การใช้กลยุทธ์คำขอร้องโดยครูไทยและครูฟิลิปปินส์

THE USE OF REQUEST STRATEGIES BY THAI AND FILIPINO TEACHERS

PAKIN ONCHAIYA

Burapha University

2021

การใช้กลยุทธ์คำขอร้องโดยครูไทยและครูฟิลิปปินส์

ภาคิน อ้นไชยะ

วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต
สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสาร
คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยบูรพา
2564
ลิขสิทธิ์เป็นของมหาวิทยาลัยบูรพา

THE USE OF REQUEST STRATEGIES BY THAI AND FILIPINO TEACHERS

PAKIN ONCHAIYA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR MASTER OF ARTS
IN ENGLISH FOR COMMUNICATION
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
BURAPHA UNIVERSITY
2021

COPYRIGHT OF BURAPHA UNIVERSITY

The Thesis of Pakin Onchaiya has been approved by the examining committee to be partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in English for Communication of Burapha University

Advisory Committee

..... Principal advisor
(Dr. On-usa Phimsawat)

Examining Committee

..... Principal examiner
(Assistant Professor Dr. Khomduen Phothisuwan)

..... Member
(Dr. Nattapat Pattana)

This Thesis has been approved by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences to be partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in English for Communication of Burapha University

..... Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
(Dr. Suchada Rattanawanitpun)
.....

60920231: MAJOR: ENGLISH FOR COMMUNICATION; M.A. (ENGLISH FOR COMMUNICATION)
KEYWORDS: Request Strategies, Pragmatic Competence, Social Status, Cultural Differences, Linguistic Competence

PAKIN ONCHAIYA : THE USE OF REQUEST STRATEGIES BY THAI AND FILIPINO TEACHERS. ADVISORY COMMITTEE: ON-USA PHIMSAWAT, 2021.

Requests are important speech acts that can be susceptible to misunderstanding. Especially for English as a foreign language (EFL), it can be difficult for them to use appropriate linguistic forms to express their requests and strategies to accomplish their intention. This present study aims at investigating the English request strategies used by 30 Thai and 30 Filipino teachers, as well as the differences in their request strategies regarding directness levels based on Schauer's (2009) taxonomy. By using a triangulation approach, two methods of data collection – Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) and interview – were utilized to investigate request strategies and additional complications that might affect the use of these strategies. The results revealed that Thai teachers used direct as much as indirect requests, while Filipino teachers mostly used indirect requests. There were significant differences between the groups of Thai and Filipino teachers in their use of six different strategies. In terms of the social aspect of making a request and other related information, both groups had high awareness of social status and social distance. From the interview, it was found that although Thai teachers had more difficulties in making requests caused by the lack of English proficiency. The present study's significance lies in the fact that in the linguistic field of pragmatics, people from different cultures showed their verbal behavior differently, especially request strategies due to various factors, such as pragmatic proficiency, pragmatic awareness, and interlanguage competence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the incredible assistance and support of a large number of people. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to my advisor, Dr. On-Usa Phimsawat, for her essential support, insightful suggestions, and constant encouragement during this project.

All committee members are acknowledged for their contributions, especially Dr. Suchada Rattanawanitpun, Asst. Prof. Dr. Somboon Chetchumlong, Asst. Prof. Dr. Khomduen Phothisuwan, and Dr. Nattapat Pattana. Asst. Prof. Rinda Warawudhi, who supported the data validation procedure, deserves special thanks. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to Mrs. Sumana Malihom for her invaluable help in teaching me about the study's statistics and assisting me with data analysis. My heartfelt thanks go out to all of the lecturers in Burapha University's Department of Western Languages for their inspiration and invaluable guidance during my Master's Program studies.

I would like to thank Director Chuan Kitikiatisak and Dr. Steven Chana Kitikiatisak for giving me the opportunity to finish my thesis and for their encouragement. Without their guidance and support, I will be unable to accomplish this degree.

I would like to thank all of the study participants for their time, effort, and involvement, especially the Thai and Filipino teachers. For their tremendous assistance and support, I am grateful to my Maryvit Sattahip School colleagues, Principal Hongthong Maneekhum, and Miss Kanokwan Kaewpirom. Without their generous sponsorship, this study would not have been feasible.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to my family, particularly my father, mother, wife, and children, for their unwavering support and encouragement in helping me reach my objectives.

Pakin Onchaiya

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ..... D
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... E
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... F
LIST OF TABLES ..... H
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 9
Statements and significance of the problems 9
Purposes of the study 13
Research questions 14
Contribution to knowledge 14
Scope of the study 14
Limitation of the study 15
Definition of terms 15
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEWS 17
1. Definition of Pragmatics 17
1.1 Speech act 18
1.2 Request strategies 19
1.3 Request strategies by Schauer (2009) 22
1.3.1 Direct request 23
1.3.2 Conventionally indirect requests 25
1.3.3 Non-conventionally indirect request 26
1.4 Modification devices 27
1.5 Politeness theory 28
2. Cultural differences 30
3. Workplace communication 32
3.1 Intercultural workplace communication 33

4. Related studies on request strategies 35
4.1 Single language studies 35
4.2 Interlanguage pragmatic studies 35
4.3 Cross-cultural studies 36
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 38
Research design 38
Participants 39
Research Instruments 39
Data collection 40
Data analysis 41
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS 42
Part I: Types and frequency of occurrence of request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers 42
Part II: The differences of request strategies between Thai and Filipino teachers by T-test 47
Part III: The reasons why each group of participants uses particular request strategies, social aspects 49
Social aspects 49
English proficiency aspect 52
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION 54
Summary of the findings 54
Discussion 55
Conclusion 59
Recommendation for further studies 61
REFERENCES 62
APPENDIX A 70
APPENDIX B 76
BIOGRAPHY 78

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1 Overview of request strategies by Schauer (2009) 23

Table 2 Frequencies and percentage of occurrences of the request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers.....43

Table 3 The t-test of request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers 47

Table 4 The consideration of interlocutor's social status and interlocutor's social distance by 30 Thai teachers. 49

Table 5 The consideration of interlocutor's social status and interlocutor's social distance by 30 Filipino teachers.....50

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statements and significance of the problems

The English language has become the world's most influential language and powerful than other languages when considering language opportunities (Chan, 2016). Chan measured the Power Language Index by looking at the geography, economy, communication knowledge, and diplomacy that each language created (2016). Therefore, English language skills were stressed in Thailand and other countries much more than in the past (Kirkpatrick, 2010). The critical aspect of language learning and teaching today is "communicative competence," which aims at developing learners and speakers of English for communication in the real context. The definition of communicative competence was mentioned by Hymes (1972), who stated that knowing and being able to speak a language involves possessing not only linguistics knowledge but also an ability to use that knowledge in communication, which requires the possession of social and cultural experience as well. In order to successfully achieve appropriate requests and intercultural communication, speakers need to acquire pragmatic knowledge to avoid being perceived as impolite by native English speakers or ESL speakers. Speakers of a language need to acquire sufficient knowledge of the target language's request speech acts, especially in English.

Many countries have developed verbal behaviors and politeness as part of their language culture, which change from language to language. In pragmatics, people in different cultures show their verbal behavior rather differently for various reasons, such as pragmatic proficiency, pragmatic awareness, and interlanguage competence. A lack of these reasons may cause misunderstandings and communication breakdowns, especially when intercultural communication takes place. According to Thomas (1983) and Wolfson (1989), requests are necessary speech acts that can be susceptible to misunderstanding. Native or fluent English speakers consider pragmatic errors to be more severe than syntactic or phonological errors. According to Searle (1969), requests are the speech acts in the illocutionary force of utterance. Many researchers have investigated the speech act of requesting, such as Fukushima1996, Kasper, 1997;

Taguchi, 2006; Hendriks, 2008; Jalilifar, 2009; Pinyo, 2010. Requests are the most frequently used speech acts in daily life compared to other speech acts. English learners or users cannot avoid making requests in their workplaces (Fraser, 1978). For example, speakers will need to ask for information, goods, or favors in their daily lives. Since the requirement of request utterance has various actions, the illocutionary force of request also varies widely. Especially for English as a foreign language (EFL) learners, it can be difficult for them to use appropriate linguistic forms to express their requests and strategies to accomplish their intention. Even if EFL learners make the correct contextual judgments, choosing appropriate linguistic forms to express their thoughts can be difficult for them due to their cultural background and possible first language transfer, as well as the variety of forms that can be employed to formulate a request (Omar, 2006; Woodfield, 2008). These are the reasons why requests are the most interesting speaking act, as many experts have discovered in recent years. According to House and Kasper (1987), Requests are directive speech acts meant to persuade the addressee to take a specific action. Because the illocutionary power of request varies greatly depending on the activity, requests are the most commonly utilized directives. The importance of requests and the reasons for their appropriate use, mentioned above, are evident in everyday utterances between interlocutors. They have to be aware and use request strategies carefully. In particular, in the workplace or on a daily basis, for example, between Thai and Filipino teachers in a private catholic school, there are always communication breakdowns. According to Clyne (1996), intercultural communication breakdowns in the workplace occur at both the discourse and pragmatic levels. In summary, misunderstandings between interlocutors occur because of a lack of pragmatic competence rather than language structure.

The obstacles in making requests between Thai and Filipino teachers at the Maryvit Sattahip School in Thailand were discovered over a three-month period, including several interesting aspects such as misunderstanding and communication breakdowns. When Thai teachers asked Filipino teachers to do something or for information, it appeared that the lack of pragmatic competence and verbal behavior caused problems. For example, when a Thai teacher asked a Filipino teacher to sign some school documents, they said, “sign this paper.” This utterance made Filipino teachers feel like they were forced to do the action, while Thai teachers were not aware

of how to use language to make requests in English appropriately. The worst-case scenario as a result was the intercultural and interaction traps in the workplace, causing frustrations at the communication. This example showed that it was difficult for non-native speakers, especially Thais, to understand English's appropriate language or pragmatic use.

On the other hand, when a Filipino teacher asked a Thai teacher to do something, such as check documents or reschedule a meeting or asked for help, the Thai teacher would misunderstand and need the requested to be further. The worst-case scenario was a misunderstanding, leading to a communication breakdown. Previous studies have found that possible factors leading to communication breakdowns consist of speakers' language proficiency, cultural differences, and interpersonal variables.

Many studies have shown that the lower proficiency levels of second-language speakers of English (L2) tend to use more direct strategies (e.g., Rose, 2000, Jalilifar, 2009). According to Jalilifar's study, most Iranian learners overgeneralize the use of direct requests. It appeared that Iranian learners rely on their L1 sociopragmatic knowledge while speaking to unfamiliar superiors. The results of this study indicated that with increasing proficiency level, the use of direct requests- mainly Imperative- decreases, and at the same time, the use of conventional and non-conventional indirect types of requests increases. It means that the higher proficiency levels language users tend to use indirect strategies, while lower proficiency levels language users tend to use direct strategies. The pragmalinguistic transfer at lower levels has influenced the learner's knowledge in terms of illocutionary force or politeness value assigned to particular linguistic form-functions in their native language. This example showed that language proficiency is the most important aspect of speakers' requests, which affects the use of request strategies.

Cultural differences are an essential factor that affects how interlocutors communicate due to capable speakers knowing what is acceptable and appropriate or not in a given context, particularly between Thais and Filipinos (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003). There are varieties of English in the ASEAN context in which the L1 transfer may affect the L2 production of requests. For Thailand, English is used as a foreign language; even though Thai people have learned English as the first foreign language in school, the English proficiency level in Thailand is different from many countries in

ASEAN, especially the Philippines (Wiriyachitra, 2002). Cultural differences might affect the use of requests by Thai and Filipino teachers in this study as well. For the Philippines, English is used as one of the official languages and is looked at as being in the outer circle of English, which is mainly used and recognized by the government, and in the fields of law and education on a daily basis (Bolton, 2008). The different aspects of the two countries in language proficiency and cultural differences might affect the use of request strategies. However, many elements cause communication breakdowns and patterns of pragmatism in requests.

Many cross-cultural studies (e.g., Félix-Brasdefer 2007; Olshtain & Cohen, 1989; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987; Takahashi, 1996; Hill, 1997) have investigated particular speech acts in various languages to find differences in request strategies in native and non-native speakers. A few studies have compared request strategies or pragmatic competence between non-native speakers in some workplaces. Many studies have focused on the production of speech acts across different proficiency groups, the effects of proficiency on speech acts, the impact of proficiency on learners' appropriate production of pragmatic functions, and the relationship between proficiency and pragmatic comprehension. These cross-cultural studies have revealed mixed findings in various aspects. For example, Jalilifar (2009) investigated the request strategies used by Iranian English learners as a foreign language (EFL) and Australians who speak English natively. The findings showed that the EFL learners with a higher proficiency often overused indirect requests, the native group used a more balanced strategy, and the learners with a lower proficiency overused direct requests. Not enough knowledge was acquired concerning the social status of the Iranian EFL learners; therefore, their social behavior was not demonstrated.

In contrast, the native group was described by a more balanced use of this strategy, while the lower proficiency overuses the direct strategy. The aspect of the social status of Iranian EFL learners had not acquired sufficient pragmatic knowledge to show their proper social behavior. Simultaneously, Tawalbeh and Al-Oqaily (2012) compared directness and politeness in Saudi Arabic speakers' requests with American English speakers. The findings revealed that native Saudi Arabic speakers used varied kinds of request strategies, while American speakers had a higher tendency to use conventional indirectness. These studies are examples of cross-cultural studies that

investigated both EFL and native English speakers. However, it is worth investigating whether or not different Thai and Filipino teachers' English requests are another aspect of the difference between EFL and English as a second language (ESL) speakers. These studies recommended that the importance of contextual factors in learners' acquisition of pragmatic competence should be considered for further research (Kasper & Rose, 2001).

According to Kasper & Rose (2001), the research gap concerns the circumstances surrounding a learner's acquisition of pragmatic competence. The majority of prior studies on request were conducted with a variety of native and non-native English speakers. However, little research has been done on request strategies among groups of Thai and Filipino English teachers. In the academic world, these two groups of teachers perform a critical role. They are the persons that teach English to their students by sharing their knowledge, competence, and experience. In addition, both Thai and Filipino teachers must be aware of the similarities and differences in cross-cultural concerns, such as the speech act of request. As a result, this research is a cross-cultural study of Thai and Filipino teachers' English request speech acts, which may help raise awareness of the importance of pragmatic knowledge and appropriate intercultural communication requests among Thai and Filipino teachers.

Purposes of the study

The present study is aimed at:

1. investigating what request strategies are employed by Thai and Filipino teachers.
2. examining whether or not there are any differences in request strategies in terms of directness level.
3. exploring the reasons why each group of participants uses particular request strategies and other relevant factors.

Research questions

1. What request strategies are used by Thai and Filipino teachers?
2. Are there any differences in request strategies in terms of directness level?
3. How do they employ these strategies in terms of directness and other relevant factors?

Contribution to knowledge

This research will shed more light on Thai and Filipino teachers' request strategies and how to develop their pragmatic ability that would help them become more competent users of the target language and fill the gap of cross-cultural study in the field of pragmatic competence in request. This study may also help raise Thai and Filipino teachers' awareness of the importance of pragmatic knowledge and appropriate intercultural communication requests.

Scope of the study

The participants in this study were teachers who work as English teachers in Maryvit Sattahip School's foreign language department, and they included:

1. Thai teachers having at least a year of teaching experience and varying levels of English ability. The researcher was not a participant in this study because he was an outsider.

2. Filipino teachers who have a minimum of 1-year of experience in teaching English.

The present study's primary focus is on making requests in the workplace by Thai teachers and Filipino teachers. According to the politeness theory, the situation from Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) was customized by social status and social distance.

This study employed a framework of request strategies by Schauer (2009), which summarized a combination of directness and strategy types in a Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) project by Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) and Trosborg (1995) taxonomy to investigate the request strategies of the Thai teachers and Filipino teachers.

Limitation of the study

This is a case study in a particular school in the eastern part of Thailand. There are some limitations that this study wants to investigate about making requests in the workplace and focus on the directness level of request strategies by WDCT only, which does not extend to other areas of pragmatic competence in requests. Purposive sampling was used to collect only thirty Thai teachers and thirty Filipino teachers from Maryvit Sattahip School in Thailand with different English levels; thus, the sample may not be generalized to account for the more significant population.

Definition of terms

1. Pragmatic competence

Pragmatic competence in this study refers to the ability to use an appropriate language form to express a particular meaning for a specific situation in the workplace and to understand a Thai teacher's and Filipino teacher's intention when he/she makes an utterance. It was measured by a written discourse completion test.

2. Written Discourse completion test (WDCT)

A written discourse completion test in this study is a test that requires respondents to read a Thai or English description of a situation and to write down their responses in each situation in English. The WDCT was designed for particular participants in a workplace context at school. In this study, the WDCT consisted of sixteen scenarios, where each scenario combined the setting, social status, and social distance. The setting explained the set of situations in each scenario. The social status describing the speakers as equal and higher ranks also be applied in each scenario to examine how the societies' relation affects request strategies selection.

3. Thai teachers

Thai teachers are native Thai teachers who teach English and use English on a daily basis at Maryvit Sattahip School. They have at least one year of English teaching experience, but they have different levels of English. All of them have experienced TOEIC test scores of 300-800 points.

4. Filipino teachers

Filipino teachers teach by using English at Maryvit Sattahip School at every level of the students. The Filipino teachers have a minimum TOEIC score of 600 based on the requirement of the school. They have a minimum of 1 year of English teaching experience in Thailand.

5. Request strategies

The request strategies in this study were categorized according to the degree of directness using Schauer's (2009) coding scheme. This classification scheme's directness category is based on Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989), Trosborg (1995), and Van Mulken (1996), which have been adjusted to better clarify the data in this study. A request utterance can be classified into one of three main categories (from most to least direct) based on the directness of the locutionary act: direct requests, conventionally indirect requests, and non-conventionally indirect requests.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEWS

This study aims to find patterns in Thai and Filipino teachers' request strategies, as well as differences in request strategies in terms of directness level. In addition to looking into why each group of participants employs specific request strategies and other relevant factors. This chapter provides an overview of related research and literature. The literature includes a theoretical foundation in pragmatism, focusing on topics related to the speech act, such as request methods, politeness theory, cultural differences, and workplace communication. There is also research on request methods that are related to single language studies, pragmatic interlanguage studies, and cross-cultural studies.

1. Definition of Pragmatics

The study of pragmatics began around 40 years ago with many philosophies that developed ideas concerning the functions and use of language by philosophers such as Austin (1962), Grice (1975), and Searle (1989). Two definitions are now commonly used to describe pragmatics from the perspective that is most relevant for the present investigation:

Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of their choices, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects on the use of language it has on other participants in the act of communication (Crystal, 1985, p. 240). On the other hand, pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society. (Mey, 2001, p. 6) based on the speech act theory (e.g., Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Moeschler, 2002), the cooperative principle (e.g., Grice, 1975), conversational implicature (e.g., Murray, 2010), and politeness theory (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1978; Eelen, 2014).

In summary, pragmatic competence is a crucial part of communication in the real context. Many researchers in this field try to emphasize that actual language use is an essential factor in pragmatics research, and the point of view of the user or production in social contexts must be studied to accomplish and appropriate use in

language communication. The cornerstones of pragmatics theory were described in the following Sections 1.1-1.3, especially in speech act and politeness theory.

1.1 Speech act

Many philosophers determined the speech act theory, such as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). Austin (1962), who is generally regarded as the father of pragmatics and speech act theory (Mey, 2001), believed that speakers use language to say things and do things. Thus, utterances could be regarded as speech acts. Based on this notion, he developed a system that distinguished three components of speech act:

1. the locutionary act (the actual words that the speaker uses),
2. the illocutionary act (the intention or force behind the words),
3. the perlocutionary act (the effect the utterance has on the hearer).

In the sentence "It is hot in here," for example. Using this component to investigate, we want to find out what the true meaning of interlocutor is. This sentence is a regular utterance in the locutionary act. It implies that the speaker meant the hearer's action in the illocutionary act. Furthermore, the hearer could witness the perlocutionary behavior in order to interpret the statement.

The investigation of the illocutionary deed is the key focus of this work. As Searle (1969, 1975, and 1976), one of Austin's students, who developed the speech act theory, noted that 'the illocutionary point of requests is the same as that of commands: both are attempts to get hearers to do something. Nevertheless, the illocutionary forces are clearly different. Moreover, another speech act theory of direct and indirect was also employed by Labov & Fanshel (1977). They emphasized that indirect requests inquiring about the speakers' ability to perform the desired action, such as those mentioned above, "Can you pass me the salt?" were more conventional than direct ones. Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) further developed the aspect of conventionality in request utterances, which formed the basis of the request strategy scheme used in the present study.

Even though many distinguished above were used, the classification system of Searle (1976) would not be underestimated because it most widely used to distinguish five speech act classes as follows;

1. Representatives refer to the state of affairs such as statements, claims, hypotheses, descriptions, suggestions, which speakers commit themselves to something being true.

2. Directives are attempted by speakers to get the hearer to carry out an action such as commands, requests, challenges, invitations, entreaties, and dares.

3. Commissives commit a speaker to some future course of action, such as promises or threats.

4. Expressives show the speaker's psychological state, for example, to thank or to apologize.

5. Declarations refer to the state of affairs they name, such as blessings, hiring, firings, baptisms, arrests, marrying, and declaring mistrials.

On a daily basis, we perform verbal actions in different types, and the activities carried out through language are called speech acts. From the classification of speech act types, the request is in the directives attempted by speakers to get the hearer to do something and is the main point of the present study.

This section showed various perspectives about the speech act, which used many theories to investigate the request speech act. Even though both Austin's and Searle's classifications of speech acts have been criticized for not being based on clear principles (Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983; Wierzbicka, 2003), their impact on the discipline should not be underestimated. The following is a summary of the request speech act strategies, which are the focus of this study.

1.2 Request strategies

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), requests are face-threatening acts in which both the speaker's and hearer's faces are at risk. When making a request, the speaker forces on the hearer's claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984, p. 201). To minimize the imposition, speakers tend to use more indirect request strategies that sound more polite and preserve the hearer's face. Blum-Kulka & Olshtain describe three major levels of the directness of request strategies, and then the three levels are divided into nine sub-levels of request strategies, which create the scale of directness.

Strategies classification in the study entitled a Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) of Blum-Kulka & Olshtain (1984) was considered

the well-known strategies classification in making requests. Even though the level of directness has many different options in theoretical, the three major levels of directness that can be expected to be the main focus of this study are categorized:

1. Direct request or explicit level, for example, “Close the door.”

2. The conventionally indirect level, these strategies are normally referred to as speech act literature. The example would be “Could you do it” or “Would you do it” as requests.

3. The nonconventional indirect level, the open-ended requests of indirect strategies used by interlocutors for the implementation of the act or by reliance on contextual clues, for example, “it is cold in here.”

Defining unit for analysis what request strategy is aimed at the sequence of utterance from discourse completion test. This classification proposed by Hlum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) in CCSARP was applied. In this model, the first three segments are recognized for request utterance: (a) Address term, (b) Head Act, (c) Adjunct(s) to Head act. For example, in the sentence,

Somchai, could you lend me 5,000 baht for a month. I should pay my tuition by the end of this month.

a. “Somchai” is the Address term.

b. “could you …” is the Head act.

c. “I should pay …” is the Adjunct to Head act.

From the example of the segmentation, only the head act is realized in classifying the directness levels in request.

These categories are expected to be displayed in all languages studied. The distribution of strategies is meant to show the relative degree of directness preferred in making requests in any language compared to another in the same situation. The list of nine request categories is shown below.

The request strategies in the following classification are ordered according to the decreasing degree of directness. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989 as cited in Francis, 1997, p. 28) summarized a combination of the level of directness and strategy types in Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) as follows:

1. Mood derivable: Utterances in which the grammatical mood of the verb signals illocutionary force (e.g., “Close the door.”). The word “close” at the beginning

of the utterance is the head act which shows the intention of the speaker to request action from the hearer.

2. Performatives: Utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named (e.g., “I tell you to close the door.”). “you” is explicitly named by the speaker, which intends to specify the person to do the action.

3. Hedged performatives: Utterances in which naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions (e.g., “I would like to ask you to close the door.”). The word “you” is modified by “I would like to ask” to show hedging expression of the speakers.

4. Obligation statements: Utterances which state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act (e.g., “Sir, you'll have to close the door.”). The word “Sir” is the address term. “you’ll have to …” is the intent of the speaker to show responsibility or task of the hearer to carry out the act.

5. Want statements: Utterances which state the speaker's desire that the hearer carries out the act (e.g., “I want you to close the door.”). “I want you to ….” is the speaker’s desire of the utterances.

6. Suggestory formulae: Utterances that contain a suggestion to do something (e.g., “How about cleaning up?”). This example shows that the speaker gives the suggestion to the hearer to carry out the act by some guideline of action.

7. Query-preparatory: Utterances containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g., ability, willingness) as conventionalized in any specific language (e.g., “Would you mind moving your car?”). The word “Would you… or Could you…” are at the beginning of the utterances to show mitigation of the speakers.

8. Strong hints: Utterances containing partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act (e.g., “The game is boring.”). This example shows the speakers’ meaning to get some action from the hearer by avoiding the real intention but using strong motion to give utterance. The real meaning is that the speaker does not want to watch or play in this game anymore.

9. Mild hints: Utterances that make no reference to the request proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as requests by context (e.g., “We’ve been playing this game for over an hour now.”). From this example, the speakers use more proper

utterance to mitigate the real intention. The real meaning is the speaker wants to go or change to other activities.

A second request strategy framework that considered the impact of second-language speakers of English (L2) learners and native speakers' request strategy use was developed by Trosborg (1995). Although Trosborg's taxonomy is similar to that of the CCSARP in several aspects, there are some differences. For example, the equivalent of CCSARP direct strategies "want statements" are classified as conventionally indirect and divided into two categories (wishes and desires/needs). This points out that although there may be some consensus on the classification of several categories, there are some arguments on a definite categorization system for request strategies. So that, in Schauer's study, he combined both the CCSARP and Trosborg's (1995) taxonomy to investigate the classification systems for his study.

1.3 Request strategies by Schauer (2009)

The directness categories in Schauer (2009) slightly modified the classification to clarify better the data, based on Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989), and Trosborg (1995). The directness of the locutionary act, a request utterance, can be assigned to one of three major categories (from most to least direct requests), consisting of direct requests, conventionally indirect requests, and non-conventionally indirect requests will be discussed in more detail below in Table 1.

Table 1 Overview of request strategies by Schauer (2009)

Direct requests	
Imperatives	"Speak louder, please."
Performatives	
Unhedged	"I ask you to close the door."
Hedged	"I want to ask you the way to school."
Want statements	"I would like to enter the room."
Locution derivable	"Where is the St.Stephen building?"
Conventional Indirect requests	
Suggestory formula	"How about lending me some of your records?"
Availability	"Do you have time to finish this questionnaire for me?"
Prediction	"Is there any chance that we can meet another time?"
Permission	"Could I borrow those books that you are using, please?"
Willingness	"Would you mind filling in a questionnaire for me?"
Ability	"Can you open the door for me, please?"
Non-Conventionally indirect requests	
Hints	"I have to meet someone in this school."

1.3.1 Direct request

The speaker's intent is obvious in the direct request category, but the hearer's inferential process length is short (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). This category consists of: Imperatives, performatives, want statements, and locution derivable.

1. Imperatives are the most direct forms of requests because they leave little room for misunderstanding and show that the speakers do not want to persuade their interlocutor or give reasons. For example, "Hey, move out of the way" or "Speak louder, please." As the example indicates, imperatives can be part of a request utterance

that also contains elements that downtone the request's force, such as the politeness marker "please."

2. Performatives are the second direct request strategy in Schauer (2009). consisting of two subcategories: unhedged performatives and hedged performatives. These two strategies clearly state the request's illocutionary force, including a performative verb.

2.1 Unhedged performatives, for example, "I ask you to close the door" or "I'm asking you if you *could* give me some more advice on where to sit." The second example shows unhedged performative, which be softened by past tense modals such as *could*. Like imperatives, unhedged performatives are not modified by the inclusion of downtoning elements. This request utterance is generally regarded as impolite, which is commonly used, for example, in the military.

2.2 Hedged performatives also contain a performative verb. However, their illocutionary force is softened by a verb immediately preceding the performative verb. For example, "So I want to ask you if we could *maybe* arrange a meeting during the holidays" or "Sorry, I've difficulties in finding material for my essay, so I thought I *could* ask you to bring an article." Both examples show that speakers can reduce the illocutionary force of the request by employing past tense modals "Could" or downtoners such as "maybe" or "possibly." The illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified by using modal verbs or verbs expressing an intention. For example: "I must/have to ask you to clean the kitchen right now." In the sentence above, the speaker delivers a request using a modal verb to be more polite. By adding this modal verb, the power of request will be reduced.

3. Want statements are used to explicitly state speakers' desire, wish or need that the interlocutors carry out the requested action. These utterances in this category were classified as direct strategies in the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) and as conventionally indirect in Trosborg (1995). Schauer's study categorized want statements as direct strategies and follow the CCSARP. For example, "Excuse me, I would like to enter the room" or "I really like you to complete it if you could find the time."

4. The CCSARP defines locution derivable requests as utterances derived directly from the semantic meaning of the locution. In Schauer (2009), the majority of

requests in this category are requests for directions. For example, “Erm, excuse me, sir, where is the St.Stephen building?” or “Which way is the St.Stephen building?”. The illocutionary intent is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the locution. For example: “Madam, you’ll have to/should/must/ought to move your car.” The speaker uses a locution derivable strategy in making his request. It seems from the use of modal “have to, should to” in the sentence. The function is to create politeness and derive the semantic meaning of the request.

1.3.2 Conventionally indirect requests

The request strategies in this category contain, as their name indicates or a conventionalized linguistic form that is commonly used to make requests, but the inclusion of which makes the illocutionary force less clear and softens the request’s impact interlocutor. Therefore, the hearer needs to be aware of modal verbs such as “Can” to trigger some action and not just enquire about the hearer’s ability. Schauer (2009) followed Trosborg’s (1995) and Warga’s (2004) subcategories of conventionally indirect requests to investigate in his study consist of the suggestory formula, availability, prediction, permission, willingness, and ability.

1. Suggestory formula can be realized through different structures or certain languages. The illocutionary intent of the request utterance is phrased as a suggestion. For example, “How about lending me some of your records?” or “Why don’t you come with me?”.

2. Availability category addresses the interlocutors’ possible other commitments by enquiring about their temporal availability. For example, “Somchai, I know you’re busy, but do you have time to finish this questionnaire for me?”. By using this strategy, speakers show consideration toward their interlocutors because they provide a possible reason to reject the request-lack of time.

3. Prediction categories are frequently employed by speakers to distance themselves from the request by formulating the utterance in an impersonal way. For example, “Excuse me, is it possible to see you during the holiday?” or “Is there any chance that we can meet another time?”. In this category, lower-status interlocutors often use requests toward higher-status interlocutors, as their content signals that the hearer can predict probability.

4. Permission is drawn the attention of speakers because they are the focus of request. For example, “Excuse me, could I get through, please?” and “Could I borrow those books that you are using, please?”. The speakers soften the request’s illocutionary force by clearly conveying to the interlocutors that they are in the position of power to grant permission. The illocutionary force can be further reduced by including downtoning devices, such as politeness markers which are “please,” “will/would.”

5. Willingness is used to indicate that the speakers are aware that no obligation exists on the hearer’s part to carry out the desired action. For example, “Would you mind moving our meeting a bit?” and “Would you mind filling in a questionnaire for me?”. In Trosborg’s (1995) coding scheme, request utterance in this category may also be embedded in expressions of appreciation, hope. For example, “It would be grateful if you could bring them in tomorrow for me.”

6. Ability concentrates on the hearers’ ability, which addresses their mental or physical capacity to perform the action referred to in the utterance. For example, “Peter, can you open the door for me please?”. As the example shows, the illocutionary force can again be decreased using downtoning devices, such as politeness markers or past tense modals.

1.3.3 Non-conventionally indirect request

This category constitutes the least direct category of request utterance. Even though they were originally divided into two subcategories consist of mild and strong hints, Schauer’s (2009) coding scheme follows later studies on hints in requests and combines all the hints into one category. By using this category, the speaker intends to get the hearer to carry out some implied requested act in such a way that the recognition of his or her intention will not be grounded in the utterance meaning of the hint (Weizman, 1989). For example, “I have to meet someone in this school” and “Excuse me.” Hints are the least transparent forms of request which take the interlocutor longer to decode than the more direct and obvious strategies, such as hedged performatives or locution derivable requests. Compared to direct and conventionally indirect requests, hints are also more likely to be misinterpreted or not recognized as a request.

Each strategy consists of two aspects: Head acts refer to the main expression for making the request, and supportive moves refer to reason expression of the requestor other supportive information or politeness markers. For example, “Excuse me, “Can I

borrow your pencil?". "Excuse me" is a supportive move, and "Can I borrow your pencil?" is the head act of this sentence.

In addition, in these strategies, the speakers have their mitigating of the request, which can be internal, such as to request perspective, syntactic and other downgraders, and upgraders and external such as adjuncts to the head act (Blum-Kulka & Olhstain, 1984, p. 203-205) which were reviewed in the next section below as modification devices.

1.4 Modification devices

Another essential aspect that is used to study speech acts of request is "modification devices." Modification devices are used to soften the impact of requests as FTA; speakers also use external and internal modifications, which each function can be either moderate or degrade the request.

External modifiers, which are also called "Adjunct to the head Acts," occur in the context of a speech act and are optional clauses, which modify the illocutionary force indirectly according to the categories by Edmondson & House (1989), and House & Kasper (1981). For example, "You have beautiful handwriting, would it be possible to borrow your notes for a few days?" this sentence uses a sweetener strategy.

For internal modifiers, these modifiers will appear in supportive moves of the speech act, which can be divided into downgrades and upgrades. Downgraders are used to moderate the request's illocutionary force, while upgraders are used to enhance the request's illocutionary force. Furthermore, downgraders are divided into syntactic downgraders and lexical downgraders. For example, in the interrogative strategies, "Could you do the cleaning up?" this sentence uses a syntactic downgrader.

For second-language speakers, direct requests do not pose a problem as they are similar in most languages. In relation to indirect requests, second language speakers may face a problem, particularly Thai teachers in this study. Even though they have learned to use indirect request strategies in their mother tongue and they are part of their pragmatic competence in their native language, they are not always transferable to another language. Blum-Kulka (1982, p. 33) pointed out that "conventional indirect speech acts represent a special case of interdependence between conventions of language and conventions about the use of language." This interdependence can be differentiated in different languages and cultures. Therefore, when learning a new

language, learners need to learn the strategies that are considered appropriate in that language.

Requests are considered face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1978). The speaker faces the hearer's claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition by making a request. The variety of direct and indirect ways for making requests seemingly available to speakers in all languages is probably socially motivated by the need to reduce the imposition involved in the act itself. This aspect is related to politeness theory, which is reviewed in the next section below.

1.5 Politeness theory

This section focuses on politeness theories that are of particular relevance for interlanguage pragmatics in various contexts. The studies of Eelen (2014), Fraser (1990), and Watts (2003) provide a general overview of linguistic politeness. While Chen (1993), Mao (1994), Pizziconi (2003), Fukada & Asato (2004) focus their studies on the politeness theory in the Asian context. These studies all mentioned that similar to speech act theory, the cooperative principle, and the conversational implicature concept, politeness theory is considered one of the cornerstones of pragmatics research. The early study which concentrated on linguistic politeness was Lakoff (1973, 1977). She mentioned that the pillars of our linguistic and non-linguistic interactions are to make yourself clear and be polite. She also proposed the three rules of politeness, including:

1. Formality: Don't impose/remain aloof.
2. Hesitancy: Allow the addressee his options.
3. Equality or camaraderie: Act as though you and the addressee were equal/ make him feel good (Lakoff, 1977, p. 88).

Lakoff emphasized that the appropriate rules of politeness have to be selected by the speaker depending on the conversation's contextual conditions. However, even he concentrated on contextual conditions, he also focuses on the status between interlocutors. For example, if Western speakers addressed a higher status hearer by their first name when they had not previously been allowed to do so, it would be considered impolite. For the present study, the participants are inequality, making them feel comfortable making equal utterance addressees such as colleagues or friends.

The importance of factors about status differences between the interlocutors and the speaker's relative power and the hearer was also stressed by Brown & Levinson (1987) in their investigation of linguistic politeness. In addition to the two factors mentioned above, they included an additional element in their study, which then formed the third factor of their investigation of linguistic politeness, namely the degree of imposition involved in the hearer's utterance. The interlocutors' status and the degree of the imposition involved in the individual request will provide the basis of request strategies.

Another essential aspect of the politeness theory by Brown & Levinson (1987) are the three basic ideas: face, face-threatening acts (FTAs), and politeness strategies. In social interaction, such as workplace and various activity of interlocutors, the speaker has the following options: (1) to do the act badly "on record," (2) to use positive action "give face" (positive politeness), (3) to use adverse action "negative politeness," (4) to perform the act in a way that will enable—these or her to avoid taking responsibility for doing it "off the record."

In Asian countries, Philippine society is considered a unique blend of eastern and western cultures resulting from trade and conquest in earlier times (Quisumbing, 2004), while any country has never colonized Thailand. One of the core values of Filipino personhood is equality. "Kapwa" implies a moral obligation to treat others as equals. That is, "people are just people despite their age, clothes, diplomas, color or affiliations" (De Guia, 2008). On the other hand, Thais place great value on respectful behavior and submissiveness (Knutson, 1994). In addition, "Thais are taught to obey and respect people with higher status by birth, education, or knowledge and age" (Nakata & Dhiravegin, 1989).

Therefore, politeness serves to minimize such face threats. The notion of "politeness" is socially determined as it is related to social differentiation and making appropriate choices that are situationally dependent and may differ for all interlocutors (Coulmas, 2013). To put it another way, what is considered polite or impolite may vary according to different contexts and cultures as it can be interpreted differently by people who believe in different sets of values.

2. Cultural differences

Familiarity with the language norm or first-language speakers of English (L1) is very important for interlocutors' communication. When they react toward their interlocutors, they need to be aware of appropriate behavior to avoid impolite or inappropriate utterances. What is considered appropriate or polite by speakers in a particular language like English is cultural norms. Cultural norms are what make a request appropriate or polite by speakers in a particular language. As Gudykunst & Kim (2003) mentioned the relationship between culture and language, human culture development is made possible through communication. Through communication, culture is transmitted from one generation to another. Culture and communication are intertwined, according to Hall (1959); Hall maintains that "culture is communication" and "communication is culture." In other words, how we communicate results from where we were raised and where we learned the language. However, we were not aware of how culture influences our general communication behavior in a particular language.

Gudykunst & Kim (2003) emphasized that culture always affects the way interlocutors communicate as a result of capable speakers know which what acceptable and appropriate in a given context or not. The reason why they know this because they have been socialized into a particular culture and aware of the rules or expectations from an early age. Especially for Filipino teachers in this study, they have been raised and socialized from a particular culture close to the English norm. So that it easier for them to understand and communicate appropriately using English. A good example in English culture, small children are frequently told to "mind their p's and q's," which means that they have to remember to say "please" and "thank you." This example showed that we had learned the process of L1 socialization in each language from an early age. The important thing is that members of a particular culture tend not to think of these rules as culture-specific but often assume that these rules will be wildly acceptable.

Another definition of Kachru (1999) makes the link between pragmatics and culture very clear:

By culture, he means "the pattern of meanings embodied in symbolic forms, including actions utterances and meaningful objects of various kinds, by virtue of which individuals communicate with one another and share their experiences, conceptions,

and beliefs" (Thompson, 1990, p.132). Culture is not static; it evolves as people conduct their daily lives. Nevertheless, culture also denotes a body of shared knowledge, that is, what people must know in order to act as they do, make the things they make, and interpret their experience in the distinctive way they do (Holland & Quinn, 1987, p.4). "Act" in this sense includes verbal acts, whether in the spoken or in the written mode. The shared knowledge in verbal behavior refers to the familiar conventions followed in using language, which makes it easier for us to interpret or make sense of one another's utterances and actions. (Kachru, 1999, p.77)

According to Kachru (1999), interlocutors of a particular language need to have access to encode and decode the meaning of utterance using shared knowledge. If not or unfamiliar with the norms, it might be difficult for them to understand what they intend to communicate in a manner.

In 1912, the book called "Qualifications for being a refined person" in Thailand was published with the purpose of teaching people proper behavior. The norms in this book, such as not speaking up before the other finishes his/her turn, are, for the most part, still considered appropriate and polite.

According to Boonkongsaen (2013), she investigated the use of refusal strategies conducted in English between Filipinos and Thais. Data were collected through a discourse completion task (DCT). The result showed that both groups preferred to use indirect strategies to the direct ones. In general, Filipinos were more direct than Thais when dealing with refusals. Thais were less direct than Filipinos when declining the interlocutor of higher status. As language and culture are intimately related, English refusal strategies used by Filipinos and Thais reflected tendencies in their social norms.

Many definitions of culture and examples above show the importance of culture, affecting language in pragmatic competence. The rules and norms in each culture may vary according to their values and traditions. For the present study, the cultural differences between Thai and Filipino teachers are important aspects that cannot be overlooked because they have been socialized from different contexts and norms.

3. Workplace communication

The researcher analyzed related workplace communication research conducted in English over the previous two decades in this part. The perception of the function and use of English in a particular area or job is a major concern in the English for Special Purposes (ESP) program. In addition, various sociolinguistic researchers have explored how people use their language to communicate in their working lives or in their daily lives as a result of the emergence of a globalized workforce and the widespread usage of English as the official workplace language.

The important step in establishing the field of workplace discourse was the development of a methodology that created opportunities for crucial access to real workplace communication. This allowed authentic interaction research rather than the perception of communicative behavior, which is notoriously unreliable (Angouri, 2010; Kasper, 1997). In their research on multicultural factories in Australia, Michael Clyne (1996) and his colleagues were influential in authentic interaction research. In their study, the researchers aimed to provide data on workplace communication in English between immigrants to Australia from different non – native English speaking countries and cultural backgrounds. The analysis investigated 182 hours of recordings involving 39 key informants derived from 8 different places, including factories, a catering section, offices, and a parents' group meeting at a multicultural high school. The team initially had meetings with management, unions, and workers in collecting this data, followed by fieldworker visits where communication patterns were observed and later recorded. There were examples of a number of different speech acts from the data collection, such as receiving and making requests, instructions, and complaints, and giving advice. A principal focus in the analysis was an intercultural communication breakdown, and the researchers used triangulation in the form of participant interviews to support their understandings.

This project result highly influenced the establishment of the possibility of collecting authentic recordings as information about the workplace and was taken by the longstanding language in the workplace project in New Zealand (Holmes, 1996). The result was a participatory approach, which reduced the researcher's involvement in avoiding interaction's naturalness.

According to the success of the research which was mentioned above, many researchers have developed and adapted this philosophy around the world, including Angouri (2007) in studying multinational organizations in Europe, Schnurr & Chan (2011) in studying companies in Hong Kong, Ladegaard (2011) in studying global business corporations, as well as several researchers working in the United Kingdom (e.g., Koester, 2010; Mullany, 2007; Richards, 2006). Consequently, there is growing knowledge of authentic workplace talk and analysis of these interactions, providing useful information about how people talk in workplaces daily. Related to this present study, the workplace as in a school is another context for exploring language use in a natural situation.

Li (2000) is another longitudinal study of request speech act in the workplace. This study was conducted at an inner-city job training program operated by the Chinese American Association (CAA) and later at workplaces in the Northeastern United States. Twenty Chinese immigrant women from Mainland China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Burma participated in this study. The researcher observed classrooms, programs, communities, and workplaces. Ming, the youngest participant in the group, is the researcher's key participant and was observed by the researcher for 18 months. Ming's story shows that making requests in a second language is the linguistic and socialization process. Sociocultural information is encoded in the organization of conversational discourse; L2 learners acquire implicit knowledge of the principle of social order, the system of belief, and sociolinguistic convention. Ming's initially used an indirect requesting style even by Chinese standards. This study showed and supported that the language norm of L1 affects L2 in request speech acts in workplaces due to socialization.

3.1 Intercultural workplace communication

The cornerstone of research into intercultural workplace communication tends to combine the preoccupation with essential cultural (national, ethnic, linguistic) differences between people working together and their effect on their interpersonal relationships and productivity, with the arguments and goals of either diversity management or anti-discrimination (Lahti & Valo, 2017). This combination's effects are reflected in the theoretical frameworks widespread in mainstream intercultural workplace communication research: information and decision-making, social identity

and classification, and modern critical theory (Lahti & Valo, 2017; see also Mannix & Neale, 2005).

The information and decision-making framework focus on how differences in individuals' culturally shaped interpretations, knowledge, and skills hinder or enhance workplace performance in building interlocutors' understanding, problem-solving, or innovation (see Mannix & Neale, 2005). The social identity and categorization framework considers different cultural memberships as triggering the building of subgroups that prevents individuals from developing relationships and sharing information between interlocutors. The critical modern framework (Baxter & Asbury, 2015) elicits the systemic oppression of culturally non-mainstream employees that undermines their wellbeing and efficiency. When these frameworks are put together, one can see how intercultural workplace communication has been seen as a "double-edged sword" (e.g., Stahl et al., 2010). In other words, intercultural communication at work may indicate misunderstandings, intergroup bias and discrimination, and enhanced decision-making, learning, and synergy.

Culturally diverse employees with different first languages, values, schemes for perception and conduct have been argued to experience misunderstandings (e.g., Mak & Chui, 2013; Peltokorpi, 2007) and favor interactions with those colleagues whom they perceive to be culturally similar to them (e.g., Ferguson & Porter, 2013; Vallaster, 2005). Moreover, organizations subject the representatives of cultural minority groups to sanctioning mistreatment and exerting pressures on them to conform to the mainstream workplace culture (Kamenou & Fearfull, 2006). At the same time, it has also been proposed that cultural differences associated with employees' diverse perspectives, knowledge, and skills can enhance organizational performance in terms of information processing, problem-solving, innovation, and intercultural learning (e.g., Ely & Thomas, 2001; Méndez García & Pérez Cañado, 2011).

In each notion of an intercultural workplace, interactions are the consequence of the limited conceptualization of culture and its communication relationship. All the research mentioned above focuses on cultural differences among people interacting in the workplace associated with their national or ethnic backgrounds (in some cases, also "race" is presented as a transparent proxy for ethnicity). The underlying assumption is that culture is synonymous with nation/ethnicity as an objective identity and previous

fact. Such culture entails a static and massive set of values, skills, experiences, perception modes, and psychological states that are omnipresent, “naturally” shared by all group members, and expressed in communication.

4. Related studies on request strategies

4.1 Single language studies

Many studies have investigated request strategies used in a single language, such as Rue, Zhang & Shin (2007). They investigated request strategies in 12 Korean office workers and focused on the social status of the request. The findings showed that more direct strategies are used for higher status addressees. Most of the participants preferred conventionally indirect strategies.

Moreover, Shams & Afghari (2011) used questionnaires to investigate gender and culture’s effect on indirect request comprehensibility. They investigated 60 Persians divided by gender by including 20 items of which situation and implied indirect request. The finding showed that culture’s effect on indirect speech act interpretation was significant, but gender had no effect.

The strategies used in these studies imply that depending on their pragmatic feature or culture in their language, it affects the use of request strategies speech act in single language studies.

4.2 Interlanguage pragmatic studies

These studies aimed to investigate pragmatic knowledge and learners’ development in a foreign language context. Most studies in this section have been done in English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as a second language (ESL).

Xiao-lee (2011) investigated the effect of explicit and implicit instructions of request strategies in online communication of Chinese EFL learners divided into two groups of explicit and implicit. Two groups were instructed differently and were given a pre-test and post-test DCT and role play. The findings found that the explicit group progressed more than the implicit group. Another study by Farahian et al., (2012), studied the effectiveness of explicit instruction of refusal, offers, and requests. The finding showed that refusals’ explicit instruction increased the participant groups’ second language (SL) pragmatic ability.

However, some studies did not have the same conclusion as Xiao-lee (2011). Vahid Dastjerdi & Rezvani (2010) studied explicit and implicit English learners' ability and user requests' ability. The result revealed that the significant effect of both explicit and implicit on learners' production of requests. In another study, Jalilifar (2009) conducted a study on 69 Persian EFL learners and 10 Australian native English speakers to find request strategies used by each group. This study also used DCT to collect the data. The finding showed that as the proficiency level increased, learners' use of direct requests decreased. In the aspect of conventional and non-conventional strategies increase, but the group of lower proficiency is overuse of direct request.

Moreover, many studies focused on modifying requests that look into the internal and external modification of requests. Martínez-Flor (2008) examined whether the occurrence of request modification devices takes place in films. He also investigated internal and external modifiers, which are similar to Hassan & Rangasawmy (2014). This study's findings show that a longer length of stay helps the learners modify their request utterances more skillfully with internal and external modifiers to make them appropriate according to the context. According to Martínez-Flor (2008), most of the request moves identified in the films analyzed are modified using these devices. For instance, all types of internal and external modifiers are found. Different sociopragmatic variables, such as the speaker's intentions, participants' relationships, or the degree of politeness, have been considered paramount for the appropriate selection and use of these request modification devices.

4.3 Cross-cultural studies

In this section, the researcher looked at studies that looked into how a particular speech act in different languages to determine native speaker request strategies. In addition, these investigations aimed to discover the parallels and differences between languages or English in other countries.

According to Hilbig's (2009) study, she tried to investigate Lithuanian and British English request strategies using the principle from Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper's (1989) CCSARP. The data were collected from Lithuanians and English speakers using DCT and open-ended questionnaires. The findings showed that both groups tend to use conventionally indirect requests, but Lithuanian speakers used more

direct strategies than English speakers, and they had a tendency to use more positive politeness strategies.

As indirectness and politeness are essential aspects in cross-cultural studies, many researchers have been drawn to this field of study. For instance, Tawalbeh and Al-Oqaily's study (2012) compared directness and politeness in requests of Saudi Arabic speakers with American English speakers. The findings revealed that native Saudi Arabic speakers used varied kinds of request strategies, while American speakers tended to use conventional indirectness more.

Moreover, many studies focus on the modification of requests, which looks into the internal and external modification of requests. Martínez-Flor (2008) examined whether the occurrence of request modification devices takes place in films. He also investigated internal and external modifiers, which are similar to Hassan and Rangasawmy (2014). This study's findings show that the longer length of stay helps learners modify their request utterances more skillfully with internal and external modifiers to make them appropriate according to the context.

Despite these previous studies, there is a gap in the research concerning the speech act of request. Few studies have investigated the cross-cultural differences of English request strategies between Thai and Filipino teachers with differing English and intercultural pragmatic competence backgrounds. In ESL and EFL contexts in particular, such as with Thai and Filipino teachers, the differences in English language use are additional aspects that support the previous studies in one way or another.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to find out what request strategies Thai and Filipino teachers use, whether there are any differences in request strategies in terms of directness levels, and how they use them. This chapter discussed the research design, the procedure of selecting participants, the instruments, and the data collection processes.

Research design

Mix methodology was used to examine in this study to reveal the pattern of request strategies by Thai teachers and Filipino teachers and investigate the differences of request strategies by Thai teachers and Filipino teachers.

By using the triangulation approach, both a quantitative – Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) – and qualitative – interviews – approach were used to investigate request strategies and additional information that might affect the participants' use. The WDCT applied both Schauer's (2009) and Pinyo's (2010) concepts of pragmatic competence in the request framework, and the explanation of request strategies selection was based on Schauer's (2009) coding scheme of directness framework. The other aspect of social status and social distance awareness were collected by interviewing the participants.

The frequency formula was used to calculate the occurrence of request strategies in the quantitative approach, and the percentage formula was utilized to explore the strategies. The differences in Thai and Filipino teachers' request strategies were investigated utilizing a quantitative approach employing a t-test.

Apart from the qualitative approach, a Semi-structured interview was employed to find answers to three questions. The first question was asked whether the interlocutors' social status influenced their utterance in each situation. The second question was whether the interlocutors' social distance influenced their utterance in each situation and how it did. The third question was asked whether they have any

problem with requesting to focus on why each group of participants use particular request strategies and elicit other related information based on the WDCT form.

Participants

The study employed qualitative purposive sampling (Palinkas et al., 2015). Thirty Thai and thirty Filipino teachers from Maryvit Sattahip School took part in the study. Both sets of English teachers had to be teaching English in Thailand for at least a year in order to be considered for the study. They have varied levels of teaching experience and English language proficiency. All of the participants have worked together as friends or colleagues in the background. Participants commonly communicated in English at the workplace.

Research Instruments

The present study employed two sets of instruments: a written discourse completion test (WDCT) and semi-structured interviews. All of the instruments were administered in the pilot study to test the reliability and validity. Therefore, it was used in the actual research after being revised. Below is the description of each instrument.

1. Written Discourse completion test (WDCT)

The WDCT was used in this study, which required respondents to write and read what they would say in each situation. The WDCT included 16 specific workplace communication questions for the speech act of requests. Each test item was created with social status and social distance in mind.

The WDCT was used in this investigation for two reasons. For the first reason, WDCT could exert control over request variables. The second reason is that writing a request may differ from speaking in a real-life situation in which participants had little time to ponder. Participants, on the other hand, can think about the request before writing it. Furthermore, by adding additional contextual and social clues, the application of WDCT can be improved. Because the social factors involved may be systematically controlled, the WDCT is particularly suited to investigating variational pragmatics (Kasper, 2000). Furthermore, WDCT is less effective in the face.

The WDCT was created specifically for this study to include workplace scenarios that occur in a school setting. Respondents were instructed to read the scenarios in the WDCT questionnaires and react to each one. Personal information inquiries and sixteen request scenarios were incorporated in the WDCT.

The way to ascertain the authenticity of the WDCT is the authentic questionnaires, which the researcher provided to the participants to identify and classify situations. Then the researcher investigated the responses to find the most sixteen-making request situations that they often use in their workplace.

The WDCT scenarios' English language correction was done by two native English speakers who are English lecturers at Burapha University's Department of Western Languages, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Furthermore, the researcher and the two raters divided the types of strategies for inter-rater reliability on the coding of request methods. Burapha University's second and third raters are native English speakers.

2. Semi-structured interview

The participants were invited to an interview session. There were three questions to the interview. The first was to see if the social status of the interlocutors influenced their responses in each case. The second question was if and how the social distance between the interlocutors influenced their utterances in each situation. The third inquired whether they had any reservations about inquiring as to why each group of participants utilized specific request techniques and elicited more information from the WDCT form. Thai teachers had two options: they may respond in either Thai or English.

Data collection

The procedure for data collection was outlined as follows:

1. After getting the participants' consent form, a WDCT response started.

2. The researcher gave WDCT questionnaires to each participant: thirty Thai teachers and thirty Filipino teachers in November-December 2020.

3. At the beginning of the questionnaire, the researcher informed the participants about the research purposes.

4. The participants wrote down their requests onto the free provided space following each scenario. The participants wrote down their requests in the English language.

5. The time limit for questionnaire response was 1 hour.

6. For the interview, after the WDCT test, the participants were interviewed to obtain the answers by semi-structured interview to focus on why each group of participants uses particular request strategies and the aspect of social status and social distance.

Data analysis

The request strategies were examined using Schauer's (2009) coding method, which split the three levels of indirectness into twelve separate sub-levels.

The participants' WDCT responses were characterized and evaluated using a descriptive methodology based on Schauer's twelve request strategy classifications (2009). The responses were grouped for descriptive statistics to identify the differences in request strategies between the two groups. Each time that happened, the participants' request strategies were counted. If the same strategy was employed more than once, the frequency of occurrence was also calculated.

Percentage formula:

$$P = \frac{X}{N} \times 100$$

P = percentage

X = frequency

N = number of sample

The t-test was performed to assess the differences in request strategies in a group of Thai and Filipino teachers to see if there are any differences in directness level.

Three questions in the interview focused on why each group of participants employs specific request tactics and social characteristics. All of the data was gathered in written form and analyzed using a descriptive method.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The findings of the data analysis were provided in this chapter. The data analysis was centered on the study's goal of comparing Thai and Filipino teachers' request strategies to understand the variations in request strategies employed in the workplace regarding directness levels. It was also done to see if the two groups' request strategies were affected by their social status and social distance.

Thirty Thai teachers who teach English at any level or use English on a daily basis took part in this research. Another group consists of thirteen Filipino teachers that teach English to students at various levels at Maryvit Sattahip School. The request strategies were collected using the WDCT scenarios based on Schauer (2009) and Pinyo's (2010) pragmatic competence in the request framework. In addition, the request strategies were investigated using Schauer's (2009) taxonomy of the directness framework's coding system.

The result presented in this chapter was divided into three parts.

Part I: Types and frequency of occurrence of request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers.

Part II: The differences of request strategies between Thai and Filipino teachers by T-test.

Part III: The reasons why each group of participants used particular request strategies, social aspects.

Part I: Types and frequency of occurrence of request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers

The frequency and percentage of occurrences of request strategies were examined in the study to investigate the strategies of request used by Thai and Filipino teachers.

Table 2 Frequencies and percentage of occurrences of the request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers

Request Strategies	Thai teachers			Filipino teachers		
	Frequency	Percentage	Rank	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Direct requests						
1. Imperatives	90	18.75	2	12	2.5	8
2. Performatives Hedged	4	0.83	9	2	0.42	12
3. Performatives Unhedged	10	2.08	6	51	10.63	4
4. Want statement	39	8.13	4	38	7.91	5
5. Locution derivable	10	2.08	6	5	1.04	11
Conventional indirect request						
6. Suggestory formula	3	0.63	10	16	3.33	7
7. Availability	6	1.25	7	6	1.25	10
8. Prediction	2	0.42	11	8	1.67	9
9. Permission	47	9.79	3	94	19.58	2
10. Willingness	30	6.25	5	78	16.25	3
11. Ability	234	48.75	1	149	31.04	1
Non-conventional indirect request						
12. Hints	5	1.04	8	21	4.38	6
Total	480	100		480	100	

According to Table 2, Thai teachers used the direct requests as much as indirect requests in the first six frequency ranks of occurrence. In contrast, Filipino teachers mostly employed indirect requests. In particular, in the non-conventional indirect category, Filipino teachers used hint strategy in the first six frequency ranks, while Thai teachers used the direct requests as much as conventional indirect requests. In the second-highest frequency used by Thai teachers, they used the imperative strategy much more than the Filipino teachers.

The strategies of request that the Thai and Filipino teachers in the present study employed the most to respond to the directness strategies of the request were the ability type, 48.8%, and 31.0%, respectively. Moreover, Thai teachers' second-highest occurrence was imperatives type, 18.8%, while Filipino teachers were permission type, 19.6%, respectively. The third highest frequency of occurrences in the request strategies employed by the Thai was permission in conventional indirect request, 9.8%, while Filipino teachers were the willingness, 16.3%, respectively. The fourth highest frequency of Thai teachers' request strategies was the want statement in the direct requests, 8.1, while Filipino teachers were performative unhedged, 10.6, respectively. The fifth highest frequency of Thai teachers' request strategies was willingness, 6.3, while Filipino teachers were the wants statement, 7.9. Thai teachers used performative unhedged and locution derivable as their sixth most common request strategy (2.0), while Filipino teachers used non-conventional indirect requests (4.4).

The seventh highest frequency of Thai teachers' request strategies was availability, 1.3, while Filipino teachers were the suggestory formula, 3.3, respectively. The eighth highest frequency of occurrences by Thai teachers was the hints in non-conventional indirect request, 1.0, while Filipino teachers were imperatives, 2.5, respectively. The ninth highest frequency of Thai teachers' occurrences was performatives hedged, 0.8, while Filipino teachers were prediction, 1.7, respectively. The tenth highest frequency of Thai teachers' request strategies was the suggestory formula, which was 0.6, while Filipino teachers were the availability, 1.3 respectively. The eleventh highest frequency of Thai teachers' occurrences was the prediction, 0.4, while Filipino teachers were locution derivable, 1.0, respectively. The twelfth highest frequency of Filipino teachers was performatives hedge, 0.4.

According to Table 1, the strategies of request that the Thai and Filipino teachers in the present study employed the most to respond to the directness strategies of the request was the conventional indirect requests, but Thai teachers used direct requests rather than Filipino teachers. There was clearly a difference in the non-conventional indirect requests that is the hint.

The examples showing conventional indirect requests, especially ability strategy, could be explained by questions number 10 and 11 which participants made the request utterances to substitute their class and ask interlocutors to move the car. The

participants most employed the example of ability strategy were the head act such as “Can you….” Or “Could you.” For example, “Can you move your car for me please?” or Could you substitute for my classes tomorrow?” were used to make requests by both Thai and Filipino teachers.

The differences of the second-highest frequency between Thai and Filipino teachers were direct requests and conventional indirect requests. Thai teachers mostly used imperative strategy to make requests, which could be explained by questions 1 and 11, which asked the school director to speak louder and asked their colleague to move the car. For example, “Please speak louder” and “Please move your car.” However, Filipino teachers mostly used the permission strategy. Filipino teachers used conventional indirect second-most frequent, which could be explained by questions 2 and 8, which asked the school director for directions to the St. Stephen Building and asked their principal for an explanation about salary. For example, “May I know the way to St.Stephen building?” and “May I ask the reason why I didn’t get any pay raise?”. However, Thai teachers used the permission strategy as the third-highest frequency, while Filipino teachers used the willingness strategy at the third-highest frequency.

For the fourth rank, both Thai and Filipino teachers used direct requests. Thai teachers used the want statement strategy while Filipino used performatives unhedged in this stage. The examples of these two strategies could be explained by questions number 5 and 8, which asked the head of their department to recheck an important academic document and asked the principal for an explanation about a pay raise. For example, some Filipino teachers made requests by using “I would like to ask…” to express their intention that they wanted the listeners to perform an action for them. The head act of these utterances showed the performatives unhedged strategy which some Filipino teachers used. On the other hand, some Thai teachers made requests by using “I want to know the reason why…” in question number 8 to express their intention to explain the listeners’ explanation.

There were differences of directness between Thai and Filipino teachers at fifth to the eleventh rank of frequency. These frequencies could be explained in this section by each rank between two groups of participants. At the fifth rank, willingness strategy at the conventional indirect request was used by Thai teachers, for example, question

number 11 such as “Would you please move your car?” while Filipino teachers used want statement strategy at direct request such as in question number 16, “I would like to know how much money is raised from the school?”. At the sixth rank, performatives unhedged and locution derivable were used by Thai teachers. In contrast, Filipino teachers used hint strategy at non-conventional indirect requests in this stage; for example, Thai teachers said that “I want to ask for leaving half-day” at question number 4.

In response to question 6 of the tips approach, which asked the head of academic affairs for some ideas and suggestions on this new subject, Filipino teachers stated, “I’m extremely sorry since I don’t have any experience teaching this subject.” This case demonstrated speakers' inferred meaning in expressing their need for guidance from listeners.

At the seventh rank, Thai teachers used locution derivable in the direct request while Filipino teachers used the suggestory formula in conventional indirect request, for example, at question 3, the Thai teacher said, “Where is the St.Stephen building?” while Filipino said at question 15 that “How about give me 100 baht for sports day?”. At the eighth rank, Thai teachers used availability while Filipino used imperative strategy; for example, at question 3, the Thai teacher said, “Do you have time for my question?” and for Filipino teacher at question 9, they said that “Please turn off your phone.” At the ninth rank, Thai teachers used permission. In contrast, the Filipino teacher used a prediction strategy; for example, in question 7, the Thai teacher said, “ Can I borrow money from the school?” while the Filipino teacher said at question 5 that “Would it possible for you to recheck my document within three days?”. At the tenth rank, Thai teachers used performative hedges while Filipino teachers used availability, such as question 15, “I want you all to collect 100 baht for sports day.” Filipino said at question 5 that “Could you spare me some of your time?”. The example that shows the suggestory formulae and locution derivable for the eleventh rank of both groups are in question 16 by a Thai teacher who said that “How about your salary?” while Filipino said at question 2 that “Where is the St.Stephen building?”. The last example that shows twelfth rank, prediction, and performative hedged is in question 9 and question 11, such as “Is it possible if you turn off your phone?” and “I ask you to move your car.”

Part II: The differences of request strategies between Thai and Filipino teachers by T-test

The purpose of this study was to see if there were any differences in request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers with regard to directness. The t-test was used to compare the Percentage request strategies of the two groups of participants in order to ascertain the outcome.

Table 3 The t-test of request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers

Request Strategies	Thai teachers		Filipino teachers				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	T	P	
Direct requests							
1. Imperatives	3.00	3.248	.40	.724	4.279	.000	*
2. Performatives Hedged	0.13	.434	0.07	.365	.644	.522	
3. Performatives Unhedged	.33	.661	1.70	2.602	-2.789	.009	*
4. Want statement	1.30	1.179	1.27	1.258	.106	.916	
5. Locution derivable	.33	.844	.17	.379	.986	.330	
Conventional indirect request							
6. Suggestory formula	0.10	.305	.53	1.167	-1.968	.057	
7. Availability	.20	.551	.20	.407	.000	1.00	
8. Prediction	0.07	.254	.27	.583	-1.722	0.93	
9. Permission	1.57	1.633	3.13	2.474	-2.895	.006	*
10. Willingness	1.00	1.486	2.60	2.444	-3.064	.004	*
11. Ability	7.80	3.624	4.97	3.275	3.177	.002	*
Non-conventional indirect request							
12. Hints	.17	.379	.70	1.264	-2.214	.034	*

*p<0.05

Following Table 3, it showed that under the requests related directness levels, there were significant differences between the Thai and Filipino teachers in six strategies: imperatives, performatives unhedged at the direct level, permission, willingness, ability at conventional the indirect level, and hints at the non-conventional indirect level. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the other strategies in the coding scheme of Schauer's (2009) taxonomy of the directness framework at the .05 level. It could be concluded that there were differences in the request strategies employed by Thai and Filipino teachers.

Examples that showed the imperatives were found in the requests like "Sorry, speak louder please" (question 1) or "We need to pay one hundred baht for our sports day, so please pay now" (question 15), which found mainly by Thai teachers. These indicated that the speakers do not want to persuade their interlocutor or give reasons too much. Even though Filipino teachers significantly used less imperative strategies in every situation provided.

For performative unhedged, this strategy was found mainly by Filipino teachers. For example, "I would like to ask for your help if you could give me some tips on how I can teach this subject" (Question 6) or "I would like to ask for some help to recheck my documents" (Question 5). These examples showed unhedged performative, which is softened by past tense modals such as could or "I would like you to…"

Regarding conventional indirect requests, three strategies are significantly different between Thai and Filipino teachers: permission, willingness, and ability strategy. Examples that showed permission strategy used by Filipino teachers like "May I ask for an explanation why the school did not provide me a pay raise?" (Question 8) or "Can I leave early today?" Especially in question 4, which asked about leaving work early. The speakers soften the request's illocutionary force by clearly conveying to the interlocutors that they are in the position of power to grant permission. The illocutionary force was reduced by including downtoning devices, such as politeness markers.

For willingness strategy, the responses were found from Filipino teachers like "Is it okay if I ask how much increase you have this year?" (Question 16) or "Would you mind switching it off or put it in silent mode?" (Question 9) These examples

indicated that the speakers are aware that no obligation exists on the hearer's part to carry out the desired action.

For ability strategy, the responses were found from Thai teachers like "Could you please explain it again?" (Question 1) or "Can we swap our teaching schedule for today?" (Question 10) As the examples showed, the illocutionary force can again be decreased using downtoning devices, such as politeness markers or past tense modals.

In terms of non-conventional indirect requests, the hint strategy was used by Filipino teachers much more than Thai teachers. For example, in scenario 16, the response showed a hint strategy like "*I think there is something wrong with my salary*." The speaker intends to get the hearer to carry out some implied requested act in such a way that the recognition of his or her intention will not be grounded in the utterance meaning of the hint.

Part III: The reasons why each group of participants uses particular request strategies, social aspects

The semi-structured interview was employed to find answers about social status and social distance by the two questions. The first question asked whether the interlocutors' social status influenced their utterance in each situation. The second question asked whether the interlocutors' social distance influenced their utterance in each situation and how it did. From the two questions, the participants were asked to indicate one of the three scales – no, uncertain, and yes – seen in Tables 4 and 5. The final question focused on why each group of participants used particular request strategies and elicited additional related information based on the WDCT form.

Social aspects

Table 4 The consideration of interlocutor's social status and interlocutor's social distance by 30 Thai teachers.

Question	No	Uncertain	Yes
1	-	8	22
2	5	8	17

Based on the interview information, for question one, eight Thai teachers reported that they were uncertain whether their requests were socially appropriate for the given scenarios. The other twenty-two indicated that they took the social situation into account when creating their utterances. Five Thai teachers did not consider social distance before making a request for question two, while eight Thai teachers were uncertain. However, seventeen Thai teachers indicated that they considered interlocutor's social distance.

Table 5 The consideration of interlocutor's social status and interlocutor's social distance by 30 Filipino teachers

Question	No	Uncertain	Yes
1	7	8	15
2	7	8	15

Based on the interview information from question two, seven Filipino teachers reported that they did not consider social aspects whether their requests were socially appropriate for the given scenarios, while eight participants indicated that they were uncertain. The other fifteen Filipino teachers took the social situation into account when creating their utterances.

Table 4 and table 5 show differences in the social aspect between the two groups of participants. Thai teachers tended to consider social aspects much more than Filipino teachers, but there was some ignorance about social distance. Even though both groups were uncertain about social aspects simultaneously, Filipino teachers tend to ignore the social aspects much more than Thai teachers from the two questions.

To focus on why each group of participants used particular request strategies and elicit other related information based on the WDCT form, both the Thai and Filipino teachers were asked how the hearer's social status and social distance in each given scenario influenced their requests. Both groups gave somewhat similar explanations in this regard. They said that they considered the polite speakers when they have to make requests, whether higher status or the large of social distance, and wanted to make formal utterances with them. Moreover, they all said that they should

be less formal to those at the same level, and informal utterances can be used when the social distance was small as the examples below will show some perspectives of the interlocutor participants' social status and interlocutor's social distance.

Participant 8 (Thai teacher)

"I have to use formal utterance when we make the request with the older or higher status, but I can use informal utterance for those who were in an equal or lower status."

Participant 12 (Filipino teacher)

"Regarding social status and social distance, I think I have to be formal with people whose social status is higher than mine or social distance is large. I think I can use informal utterances with people whose social status is the same as me or social distance is small."

However, some participants did not consider the social aspect. In particular, the Thai teachers who ignored the interlocutor's social distance explained that social distance is less important than social status when they make a request in a workplace situation, as the example below demonstrates.

Participant 20 (Thai teacher)

"I think I can use the same utterance to everyone whomever people whose status is higher than mine or people whose social distance is small."

Moreover, some Filipino teachers did not consider either the interlocutor's social status or social distance when making requests. They explained that the request should be made in a polite manner, regardless of status or distance, as the example below demonstrates.

Participant 27 (Filipino teacher)

"Whoever it is, your boss or your close friends, I always politely ask because you are asking a request or favor."

Participant 11 (Filipino teacher)

"I used the similar utterance with every status or distance when I have to make the request."

English proficiency aspect

This study also investigated the effect of English proficiency on request strategies employed by Thai and Filipino teachers. From the participants' responses, especially the Thai teachers, it is clear they encountered difficulties while making requests, including not recalling some vocabulary items or constructing grammatically correct sentences. This lack of language proficiency is due to the participants' insufficient linguistic ability, which limited what they wanted to express, as the explanation below shows.

Participant 16 (Thai teacher)

"The problem is that I was unable to recall appropriate requests from my background knowledge when I do the test."

Participant 22 (Thai teacher)

"I think some of my requests were not appropriate because, at that moment, I could think only some simple sentences."

Participant 28 (Thai teacher)

"I rarely use it, so I couldn't think of what I wanted to say and how to use it appropriately."

However, according to the responses of Filipino teachers, making requests is not difficult. Despite their lack of language skills, the majority of Filipino teachers were able to make the requests fluently.

It was determined from the participants' explanations in the semi-structured interview that both groups had a good awareness of the social aspects of English requests. However, within two groups of participants, some participants have diverse viewpoints on story aspects. Furthermore, Thai teachers found it more difficult to make

the request. It was owing to their inability to express themselves verbally due to a lack of language competence.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The current study strived to investigate the request strategies employed by Thai and Filipino teachers who work in a school setting. Also, it aimed to investigate the differences in request strategies of Thai teachers and Filipino teachers concerning directness level and examine whether social status would have any effects on the selection of request strategies used by Thai and Filipino teachers.

Summary of the findings

The research findings were revealed as follows:

The strategy of request that Thai and Filipino teachers employed the most to respond to the WDCT was the ability in conventional indirect request. In the first six highest frequency ranks of occurrences, Thai teachers used direct requests as much as an indirect request, while Filipino teachers mostly used indirect requests of Schauer's (2009) taxonomy. Especially non-conventional indirect, Filipino teachers used hint strategy in the first six highest frequency ranks. Particularly the second highest frequency used by Thai teachers was imperative strategy much more than Filipino teachers.

The findings revealed that there were significant differences in the six strategies imperative, unhedged performatives, permission, willingness, ability, and hints at a significant level of.05. In contrast, there were no statistically significant differences between other strategies such as performatives hedged, want statement, locution derivable, suggestory formula, availability, and prediction.

Regarding the role of social status consisting of higher, equal, and lower social status in WDCT scenarios, the finding revealed that both groups had a high awareness of the social aspects of English use. However, some participants have a different perspective of social aspects between the two groups.

The results from the interview revealed that Thai teachers had more difficulty making requests than Filipino teachers in terms of English competence on request

strategies. It was due to their incapacity to express themselves verbally due to a lack of language competence.

Discussion

Based on these findings, the following observations can be made:

The findings showed that both groups used varied request strategies and tended to use conventionally indirect requests. However, Thai teachers tended to use more direct strategies, in particular the imperative strategy. In general, of all request strategy types investigated in this study, ability had the highest frequency in both groups. This supported previous studies' findings on requests (e.g., House & Kasper, 1987; Otçu & Zeyrek, 2008; Woodfield, 2008;). This finding also aligned with Tawalbeh and Al-Oqaily (2012) and Daskalovska et al., (2016), who explained that both ESL and EFL speakers' most frequently used request strategy was conventional indirect. This finding concurred with Jalilifar (2009) that conventional indirectness was the most frequent strategy used by the participants, conveyed by only one indirect sub-strategy: query preparatory, which belongs to ability and willingness. This strategy constituted more than half of all requests produced by the participants. As the results showed, most of the responses in all situations were conventional indirect strategies belonging to the ability category.

Even though there were a large number of different expressions, the five most often used structures were: Can I/you (please), Could I/you (please), I want/ wanted/ would like to ask…, Would you /mind/ like/ be interested/ be kind…, and Do you have. Some of the other structures that were used fewer times were: I will be grateful/ be honored/ be glad/ appreciate..., May I ask…, I would really appreciate/be grateful/ be delighted…, I was wondering if you could…, Is it possible…, Would it be a problem and so on.

Since Thai teachers tended to use more direct strategies than Filipino teachers, they negatively transfer their pragmalinguistic forms of directness in request realization. That is, where more indirectness is demanded in English, they prefer direct strategies. In other words, to achieve requestive goals, the present study participants may resort to a familiar and easy form of request, which has been experienced in their

native language. Thai teachers' limited use of other strategies suggests that overall their request strategy repertoire is more limited than Filipino teachers.

According to Pinyo (2010), a possible explanation for these differences could be linked to the participants' cultural differences and pragmatic competence. The contributing factor to pragmatic competence is exposure to English. The participants' educational backgrounds, teaching experience, and daily activities in English might also affect their pragmatic competence.

In comparing the differences in the request strategies employed by Thai and Filipino teachers, the results indicated significant differences in six strategies: imperative, performative unhedged, permission, willingness, ability, and hints at a significant level of.05.

The findings indicated that imperative and performative unhedged were significant differences between Thai and Filipino teachers for direct request. The results were in line with Hilbig's (2009) findings that both groups tended to use conventionally indirect requests; however, Thai teachers used more direct strategies than the EFL speakers, while the Filipino teachers used less imperative in every situation ESL speakers. Interestingly, the examples that showed the imperatives were found in the requests like "Sorry, speak louder please" or "We need to pay one hundred baht for our sports day, so please pay now," which was mostly found by Thai teachers. These indicated that Thai teachers tended to use direct requests while Filipino teachers significantly used less imperative strategies in every situation provided.

For performative unhedged, this strategy was found mainly by Filipino teachers. For example, "I would like to ask for your help if you could give me some tips on how I can teach this subject" or "I would like to ask for some help to recheck my documents." These examples showed unhedged performative, which is softened by past tense modals such as could or "I would like you to…"

There were significant differences in three strategies in a conventional indirect request, namely permission, willingness, and ability. Interestingly, Filipino teachers' examples showed permission strategies like "May I ask for an explanation why the school did not provide me a pay raise?" or "Can I leave early today?" Especially in question 4, which asked about leaving work early. The speakers soften the request's illocutionary force by clearly conveying to the interlocutors that they are in the position

of power to grant permission. The illocutionary force was reduced by including downtoning devices, such as politeness markers.

For the willingness strategy, the responses were found from Filipino teachers like “Is it okay if I ask how much increase you have this year?” or “Would you mind switching it off or put it in silent mode?” These examples indicated that the speakers are aware that no obligation exists on the hearer’s part to carry out the desired action.

For ability strategy, the responses were found from Thai teachers like “Could you please explain it again?” or “Can we swap our teaching schedule for today?” As the examples showed, the illocutionary force can again be decreased by using downtoning devices, such as politeness markers or past tense modals.

There were significant differences in three strategies in a conventional indirect request: permission, willingness, and ability. Both group’s considerable use of the conventionally indirect strategy may be due to English usage in daily life concerning speech act theory. Previous studies (Searle, 1969; Leech, 1983) have mentioned that indirect speech acts correlate with politeness in Western cultures because Western language usage is fundamentally associated with negative politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Interestingly, in a non-conventional indirect request, the Filipino teachers used the hints strategy much more than the Thai teachers. For example, the response to scenario 16 was often a hint strategy, such as ‘I think there is something wrong with my salary.’ The speaker intends to get the hearer to carry out some implied requested act in such a way that the recognition of his or her intention will not be grounded in the utterance meaning of the hint. According to Weizman (1989), in using a hint to realize a request, the speaker intends to get the hearer to carry out some (implied) requested act in such a way. The recognition of his or her intention will not be grounded in the utterance meaning of the hint.

A possible explanation for why hints are not used as much by Thai teachers could be that they may be unsure about their ability to encode their intent in the L2 in a way that will be inferable by a member of a different speech community and culture. Thus, they might feel more at ease using strategies such as the conventionally indirect ones that ensure that their communicative intent will be received and understood by their hearer.

In determining whether or not social status and social distance affect the request strategies used by the Thai and Filipino teachers, the finding was consistent with Brown and Levinson's (1987) study and Pinyo (2010). They contended that relative social aspects play a significant role in determining certain aspects of politeness in linguistic fields. For instance, requests and responses are greatly affected by the social aspects of speakers. Regarding the role of social status and social distance – consisting of higher, equal, lower, close colleagues and not familiar colleagues in the WDCT scenarios – the findings revealed that both groups had a high awareness of the social aspects of English requests. However, some of the participants in both groups had different perspectives of these social aspects.

The findings also suggested that Filipino teachers tend to value equality while Thai teachers value social hierarchy. Filipinos may use the same request strategy to make the utterances an interlocutor of a higher, equal, or lower status. In other words, Thai teachers are more sensitive to social rank than Filipinos. This is probably because Philippine society is considered a unique blend of eastern and western cultures resulting from trade and conquest in earlier times (Quisumbing, 2004), while any country has never colonized Thailand. It is also implied that Thai teachers still maintain their traditional culture and norms compared with Filipino teachers. One of the core values of Filipino personhood is equality. "Kapwa" implies a moral obligation to treat others as equals. That is, "people are just people despite their age, clothes, diplomas, color or affiliations" (De Guia, 2008). On the other hand, Thais place great value on respectful behavior and submissiveness (Knutson, 1994). In addition, "Thais are taught to obey and respect people with higher status by birth, education, or knowledge and age" (Nakata & Dhiravegin, 1989).

Furthermore, a deep look into the participants' utterances made in the situation revealed that they were polite with every status interlocutor. This is probably because their L1 culture influenced them. This finding is also reported by Wannaruk (2005), who found overly-polite expressions from the EFL participants.

Nevertheless, the present study's findings were consistent with those of Mei-Chen (1996), who examined Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness theory and found that social status and social distance did not significantly affect her participants' utterance choices. She also suggested that this claim should be reconsidered.

From the perspective of the effect of English proficiency on the request strategies employed by Thai teachers, according to Jalilifar (2009), concerning the correlation between the complexity of request strategies and the level of language proficiency in EFL participants, the findings of the previous studies, following other studies in this field (Harlow, 1990; Francis, 1997; Parent, 2002), support the notion that the request development of learners goes from direct to indirect and from being simple to complex. On the one hand, there is a positive correlation between indirect strategy types and English proficiency level. In other words, the higher proficiency group used more indirect strategy types – both conventionally and non- conventionally indirect strategies – than learners with lower language proficiency.

The Thai teachers, in particular, encountered difficulties while making requests from the interview. This supports both Pinyo's (2010) and Jalilifar's (2009) findings that lower proficiency learners are probably not sufficiently competent to use as wide a variety of strategies as proficient learners. The greater use of imperative as the most direct type of requesting by the low learners, as Harlow (1990) suggests, is probably due to the linguistic deficiency or perhaps lack of attention to politeness rules (p. 335). They do not possess enough linguistic ability to employ other types of direct. So, it may be claimed that learners with lower language proficiency show a particularly strong preference for Imperative because this sub-strategy, especially in elided form, does not demand high linguistic proficiency; it is formally very simple (e.g., Give me the pen). These results contributed to previous studies in that linguistic competence was necessary for pragmatic competence; however, it is insufficient for EFL teachers such as Thai teachers.

Conclusion

This present study investigated the request strategies of thirty Thai and thirty Filipino teachers. The findings were by no means intended for generalization. The present study results may provide some useful information about the pragmatic competence scenario in requests of Thai and Filipino teachers.

In addition, the study may help disclose the differences between the Thai and Filipino teachers, the factors affecting their pragmatic competence, social status, and related factors in their utterance production. The following implications are made.

Thai and Filipino teachers used varied request strategies and tended to use conventionally indirect requests, but Thai teachers had a tendency to use more direct strategies, especially the imperative strategy. A possible explanation for these differences could be linked to the participants' cultural differences and pragmatic competence. The contributing factor to pragmatic competence is exposure to English, for example, the participants' educational backgrounds, teaching experience, and daily activities in which they use English.

In a similar vein, of all request strategy types investigated in this study, the ability is the one that was used with the highest frequency by both groups. This supports previous studies that the most frequently used request in ESL and EFL requests were conventional indirect requests. These findings are similar to the cross-cultural studies which investigated EFL and native English speakers. In addition, these argued that there were different strategies of the request of Thai teachers and Filipino teachers, which is another aspect of the difference between EFL and ESL speakers.

A t-test was used to compare Thai and Filipino teachers' differences in request strategies to emphasize that there were different strategies used between Thai and Filipino teachers. The results indicated that there were significant differences between the teachers in the six strategies. The significance of the present study lies in the fact that in the aspect of pragmatism, people who use English in different countries show their verbal behavior rather differently for various reasons, such as pragmatic proficiency, pragmatic awareness, and interlanguage competence. As Gudykunst & Kim (2003) state, human cultural development is made possible through communication, which transmits culture from one generation to another in the relationship between culture and language.

In focusing on why each group of participants used particular request strategies and elicited other related information based on the WDCT form, the findings revealed that both groups had a high awareness of social aspects of the English use of requesting groups providing similar explanations. Even though both groups were uncertain about social aspects simultaneously, the Filipino teachers tended to ignore the social aspects much more than the Thai teachers in the first two questions. This implies that the feature of their native language influenced them. This finding was also reported by Wannaruk

(2005), who found overly-polite expressions from EFL participants, such as Thai teachers.

Based on the responses to the third interview question, some Thai teachers encountered difficulties while making requests. This implies that the lack of language proficiency is due to the participants' insufficient linguistic ability, limiting what they wanted to express. Therefore, linguistic deficiency correlates with the directness level of a request strategy.

Recommendation for further studies

The recommendations for further studies are provided as follows:

1. Future research should include a more diverse range of the target population, reflecting the entirety of request strategies and providing a wide range of situations that can be applied to both the male and female perspectives.

2. Since the present study focused only on request speech, future research should investigate EFL or ESL teachers' pragmatic attitudes in other speech acts, such as apologies and complaints.

3. Future research into the pragmatic use of English in other contexts, such as movies, textbooks, and social media, would be fascinating in terms of quantity and quality.

REFERENCES

Angouri, P. M. (2007). *Language in the workplace: A multimethod study of the communicative activity in seven multinational companies situated in Europe* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex).

Angouri, J. (2010). 'If we know about culture it will be easier to work with one another': Developing skills for handling corporate meetings with multinational participation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *10*(3), 206-224.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baxter, L. A., & Asbury, B. (2015). Critical approaches to interpersonal communication. *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives*, 189-201.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English. *Applied Linguistics*, *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*(3), 196-213.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989a). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 1–36). Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Bolton, K. (2008). English in Asia, Asian Englishes, and the issue of proficiency. *English Today*, 24(2), 3-12.

Boonkongsaen, N. (2013). Filipinos and Thais saying "no" in English. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities*, *16*(1), 23-40.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56–289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chan, K. L. (2016). Power language index. *Which are the world's most influential languages*.

Chen, R. (1993). Responding to compliments A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of pragmatics*, *20*(1), 49-75.

Clyne, M., & Clyne, M. G. (1996). *Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. (2013). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Dastjerdi, H. V., & Rezvani, E. (2010). The impact of instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' production of requests in English. *Journal of language teaching and research*, 1(6), 782.

Daskalovska, N., Ivanovska, B., Kusevska, M., & Ulanska, T. (2016). The use of request strategies by EFL Learners. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 232, 55-61.

De Guia, K. (2008). Indigenous Filipino values: a foundation for a culture of non-violence. In *Proceedings of a presentation at the Forum towards a Culture of Non-Violence, March* (Vol. 5).

Edmondson, W. J., & House, J. (1981). *Let's talk, and talk about it: a pedagogic interactional grammar of English*. Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Eelen, G. (2014). *A critique of politeness theory* (Vol. 1). Routledge.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative science quarterly*, *46*(2), 229-273.

Farahian, M., Rezaee, M., & Gholami, A. (2012). Does direct instruction develop pragmatic competence? Teaching refusals to EFL learners of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(4), 814-821.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Natural speech vs. elicited data: A comparison of natural and role play requests in Mexican Spanish. *Spanish in Context*, *4*(2), 159-185.

Ferguson, M. J., & Porter, S. C. (2013). An examination of categorization processes in organizations: The root of intergroup bias and a route to prejudice reduction.

Francis, C. (1997). Talk to Me! The Development of Request Strategies in Non-Native Speakers of English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *13*(2), 23-40.

Fraser, B. (1978). *Acquiring social competence in a second language*. RELC Journal, 9(2), 1–21.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *14*(2), 219-236.

Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of pragmatics*, *36*(11), 1991-2002.

Fukushima, S. (1996). Request strategies in British English and Japanese. Language Sciences, 18(3-4), 671-688.

García, M. D. C. M., & Cañado, M. L. P. (2011). Multicultural teamwork as a source of experiential learning and intercultural development. *Journal of English Studies*, (9), 143-164.

Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Dalam P. Cole & JL Morgan (Eds). Syintaz and Semantics Volume 3 Speech Act.

Gudykunst, W. & Kim. Y. (2003) *Communicating with Strangers. An approach to intercultural communication* (4th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The Silent Language*. New York: Doubleday and Co.

Harlow, L. L. (1990). Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(3), 328–351.

Hassan, R. K., & Rangasawmy, S. (2014). Internal/external modifiers in request speech act among Iranian study abroad learners. *Research Journal of Recent Science*, *3*(5), 55-64.

Hendriks, B. (2008). Dutch English requests: A study of request performance by Dutch learners of English. In M. Puetz & J. Neff van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 335–354). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hilbig, I. (2009). Request strategies and politeness in Lithuanian and British English.

Hill, T. (1997). *The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context* (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University).

Holland, D., & Quinn, N. (Eds.). (1987). *Cultural models in language and thought*. Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, J. (1996). The New Zealand spoken component of ICE: Some methodological challenges. Comparing English World-Wide: *The International Corpus of English*, 163-178.

House, J. and G. Kasper (1981) Politeness markers in English and German. In F. Coulmas (ed), *Conversational routine*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 157-185.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. *Perspectives on language in performance*, 2, 1250-1288.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request Strategies: Cross-Sectional Study of Iranian EFL Learners and Australian Native Speakers. *English language teaching*, 2(1), 46-61.

Kachru, Y. (1999). Culture, context, and writing. *Culture in second language teaching and learning*, 75-89.

Kamenou, N., & Fearfull, A. (2006). Ethnic minority women: A lost voice in HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *16*(2), 154-172.

Kasper, G. (1997a). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* Honolulu: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre, University of Hawai'i. Retrieved 10 September 2008, from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model (Vol. 1). Hong Kong University Press.

Knutson, T. J. (1994). Comparison of Thai and US American cultural values: 'mai pen rai'versus 'just do it'. *ABAC Journal*, *14*(3), 1-38.

Koester, A. (2010). *Workplace discourse*. A&C Black.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Ladegaard, H. J. (2011). 'Doing power'at work: Responding to male and female management styles in a global business corporation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(1), 4-19.

Lahti, M., & Valo, M. (2017). Intercultural workplace communication. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*.

Lakoff, R. (1973). *The logic of politeness: Or minding your p's and q's*. Paper presented at the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, Chicago.

Lakoff, R. (1977). *What you do with words: Politeness, pragmatics and performatives*. Paper presented at the Texas Conference of Performatives, Presuppositions, and Implicatures, Arlington.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics Cambridge University Press. *Cambridge UK*.

Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. Canadian Modern Language Review, 57(1), 58-87.

Mak, B. C. N., & Chui, H. L. (2013). Colleagues' talk and power after work hours: A community of practice in Facebook Status Updates?. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *2*(2), 94-102.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. (2005). What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. *Psychological science in the public interest*, *6*(2), 31-55.

Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory:'Face'revisited and renewed. *Journal of pragmatics*, *21*(5), 451-486.

Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Analysing request modification devices in films: Implications for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. In *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 245-280). Springer, Dordrecht.

Mei-Chen, H. (1996). *Achieving cross-cultural equivalence in a study of American and Taiwanese requests*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics. An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Moeschler, J. (2002). Speech act theory and the analysis. *Essays in speech act theory*, *77*, 239.

Mullany, L. (2007). *Gendered discourse in the professional workplace*. Springer.

Murray, N. (2010). Pragmatics, awareness raising, and the cooperative principle. *ELT journal*, *64*(3), 293-301.

Nakata, T., & Dhiravegin, L. (1989). Social and cultural aspects of Thai polity. *Thailand*.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1989). Speech act behavior across languages. *Transfer in language production*, *53*, 67.

Omar, A. S. (2006). Kiswahili requests: Performance of native speakers and learners. *Pragmatics and language learning*, 11, 227-252.

Otcu, B., & Zeyrek, D. (2008). Development of requests: A study on Turkish learners of English. In M. Puetz & J. Neff van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and crosscultural perspectives* (pp. 265–300). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Peirce, C. S. (1905).

Parent, M. P. (2002). The production of requests by Catalan learners of English: situational and proficiency level effects. *ATLANTIS*, 2, 147-168.

Peltokorpi, V. (2007). Intercultural communication patterns and tactics: Nordic expatriates in Japan. *International Business Review*, *16*(1), 68-82.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and policy in mental health and mental health services research*, *42*(5), 533-544.

Pinyo, S. (2010). *Pragmatic competence in requests*: A case of Thai English Teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Prince of Songkla University).

Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of pragmatics*, *35*(10-11), 1471-1506.

Quisumbing, L. R. (2004). Peace, tolerance and harmony as core values of Philippine culture. *Teaching Asia-Pacific Core Values of Peace and Harmony: A Sourcebook for Teachers/Asia-Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID)*, 215-228.

Richards, K. (2006). *Language and professional identity: Aspects of collaborative interaction*. Springer.

Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. Studies in second language acquisition, 22(1), 27-67.

Rue, Y. J., Zhang, G., & Shin, K. (2007). Request strategies in Korean. In *Proceedings of the 5th Biennial Korean Studies Association of Australasia Conference* (pp. 112-119).

Schauer, G. (2009). Interlanguage pragmatic development: *The study abroad context*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.

Searle, J. R. (1975). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in society*, *5*(1), 1-23.

Schnurr, S., & Chan, A. (2011). When laughter is not enough. Responding to teasing and self-denigrating humour at work. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(1), 20-35.

Shams, R., & Afghari, A. (2011). Effects of Culture and Gender in Comprehension of Speech Acts of Indirect Request. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(4), 279-287.

Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of international business studies*, *41*(4), 690-709.

Taguchi, N. (2006). Analysis of appropriateness in a speech act of request in L2 English. *Pragmatics*, *16*(4), 513-533.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *18*(2), 189-223.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT journal*, *8*(2), 131-155.

Tawalbeh, A., & Al-Oqaily, E. (2012). In-directness and politeness in American English and Saudi Arabic requests: A cross-cultural comparison. *Asian Social Science*, *8*(10), 85.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.

Thompson, M., Ellis, R., & Wildavsky, A. (1990). *Cultural Theory*. Boulder, Colo.

Trosborg, A. (1995). Requests, complaints and apologies. *Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter*.

Vallaster, C. (2005). Cultural diversity and its impact on social interactive processes: Implications from an empirical study. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *5*(2), 139-163.

Van Mulken, M. (1996). Politeness markers in French and Dutch requests. *Language Sciences*, *18*(3-4), 689-702.

Wannaruk, A. (2005). *Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals*. Retrieved February 2009, from the World Wide Web: http://rel.sagepub.com.

Warga, M. (2004). Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Weizman, E. (1989). Requestive hints. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 71–95). Norwood: Ablex.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wiriyachitra, A. (2002). English language teaching and learning in Thailand in this decade. *Thai TESOL focus*, 15(1), 4-9.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.

Woodfield, H. (2008). Problematising discourse completion tasks: Voices from verbal report. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 21(1), 43–69.

Xiao-le, G. (2011). The effect of explicit and implicit instructions of request strategies. International Communication Studies, 1, 104-123.

APPENDIX A

Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT)

Written Discourse Completion Test

Part 1 Personal information and Educational background

Please tick / in the box ☐ and provide your personal details

1. Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Age: _____

3. Nationality

☐ Thai ☐ Filipino

4. At what educational Level did you graduate? (Highest education)

Bachelor's degree, major_____

Institution_____

Master degree, major_____

Institution _____

Doctor degree, major_____

Institution _____

Other (please specify) _____

5. At present, at what educational level do you teach? (can answer more than 1 item.)

☐ Primary ☐ Lower secondary ☐ Upper secondary

☐ Other (please specify _____)

6. At work, do you have a chance to use English in workplace?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Standard English Test

☐ TOEIC ☐ TOEFL ☐ IELTS ☐ Others_____ ☐ None

Score/Level _____

Part 2 Please read the following situations and write what you would response in each situation.

1. You are attending a meeting. The **school director** is explaining a new policy, but you cannot hear him very well. You ask him to speak louder.

You say:

_____

_____

2. This is the first time that you have a meeting at Maryvit School, Pattaya. You are standing in front of the academic office. Your meeting is taking place in the St. Stephen building, but you do not know where St. Stephen building is. The **school director** is walking towards you. You ask him for directions to the St. Stephen building.

You say:

_____

_____

3. You are running a project for which you would like **your principal** to complete a lengthy questionnaire. She is a very busy person, but the questionnaire is essential for your project. At the end of your class, you go up to the principal's desk and ask her to complete the questionnaire for you.

You say:

_____

_____

4. Your mother will be visiting from out of town, and you want to pick her up at the airport. However, her flight arrives at 3:00 PM, but you have to work until 5:00 p.m. How do you ask your **school director** to let you out of work early?

You say:

_____

_____

5. At work, you want the **head of your department** who always seem very busy to recheck an important academic document for you. You ask the head of your department

to recheck and give it back to you within three days because you have to send it back to the academic office within one week. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

6. You are assigned to teach a new subject in the next semester, but you have no experience teaching this subject. **The head of academic affair** who has been teaching this subject for more than 5 years. You ask him/her for some advice and suggestion about this new subject.

You say:

_____

_____

7. You had a car accident and you needed to be responsible for any damage of another car for 50,000 baht, but you do not have enough money. You ask the **school director** for a loan because the school has an emergency loan policy for teachers. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

8. At the end of the academic year, the school provides a pay raise for all teachers except you. You are skeptical about your salary. You want to know the reason why you didn't receive a pay raise even though you have worked in this school more than one academic year. You ask your **principal** for an explanation. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

9. In the monthly meeting, the mobile phone of one of your colleague rings. You want to ask her/him **who you are not familiar with**, to turn off the mobile phone. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

10. You have an appointment with your doctor tomorrow afternoon, but you have classes for teaching. Your **close colleague**, who is in the same level with you, is available tomorrow afternoon. You ask her to substitute for your classes tomorrow afternoon.

You say:

_____

_____

11. You need to go outside of the school for some personal business, but your colleague **whom you are familiar with** has parked his/her car in blocking yours. You cannot go if he/she does not move her car. You ask him/her to move the car.

You say:

_____

_____

12. You are called to meet the principal. When you arrive at her door, two of your colleagues, **whom you are not familiar with**, are standing in front of her office and are blocking the door. You ask them to move aside.

You say:

_____

_____

13. While you are giving some test to your students, you forgot your book in another classroom, where your friend is in. You cannot go because this is an important test of your students and you have to make sure that they will not cheat. You ask **your colleague who is younger than** you to get the book for you by your telephone call.

You say:

_____

_____

14. At school, something is wrong with your computer. You have to finish some work which is due tomorrow. One of your colleague is very skillful in fixing computers. **You do not know him/her**. However, you want to ask him/her to fix your computer. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

15. At the annual sport day, you are responsible for cheer activities and you have to collect 100 baht from **every teacher who you are not familiar with** in your team for the cheer activities. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

16. At the end of academic year, the school provides a pay raise for all teachers and you are skeptical about your salary. You want to know how much raise your **friends who have worked the same period of employment** received. What would you say?

You say:

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. During the WDCT, did you take into account the interlocutor's social status in the given situation before you made the utterance? How?

2. During the WDCT, did you consider the interlocutor's social distance in the given situation before making the utterance? How?

3. During the WDCT, did you have any problems with making requests in English from the given situations?

BIOGRAPHY

NAME	Pakin Onchaiya
DATE OF BIRTH	06 March 1987
PLACE OF BIRTH	Bangkok
PRESENT ADDRESS	39/34 Moo 10 Bangsarae Sattahip Chon-buri 20250
EDUCATION	Bachelor of Arts English Business Communication, Sripatum University Chonburi Campus