers than their Arabic counterparts, and hence their requests sounded more polite and more tactful. The reason for this may be the linguistic superiority of the native speakers group, according to Al-Tayeb Umar (2004).

Hong Gao' s study (2009) refered to one of the most meaningful findings of the CCSARP (by Blum-Kulka et al., 1989), i.e., all languages studied almost preferred conventionally indirect request strategies. However, as she (2009, p. 1) pointed out, "there remains a distinct Western bias in the CCSARP: all of the languages and varieties studied (except for Hebrew) are either Germanic or Romance, and all of the cultures studied are either Western or heavily influenced by Western culture". As a result, in this article, she focused on the strategy types of making requests as classified in CCSARP for analyzing the linguistic features in Chinese speakers request speech act realization. On the basis of all the differences discussed in her paper, she (2009, p. 13) concluded that "Chinese does not fit into the universal category of conventionally indirect requests claimed by CCSARP"; and more clearly, "Chinese finds imperatives the most proper and efficient way of making requests".

Al-Marrani and Sazalie (2010) concentrated socio-pragmatically on the polite request strategies used by Yemeni learners of English as a foreign language based on Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). They (2010) suggested that Yemeni EFL students used conventionally indirect strategies more than other strategies. They also found that these students would select using direct strategies when the speakers and their addressees had equal status and when the speakers had a higher social status than the addressee. The students behaved so to show solidarity with their addresses.

Shahrokhi (2012) focused on the request strategies applied by Persian

male speakers regarding social distance, social dominance and imposing request according to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). He described "challenging ability" as a cultural strategy. Furthermore, his results showed that those Iranian men who had speaking dominance on their hearers, knew each other well, and their imposition of request was low, employed this strategy more. He also added this strategy to the list of direct strategies.

Ghavamnia, Tavakoli and Rezazadeh (2012) worked on the request strategies used by Iranian English learners, Persian speakers and English speakers to achieve the type, frequency and semantic framework contents related to the addresses power. The data were coded and analyzed following Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (1995) model. Their findings suggested that there were some differences with regard to frequency and type of request strategies employed by these groups. Although English native speakers used more indirect requests, Persian native speakers tended to use more direct strategies while requesting.

Rattanapitak (2013) dealt with the request strategies in the Burmese language. The findings indicated that the three main request strategies in Burmese were: direct, conventional indirect, and non-conventional indirect. With regard to the preference strategy, both direct and conventional indirect requests were applied in Burmese. This result contrasted with the universal request phenomena proposed by Blum-Kulka et al (1989). Similarly, direct requests almost reported impolite in other languages were not necessarily considered impolite in Burmese.

Shahidi Tabar and Akbari Malek (2013) discussed the notion of indirectness in the speech act of request among Iranian Turkish speakers with regard to the two factors, social distance and social dominance based on Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and Brown and Levinsohn (1987). Results of this study made clear that these two models were not satisfactory for investigating all the answers. Furthermore, the study yielded conflicting data because most of the responses could not be coded based on these frameworks.

Khalib and Tayeh (2014) addressed the request strategies used by Malaysian students according to the taxonomy proposed by Blum-Kulka et al.

(1989). Regarding power and social distance, they aimed to identify the degree of indirectness of request strategies used by these students while encountering their professors and classmates. The results demonstrated that the students preferred conventionally indirect strategies, when they made requests to their professors and to their friends as well. Moreover, the findings confirmed that "the Malay culture conformed to Brown and Levinson (1978) theory on face which highlights that in order to keep either positive or negative face on FTA (Face Threatening Acts), politeness or indirectness strategies employed" (Khalib and Tayeh, 2014, p. 44).

Yazdanfar and Bonyadi (2016) put forward a comparative study of request speech act in Persian and English. They examined the request strategies used by Persian and English speakers based on directness level and supportive moves in English and Persian TV series adopting Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). The results revealed that speakers of both languages selected the direct level as their most frequently used strategy; however, the English speakers employed more conventionally indirect strategies than the Persian ones. Conversely, the Persian speakers used more non-conventionally indirect strategies than the English speakers. Also, they concluded that American English speakers used more mitigation devices than Persian speakers.

Sheykhmohammadi, Yarahmadzehi and Mohammadian (2019) aimed to describe and analyze the type and number of request strategies in Kurdish, Mokri dialect, regarding the effectiveness or non-effectiveness of social factors, such as gender and power of the addressee, based on Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) model. Their findings showed a meaningful difference between genders regarding the type of request strategies; and power of the addressee had significant effect on choosing the strategies. With regard to the "negative and positive face" in Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, Kurdish people, as members of a cooperative group, employed Positive face saving acts in their interactions more.

Rahmadiyanti Tambulana and Sutrisno (2020) investigated the types of request strategies used by the characters in the movie Silver Linings Playbook (Russell, 2012) according to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). They

also looked at the types of request goals made by this movie characters. The study findings showed that "mood derivable" (a direct request) was most frequently used request strategy in this movie. Regarding goals, "requests for action" was the most frequent employed type by the the movie characters and dominated by "mood derivable" strategy.

Shakki, Naeini, Mazandarani and Derakhshan (2020) reviewed the instruction of the L2 speech acts in English pragmatics in the Iranian context from 2000 to 2020. Their results revealed that pragmatics was amenable to instruction; and also, the most frequently instructed speech act was request (conducted in 29 studies), whereas the least instructed speech act was invitation (applied just in one study).

Derakhshan and Shakki (2021) aimed to provide a quantitative and reliable measure of the effects of instruction for the speech act of request in Iran, and also illustrated a description of the relationship between some variables that moderate its effectiveness (for example, age and gender). Their results revealed that (1) an overall large effect size on the effectiveness of the instruction of request (g = 1.48) existed in an Iranian context; (2) some variables like gender and treatment type were found to be a moderator for this effectiveness; (3) as to the gender, males yielded larger effect size (g = 3.09) than females (g = 1.10); (4) and considering treatment types, the explicit group produced a larger effect size (g = 1.53) than the implicit one (g = 1.20).

Shakki, Naeini, Mazandarani and Derakhshan (2023) unraveled the overall effectiveness of the intervention on the speech acts of request, apology, and refusal in an Iranian EFL context. To this aim, out of 80 studies, 57 papers were chosen based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and coded for the analysis. The results showed the effectiveness of the instruction of request, apology, and refusal. Also, they generated a mean of (g = 1.43) which was significant; and reflected a quite large gain of instruction.

3. Methodology
3.1. Participants
One hundred Birjandi teenage students (50 males and 50 females)

studying in two high schools of Birjand, namely Shahid Beheshti (boys' high school) and Farzanegan Hazrat Zeynab (girls' high school), were randomly selected. The participants were studying at the seventh to the ninth grade of the first intermediate level, and their age ranged from 12 to 16 years. To decrease the effects of other variables, those Birjand high schools with the same educational, and the same inhabitancy level were selected. To choose students with almost the same family backgrounds the participants were asked some information, including the living place, father and mother's job, and their educational levels (this part locates at the beginning of the questionnaire).

3.2. Instrument and procedure

The instruments applied for the data collection were Discourse Completion Test/Task (DCT) and role-play, the former is the primary instrument employed in the studies related to speech acts and cross cultural pragmatics (Chaudron, 2005; Kasper & Dahl, 1991). It's worth noting that DCTs are open-ended questionnaires used by Blum-Kulka in 1982 for the first time. The type of the questionnaire designed by Blum-Kulka (1982) describes speech act situations involving the setting, the social distance between the interlocutors, and their relative status. Then, an incomplete dialogue is distributed among the partcipants. These participants being native and nonnative Hebrew speakers, were asked to fill in the dialogue with their potential reactions to the situations represented. Of course, DCTs have some advantages and disadvantages. One of the most considerable advantages of DCTs is being useful for collecting a large amount of data in a short period of time (Wolfson, Marmor & Jones, 1989). In addition, there is the possibility of controlling situational variables, like social power, age, gender and second language skills. In contrast, one of the main criticisms of DCTs is that they are not natural speech. Therefore, in order to decrease the effect of this weakness on the results, the authors decided to employ role-play for gathering the data of their study, as well as a DCT.

The DCT applied in the present study comprised two parts; the first one included some personal information of the participants, such as gender,

age, birth place, living place, level of education, place of education, parents' jobs and their levels of education. The second part contained six discourse situations containing some dialogues. These situations represented a short description of the situation related to the speech act of request. The participants were asked to consider themselves in the situations provided and make a request from their addresses. The situations involved normal and daily circumstances. In order to answer the possible questions asked by the participants, one of the authors was present while they were filling out the questionnaire. In the present study, the social dominance ($X^1 > Y^2$, $X < Y^3$, $X = Y^4$) of the students was taken into consideration.

In role-play as another method of gathering data, the participants were asked to play a specific role and employ a speech act. Kasper and Dahl (1991) express that role-play involves some properties of a natural speech, such as turn taking, false starts and hesitations. Moreover, Houck and Gass (1996) believe that role-play is an oral mode, and the data gathered in this way are close to the data used in a natural way.

3.3. Coding scheme and data analysis

In the present research, requests were categorized according to the taxonomy presented by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). We paid attention to the types of strategies found in the data based on the social dominance of the addresses toward ITS in the DCT and role-play. In addition, the linguistic data extracted from the questionnaires and role-plays indicated that the participants responses generally involved more than one strategy. Thus, apart from the type of the request strategies employed, the researchers decided to analyze the effect of the the addressee's social dominance on the number of request strategies used by the participants in each situation as well (i.e., they took into account the number of request strategies used by each participant in response to each of the addressees, e.g., 1, 2, 3 or more strategies included in one

---

[1] X is the student and Y the addressee
[2] social dominance of the speaker to the addressee
[3] social dominance of the addressee to the speaker
[4] same social dominance of the speaker and the addressee

response). The data were subsequently analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For all of the analyses, the Alpha level sets 0.05. Pearson's Chi-Square test (X2) was applied to assess whether there was a significant relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the type and number of request strategies employed by the ITS. Besides, this test applied to show whether the existing relationship was inverse or not.

4. Results

This section illustrates the strategies found in the DCTs and role-play categorized in accordance with the taxonomy proposed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989).

I. Alerters.

An alerter is an element whose function is to alert the Hearer's attention to the ensuing speech act (Blum-Kulka et. al., 1989, P. 277)

- Title/role
1) *daneʃamuz-an*
   student-PL
   "The students"
- Surname
2) *ʔæhmædi*
   Ahmadi
   "Ahmadi"
- First name
3) *mærjæm*
   maryam
   "Maryam"
- Endearment term
4) *ʔæziz=æm*
   Dear=CLIT.1SG
   "My dear!"
- Pronoun
5) *ʔun*

they

"They"

- Attention Getter

6) *be-bæʃ-id*

IMPER-forgive.PRES-2PL

"Excuse me!"

II.   Request strategies (related to the main speech act)

A request strategy is the obligatory choice of the level of directness by which the Request is realized. (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989, p. 278). Below is the classification of these strategies by Blum-Kulka et. al. (1989, p. 278-289) together with some instances of the data of the present study with regard to these strategies:

a. *Mood derivable.* The grammatical mood of the locution conventionally determines its illocutionary force as a Request. The prototypical form is the imperative. However, functional equivalents, such as infinite forms and elliptical sentence structures express the same directness level.

7) *dæftær=e   rijazi=t-o   be-h=em   be-de*

notebook=EZ   math=CLIT.2SG-OM   to-EP=CLIT.1SG IMPER-give.PRES.2SG

"Give me your math notebook."

b. *Hedge performative.* The illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified, e.g., by modal verbs expressing intention.

8) *mi-xast-æm   ʔæz   ʃoma   tæqaza   kon-æm*

IMP-want.PAST-1SG   from   you   request   SUBJ.do.PRES-1SG

ke   ma   ra   be   ʔordu   be-bær-id

that   we   OM   to   camp   SUBJ-take.PRES-2PL

"I wanted to ask you to take us to a camp."

c. *Locution derivable.* The illocutionary intent is directly drivable from the semantic meaning of the locution.

9) *ʃoma   bajæd   ketab-ha-j-i   ke   ʔæz   ketabxane*

you	must	book-PL-EP-REL		that	from	library

gereft-e-ʔ-id   *ra*   *bærgærdan-id*

take.PAST-PP-EP-2PL   OM   SUBJ.return.PRES-2PL

"You have to return the books you have borrowed from the library."

d. *Suggestory formula.* The illocutionary intent is phrased as a suggestion by means of framing routine formula.

10) *tʃera*   *bæraje*   *bærgozari-j=e*   *ʔordu*   *ba*

    why   for   holding-EP=EZ camp   with

ʔedare   *sohbæt*   *ne-mi-kon-id*

office   speech   NEG-IMP-do.PRES-2PL

"Why don't you talk to the officials for holding a camp?"

e. *Preparatory.* The utterance contains reference to a preparatory condition for the feasibility of the Request, typically one of ability, willingness, or possibility, as conventionalized in the given language. Very often, but not necessarily so, the speaker questions rather than states the presence of the chosen preparatory condition (query preparatory).

11) *mi-ʃe*   *hæfte-j=e*   *dige*   *kar*   *ʔæmæli=mun*

IMP-become.PRES.3SG week-EP=EZ   other   work

practical=CLIT.1PL

ro   *bi-j-ar-im*

OM   SUBJ-EP-bring.PRES-1PL

"May we deliver our homework follow-up practices to you next week?"

f. *Strong hint.* The illocutionary intent is not immediately derivable from the locution; however, the locution refers to relevant elements of the intended illocutionary and/or prepositional act. Such elements often relate to preconditions for the feasibility of the Request. Unlike the preparatory strategy, hints are not conventionalized and thus require more inferencing activity on the part of the hearer.

12) *ma*   *ʔindʒa*   *dar-im*   *dærs*   *mi-xun-im*

we   here   have.PRES-1PL   lesson IMP-read.PRES-1PL

"We are studying our lessons here." (intent: Clean the library later!)

III.　Request perspective.

A request can be realized from the viewpoint of the hearer, the speaker, or both participants, or any explicit mentioning of the agents can be (deliberately) avoided. In cases of embedded structures, coding relates to the verb in the Head Act.

a.　Hearer dominance

13) *miʃe*　　　　*bi-j-aj*　　　　*be*　　*mæn*　*komæk*
IMP-become.PRES.3SG　　SUBJ-EP-come.PRES.2SG　to me　　help
kon-i
SUBJ.do.PRES-2SG
"May you help me?"

b.　Speaker dominance

14) *ma*　　*tæsmim*　　*gereft-im*　　　*bæʔd*　　　*ʔæz*
we　　decisiontake.PAST-1PL　　　　after　　　　from
tæmum ʃod-æn=e　　*ʔemtehan-at*　　*be-r-im*　　　*ʔordu*
end　　become-INF=EZ　exam-PL　　　SUBJ-go.PRES-1PL　camp
"We decided to go to a camp after finishing the exams."

c.　Speakers and hearer dominance

15) *miʃe*　　*ba*　　*hæm*　　*ʔæz*　　*ʔin*　　*soʔal-at foto*
IMP-become.PRES.3SG　with　　together　　　from　　　this
question-PL　　copy
be-gir-im
SUBJ-take.PRES-1PL
"May we take some copies of these sample questions together?"

d.　Impersonal

16) *kæsan-i*　　　*ke*　　*ketab-ha-j-e*　　　*ketabxane*　　　*ra*
everybody-REL　　　that　　book-PL-EP-EZ　library　　　　　　OM
bord-ænd　　*ta*　　*færda*　*be*　　*ketabxane*　*bærgærdan-*
ænd
take.PAST-3PL　　　till　　tomorrow　　to　　　library
IMPER.return.PRES-3PL

"Those who borrowed the library books, return them till tomorrow!"

IV.   Syntactic downgraders.

Syntactic downgraders modify the Head Act internally by mitigating the impositive force of the Request by means of syntactic choices. Both the syntactic devices and their mitigating function are part of the structural properties of a given language and the ways these are put to use, and hence specific for individual languages.

a. Negation of a preparatory condition.

17) ne-mi-she   *miz-o*   *sændæli-ha*   *ro*

NEG- IMP-become.PRES.3SG   table-and   chair-PL   OM

Ɂælan   *dʒabedʒa*   *næ-kon-id*

now   moved   NEG-do.PRES-2PL

"May you not move the tables and the chairs now?

V.   Lexical and phrasal downgraders. The categories listed below serve as optional additions to soften the impositive force of the Request by modifying the Head Act internally through specific lexical and phrasal choices.

a. *Politeness marker*. An optional element added to request to bid for cooperative behavior.

18) xaheʃ   *mi-kon-æm*

please   IMP-do.PRES-1SG

"Please!"

b. *Understater*. Adverbial modifiers by means of which the speaker under-represents the state of affairs denoted in the proposition.

19) *hosejn*   *dæftær=e*   *rijazi=t*   *ro*   *je læhze*

Hossein   notebook=EZ   math=CLIT.2SG   OM   one   moment

be-h=em   *mi-d-i   mæn   diruz*   *qajeb   bud-æm*

to-EP=CLIT.1SG   IMP-give.PRES-2SG   I   yesterday   absent
be.PAST-1SG

"Hossein, do you give me your math notebook one moment? I was absent yesterday."

c. *Downtoner*. Sentential or propositional modifiers which are used by a speaker in order to modulate the impact his or her request is likely to

have on the hearer.

20) *zæhra ʤan   momken-e   ʔin   bærge-ha-ro*

Zahra   dear   possible-be.PRES.3SG   this

sheet-PL-OM

bæra=m   foto   be-gir-i   mæn   kar   ba   dæstgah ro

for=CLIT.1SG   copy   SUBJ-take.PRES-2SG   I   work

with   machine   OM

bælæd   nist-æm

know   NEG.be.PRES-1SG

"Dear Zahra, can you take some copies of these papers? I don't know how the machine works."

d. *Cajoler*. Conventionalized speech items whose semantic content is of little transparent relevance to their discourse meaning. Cajolers commonly do not enter into syntactic structures, but are interspersed to increase, establish, or restore harmony between the interlocutors, which may be endangered through the request.

21) *be-bxʃ-id   xanom   mi-dun-id   ma   diruz*

mæriz

IMPER-forgive.PRES-2PL Mrs   IMP-know.PRES-2PL   we

yesterday   sick

bud-im   næ-tunest-im   kar=e=mun   ro

be.PAST-1SG   NEG-can. PAST-1PL   work=EZ=CLIT.1PL   OM

tækmil   kon-im

completion   SUBJ.do.PRES-1PL

"Excuse me teacher. You know I was (Lit. we were) sick yesterday, I (Lit. we) couldn't accomplish my (Lit. our) homework."

VI. Upgraders.

Upgraders are elements whose function is to increase the impact of the request.

a. *Commitment indicator*. Sentence modifiers by means of which a speaker indicates his or her heightened degree of commitment vis-à-vis the state of affairs referred to in the proposition.

22) miʃe   dæftær=et   ro   be-h=em   be-d-i

IMP-become.PRES.3SG   notebook=CLIT.2SG   OM   to-EP=CLIT.1SG

SUBJ-give.PRES-2SG

ta   tæmrin-a   ro   be-nvis-æm   ta   zæng=e   bæʔd

so   exercise-PL   OM   SUBJ-write.PRES-1SG   till   bell=EZ   next

hætmæn   be-h=et   mi-d-æm

certainly   to-EP=CLIT.2SG   IMP-give.PRES-1SG

"May you lend me your notebook to write the exercises, I'll give it to you before the next session."

    b.   Time intensifier.

    23) *ketab-ha-j-i   ro   ke   ʔæz   mædrese   gereft-id*   Book-PL-EP-REL   OM   that   from   school   take.PAST-2PL

zud   pæs   bi-j-ar-id

soon   return   IMPER-EP-bring.PRES-2PL

"Return the books you borrowed from the school soon."

    c.   Repetition of request (literally or by paraphrase)

    24) *miʃe   bæʔdæn indʒa   ro   dʒaru   kon-id*

IMP-become.PRES.3SG   later   here   OM   sweep

SUBJ-do.PRES-2PL

æge   bæʔdæn   dʒaru   be-zæn-id   mæmnun   mi-ʃ-æm

if   later   sweep   SUBJ-bit.PRES-2PL   thankful IMP-become.PRES-1SG

"Can you sweep here later? I'll be thankful, if you sweep later."

VII.   Supportive moves.

In using specific types of supportive move, a speaker intends to mitigate or aggravate his request. Supportive moves are external to the Head Act occurring either before or after it.

a. *Getting a precommitment.* In checking on a potential refusal before making

his or her request, a speaker tries to commit his or her hearer before telling him or her what he is letting himself or herself in for.

25) lotf   mi-kon-id   ma   ro   be-bar-id   ʔordu
favor   IMP-do.PRES-2PL   we   OM   SUBJ-take.PRES-2PL
camp

"Would you please take us to a camp?"

b. *Grounder*. The speaker gives reasons, explanations, or justifications for his or her request, which may either precede or follow it.

26) xanom   diruz   ʔemtehan   daʃt-im   næ-tunest-im
    Mrs.   yesterday   exam   have.PAST-1PL   NEG-
can.PAST-1PL

kar=e=mun   ro   tækmil   kon-im   mi-ʃe
work=EZ=CLIT.1PL OM   completion   do.PRES-1PL   IMP-
become.PRES.3SG

je forsæt=edige   be   ma   be-d-id
one opportinuty=EZ other   to   we   SUBJ-give.PRES-2PL

"Teacher, we had an exam yesterday, we couldn't finish our work, would you give us another chance?"

c. *Disarmer*. The speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might raise upon being confronted with the request.

27) daneʃamuz-an=e ʔæziz   bizæhmæt   ketab-ha-j-i
Student-PL=EZ   dear   without trouble book-PL-
EP-Rel

ke ʔæz   ketabxane   gereft-id   ra   be   ketabxane
that   from   library take.PAST-2PL OM   to   library
bærgærdan-id
IMPER.return.PRES-2PL

"Dear students, please return the books you borrowed from the library."

d. *Promise of reward*. To increase the likelihood of the hearer's compliance with the speaker's request, a reward due on fulfillment of the request, is announced.

28) 28) kæsan-i   ke   ketab-ha-j=e   ketabxane   ra   be

moqe

those-REL	that	book-PL-EP=EZ	library		OM	to

time

tæhvil	*dæh-ænd*	*kart=e*		*ʤajze*	*xah-ændgereft*

deliver	give.PRES-3PL	card=EZreward	want.PRE-3PL	

take.PAST.3SG

"Those who return the library books on time will receive a reward card."

e. *Imposition minimizer*. The speaker tries to reduce the imposition placed on the hearer by his request.

29) xanom=e   *ʤælali*   *ʔæge* *ʃoma* *sælah* *mi-dan-id*

Mrs.=EZ	Jalali	if	you	good	IMP-know.PRES-2PL

mara	*be*	*ʔordu*		*be-bær-id …*

we OM	to	camp		IMPER-take.PRES-2PL…

"Mrs. Jalali, if good, take us to a camp."

VIII.   Aggravating supportive moves:

a. *Threat*. To ensure compliance with his or her request, a speaker threatens his or her hearer with potential consequences arising out of noncompliance with the request.

30) bætʃe-ha   *ʔin*   *dige*   *tæzækkor=e*   *axær-e*   *pæs*

child-PL	this	other	warn=EZ	last-be.PRES.3SG		so

ketab-a-j-i   *ro*   *ke*   *ʔæz*   *ketabxune*   *gereft-in*

book-PL-EP-REL	OM	that	from	library	take.PAST-2PL

pæs   *bi-j-ar-in*

return	IMPER-EP-bring.PRES-2PL

"You students (lit.: you children)! This is the last warning, so return the books you borrowed from the library."

b. *Moralizing*. In order to lend additional credence to his or her request, a speaker invokes general moral maxims.

31) mæge *ne-mi-dun-id*   *xijanæt dær*   *ʔæmanæt*   *kar=e*

Unless	NEG-IMP-know.PRES-2PL		betrayal		in

trust   work=EZ

bæd=i   *ʔæst...*

bad=INDEF   be.PRES.3SG

"Don't you know that betrayal is bad?"

5. Analysis of the data

This section comprises two parts. The first one represents the data analysis concerning the type of request strategies. The second part accounts for the data analysis regarding the number of request strategies.

5.1. Type of the request strategies

This subsection addresses the type of request strategies used by the participants. Firstly, we represent the results showing the frequencies and percentages of request strategies employed by the ITS based on the social dominance of the students and their addressees used in DCTs (table 1) and role-plays (table 2).

As table 1 demonstrates, "alerters" (765 times: 223 times encountering the addressees with same social status, 229 times and 313 times meeting the addressees/hearers with lower and higher social status, respectively) is the most common request strategy employed by ITS in DCTs. Therefore, ITS used this strategy more, while encountering those with lower social status. "Hearer dominance" is the next most applied request strategy (523 times: 198 times encountering the addressees with same social status, 189 times and 136 times meeting the addresses with lower and higher social status, respectively). ITS employed this strategy more, while they encountered those with the same social status. The participants used "preparatories" 455 times (190 times meeting the hearers with the same social status, 96 times and 169 times encountering the hearers with lower and higher social status, respectively). It shows they tended to employ "preparatories" more when meeting those with the same social status. "Grounders" are the fourth most used strategies by ITS (346 times: 136 times encountering the hearers with the same social status, 96 times and 114 times meeting the ones with lower and higher social status, respectively). Again, ITS showed tendency to apply this strategy more while encountering those with the same social status.

Table 1

Frequencies and percentages of request strategies obtained through the DCT

Type of the Request Strategy		Social dominance			Total
		X=Y	X>Y	X<Y	
Alerters	Fr	223	229	313	765
	%	8/9%	9/2%	12/5%	30/6%
Preparatory	Fr	190	96	169	455
	%	7/6%	3/8%	6/8%	18/2%
Mood derivable	Fr	9	92	16	117
	%	0/4%	3/7%	0/6%	4/7%
Hedged performative	Fr	1	6	5	12
	%	0/0%	0/2%	0/2%	0/5%
Strong hint	Fr	0	4	6	10
	%	0/0%	0/2%	0/2%	0/4%
Grounder	Fr	136	96	114	346
	%	5/4%	3/8%	4/6%	13/9%
Negation of a preparatory condition	Fr	0	6	2	8
	%	0/0%	0/2%	0/1%	0/3%
Hearer dominance	Fr	198	189	136	523
	%	7/9%	7/6%	5/4%	21/0%
Speaker and hearer dominance	Fr	2	0	6	8
	%	0/1%	0/0%	0/2%	0/3%
Imposition minimizer	Fr	2	0	1	3
	%	0/1%	0/0%	0/0%	0/1%
Understator	Fr	10	5	43	58
	%	0/4%	0/2%	1/7%	2/3%
Politeness marker	Fr	4	28	12	44
	%	0/2%	1/1%	0/5%	1/8%
Time intensifier	Fr	1	29	0	30
	%	0/0%	1/2%	0/0%	1/2%
Disarmer	Fr	1	1	0	2
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/1%
Repetition of request	Fr	1	1	1	3
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/1%

Appealer	Fr	0	0	1	1
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Commitment indicator	Fr	2	2	1	5
	%	0/1%	0/1%	0/0%	0/2%
Locution derivable	Fr	0	2	0	2
	%	0/0%	0/1%	0/0%	0/1%
Impersonal perspective	Fr	0	11	0	11
	%	0/0%	0/4%	0/0%	0/4%
Threat	Fr	0	11	0	11
	%	0/0%	0/4%	0/0%	0/4%
Getting a precommitment	Fr	0	1	0	1
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Moralizing	Fr	0	4	0	4
	%	0/0%	0/2%	0/0%	0/2%
Speaker dominance	Fr	0	0	58	58
	%	0/0%	0/0%	2/3%	2/3%
Cajoler	Fr	0	3	3	6
	%	0/0%	0/1%	0/1%	0/2%
Suggestory formula	Fr	0	0	6	6
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/2%	0/02%
Syntactic downgraders	Fr	0	2	0	2
	%	0/0%	0/1%	0/0%	0/1%
Promise of reward	Fr	4	1	0	5
	%	0/2%	0/0%	0/0%	0/2%
Total	Fr	784	819	893	2496
	%	31/4%	32/8%	35/8%	100/0%

Table 2 represented the frequencies and percentages of request strategies extracted from role-play, with regard to the social dominance of the addressees. According to this table, taking account of the social dominance of the addressees, "alerters" were the most applied request strategy by ITS (901 times: 237 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 301 times and 363 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively). ITS used this strategy more, while encountering those

with lower social status. "Hearer dominance" was the next most applied request strategy (512 times: 197 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 192 times and 123 times meeting the hearers with lower and higher social status, respectively). ITS employed this strategy more, as they encountered those with the same social status. The participants used "preparatories" (465 times: 189 times meeting the addressees with the same social status, 111 times and 165 times encountering the hearers with lower and higher social status, respectively). This shows they tended to employ "preparatories" more when encountering those with the same social status. "Grounders" were the fourth most used strategies by ITS (400 times: 137 times meeting the addressees with the same social status, 109 times and 154 times encountering the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively). Again, ITS showed tendency to apply this strategy more, when they met those with the same social status.

Table 2

Frequencies and percentages of request strategies obtained through the role-play

Type of the Request Strategy		Social dominance			Total
		X=Y	X>Y	X<Y	
Alerters	Fr	237	301	363	901
	%	8/8%	11/1%	13/4%	33/4%
Preparatory	Fr	189	111	165	465
	%	7/0%	4/1%	6/1%	17/2%
Mood derivable	Fr	7	81	18	106
	%	0/3%	3/0%	0/7%	3/9%
Hedged performative	Fr	1	5	3	9
	%	0/0%	0/2%	0/1%	0/3%
Strong hint	Fr	3	3	7	13
	%	0/1%	0/1%	0/3%	0/5%
Grounder	Fr	137	109	154	400
	%	5/1%	4/0%	5/7%	14/8%
Negation of a preparatory condition	Fr	1	1	5	7
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/2%	0/3%
Hearer dominance	Fr	197	192	123	512
	%	7/3%	7/1%	4/6%	19/0%
Speaker and hearer dominance	Fr	3	0	12	15

	%	0/1%	0/0%	0/4%	0/6%
Imposition minimizer	Fr	4	0	0	4
	%	0/1%	0/0%	0/0%	0/1%
Understator	Fr	12	8	45	65
	%	0/4%	0/3%	1/7%	2/4%
Politeness marker	Fr	4	36	21	61
	%	0/1%	1/3%	0/8%	2/3%
Time intensifier	Fr	2	30	0	32
	%	0/1%	1/1%	0/0%	1/2%
Disarmer	Fr	1	0	0	1
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Repetition of request	Fr	1	1	0	2
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/1%
Commitment indicator	Fr	0	3	3	6
	%	0/0%	0/1%	0/1%	0/2%
Locution derivable	Fr	0	2	0	2
	%	0/0%	0/1%	0/0%	0/1%
Impersonal perspective	Fr	0	8	1	9
	%	0/0%	0/3%	0/0%	0/3%
Threat	Fr	0	7	0	7
	%	0/0%	0/3%	0/0%	0/3%
Getting a precommitment	Fr	0	2	1	3
	%	0/0%	0/1%	0/0%	0/1%
Moralizing	Fr	0	5	0	5
	%	0/0%	0/2%	0/0%	0/2%
Speaker dominance	Fr	0	0	64	64
	%	0/0%	0/0%	2/4%	2/4%
Cajoler	Fr	0	1	2	3
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/1%	0/1%
Suggestory formula	Fr	0	0	9	9
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/3%	0/3%
Total	Fr	799	906	996	2701
	%	29/6%	33/5%	36/9%	100/0%

5.2. Number of the request strategies

As to the social dominance and number of request strategies used by ITS, table 3 and 4 signify the frequency and percentages of the simple and complex strategies employed by the participants in DCTs and role-plays.

Table 3

Frequencies and percentages of the number of request strategies obtained through the DCT

Number of the request strategies		Social dominance			Total
		X=Y	X>Y	X<Y	
2 strategies	Fr	6	6	4	16
	%	1/0%	1/0%	0/7%	2/7%
3 strategies	Fr	77	50	27	154
	%	12/8%	8/3%	4/5%	25/7%
4 strategies	Fr	71	78	74	223
	%	11/8%	13/0%	12/3%	37/2%
5 strategies	Fr	31	53	62	146
	%	5/2%	8/8%	10/3%	24/3%
6 strategies	Fr	9	10	29	48
	%	1/5%	1/7%	4/8%	8/0%
7 strategies	Fr	5	3	3	11
	%	0/8%	0/5%	0/5%	1/8%
8 strategies	Fr	0	0	1	1
	%	0/0%	0/0%	0/2%	0/2%
9 strategies	Fr	1	0	0	1
	%	0/2%	0/0%	0/0%	0/2%
Total	Fr	200	200	200	600
	%	33/3%	33/3%	33/3%	100/0%

Table 3 shows the frequencies and percentages of request strategies used by ITS in DCTs considering the social dominance and number of the strategies. This table reflects that combination of 4 strategies (223 times: 71 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 78 times and 74 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively) is the first most used complex strategy by ITS. This finding denotes that ITS used this strategy more while encountering those with lower social status than those with the same and higher social status. In addition, based on the data in table 3, the combination of 3 strategies (154 times: 77 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 50 times and 27 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively) is the next more complex strategy used by ITS. In these circumstances, they tended to apply this type of complex strategy as encountering those with the same social status. The next most used complex strategy is the combination of 5 strategies (146 times:

31 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 53 times and 62 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively). As the data revealed, ITS used this complex strategy more when they encountered those with higher social status.

Table 4

Frequencies and percentages of the number of request strategies obtained through the role-play

Number of request strategies	Social dominance			Total
	X=Y	X>Y	X<Y	
2 strategies	23	2	0	25
	3/8%	0/3%	0/0%	4/2%
3 strategies	53	23	16	92
	8/8%	3/8%	2/7%	15/3%
4 strategies	63	81	65	209
	10/5%	13/5%	10/8%	34/8%
5 strategies	36	57	62	155
	6/0%	9/5%	10/3%	25/8%
6 strategies	18	25	39	82
	3/0%	4/2%	6/5%	13/7%
7 strategies	6	10	16	32
	1/0%	1/7%	2/7%	5/3%
8 strategies	1	2	2	5
	0/2%	0/3%	0/3%	0/8%
Total	200	200	200	600
	33/3%	33/3%	33/3%	100/0%

Accordingly, table 4 displays the frequencies and percentages of request strategies used by ITS in role-plays as the social dominance and number of the strategies are concerned. This table illustrates that combination of 4 strategies (209 times: 63 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 81 times and 65 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively) is the first most used complex strategy by ITS. This result confirmed that ITS used this strategy more, when they met those with lower social status than those with the same and higher social status. In addition, based on the data in table 4, the combination of 5 strategies (155 times: 36 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 57 times and 62 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status,

respectively) is the next more complex strategy used by ITS. In this context, while ITS encountered those with the same social status, they tended to apply this type of complex strategy more. The next most used complex strategy is the combination of 3 strategies (92 times: 53 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 23 times and 16 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively). As the data indicated, ITS used this complex strategy more when encountering those with higher social status. The next most employed request strategy applied by ITS is the combination of 6 strategies (82 times: 18 times encountering the addressees with the same social status, 25 times and 39 times meeting the addressees with lower and higher social status, respectively). This data makes clear that ITS tended to use this complex strategy encountering those with higher social status.

Chi-square and correlation test results are shown in tables 5 and 6. Table 5 designates Chi-square results of the study as to the relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and the type of request strategies used by ITS (found in DCTs and role-plays). As the table displays, the significance number in both corpora is 0.000 and less than 0.05 (p<0.05). Consequently, the first and third hypotheses of the study are rejected. Therefore, as the first hypothesis regards, there is a significant relationship between the social dominance and type of request strategies used by ITS in DCTs. As to the third hypothesis of research, there is a significant relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and the type of request strategies used by ITS in role-plays.

Table 5

Chi-square test results related to the effect of social dominance of the addressees and type of the request strategies

Variable		Chi-square test results			
Social dominance	Instrument	X^2	DF	P	Level Reliability
	DCT	516.4	52	0.000	99%
	Role-play	483.9	46	0.000	99%

As shown in table 6, Chi-square results of the study indicate that the

significance (P value) for both corpora, i.e., DCTs and role-plays, is 0.000 and less that 0.05 (p<0.05). As a result, the second and fourth hypotheses of the research are rejected. It demonstrates a significant relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and the number of request strategies used by ITS in DCTs. With regard to the fourth hypothesis, there is a significant relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and number of request strategies used by ITS in role-plays. Furthermore, Spearman's correlation test value in table 6 is a negative number for both DCTs and role-plays; this confirms that the complexity of the request strategies would increase with increasing the social dominance of the addressees toward the addressees, and vice versa.

Table 6

Chi-square test results related to the effect of social dominance of the addressees and the number of request strategies

Variable		Chi-square test results				Spearman's correlation
Social dominance	Instrument	X^2	DF	P	Reliability Level	correlation value
	DCT	56.3	14	0.000	99%	- 0.150
	Role-play	78.8	12	0.000	99%	- 0.106

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This study came across two issues stated by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989, p. 7) in a cross-cultural investigation of different speech acts which have attracted particular attention: "(a) the value and function of politeness or deference in speech act realization, and (b) the universality of politeness phenomena across languages and cultures" (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 7).

Considering the first issue mentioned by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), and based on the data represented in table 5, there is a significant relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and the type of request strategies used by ITS in the DCTs and role-plays. The findings indicated that when ITS were in a higher social status toward their addresses, they used

request strategies which were not employed in other situations (with the same social status or lower); in this reagard, the strategies like "threat", "moralizing", and "applying syntactic downgraders" were not used by ITS. Using these strategies by ITS demonstrted that with increasing the social dominance of the addressees, they tended to increase the imposition of their request; and increase the use of intensifying supportive moves. In addition, in this situation (the higher social dominance of the addressee), ITS had much tendency to use the main request speech act directly ("Locution derivable" and "Mood derivable"). We broadly agree with Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) interpretation, where they assert those in higher positions have the tendency to request more directly than those in a powerless position. On the other hand, the participants of this study which were in the lower social status or the same social status toward their addressees employed more "grounders" and "understaters". This finding offers a good evidence for the argument stated by Scollon and Scollon (1983) predicting greater indirectness in upward speech from people in positions of relatively low power to their superiors (as mentioned in Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 137). In addition, the results of the present research is consistent with the results of some studies such as Altayyeb Umar (2004), Al-Marrani and Sazalie (2010), and Sheykhmohammadi et al. (2019). Altayyeb Umar (2004) holds that applying indirect strategies will moderate the inherent imposition of request speech acts, and make it politer and more elegant. Moreover, according to Al-Marrani and Sazalie's (2010) study, to show solidarity with the addressees, Yemeni students would select using direct strategies when the speaker and hearer have equal social status and also, when the speaker has a higher social status than the hearer. Sheykhmohammadi et al. (2019) also claim that there was a reverse relationship between the addresses power and using direct strategies in Kurdish; this means that applying the direct strategies will decrease when the power of addresses increases.

Furthermore, the results found in both corpora indicated that when the social dominance of the speakers was higher than the addressee, most of the requests were hearer-dominant. While in situations with lower social dominance of the addressees, ITS made their requests as speaker-dominant to

decrease the level of imposition inherent in the requests.

Furthermore, the results of the present study support the second issue stated by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989, p. 7), i.e., "the universality of politeness phenomena across languages and cultures". In this regard, the request strategies used by ITS showed almost a similar pattern to those mentioned in CCSARP by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). It may also bears a striking resemblance to Ochs' (1996) Universal Culture Principle. Ochs (1996) claims that certain commonalities exist across the world's language communities; and communities of practice in the linguistic means used to convey situational meanings. This principle proposes that interlocutors apply certain similar linguistic means to obtain certain similar social ends. However, ITS didn't use some request strategies mentioned in the taxonomy proposed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). Among these were: "explicit performative", "want statement", "interrogative", "conditional clause", "intensifier", "expletive", "lexical uptoner", " downtoner", appealer", "subjectivizer", "insult" and promise of reward". Reasons for this remain unclear and needs more considerations and studies. Therefore, investigating the behavior of a large number of participants as well as socio-cultural factors may indicate different findings.

Finally, as to the effect of social dominance of the addressees on the type and number of request strategies used by ITS, we see that the both corpora, i.e., the DCT and role-play data seemed to show the same results (the Chi-square results of the both corpora are significant). As for the relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and the type of request strategies, Chi-square test results in table 5 demonstrated that ITS behaved similarly. So, they employed almost the same request strategies, when they filled in the DCTs, and when they were playing roles as well.

According to the results of Chi-square and correlation tests in table 6, there is a significant and reverse relationship between the addressee's social dominance and the number of request strategies used by ITS in the DCTs and role-plays (p=0.000<0.05). It means that with the increase in social dominance of the speakers toward the the addressees, the complexity of request strategies decreases. Moreover, the findings from the two corpora, e.i., DCTs and role-

plays, indicated that in situations with higher social dominance or the same social dominance of addressees, the combination of two or three request strategies were the most prevalent complex strategy applied. Conversely, when the speakers were in a lower social status towards their addressees, they tended to use more the combination of 5, 6 and 7 strategies. Moreover, the findings specified no use of 8 and 9 strategies combination by ITS in the situations with the higher social dominance toward the addressees. The results closely match with those obtained in the study of the speech act of apology by Ahangar, Sarani and Zeynali Dastuyi (2015), Ahangar and Zeynali Dasstuyi (2016), Afghari (2007), and in the study of refusals by Ahangar, Sarani and Zeynali Dastuyi (2012) and Ahangar and Zeynali Dastuyi (2013), Felix-Brasdefer (2002), Markus (2009) and Voncanon (2006). These studies show the use of more combinated strategies by the participants, while encountering those with higher social status.

Using more complex strategies when encountering the addresses with higher social dominance by ITS seems to be related to this idea: they behave so to increase the possibility of request acceptance by the addressees and also to decrease the imposition of their requests. To put it another way, requesting a person with higher social dominance necessitates more explanation and justification than requesting a person with equal or lower social status. This result also approves the statement by Eslamirasekh, Tavakoli, and Abdolrezapour (2010) when they asserted Iranian cultural system is hierarchical in connection with politeness. It means the power of addressees is considerably effective in assuring the speakers that their requests would be accepted or rejected.

Moreover, table 6 affirmed that ITS tended to use almost the same number of request strategies while encountering the addressees with different social dominance. Given the discussion above, this study surprisingly found that both DCTs and role-plays could be appropriate and alternative methods of gathering data, especially when we have time limit and cannot use natural methods for data collection. In conclusion, we may claim that it doesn't matter which of these two methods of data collection the researchers apply in their

studies as the results may not be significantly different.

In conclusion, this study aimed at extracting and categorizing the relationship between the addresee's social dominance and the type and number of request strategies used by ITS following the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) coding scheme proposed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). The data collection was done via Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and role-play, filled and performed by 100 high school students (50 girls & 50 boys). Some tentative conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, the Chi-square test results confirmed that there was a significant relationship between the social dominance of the addressees and the type and number of request strategies used by ITS. This result indicates that social dominance is an effective factor in applying the speech act of request by ITS in two methods of data collection, i.e., DCTs and role-plays. Secondly, the findings disclosed that in situations 3 and 6 with the speaker's high social dominance towards the addressee with lower social status, applying "aggravating supportive moves" and the direct use of the head act of request increased. Thirdly, decreasing the social dominance of the speaker towards the addressees resulted in the application of more complicated strategies. It means that in these situations, the students explained the situation more to peruade the addressee for performing their request. Therefore, it gives the impression that concerning politeness, the Iranian cultural system is hierarchical. That is to say, the power (social dominance) of the addressee has a central role in the speakers' assurance toward the acceptance or rejection of their requests. Fourthly, in most situations, the participants used the request strategies in the suggested classification by Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989). Therefore, "the universality of politeness phenomena across languages and cultures" claimed by Blum-Kulka et al (1989, p. 7), is confirmed in this study. Fiftly, ITS didn't employ all the request strategies mentioned in the model proposed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). For example, they didn't use "interrogatives", "conditional clauses", "downtoners", "appealers", "intensifiers", "expletives", "lexical uptoners", "insults" and "explicit performatives". Hence, the culture-specifity of applying the speech act of request is confirmed here. Finally, this study indicated no significantly

different results in the use of the request strategies employed by ITS in the two corpora, i.e., the data collected using the DCTs and role-plays. This can be a good result as it may help the researchers in this field to decide which method they would select for data collection. The authors end their paper with some suggestions for further research or implications: other researchers can investigate the transferred pragmatic errors in request speech act used by Iranian foreign language learners. In addition, they may examine the negative effects of the interference of pragmatic rules on the request speech act strategies used by Iranian bilingual students.

References

Ahangar, A. A., & Zeynali Dasstuyi, S. (2016). Apology speech act realization in the sarawani balochi dialect: a case study of female university students. *Studia Linguistica*, 72 (1). 39-75. https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12056

Ahangar, A. A., & Zeynali Dastuyi, S. (2013). Refusal speech act realization in sarawani balochi dialect: a case study of female university students. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 9. 245-274. https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2013-0014

Al-Marrani, Y., Sazalie, A. (2010). Polite Request Strategies by Male Speakers of Yemeni Arabic in Male-Male Interaction and Male-Female Interaction. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, (30), 63-80.

Al-Tayeb Umar, A. M. (2004). Request strategies used by advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational & Social Science & humanities*, 16, 42-87.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Appl. Linguist.*, 3, 29–59.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: a cross- cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 196–213.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies.* Ablex, Norwood, NJ.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byon, A.S. (2004). Sociopragmatic analysis of Korean requests: Pedagogical settings. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 36, 1673-1704. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.003

Chaudron, C. (2005). Data collection in SLA research. In C. J. Doughty, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 762-827). Blackwell publishing.

Derakhshan, A., & Shakki, F. (2021). A meta-analytic study of instructed second language pragmatics: A case of the speech act of request. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics,* 12(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.22055/RALS.2021.16722.

Eslamirasekh, A., Tavakoli, M., & Abdolrezapour, P. (2010). Certainty and convential indirectness in Persion and American request forms. *The Social Sciences*, 5(4), 332-339. DOI: 10.3923/sscience.2010.332.339

Ghavamnia, M., Tavakoli, M., & Rezazadeh, m. (2012). A comparative study of requests among L2 English, L1 persian, and L1 English speakers. *Revista Electronica De Linguistica Aplicada,* 10, 105-123.

Hong Gao, H. (2009). Features of request strategies in Chinese. *Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics 1 Working Papers* 47 (1999), 73–86.

Houck, N., & Gass, S. M. (1996). Non-native refusals: A methodological perspective. In S.M. Gass, & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 45-64). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hudson, T., E. Detmer, & Brown, J. (1995). *Developing Prototypic Measures of Cross-Cultural Pragmatics.* Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'I. Honolulu.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 49-69. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009955

Khalib, F., & Tayeh, A. (2014). Indirectness in English requests among Malay university Students. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 44-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.223

Ochs, E. Linguistic-resources for socializing humanity. In: J. Gumperz, & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 401-431). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rahmadiyanti Tambulana, F., & Sutrisno, A. (2020). Request Strategies Found in the Movie Silver Linings Playbook. *Lexicon*, 7 (2), 160-170. https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v7i2.66564

Rattanapitak, A., (2013). Request strategies in Burmese. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman*

Area, 36(1), 73-90.

Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: Acontrastive study of requests and apologies*. Amesterdom, Philadelphi: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rose, K. (1992). Speech act research and written questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of pragmatics*, 1(3), 49-62.
https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90028-A

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 59–82). New York: Academic Press.

Shahidi Tabara, M., & Akbari Malek, L. (2013). Delving into speech act of requests of Iranian Turkish informant. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1724 – 1731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.247

Shahrokhi, M. (2012). Perception of dominance, distance and imposition males' request speech Act strategies. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 678-685.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.181

Shakki, F. (2022). Meta-analysis as an emerging trend to scrutinize the effectiveness of L2 Pragmatics instruction. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 13.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1016661

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Instructed second language English pragmatics in the Iranian context. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 39(1), 201–252.
https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2020.38481.2886.

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). A meta-analysis on the instructed second language pragmatics for the speech acts of apology, request, and refusal in an Iranian EFL context. *Language Related Research*, 13(6), 461– 510. https://doi:10.52547/LRR.13.6.15

Sheykhmohammadi, Ch., Yarahmadzehi, N., & Mohamadian, A. (2019). Selection of the request speech act strategies in Kurdish regarding two Social Factors: Gender and Power. *Journal of Language Researches,* 10 (1), 183-202.
https://doi.org/10.22059/jolr.2019.72008

Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 145-178.
https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90023-2

Wolfson, N., Marmor, Th. & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts

across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (174–196). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.

Yazdanfar, Sh., & Bonyadi, A. (2016). Request Strategies in Everyday Interactions of Persian and English Speakers. *Sage Open*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016679473

Appendix

Request situations

Situation 1. Making a copy of some sample questions

It's exam time, and you want to copy sample questions using the copy machine, but you don't know how it works. At the same time, one of your classmates whom you are not so intimate, is passing there. You want to ask for help (+SD X=Y).

You: ………………………………………………………………………………………

Your classmate (whom you are not intimate with): Yes, just do it a little faster, now the class begins.

Situation 2. Borrowing the mathematics notebook

You were sick and did not take part in the math class. You want to request one of your classmates to see if she would give you the answers to the questions (-SD X=Y).

You: ………………………………………………………………………………………..

Your classmate: Yes, of course. Just do not forget to bring it back until tomorrow. I have not still done my next session's homework.

Situation 3. Handing in the library books

You have been appointed as the principal of the school in Modam Project day[1] and have decided to ask the students to return the books they have borrowed from the library (+SD X>Y)

You (as the principal of the school):………………………………………………………

The students: Yes! Is there a puunishment if we bring it until the end of the week?

Situation 4: Going to a camp

It's the last days of the exams, and the summer holidays are coming closer. You would like to go to a camp with your classmates. You decide to talk to the school principal (+SD X<Y).

You:………………………………………………………………………………………

Principal of the school: We agree as well. But holding a camp needs the officials

---

[1] A special day in which the students, themselves, would administer differenet parts of the school

permission, and we are not allowed to decide alone.

Situation 5: Handing in the homework follow-up practices

The teacher of "professions and skills" course asks you to hand in your homework follow-up practices in a week, but the opportunity has ended, and you have not still completed your homework. You want them to give you another chance (-SD X<Y).

You:…………………………………………………………………………………..

The teacher: Ok! I can give you another chance until the next session, but if you don't hand in your homework on time, you will not obtain the score of the homework follow-up practices.

Situation 6: Cleaning the study hall

You are studying in the study hall, at the same time, the school janitor enters and moves the tables and chairs for cleaning. You want to ask them to do this later (-SD X>Y).

You:…………………………………………………………………………………..

The school janitor: Sorry, I remove just these and leave the rest. I will move them later.