

# A Comparative Study of Perception of (Im)Politeness between Iranian EFL Learners and Americans: The Case of Request Speech Act

Lyginamasis iranietiečių EFL studentų ir amerikiečių (ne)mandagumo suvokimo tyrimas: prašymo raiškos atvejis


LINGUISTICS / KALBOTYRA

## Bahareh Ghasempour

MA student, Amin Institute of Higher Education, Fooladshahr, Iran.

## Maryam Farnia

Assistant professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Payame Noor University, Iran.

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.29.14168>

Learning a language means learning the culture. What we act and speak reflect the culture of our language. Requests have attracted the attention of many researchers which they have often been investigated adjacent to the politeness (Liu, 2007; Jalilifar, 2009; Al-Marrani & Szalgie, 2010; Félix-Brasdefer, 2010; Youssef, 2012; Mohammadi & Tamimi Sa'd, 2014). The purpose of this study is to examine Iranian EFL learners, Persian native speakers, and American English native speakers' perception of speech act of requests without politeness markers. To this end, the data were collected from 35 EFL learners, 35 Persian native speakers, and 14 English native speakers. The data were collected through an open ended questionnaire in the form of Discourse Completion Task and a Perception questionnaire in the form of Likert scale adopted from Saidi and Khosravi (2015). The questionnaire consists of situations with variations in contextual variables, i.e. social status: requests made by people of higher social status, equal social status and lower social status relative to the speakers. The participants were asked to imagine themselves in the situations and rate the (im)politeness of each request situation on a 4-point Likert scale. Moreover, they were required to write down what they would

SAL 29/2016

A Comparative Study of Perception of (Im)Politeness between Iranian EFL Learners and Americans: The Case of Request Speech Act

Received 02/2016

Accepted 08/2016

## Abstract



Research Journal  
Studies about Languages  
No. 29/2016  
ISSN 1648-2824 (print)  
ISSN 2029-7203 (online)  
pp. 19-30  
DOI 10.5755/j01.sal.0.29.14168  
© Kaunas University of Technology

say if they were in a situation without politeness markers. A translated version of questionnaire was handed to Persian native speakers. Results indicated that there was a significant difference between EFL learners and English native participants, and also between EFL learners and Persian speakers' perceptions of (im)politeness of different request situations. Moreover, by comparing the three groups of participants who perceived a request as mostly/ slightly impolite, the writer provided information about their expectations of politeness in different situations. It is hoped that the findings of this study can add to the body of knowledge in speech act studies in general and to our understanding of Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers' perception of (im)politeness in particular.

**KEY WORDS:** Request; (Im)Politeness; Politeness markers; EFL learners; Persian native learners.

## Introduction

Speech act of request has attracted the attention of many researchers (e.g. Liu, 2007; Lin, 2009; Félix-Brasdefer, 2010; Youssef, 2012; Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi, 2014; Abdulsattar & Farnia, 2014). Requests are "attempts on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to perform or to stop performing somekind of action in the interests of the speaker" (Ellis, 2012, cited in Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi, 2014, p.20). Many studies investigated cross-cultural similarities and differences between native and nonnative speakers' request realization patterns (Sifianou, 1992; Jalilifar, 2009; Amooaliakbari & Paramasivam, 2012). Moreover, a large number of studies examined the effects of social and situational factors such as social power and social distance in the speech act of request (Rue, Zhang, and Shin, 2007; Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi, 2014). While there are many studies which examined the effect of contextual variables on respondents' realization of speech act of request, there are few studies which investigated the participants' perception of speech act of request without politeness markers. Therefore, the goal of the present study was to examine Iranian EFL learners and American English native speakers' perceptions of requests without politeness markers. Persian L1 data were also provided to investigate evidence of pragmatic transfer. In so doing, the data were collected from 35 EFL learners, 35 Persian native speakers, and 14 English native speakers. The data were collected through an open-ended questionnaire in the form of Discourse Completion Task and a Perception questionnaire in the form of Likert scale adopted from Saidi and Khosravi (2015).

## Literature Review

Several researchers have defined politeness phenomenon. Watts (2003) described the nature of politeness phenomenon stating "not only that it occupies a central place in the social study of language, but also that it has been the subject of intensive debate in linguistic pragmatics, sociolinguistics and, to a lesser extent, social theory for several years now" (p.10). The term politeness has various definitions, and it has been used in different contexts. Hill *et al* (1986) define politeness as "one of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport" (p.349). Watts (2003) defines linguistic politeness as "an abstract term referring to a wide variety of social strategies for constructing and reproducing cooperative social interaction across cultures" (p.47). Moreover, Watts (2003) expressed that distinguishing utterances as being impolite or polite depends primarily on the interaction and the addressee's interpretation. Watts (2003) distinguished between what is impolite and what is polite, and he introduced a new concept called "politic behavior". According to Watts (2003), politic behavior is a "linguistic behavior which is perceived to be appropriate to the social constraints of the ongoing interaction, i.e. as non-salient" (p.19). In other words, Watts (2003) asserted that the suitable behavior is placed in the middle between impolite and polite, and it is called politic, while any "observable addition to politic behavior" (p.30) is considered a polite behavior.

Impoliteness phenomenon has been investigated by fewer studies than those studying politeness. Culpeper (1996) claimed that "little work has been done on communicative strategies with the opposite orientation, that of attacking one's interlocutor and causing disharmony"

(p.349). There are several definitions for impoliteness. For example, Bousfield (2008) defines impoliteness as concept which constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered:

- i. Unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/ or,
- ii. With deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, “boosted”, or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted (Bousfield, 2008, p.72).

## Previous Studies

Many studies have investigated the speech act of request from different perspectives. Rue, Zhang, and Shin (2007) examined request strategies used by Korean speakers in role-plays. They used the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989) for analyzing the data which are gathered in a workplace setting through video-taping of role-plays. Their results showed that Korean request strategies were mainly based on power status.

Jalilifar (2009) investigated the request strategies used by Iranian learners of English as a Foreign Language and Australian native speakers of English. He used a Discourse Completion Test to collect data and it was based on two social factors of relative power and social distance. The results showed that EFL learners with higher proficiency showed overuse of indirect type of requesting. However, EFL learners with lower proficiency displayed overuse of direct strategy type. In another cross-cultural study, Abdulsattar & Farnia (2014) analyzed the cross-cultural differences and similarities of the speech act of request with regard to the realization of request external modifications. The data were collected from Iraqi and Malay university students through Discourse Completion Test adapted from Rose (1994). The aim was to examine how face rapport is managed through the use of external modifications. The results showed that grounders were the most common external modifier used in the corpus. Tamimi Sa'd and Mohammadi (2014) investigated the realization of request perspectives among Iranian EFL learners with regard to the effect of power and gender. The corpus of the study was 30 Iranian MA EFL learners. The participants were asked to answer a discourse completion task adapted from Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). The findings showed that the most frequently used request strategy were mood-derivable followed by query-preparatory and strong hints. Also, Saidi and Khosravi (2015) conducted a study to analyze Iranian EFL learners' perceptions of the requests which do not have any politeness markers in terms of their gender. Data were collected from 60 EFL learners through an open-ended questionnaire in the form of discourse completion task and a Likert scale questions. The results showed that both male and female respondents were similar with regard to the perceptions of (im) politeness of the requests while their responses in open-ended questionnaires showed some variations. For example, in a situation in which a request was made by the employee to another employee with the same status in a formal setting, male participants stated that they would complain about the way language was used for making request and female participants stated that they would refuse the request either verbally or nonverbally. Therefore, it seems that female respondents showed more reaction to impolite behavior.

## Research questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent are there differences or similarities between Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers' perceptions of requests without politeness markers?
2. To what extent are there differences or similarities between Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers' perceptions of requests without politeness markers?

## Method

### Participants

Data were collected from 35 Iranian EFL learners, 35 Iranian Persian native speakers, and 14 native speakers of English.

### Instrumentation

The data were collected through an open ended questionnaire in the form of Discourse Completion Task and a Perception questionnaire in the form of Likert scale adopted from Saidi and Khosravi (2015). The questionnaire consists of situations with variations in contextual variables, i.e. social status: requests made by people of higher social status, equal social status and lower social status relative to the speakers. The participants were asked to imagine themselves in the situations and rate the (im)politeness of each request situation on a 4-point Likert scale.

Moreover, they were required to write down what they would say if they were in a situation without politeness markers. A translated version of questionnaire was handed to Persian native speakers.

In order to answer the first and two research questions about the differences between Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers, and between Iranian EFL and English native speakers' perception of impoliteness marker, a two independent t-tests was run to compare the three groups.

As illustrated in Table 1, a two independent t-tests was run to compare Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers' perceptions of the (im)politeness across the situations. The results of two independent t-tests revealed that there was a significant difference between Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers' perceptions of the (im)politeness across the situations.

A two independent t-tests was also run to compare Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers' perceptions of the (im)politeness across the situations. As shown in Table 2, the results revealed that there was a significant difference between Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers' perceptions of the (im)politeness across the situations.

## Results and Discussion

**Table 1**

The results of t-test between Iranian EFL learners and English native speakers' perceptions of the (im) politeness

participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
English native speakers	14	26.0714	3.17355	3.648	47	.001
EFL students	35	21.0286	4.74952			

**Table 2**

The results of t-test between Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers' perceptions of the (im) politeness

participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Persian native speakers	35	15.0571	4.40550	-5.453	68	<.001
EFL students	35	21.0286	4.74952			

### Situation 1 and 7: The case of high-low status

13 English native and 25 Iranian EFL participants perceived the request in situation 1 as mostly/ slightly impolite while one English native and 10 Iranian EFL participants perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite. On the other hand, 31 Persian participants perceived the request in situation 1 as mostly/ slightly polite whereas four perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite. Nine English native and 20 Iranian EFL participants rated the request in situation 7 as mostly/ slightly polite while 5 and 15 respectively, perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite. On the other hand, 29 Persian participants perceived the request in situation 7 as mostly/ slightly polite while six thought that it was mostly/ slightly impolite.

Table 3 illustrates the strategies which are used by all participants who perceived the requests in situation 1 and 7 as mostly/ slightly impolite or polite along with their frequency of use.

Most Iranian EFL learners who perceived request 1 as mostly/ slightly impolite tend to respond politely by positively verbal expressions such as “here you are” and “Yes, sir” while some of them deemed that they would say nothing and just give the pen. English native participants who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would respond neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction while some of them respond politely by positive verbal expressions. However, most of the Persian speakers perceived the request as mostly/ slightly polite and responded to it politely, both verbally and non-verbally while 2 of them responded negatively.

Nine English native participants who perceived request 7 as mostly/ slightly polite tend to respond politely by positive verbal expressions such as “sure”, “Ok”, “no problem”. However, English native participants who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would just obey the request and say nothing.

Strategies/ Situations	1			7		
	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)
1. Directly refusing a request verbally or nonverbally	0	0	0	1	0	2
2. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using verbal expressions	2	1	0	1	0	1
3. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using non-verbal reactions	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Agreeing to the request and using positive verbal expressions	19	5	21	10	9	11
5. Agreeing to the request and using positive non-verbal reactions	4	0	6	0	0	2
6. Agreeing to the request and using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction	7	6	6	17	5	12
7. Agreeing to the request and using negative verbal expressions	0	2	1	2	0	3
8. Agreeing to the request and using negative non-verbal reactions	3	0	1	4	0	4

**Table 3**  
Participants' Strategies in Situations 1 and 7

Iranian EFL learners who perceived request 7 as mostly/ slightly polite tend to respond politely by positive verbal expressions such as “ok, sir”, and “of course”. However, most Iranian EFL learners who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would respond neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction while some of them stated that they obey the request reluctantly or refuse it by making an excuse. Most of the Persian speakers perceived the request as mostly/ slightly polite and responded to it politely, both verbally and non-verbally.

With regard to situations 1 and 7 in which the request was made by a person of higher status, the results revealed that both Iranian EFL and English native participants mostly agreed that the request posed by the teacher was more impolite than the one made by the boss. This might suggest that a teacher in an educational setting is expected to be more polite than a boss in an occupational setting. However, Persian speakers perceived the both situations as mostly/ slightly polite. Maybe, this result suggest that Persian speakers expect from the persons of higher status that they do not use polite markers in their requests or maybe it was happened because of the structure of Persian language.

In the situations which the speaker was of higher status, most of the participants tend to respond politely to the requests by using a number of positive verbal or non-verbal expressions. This might be happened because the teacher is a respectable person whose requests should be politely considered. The same results in situation 7 might show that they respect to their boss because of some job-related considerations.

#### **Situation 2 & 8: The case of low-high status**

10 and 13 English native participants perceived the requests in situation 2 and 8 as mostly/ slightly impolite respectively while 4 and 1 perceived them as mostly/ slightly polite. Among Iranian EFL learners, 18 perceived the request in situation 2 as mostly/ slightly impolite while 21 had this opinion about the request in situation 8. 17 and 14 Iranian EFL learners thought that the requests in situation 2 and 8 were mostly/ slightly polite, respectively. On the other hand, 3 and 8 Persian speakers perceived the requests in situation 2 and 8 as mostly/ slightly impolite respectively while 32 and 27 perceived them as mostly/ slightly polite.

Table 4 demonstrates the strategies used by all participants who perceived the requests in situation 2 and 8 as mostly/ slightly impolite or polite along with their frequency of use.

As regards the request in situation 2, all English native participants who perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would repeat the point for the student without using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction while the participants who perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite tend to respond politely by positive verbal expressions such as “sure”, “listen again”. Most Iranian EFL learners who perceived request 2 as mostly/ slightly polite deemed that they would repeat the point again politely. However, Iranian EFL learners who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would repeat the point for the student without using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction and some of them stated that they would add some politeness markers like “please”. On the other hand, most Persian speakers perceived the request 2 as mostly/ slightly polite and they claimed that they responded to it politely or without using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction while some of them who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they refused to answer the request verbally or nonverbally.

Results show that most Iranian EFL and English native participants agreed to the request without using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction. However, some of the Persian speakers refused to answer the request.

Strategies/ Situations	2			8		
	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)
1. Directly refusing a request verbally or nonverbally	0	0	2	1	1	0
2. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using verbal expressions	2	0	0	8	8	5
3. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using non-verbal reactions	0	0	0	1	0	1
4. Agreeing to the request and using positive verbal expressions	13	3	10	3	1	6
5. Agreeing to the request and using positive non-verbal reactions	2	0	1	1	0	0
6. Agreeing to the request and using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction	14	11	19	11	0	17
7. Agreeing to the request and using negative verbal expressions	3	0	3	6	2	4
8. Agreeing to the request and using negative non-verbal reactions	1	0	0	4	2	2

Table 4

Participants' strategies in situations 2 and 8

Considering the request in situation 8, most English native participants who perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite mentioned that they would react verbally. They stated expressions like "I will want to talk to the manager". Also, most Iranian EFL learners perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite. Most of them complained about the language which was used for making the request and some of them stated that they would leave the restaurant. However, most Persian speakers perceived the request as mostly/ slightly polite and stated that they would order the food.

In situations 2 and 8 in which the request was made by a person of lower status, the results showed that both Iranian EFL and English native participants mostly agreed that the request posed by the waiter was more impolite than the one made by the student. However, Persian speakers perceived the both situations as mostly/ slightly polite.

### Situation 3 & 5: Equal status (formal setting)

12 English native participants perceived the request in situation 3 as mostly/ slightly impolite while 2 of them rated it as mostly/ slightly polite. In addition, 23 Iranian EFL learners perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite whereas 12 rated it as mostly/ slightly polite. However, only four Persian speakers perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite and the rest perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite.

As regards the request situation 5, only one English native participant perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite while 13 rated it as mostly/ slightly impolite. Also, among the Iranian EFL learners, 29 of them perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite while 6 agreed that the request in this situation was mostly/ slightly polite. Moreover, 23 Persian speakers agreed that the request in this situation was mostly/ slightly impolite whereas 12 rated it as mostly/ slightly polite.

**Table 5**  
Participants'  
strategies in  
situations 3 and 5

Strategies/ Situations	3			5		
	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)
1. Directly refusing a request verbally or nonverbally	10	0	0	15	8	13
2. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using verbal expressions	2	0	0	3	2	5
3. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using non-verbal reactions	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Agreeing to the request and using positive verbal expressions	8	3	16	2	1	2
5. Agreeing to the request and using positive non-verbal reactions	0	0	3	0	0	1
6. Agreeing to the request and using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction	8	7	14	4	1	5
7. Agreeing to the request and using negative verbal expressions	5	4	2	5	2	5
8. Agreeing to the request and using negative non-verbal reactions	2	0	0	6	0	4

Table 5 showed the strategies which are used by all participants who perceived the requests in situation 3 and 5 as mostly/ slightly impolite or polite along with their frequency of use.

Most English native participants who perceived the request 3 as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would agree to the request without using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction while the participants who perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite tend to respond it politely and use expressions such as "Ok" and "Sure". Iranian EFL learners who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite mostly refused the request verbally and stated expressions such as "sorry, I am busy" or "It is none of my business". Although, some participants who perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite, they would agree to the request and use some positive expressions. On the other hand, Iranian EFL learners who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly polite tend to respond it politely.

However, most Persian speakers perceived the request 3 as mostly/ slightly polite and stated that they would agree to the request and use some positive polite expressions like "Of course", "Sure". Moreover, some of them stated that they would just fetch a glass of water without saying anything.

Considering situation 5, most of all three groups of participants rated it as mostly/ slightly impolite. Most of them stated that they would refuse the request directly either verbally (It is not my job, I hear but I do not want to answer) or non-verbally (I frown at him/ her). Also, some of them mentioned that they would complain about the way language was used for making request by using both verbal (Be polite, do not be rude) or non-verbal (I look at him frowning) expressions. Some of them also stated that they would agree to the request reluctantly and employ a number of negative expressions (you should tell it in a better way).



On the other hand, those participants who perceived the request 5 as mostly/ slightly polite stated that they would agree to the request and use some positive expressions (Ok, Sure). Some of them also stated that they would say nothing and just answer the phone.

Among eight request situations, all three groups perceived request 5 as the most impolite one. In situation 5, the request was made by the employee to another employee with the same status in a formal setting. This result might show that when a person ask a request which have not any politeness marker to another person with the same status, it would be perceived as more impolite. So, most of the participants refuse the request verbally or non-verbally. However, in situation 3, most Iranian EFL learners refused the request but English native speakers preferred to say nothing.

#### Situation 4 & 6: Equal status (informal setting)

With regard to situation 4, 13 English native participants and 21 Iranian EFL learners rated it as mostly/ slightly impolite while 1 and 14 respectively perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite. However, 26 Persian speakers rated it as mostly/ slightly polite whereas 9 perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite.

On the other hand, 12 English native speakers thought that the request in situation 6 was mostly/ slightly impolite whereas 2 agreed that it was mostly/ slightly polite. However, 27 Iranian EFL learners and 30 Persian speakers rated it as mostly/ slightly polite while 8 and 5 respectively perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite.

As regards all participants' strategies to confront with the request they perceived as mostly/ slightly impolite or polite, table 6 illustrates the results.

Strategies/ Situations	4			6		
	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)	EFL Learners (N=35)	English Native (N=14)	Persian Native (N=35)
1. Directly refusing a request verbally or nonverbally	20	12	17	0	0	1
2. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using verbal expressions	0	0	0	1	1	0
3. Complaining about the language which was used for making the request by using non-verbal reactions	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Agreeing to the request and using positive verbal expressions	9	2	11	17	5	10
5. Agreeing to the request and using positive non-verbal reactions	0	0	1	4	0	3
6. Agreeing to the request and using neither a verbal nor a non-verbal reaction	6	0	6	13	7	15
7. Agreeing to the request and using negative verbal expressions	0	0	0	0	1	4
8. Agreeing to the request and using negative non-verbal reactions	0	0	0	0	0	2

Table 6

Participants' strategies in situations 4 and 6

Most English native participants who perceived the request 4 as mostly/ slightly impolite agreed that they would refuse the request verbally through using such expressions as “Sorry, I cannot help you”, “I don’t have money at the moment”. Only one person who perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite mentioned that he agreed to the request and responded it politely. In addition, most of the Iranian EFL learners who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly impolite had the same reaction like English native participants. However, those participants who perceived the request as mostly/ slightly polite asserted that they would lend money by using some positive expressions (How much do you need?) and some of them stated that they would lend money without say anything.

Nevertheless, most Persian speakers perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite and stated that they would lend money by using some positive expressions (sure, here you are) and some of them agreed to the request using no special verbal or non-verbal reaction. Although some of them perceived it as mostly/ slightly polite, they stated that they would not lend the money.

Taking situation 6 into account, most English native participants who perceived it as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would agree to the request using no special verbal or non-verbal reaction and some of them using a number of positive verbal expressions such as “OK”, “Here you are”. However, Iranian EFL learners and Persian speakers mostly perceived the request in situation 6 as mostly/ slightly polite and stated that they would give the eraser and apply some positive expressions such as “Here you are”, “sure dear”, and “Take it”. In addition, some of them stated that they would agree to the request using no special verbal or non-verbal reaction. On the other hand, some Persian speakers who rated it as mostly/ slightly impolite stated that they would give the eraser and apply some negative expressions (you have to say please).

With regard to situations 4 and 6 in which the requests were made in informal settings, the request situation 6 was rated less impolite than the one in situation 4. This might show that people in an informal setting like a classroom would not expect a higher degree of politeness. Moreover, both Iranian EFL and Persian speakers rated the request 6 as mostly/ slightly polite; however, English native participants rated it as mostly/ slightly impolite. This might indicate that Iranian people are more benevolent and want to help other people.

The findings of this study show that requests without politeness markers were rated as mostly/ slightly impolite. However, in situations where the status of the interlocutors was unequal in a formal setting (workplace), the request without politeness markers was rated as polite. In other words, interlocutors do not regard a direct request strategy as a face-threatening act from another speaker of higher social status.

---

## Conclusion

The present study aimed at investigating three groups namely Iranian EFL learners, English native speakers and Persian native speakers’ perceptions of (im)politeness of request speech act in request situation without politeness marker.

The findings demonstrated that there was a significant difference between EFL learners and English native participants, and also between EFL learners and Persian speakers’ perceptions of (im)politeness of different request situations.

By comparing the three groups of participants who perceived a request as mostly/ slightly impolite, the writer provided information about their expectations of politeness in different situations. The results showed that all three groups perceived request 5 as the most impolite one. Moreover, the three groups rated request 7 as the least impolite one. Also, both Iranian EFL learners and Persian speakers perceived the request 6 as mostly/ slightly polite; however, most of English native speakers rated it as mostly/ slightly impolite.

It is hoped that the findings of this study can add to the body of knowledge in speech act studies in general and to our understanding of Iranian EFL learners and Persian native speakers' perception of (im)politeness in particular. Also, the findings should make an important contribution to the fields of politeness/ impoliteness studied. It is unfortunate that the study did not include follow-up interviews with the participants. Therefore, in terms of directions for future research, further work could involve cross-linguistic and cross cultural studies with larger samples and more situations to obtain more valid results.

1. Al-Marrani, Y. M. A. and Szalgie, A. B., 2010. Polite Request Strategies by Yemeni Females: A Socio-Pragmatic Study. *Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2 (6), pp.478–516.
2. Amooaliakbari, S. and Paramasivam, S., 2012. Iranian EFL Learners' Interlanguage Request Modifications: Use of External and Internal Supportive Moves. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(7), pp.1387–1396.
3. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., and Kasper, G., 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, N. J.: Albex.
4. Blum-Kulka, S. and Olshtain, E., 1984. Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), pp.196–213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196>
5. Bousfield, D., 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.167>
6. Culpeper, J., 1996. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), pp.349–367. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3).
7. Ellis, R., 2012. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. USA: Oxford University Press.
8. Félix-Brasdefer, J. C., 2010. Intra-Lingual Pragmatic Variation in Mexico City and San José, Costa Rica: A Focus on Regional Differences in Female Requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(11), pp.2992–3011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.015>. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.015>
9. Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., and Ogino, T., 1986. Universals of Linguistic Politeness: Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10(3), pp.347–371. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(86\)90006-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(86)90006-8). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(86\)90006-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(86)90006-8)
10. Jalilifar, A., 2009. Request Strategies: Cross-Sectional Study of Iranian EFL Learners and Australian Native Speakers. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), pp.46–61. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n1p46>
11. Lin, Y. H., 2009. Query Preparatory Modals: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Situational Variations in Request Modification. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(8), pp.1636–1656. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.12.007>.
12. Liu, C. N., 2007. *Pragmatics in Foreign Language Instruction: The Effects of Pedagogical Intervention and Technology on the Development of EFL Learners' Realization of «Request»* (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX).
13. Mohammadi, M. and Tamimi Sa'd, S. H., 2014. Native Speakers' Assessment of (Im) Politeness of Non-native Speakers' Requests. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 3(4), pp.23–40. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2013.591>
14. Rose, K. R., 1994. On the Validity of Discourse Completion Tests in Non-Western Contexts. *Applied linguistics*, 15(1), pp.1–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/15.1.1>. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/15.1.1>
15. Rue, Y. J., Zhang, G. and Shin, K., 2007. Request Strategies in Korean, 5th Biennial Korean Studies Association of Australasia Conference, 12–13 July 2007, pp.112–119. Perth, Australia.
16. Saidi, M. and Khosravi, M., 2015. EFL Learners' Perceptions of (Im)Politeness: The Possible Gender Differences. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), pp.1–11.
17. Abdulsattar, H. Q. and Farnia, M., 2014. A Cross-Cultural Study of Request Speech Act: Iraqi and Malay students. *Applied Research on English Language*, 3(6), pp.35–54.

## References

18. Sifianou, M., 1992. The Use of Diminutives in Expressing Politeness: Modern Greek versus English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 17(2), pp.155–173. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90038-D](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90038-D). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90038-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90038-D)
19. Tamimi Sa'd, S. H. and Mohammadi, M., 2014. A Cross-Sectional Study of Request Perspective Use among Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 3(5), pp.19–31. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2014.656>
20. Watts, R. J., 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615184>
21. Youssef, A. M. S., 2012. Study of Request Strategies Employed by Libyan and Malay Postgraduate Students at USM. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 2(2), pp.144–151. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v2i2.1631>

## Santrauka

### Bahareh Ghasempour, Maryam Farnia. Lyginamasis iranietišų EFL studentų ir amerikiečių (ne)mandagumo suvokimo tyrimas: prašymo raiškos atvejis

Mokyti kalbos – vadinas, mokyti kultūros. Kaip mes elgiamės ir kalbame, atspindi mūsų kultūrą. Prašymo, taip pat ir mandagumo raišką svetima kalba tiria daugelis mokslininkų (Liu, 2017; Jalilifar, 2009; Al-marrani ir Szaliev, 2010; Felix-Brasdefer, 2010; Youssef, 2012; Mohammadi ir Tamimi Sa'd, 2014). Šio tyrimo tikslas – ištirti, kaip iranietiški EFL studentai, persų kalbos studentai, kuriems persų kalba gimtoji, ir amerikiečiai, kalbantys anglų kalba, suvokia prašymą, kai nėra specialių mandagumo ženklų. Tuo tikslu buvo gauti 35 EFL studentų, 35 persų studentų, kuriems persų kalba gimtoji ir 14 anglų kalba kalbančių studentų rezultatai. Duomenys buvo renkami naudojant „open end“ klausimą *Discourse Completion Task* forma ir *Perception* klausimyno Likerto skalę, paimtą iš Saidi ir Khosravi (2015). Klausimą sudaro situacijos su įvairiais konteksto kintamaisiais, konkrečiai – priklausomybė nuo socialinio statuso. Buvo tiriami prašymai, sakomi aukštesnio socialinio statuso, tokio paties ir žemesnio statuso žmonėms. Dalyvių buvo prašoma įsivaizduoti save panašiose situacijose ir įvertinti kiekvienos situacijos prašymo mandagumą 4 balų Likerto sistemoje. Be to, jų buvo prašoma užrašyti, ką jie saktų tokioje situacijoje, kai nėra mandagumo ženklų. Klausimyno vertimas buvo pateiktas persams, kurių gimtoji kalba – persų. Rezultatai parodė, kad mandagumo suvokimas buvo ryškus tarp EFL studentų ir studentų, kurių gimtoji – anglų ir taip pat tarp EFL studentų ir persiškai kalbančių studentų. Be to, lyginant tris dalyvių, kurie suvokė prašymą kaip daugiau/ truputį nemandagų, grupes, rašytojas pateikė informaciją apie jų mandagumo lūkestį skirtingose situacijose. Manoma, kad šio tyrimo rezultatai gali prisidėti prie šnekos akto tyrimo apskritai ir prie mūsų supratimo apie iranietišų EFL studentų ir persų studentų (ne)mandagumo suvokimą.

## About the Authors

### Bahareh Ghasempour

MA student of English Language Teaching Amin Institute of Higher Education, Fooladshahr, Iran.

#### Academic interests

Sociolinguistics, genre analysis, English for specific purposes.

#### Address

Amin Institute of Higher Education, Institute of Foreign Languages, Fooladshahr, Isfahan Province, Iran.

#### E-mail:

rashmesi@yahoo.com

### Maryam Farnia

Assistant professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Payame Noor University, Iran.

#### Academic interests

Interlanguage pragmatics; cross-cultural pragmatics; im(politeness); genre analysis.

#### Address

Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Payame Noor University, PO Box 19395-3697, Tehran, Iran.

#### E-mail:

mfarnia@nj.isfpnu.ac.ir