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Abstract

RAHMAWATI FITRIANA: This paper is aimed to analyze the speech act of requesting strategies used by people in their society. In their dialogue routine, s/he almost meets the simple dialogue used around them. Particularly, the dialogues will be used in expressing their requesting, something to anyone else, and even on bargaining term. The writer would like to know on how the people in giving response to the simple dialogue. The writer took the Blum-Kulka’s (1989) definition in analyzing of these strategies. In fact, the request and apology will be quite on the same ground and function, as the writer found in these analyzing. Both of the them are used in conventional routine unconsciously. Level of relationship between speaker and hearer is also one of factor beside, gender, age, and setting influenced in making a dialogue by using requests strategies.
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PENDAHULUAN

Communication is a way of human being to interact among others. Well interacting is likely able to express the feeling, thinking and even getting someone’ ideas either in verbal or nonverbal communication. It is also symbolized as an transferring people’s existed in their environment, and how cultural would be supposed to go through the next family life. Hall (1983:296) states that we use language to communication—to get our ideas across to other people and to discover what they have in mind themselves. Without such communication, society can not exist, culture could not be transmitted from one generation to the next, and human interaction would be virtually impossible. Therefore, human beings should be maximally well interacted to others because by communicating, they will have unconsciously to broaden their knowledge and because of more flexible of thought that they have, it would be greatly increased capacity of their brain to interpret and produce language.

In similar with cultural in which can be transmitted to other society, it is meant that in every communities have their own languages in order to transfer to other language, and its language will have a particular language which can be signed as the blueprint of that culture. In this case, Wardhaugh adds that in using of speaking to one to another, it can be used of sentences, to be more precisely, that is using of utterances. He argues that there is an attempt from anyone in classifying these utterances in a variety of ways. (.1986:282). Finegan (1992:342) adds also that what people do with the sentences and describe some of the ways in which sentences are used in verbal interaction.

Language used through sentences or more specifically utterances among in different cultures will be able to figure out how the people use it as a tool for doing things: to ask question, request favours, make comment, report news, give directions, offer greetings and perform hundreds of other ordinary verbal actions in daily life (Finegan.1992:343). In similar, (Wardhaugh) also adds that sentences and utterances can be possible to attempt a classification in terms of what sentences do, which is stated particularly as functional approach that can be considered of such function, as stating, questioning, requesting and exclaiming. In building of communication run well, therefore it is needed communicative function of that language and these communications can be categorized as speech acts which are used in our daily dialogue or conversation.

As mentioned earlier, in speech act are included on the way on how the people expresses
in making comment, questioning, requesting, apology, offer greeting, and so on. In this paper, the writer would like to discuss one of speech acts which can be used in our daily conversation, that is requesting.

Making a request, the speaker infringes on the recipient's freedom from imposition. The recipient may feel that the request is an intrusion on his/her freedom of action or even a power play. As for the requester, s/he may hesitate to make requests for fear of exposing a need or out of fear of possibly making the recipient lose face (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 11), cited in.


And in this sense, requests are face-threatening to both the requestor and the recipient. Since requests have the potential to be intrusive and demanding, there is a need for the requester to minimize the imposition involved in the request.

The studies of request strategies have been explored by many experts of linguists. Blum-Kulka et al.(1989): Brown & Levinson (1987) are two of well-known experts who conducted the research of request strategies. Their findings was being a buss words up to know, and other researchers conducted as well of what the diversity of language concerned on the request strategies ((Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper 1989); Cuban Spanish (Ružičková 1998); (Placencia 1998); (Blum-Kulka 1987); (Sifianou 1992) (cited in J. César Félix-Brasdefer. 2005)

Requesting strategies that the writer discuss in the paper is connected to the analysis on how the person or people give response to the dialogue routine which is delivered among of them in their society, to see the interpretation whether s/he uses the request strategies whether if any difference between male and female in applying of requesting strategies. The aims of this study are to identify and investigate how the person or people respond to the dialogue routine used by using requests strategies.

**Theory of Speech-act**

According to Austin's point of view cited in Wardhaugh (1987:282) state that such utterances will perform acts; the naming of ships, marrying, and sentencing of certain cases. He also adds must meet that certain felicity condition that performatives must meet to be successful. The necessary thoughts, feeling, and intention must be present in all parties. Therefore, between speaker and hearer will be understandable each other of what speaker meant and what hearer intents to capture the illocutionary point of the utterance (Allan, Keith cited at http://www.arts.monash.edu/ling/staff/allan/assets/speech-acts.html)

Additionally, Jaworowska's definition of speech act is a minimal functional unit in human communication. Just as a word (refusal) is the smallest form found in language and a morpheme is the smallest unit of language that carries information about meaning (-al in refuse-al makes it a noun), the basic unit of communication is a speech act (the speech act of refusal).

(http://instructional1.calstatela.edu/ikamhis/tesl565_sp04/tr oy/spchact.htm)

In speech act, Austin differ this terms into three kinds of meaning (cited in Alan. 1998)

1. **LOCUTIONARY ACT**: performing of the speaker uses an identifiable expression e, consisting of a sentence or sentence fragment from language L, spoken with identifiable prosody, p. We symbolize the form of the locution and say that it has the sense.

2. **ILLOCUTIONARY ACT**: in utterance U, Speaker performs an in using a particular locution to refer, such that U has the illocutionary Force of a statement, a confirmation, a denial, a prediction, a promise, a request, and so forth.

3. **PERLOCUTIONARY ACT**: speaker's is act of achieving a particular perlocutionary effect on Hearer as a result of Hearer recognizing (what s/he takes to be) the locution and illocutionary forces in U.

According to Jaworowska, who adds that speech act theory attempts to explain how speakers use language to accomplish intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning form what is said. Thus, here interlocutors are intended to have pragmatic competence which refers to an ability to use language and contextually in appropriate ways. Moreover, the interlocutors who are involved on this conversation will also be demanded to understand well of any utterances delivered by the speakers accurately and correctly. (Yule, 1996, p.47) cited in Fujioka.2003.

Furthermore, Allan also explains that a perlocution is hearer's behavioral response to the meaning of U -- not necessarily a physical or verbal response, perhaps merely a mental or emotional response of some kind. Other perlocutions are such things as: alerting hearer by warning hearer of danger; persuading hearer to an opinion by stating supporting facts; intimidating hearer by threatening; getting hearer to do something by means of a suggestion, a hint, a request, or a command; and
so forth. However, perlocutionary effects fall beyond the boundary of linguistics because they are not part of language but behavioral and/or cognitive and/or emotional responses to the illocutions in utterances. On what linguists can properly look at, however, are the intentions of speakers to bring about certain perlocutionary effects.

Requesting as Speech act

As mentioned earlier, research in cross-cultural speech act theory has been conducted across a number of languages since the 1980s, the studies is focused on request strategies which is performing speech act such as giving ordering, making statement, promises, offering apologies and requesting, and so on. Taking into of the most notably the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project, or CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989) cited in Owen.

Politeness is one area of communicative competence in which Japanese people have problems. Politeness in requests is a particularly important issue because requests, by definition, impose on the hearer (H), and if the speaker (S) does not make a request appropriately, the desired goal may not be reached, H may be embarrassed, or the relationship may be damaged. For foreign language speakers, it is particularly difficult to judge and use politeness. (Saito, 1985), (Tracy, et al, 1984) cited in Kitao, 2000.

Politeness of request strategies are used in actual situation H H perceives a request in terms of relative imposition, which is affected by various factors, including social distance (familiarity) and social status (power) (Scollon & Scollon, 1983) cited in Kotao. If familiarity is high, relative imposition is smaller than if familiarity is low. If S has more power than H, the relative imposition is smaller. Additionally, there are several situational variables, including necessity of the request, ease of carrying out the request, and cultural differences (Brown and Levinson, 1978) cited in Katao

Therefore, the size of a request (absolute imposition) is mediated by relational distance between S and H (familiarity and power) and situational variables and becomes the relative imposition which H experiences. (Kitao, 2000). Meanwhile, Othilman and Cohen (1991) cited in Al-Tayib Umar, reports that languages do not only differ in general linguistic areas such as asphonology, syntax and lexicon, but also in the rules of speaking and the patterns of interaction which vary from one speech community to another. Thus, person or someone who have size of request will also consider the language area that they use, such as syntax or lexicon, and also are very familiar with pattern of interaction that they use in their society.

Furthermore, Al-tayib Umar states that when two group of people adopt similar strategies when addressing their request to equals or people in higher positions. In such cases, the subjects rely heavily on conventionally indirect strategies. However, when requests are addressed to people in lower positions the Arabic sample shows a marked tendency towards using more direct request strategies in performing their request than the British sample. The investigator attributes this to socio-cultural reasons. In his research, he confirms accurately that request which is addresses to the lower position will make tendency certainly and this is because of socio-cultural.

In similar with the request strategies used in dialogue routine, the effective requests strategies which is aimed to give reason, conform, and reaction to speaker and hearer of realizing illocutionary in performing a request, and the speaker should always adhere to the politeness ways. It is to considered also no matter what the object of his/her request is because requesting occurs in a situation of inequality.

Requesting Strategies

In examining the structure of speech acts, requests have been frequently analyzed in terms of discourse sequences: head acts and supportive moves. According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) cited in Brasdefer, head acts refer to the request proper or the main strategy employed to make the request. Supportive moves are the peripheral elements and refer to the pre- or post-posted moves or strategies that accompany the head act. To better account for the structure of requests, request head acts are classified according to a directness continuum. Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) classification of request head acts included three levels of directness: among others they are;

Direct strategies,

1. Mood derivable (The grammatical mood of the verb in the utterance marks its illocutionary force as a request.)

   Leave me alone. Clean up this mess, please.

2. Explicit performatives (The illocutionary force of the utterance is explicitly named by the speakers.)

   I'm asking you to clean up the kitchen. I'm asking you not to part the car here.

3. Hedged performatives (Utterances embedding the naming of the illocutionary force.)

   I'd like to ask you to clean the kitchen. I'd like you to give your lecture a week earlier.

4. Obligation statements (The illocutionary point is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the locution.)

   You'll have to clean up the kitchen. Ma'am, you'll have to move your car.
5. Want statements (The utterance expresses the speaker’s intentions, desire or feeling vis á vis the fact that the hearer does or does not.)
   I really wish you’d clean up the kitchen.
   I really wish you’d stop bothering me.

Conventionally indirect strategies

6. Suggestory formulae (The sentence contains a suggestion to the hearer.)
   How about cleaning up?
   Why don’t you get lost?
   So, why don’t you come and clean up the mess you made last night?

7. Query preparatory (The utterance contains a reference to preparatory conditions, such as ability or willingness, the possibility of the act being performed, as conventionalized in any specific language.)
   Could you clean up the kitchen, please?
   Would you mind moving your car, please?

Non-conventionally indirect strategies (hints)

8. Strong hints (The utterance contains reference to object or to elements needed for the implementation of the act, directly pragmatically implying the act)
   You have left the kitchen in a right mess.

9. Mild hints (Utterances that make no reference to the request proper or any of its elements but are interpretable through the context as indirect pragmatically implying the act)
   I’m a nun (in response to a persistent hassler).

In addition to Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) classification of request head acts, head acts were examined according to their internal and external modifications (Faerch & Kasper 1989). Internal modifications include mitigators which soften direct requests and comprise both lexical (diminutives, ‘please’, mental verbs such as ‘think/believe’) and syntactic (conditional, imperfect) mitigators. And, external modifications include optional supportive moves that modify the head act. These peripheral elements commonly include: reasons, preparators (e.g., I am sorry sir, I cannot collect my assignment on time because I got problem. Would you give me an extra time?), and disarmers (e.g., I know that you take good notes and I see that you have them with you, can I can borrow them).

Request Perspectives

Requests usually include reference to the requestor, the recipient of the request, and/or the action to be performed. The speaker can manipulate requests by choosing from a variety of perspectives (Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G., 1989) in making requests, there are four points:

1. Hearer-oriented (emphasis on the role of the hearer): (e.g. situation) Could you clean up the kitchen, please?
2. Speaker-oriented (emphasis on the speaker’s role as the requester): (e.g. situation) Do you think I could borrow your notes from yesterday’s class?
3. Speaker- and hearer-oriented (inclusive strategy): (e.g. situation) So, could we tidy up the kitchen soon?
4. Impersonal: (e.g. situation) So it might not be a bad idea to get it cleaned up.


Conversational routine

According Ancaro, (2005) conversational routine is perform four formulaic speech act, that is thank you, apologies, requests and offers. While Finegan (1992:364) points out that conversational routine is more that the core part of conversations. Core parts are relatively less predictable, and whereas children are trained not to ask certain kinds of questions, they are drilled on the proper way to open and close conversation. Therefore, person or someone or even children are also trained or more appropriate word, that drilled to open and close their conversation well, because they have the nature way to do this pattern. In spite of that, in this research the writer is not use term conversation routine, but it is changed by term of dialogue routine, which is emphasized on requesting strategies. In the writer’s assumption that the term conversation routine which is delivered between speaker and hearer or between interlocutors will be based on the length of this conversation used. For this reason, the writer took the term of dialogue routine, because it is also more brief, accurate, and the answers are set appropriately.

Research Methodologies

Respondents, Instruments, and Procedures

In this research, the population of this study is elected respondents which are from different background. There are ten respondents elected randomly. Five respondents are taken from under graduate students at Indonesia University of Education, three respondents are taken from public service office that are able to speak and write well, and two respondents are taken from chemistry department which took an English subject, they are now at fifth semester. The assumption of taking these respondents is that, the writer would like to identify how the response of different person in
using request strategies in real situation. The questionnaires are the simple dialogues which often meet in their routine activity. They are written in English version. The writer set in English version, in order to make easy to analyze them. Taking an example; the use of modal auxiliary "Would or Could" in requesting strategies which is formed more accurate in analyzing in dialogue, because level of formal and informal used is more appropriate. In fact, some languages in this world will have strengths and weakness partly.

The instruments taken are consisted on twelve questions which is made up by the writer itself. In creating of these questionnaires, the writer tries to figure out what is approximately of dialogue used at our routine day,. For the twelve questionnaires are distributed to three parts of respondents. Particularly, to the person in public service office, the writer personally visited them in order to know how much their understand on questionnaire is, the writer also took some short interview in order to dig deeply of what they know of requesting of politeness. Because it is to do that they are from different background specifically.

After the data collected, the writer then calculated percentages of the requesting strategies of politeness used by different group of persons. After, the percentages is done, the data of requesting strategies of politeness will be tabulated on the list of which is to make easy to see the reflection of requesting strategies of politeness used by these respondents.

Findings and discussions

In this part, the writer would like to analyze the ten respondents’ response o the questionnaires and interview given and then to calculate them in using the requesting strategies of politeness taken from Blum,Kulka’s point of view. The following statements are the analyzing of them, such as:

1. Direct strategies

   Mood derivable :The grammatical mood of the verb in the utterance marks its illocutionary force as a request.: On this direct strategies which is classified on mood derivable can be seen on situation #1, situation #5, situation #6, situation#7, situation#8, and situation #11. Each of respondents tried to use the modal auxiliary to express how much they need to ask for something to the hearer in order to accept his/her intention. The using of the modal auxiliaries is also to show how much of requesting strategies is influenced on their dialogue, and even he uses double modal auxiliaries, an example on the respondent#2.

2. Explicit performatives.

   The illocutionary force of the utterance is explicitly named by the speakers. In this strategies, the situation happened to be proved is on situation #2. Here, the respondents use the statements explicitly by offending the speaker to give the response on what he/she did it. The expression consisted from the word why do you do that or where should you go on is able to prove that the speaker was offended by the hearer. The using of modal "should" in 83.33% will also show that how much strong the situation happened.

3. Hedged performatives

   Utterances embedding the naming of the illocutionary force. In this part, the situation can be shown on situation#5. On this situation, the speakers are really to ask to the hearer/participant to understand on the regulation used in this seminar. As it is indicated that the use of modal "would+like/mind" in 85.71%, is to show how the politeness expressing is needed on this situation.

4. Obligation statements :

   the illocutionary point is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the locution. On this situation, it refers also to the situation#5. It is because of the illocution point that the speaker need to force to the hearer is achieved well. Although, modal used is "would" more than "will", but the essence of the speaker’s meant is successfully achieved.

5. Want statements :

   the utterance expresses the speaker’s intentions, desire or feeling the fact that the hear do X. For this part, the situation#8 respondent#4 will show the utterances expression from the speaker’s attentions or the feeling. The situation tell us how the speaker are really to express her feeling to the hearer in order the hearer understand on her condition. The intention word "I really to say" is able to prove that she is very serious to ask permission of because an unfortunate accident.

Conventionally indirect strategies

1. Suggestory formulae: the sentence contains a suggestion to X.

   This situation can also be seen on situation #2 in respondents#1 and 2, where the speaker will have suggestion to the hearer to do something, although the word expressions are very sarcasm or frankly to say. But other
respondents is still using the requests of politeness in expressing their intention to the hearer.

2. Query preparatory:

the utterance contains reference to preparatory conditions, such as ability or willingness, the possibility of the act being performed, as conventionalized in any specific language. In this situation, mostly of respondents use the modal auxiliaries much than the others. Let see on situation#4, situation#5, situation#6, situation#8, and situation#12. The respondents are almost use “could and would+like/mind” in expressing of politeness in certain situation.

Non-conventionally indirect strategies (hints)

1. Strong hints:

the utterances contain partial reference to object or to elements needed for the implementation of the act, directly pragmatically implying the act. On this situation, it is rarely happened in here. Essence of this situation demands the speaker to do something in spite of to ask to do something in hurry. It can be seen on situation#10, where the boyfriend really wants to pick his girlfriend up but it can not be done. The boyfriend actually really wants to do that. And situation#11, where the buyer really wants to buy the minimal price but unfortunately, the seller denied to bargain of cost and give the fix cost to the buyer. It could be said that a bargaining is one a way to ask a real implementation of an act.

2. Mild hints:

utterances that make no reference to the request proper or any of its elements but are interpretable through the context as requests, indirectly pragmatically implying the act. In this situation, particularly, the speaker is to express the intention in many ways or it can be said that the speaker use personification term in expressing of his/her idea, not really want to know of what he/she is meant but it can be the reflection of the speaker’ point of view.

After, the analyzing of request strategies of politeness used by the respondents, in fact it was also found that in dialogue routine is not request speech act is used automatically but also the apology speech acts used is followed as well. These can be proved by numbers of respondents which included the utterances of “I’m sorry” “I’m sorry, I’m afraid that” “I beg your pardon” “I present my apologies” “I owe you an apology” “I beg your pardon” “I’m so sorry, it’s so unusual” “I’m sorry” “oh (I’m sorry)”
The table below shows the different types of request strategies used, their characteristics, and how they might be used in different situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self denigration or self reproach</th>
<th>e.g. how stupid of me, how awful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing responsibility</td>
<td>e.g. I didn’t mean to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging responsibility for the offending act</td>
<td>e.g. that was my fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising for bearance from a similar offending act</td>
<td>e.g. I promise you that that will never happen again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering redress</td>
<td>e.g. please let me pay for the damage I’ve done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In more specific, the request strategies used in dialogue routines will also have been influenced by other factor such as gender, age, setting and level of relationship of interlocutors. The speaker can not predict exactly that the hearer will accept their statements as possible as much. It is taken an example from situation#2, the respondents will answer these questionnaire if he/she ever visit the public service office and ever saw these accidents, such as; in the bank. If it is so, the respondents will be recognize the answer well. Other factor comes from the setting where the dialogue is taken place.

Each of us will have different perception in concerned on setting used in dialogue. Some of us will refer the formal, semi formal and informal is quite hard to differ, particularly semi-formal and informal. It might be concerned on the exactly place where the dialogue is taken place. Moreover, it is also based on the relationship between the speaker and hearer, an example is how close relationship between them. It can be compared between situation#4 and situation#7. Both of them are rendered to the low and medium relationship. For the situation#4, the speaker or hearer has been working with the director since number years ago, it could be the relationship will be high, but unfortunately, the secretary has been working just a couple months, so this will be low relationship. On the other hand, the situation#7 is also quite the same, if the patient is a long term medical checking up, the level of relationship will be high and vice verse. It is to be considered well if it is classified on certain situation. Meanwhile, in apologies strategies, the writer observes that the use of “Sorry” is classified on implicit emotional regarding to the giving an explanation or account and expressing emotion, while the utterance term “excuse me” is classified on explicit non-emotional regarding to demanding forgiveness.

### Conclusion

In this part, the analyzing of request strategies used by the respondents by using Blum-Kulka formula is clearly explained. From the nine types of request strategies used, there are some other utterances which are connected to the apology strategies. At time being of analyzing, the writer also found that not all the types of request strategies automatically used in his/her routine dialogue. It might be happened because of social factor such as: gender, age, setting and level of relationship are influenced whether she/he is getting dialogue with others. Mostly of respondents are believed that using the highest modal auxiliary is more polite than none. Even if it is for particular situation is desired.

Meanwhile both situational and cultural factors influence use of these request strategies. Different cultures seem to agree on general trends of situational variation. For example, a big favor usually comes with more indirect and/or polite strategies than a low-relationship of level of request. Friends use more casual requests than acquaintances provided that the content of the request is the same. However, the specific directness levels appropriate for given situations might differ cross-culturally. A certain language may tend to use more direct-level requests than other languages (such as Oriental country) equally in an appropriate manner within the culture.
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