

## The Use of Internal and External Modification Strategies in the Request Patterns of Pashto and English Languages

**MIAN SHAH BACHA**

Head, Department of English,  
Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Sheringal, Dir Upper KPK, Pakistan.  
Email: [bachamsb@gmail.com](mailto:bachamsb@gmail.com)  
Tel: 324986701 / 03434199766

**RABIAH RUSTAM**

Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University,  
Islamabad, Abbottabad Campus.  
Email: [rabiakhan2008@gmail.com](mailto:rabiakhan2008@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

*This research study aims at studying requests patterns both in Pashto and English languages. Twelve open role plays (having requests and apologies situations) were given to the participants of Pashto and English languages. The data received by those open role plays from the Pashto language speakers and the secondary data of English language taken from Reiter (2000) study were analyzed. The role plays were evaluated as per the coding scheme of (Blum- Kulka, House and Kasper (1989). The coding scheme of Blum- Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) is based on three levels, i.e., directness, indirectness, and non-conventional directness. In conclusion, English speakers seemed to be consistent in the use of internal and external modification strategies, but there were some other strategies which were ignored by them. The Respondents of the Pashto language also used them but there were some strategies that they ignored completely. Both English and Pashto language respondents made use of the strategies with exception to some internal and external strategies in the request pattern of their respective languages.*

**Keywords:** Role Plays, Coding Scheme, Directness, Strategies, Internal and External.

---

### Introduction

This research aimed at finding out the phenomenon of politeness in English and Pashto languages through the role plays. However, politeness was further analyzed through different internal and external modification strategies and the main research objectives were to:

1. Find the frequency of external and internal modification strategies in both the languages
2. To explore whether the occurrence of external or internal modification strategies were more frequent in Pashto or English language
3. To point out the intensity of both internal and external modification strategies in Pashto and languages through comparative analysis.

Based on these objectives, the study has following research questions:

1. What is the frequency of external and internal modification strategies in both the languages?
2. What is the frequency of the occurrence of external or internal modification strategies in Pashto or English languages?

3. What is the intensity of both internal and external modification strategies in Pashto and languages?

This research study will prove useful for teachers to minimize confrontation and also to promote solidarity in the teacher-student interaction. This research study will also aid the immigrants who attempt to look for a better job opportunity in the United Kingdom to understand how the British behave linguistically as far as the politeness phenomenon is concerned.

### **Literature Review**

The requests can have many parts, some are, peripherals and ellipticals that can help either in the intensification or downgrading or in the mitigation of a request. House and Kasper (1981) state that it is a fact that some intensifiers were noted at the time of the request producing in English. Such intensifiers may result the study of downgraders regarding requests. It means that the use of such intensifiers in English and in other languages is literary not possible and it is even not possible to use all the internal and external devices quite frequently in both the linguistic cultures. External modification normally consists of some peripheral clauses which are used for the sake of mitigating or putting emphasis on the request pattern, and every language can have its own specific and particular modification devices. Most frequently, these external modification devices are used by the speakers or addressors to get some support for honoring and fulfilling their requests. Sometimes, the very use of these modifiers singly and sometimes in combination makes the addressee or the listener to offer without even asking him the request.

The detail of such modification devices is given below:

#### **Preparators**

A Preparator is a kind of supportive move which helps in preparing the addressee for replying and ensuing the request. In the preparator, the speaker makes a kind of announcement to check the availability of the addressee for carrying out the request or asks the hearer's permission for the request.

#### **Disarmer**

It is an external modification device which is used to disarm the addressee or hearer from any refusal. In such kind of request, all the possible objections are removed beforehand from the request that the hearer may raise.

#### **Pre-Commitments**

Edmondson (1981) has called the category of getting pre-commitments, a commitment seeking device. Basically, pre-commitments are pre exchanges that are used directly to start a head act of a request.

#### **The Promise of Reward**

The promise of reward is a supporting move which is used to make the addressee accede the request. Such a device is used by the speaker to increase the possibility of the hearer's compliance for the request.

### **The Use of Internal Modifications**

Following are the internal modification strategies:

#### **Downtoners**

Downtoners are propositional modifiers that are used by the speakers, for creating a modulating impact on the request of the addressee.

### **The Use of Diminutives**

Diminutives are used for conveying the meaning of small or little things. They can also be used for a range of various linguistic emotions. Diminutives do have an impact on an utterance and can be applied in simple declarative sentences, imperative or interrogative sentences.

### **The Use of Softening Adverbials**

The use of softening adverbials is used sometimes as downtoners because they can soften or mitigate the effect on the request. The purpose of adverbials as diminutives is to minimize the rate of the imposition.

### **Cajolers in Request**

Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) define 'cajolers' to be some semantic speech units that do not have a great role to play in the meaning of any discourse. They are used as attempts for the addressee or hearer to make them join the conversation.

### **Hedges**

Hedges are such adverbials that speakers use when they like to avoid an exact propositional expression.

### **The use of Politeness Markers**

The different internal and external speech modification devices come under the category of politeness markers, but the most frequent use in English is 'please'. Mehrabani (thanks), shukria (thanking), manana (thanks) these politeness makers were frequently used in the Pashto language.

### **Research Methodology**

The Phenomenon of politeness and its expression through the various strategies is studied with the help of two speech acts of requests and apologies. The data of the British English came through a Reiter's book (2000) but the data of the Pashto language was obtained through a translated version of Reiter's questionnaire of role plays situations.

The questionnaire of the role plays had 12 situations of requests and 12 situations of apologies. This questionnaire was adopted from Reiter's book (2000) and was translated into Pashto language. The questionnaires were given to the respondents of Swat University, Abdul Wali Khan University, Islamia College University, Sheringal University, Malakand University and the Post Graduate Jehanzeb College Swat.

The analysis of the data of this research study was based on the adopted coding scheme of Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper's (1989) CSSARP (Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project).

### **Data Analysis and Discussion**

Comparative data are given in the following tables and graphs to see the statistics of both internal and external modification strategies in English and Pashto languages. Though, there were 12 role play situations but due to the space issue, first, six situations and then, the six situations were analyzed and compared. Data of both external and internal strategies are given in the following in tabular and graphical form.

Table 1: Comparison of External and Internal Modification Strategies in British English and Pashto Language in the First Six Situations

Modification (External)	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	BE	PL										
<b>Perpetrator</b>	10	6	6	5	8	3	1	1	11	5	12	07
<b>Reason</b>	13	7	11	6	5	5	14	8	11	4	12	4
<b>Disarmer</b>	0	0	6	2	2	3	3	1	9	3	2	0
<b>Getting a Precommitment</b>	4	0				0	0	1		1	0	1
<b>Promise of forbearance</b>	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Promise of reward</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>IFID</b>	5	0		0		7	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Admission of facts (s/h inclusive)</b>	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Blame the hearer</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Put responsibility on hearer</b>	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Friendly insult</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Internal modification</b>												
<b>Downtowner</b>	6	2	2	2	5	0	5	2	7	2	0	2
<b>Diminutive +.Determiner</b>	0	1	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	3
<b>Softening adverbial</b>	7	1	1	2	5	2	4	4	7	0	0	4
<b>Cajoler</b>	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	0
<b>Hedge</b>	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	0
<b>Politeness marker</b>	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>No of request</b>	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15

### Results and Data Analysis

In the table above, the use of preparator strategy is shown in the first six role play situations of British English and Pashto language. The preparator strategy was used by the British respondents, 67% in R 1, 71% in R 2, ignored this strategy in R 3, and in R 4, 27% in R 5 and 53% in R 6. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents made use of the preparator strategy up to 33% each in R 1 and in R 3, 13% in R 2, ignored it in R4, 7% in R 5 and 47% in R 6. The reasonable use of this strategy was made only in R 6 by the respondents of both languages. The strategy of reason as an external modification device was observed in the first six role play situations. The British respondents used this strategy, 73% in R 1, 7% in R 2, 100% each in R 3, R 5 and in R 6 but ignored it in R 4 altogether. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents used this strategy 27% in R 1, 13% in R 2, 20% in R 3, ignored it in R 4, 67% in R 5, and just 60% in R 6. Thus, the British respondents were more inclined towards reasons in their requests patterns. The British respondents used disarmer strategy 47% in R 1, 12% in R 2, 7% in R 3, ignored it in R 4, 60% in R 5 and only 40% in R 6.

The respondents of Pashto language used this strategy 47% in R 1, 27% in R 2, 13% in R 3, ignored it in R 4 like the British respondents, 27% in R 5 and just 40% in R 6. Thus, the respondents of the British English. The British respondents made the strategy of pre-commitment up to 40% each in R 1 and in R 3, 47% in R 2, ignored it altogether in R 4, 80% in R 5 and just 53% in R 6. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents used this strategy 53% in R 1, 33% in R 2, 27% in R 3, 13% each in R 4 and in R 6, and only 33% in R 5. The British respondents used this strategy higher in R 5 while maximum use of the Pashto speakers was just 53% in R 1. The table above also exhibits the use of promise of forbearance strategy in both the linguistic cultures. Respondents from the British English ignored this strategy altogether, but on the other hand, the Pashto respondents used this strategy in R 5 only 7% and they also ignored it altogether in the rest of the role plays. The promise of reward strategy in the first six request role play situations was used as per the data above, the British respondents used this strategy 20% in R 2, 7% each in R 5 and in R 6

but ignored it altogether in R 1, R 3 and R 4. While on the other hand, the Pashto speakers used this strategy 27% in R 1, 13% each in R 2 and in R 4 and 7% only in R 5 but they ignored it altogether in R 3 and in R 6. Table above depicts the comparison of IFID strategy in both the British English and Pashto language. The British respondents used IFID 7% in R 4 and 13% in R 5 but ignored it altogether in R 1, R 2, R 3 and in R 6. On the other hand, the respondents of Pashto language used it 20% in R 4 and 13% in R 5 but they also ignored it in R 1, R 2, R 3 and in R 6. The above data show that the British respondents ignored this strategy altogether in R 1, R 2, R 3, R 4, R 5 and in R 6.

The Pashto respondents also ignored this strategy in all the role plays but except in R 4 wherein they used it only 27%. The reason for the higher percentage of this strategy in R 4 by the Pashto speakers is that the interlocutors are the close friends and they are also socially at par with one and other. The cross cultural comparison of the Blame on the Hearer strategy is given in the table. This strategy was ignored by the respondents of both the British and Pashto language in R 1, R 2, R 3, R 5 and R 6 except in R 4. The British respondents used it 40% while the Pashto respondents used it 20%. Thus, a difference of 20% was noticed between the interlocutors. The use of 'Put Responsibility on Hearer' strategy in British English and Pashto language has also been used by both languages' respondents. Respondents of both the languages used this strategy in R 4 only. The British respondents used it 20% in R 4 while the respondents of Pashto language used the same strategy in R 4 only 13%. Respondents of both the languages ignored it in R 1, R 2, R 3, and R 5 and in R 6 altogether. It is noted again that the British used this strategy a bit more than the Pashto speakers. The data above also show the use of Friendly insult strategy. It reveals that both the British and Pashto respondents ignored this strategy altogether in R 1, R 2, R 3, R 5 and in R 6 except in R 4. The British respondents used this strategy up to 27% in R 4 while the respondents of Pashto language used it only 7%. The British English respondents' use was 20% more than the Pashto Speakers. The downtoners strategy is shown above in the table. The British respondents made the use of downtoners 33% in R 1, 67% in R 2, just 7% in R 3, ignored it in R 4, used it 60% in R 5, in R 6 they used it up to 67%. On the other hand, respondents from the Pashto language used this strategy just 12% in R 1, ignored it in R 2, R 3, R 4 and R 5. In R 6 they used it only up to 12%. The Britishers were comparatively better in using this strategy than the Pashto speakers.

The comparative analysis of diminutive strategy is given. The British respondents ignored this strategy altogether in R 1, R 2, R 3, R 4, R 5 and in R 6. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents used it 20% in R 2, 13% each in R 4 and in R 5. They ignored it in R 1, R 3 and R 6 altogether. The Pashto speakers were comparatively better than the British respondents in the use of this strategy. In the table above, the comparison of softening adverbials as an internal strategy is discussed. The British respondents used this strategy up to 40% each in R 2 and R 3 and similarly 20% each in R 5 and R 6 but ignored it in R 1 and in R 4 altogether. Surprisingly, this strategy was altogether ignored by the British respondents in all the role play situations. The British respondents used this strategy more than the Pashto speakers. The table above depicts the use of cajolers as an internal strategy in the first six role play situations. The British respondents used this strategy up to 12% each in R 1, R 2, and R 5, just 7% in R 3, ignored it in R 4, but used the strategy up to 67% in R 6. The use of the same strategy by the Pashto respondents was just 7% in R 2 but they ignored it altogether in R 1, R 3, R 4, R 5 and R 6. Thus the British respondents were comparatively better in the use of this strategy than the Pashto respondents. The use of hedge is depicted in both the British English and Pashto language. The British respondents made use of this strategy up to 13% each in R 2, R 4 and R 5 but just 7% in R 6 but ignored it in R 1 and R 3 altogether. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents used this strategy 7% only in R 4 but ignored it in R 1, R 2, R 3, R 5 and R 6. Thus, the strategy of Hedge was most frequently used in the British English. The comparative analysis of the strategy politeness marker is given above in the table. The British respondents used this strategy 7% each in R 1 and R 2, ignored it in R 3 and R 5, used it 13% each in R 4, and R 6. The Pashto speakers made use of this strategy up to 13% in R 1, 7% each in R 2, R 4 and R 5 but ignored it in R 3 and R 6 respectively. In the first role play situations, the Pashto respondents were more consistent than the British respondents. The table above shows the use of appealer strategy in the first six role play situations. The British respondents used this strategy in R 2 and R 4 only. They used it 40% in R 2 and only 7% in R 4 but ignored it altogether in R 1, R 3, R 5 and R 6. The Pashto respondents used this strategy only 7% in R 1 but ignored it altogether

in R 2, R 3, R 5 and R 6. The strategies of preparator; reason, getting pre-commitment and diminutives were used frequently in both the linguistic cultures. The British used 100% the strategies of reason and disarmers but the use of these strategies was comparatively lower by the Pashto speakers. In some of the strategies, the British respondents were consistent but in some of the strategies the Pashto speakers were consistent.

Table 2: Comparison of External and Internal Modification Strategies in British English and Pashto Language in the last Six Request Situations (7-12)

Modification (External)	7		8		9		10		11		12	
	BE	PL										
<b>Perpetrator</b>	10	6	6	5	8	3	1	1	11	5	12	07
<b>Reason</b>	13	7	11	6	5	5	14	8	11	4	12	4
<b>Disarmer</b>	0	0	6	2	2	3	3	1	9	3	2	0
<b>Getting a Precommitment</b>	4	0				0	0	1		1	0	1
<b>Promise of forbearance</b>	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Promise of reward</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>IFID</b>	5	0		0		7	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Admission of facts (s/h inclusive)</b>	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Blame the hearer</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Put responsibility on hearer</b>	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Friendly insult</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Internal modification</b>												
<b>Downtowner</b>	6	2	2	2	5	0	5	2	7	2	0	2
<b>Diminutive +.Determiner</b>	0	1	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	3
<b>Softening adverbial</b>	7	1	1	2	5	2	4	4	7	0	0	4
<b>Cajoler</b>	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	0
<b>Hedge</b>	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	0
<b>Politeness marker</b>	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>No of request</b>	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15

In the table above, the use of preparator strategy is cross culturally compared in the last six request situations. The British respondents used this strategy 67% in R 7, 40% in R 8, 53% in R 9, 7% in R 10, 73% in R 11 and 80 % in R 12. On the other hand, the respondents of the Pashto language made use of the preparator strategy up to 40% in R 7, 33% each in R 8 and R 11, 20% in R 9, just 7% in R 10 and 47% in R 12. An overall analysis of the graph above shows that the British used this strategy more than the Pashto speakers. In table, the comparative analysis of the reason strategy is given. The use of this strategy by the British respondents was up to 8% in R 7, 73% in R 8, 33% in R 9, 93% in R 10, 73% in R 11 and 80% in R 12. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents used this strategy up to 47% in R 7, 40% in R 8, 33% in R 9, 53% in 10 but 27% each in the last two role play situations of 11 and 12. The respondents of the British English used the strategy of disarmer 40% in R 8, 13% in R 9, 20% in R 10, 60% in R 11 and just 13% in R 12 but ignored it altogether in R 7. In Pashto language, this strategy was used just 13% in R 8, 20% in R 9, 7% in R 10, 20% again in R 11 and was ignored in R 7 and R 12 altogether.

The maximum use of this strategy was made by the British respondents in R 11 and in R 12 situations. The table above also shows the comparative analysis of getting a pre-commitment strategy. This was a less frequently used strategy among the respondents of both the British English and Pashto language. The British respondents made use of this strategy only up to 27% in R 7 but ignored it altogether in R 8, R 9, R 10, R 11 and R 12. The Pashto respondents used this strategy 7% each in R 10, R 11 and R 12 but ignored it in R 7, R 8 and R 9. Thus, the Pashto respondents used this strategy more than the British but the Britishers used this strategy quite higher in R 7 than the Pashto respondents. The table also exhibits the use of a promise of forbearance strategy in the British English and in the Pashto language. The use of strategy was

made up to 47% in R 8, 13% in R 9, 7% in R 11 but the strategy was ignored altogether in R 7, R 10 and R12 by the British respondents. The Pashto speakers ignored this strategy altogether in all the role play situations. Thus, the frequency of this strategy was low but still the British respondents used this strategy in R 8, R 9 and R 1. A depiction of the strategy 'promise of reward' in the British English and in the Pashto language is given. The British respondents ignored this strategy altogether but the respondents of the Pashto language used it 7% only in R 12 but ignored it in R 7, R 8, R 9, R 10, R 11 and R 12.

The table mentioned above also depicts the strategy of IFID in the last six role play situations. The British respondents used this strategy 33% in R 7 but ignored it completely in R 8, R 9, R 10, R 11, and R 12. On the other hand, the respondents of the Pashto language used this strategy 47% in R 9 and just 13% in R 12 but ignored it in R 7, R 8, R 10 and R 11. This strategy was not used more by the respondents of both the linguistic cultures. The data above also exhibit the use of the 'admission of fact' strategy in the British English and in the Pashto language. The British respondents ignored this strategy altogether in all the role play situations. On the other hand, the Pashto speakers used this strategy just 13% each in R 8 and R 11 but ignored it in R 7, R 9, R 10 and R12. The Pashto respondents were better in the use of this strategy than the British respondents. In table above, a comparative analysis of 'Blame the hearer' strategy is given. The British respondents did not use this strategy in any of the role play situations. They ignored it altogether in all the role play situations (7-12). On the other hand, the respondents of the Pashto language used this strategy only 7% in R12 but ignored it in R 7, R 8, R 9, R 10 and R 11. This was a less frequently used strategy in both the linguistic cultures. The above table depicts the responsibility on hearer strategy in the British English and in the Pashto language. The respondents of British English ignored this strategy. On the other hand, the use of this strategy by the Pashto respondents was made up to 13% each in R 9 and in R 12 respectively but they ignored it in R 7, R 8, R 10 and R 11 altogether. In table above, the comparison of 'friendly insult strategy' is made in the British English and Pashto language. The British respondents did not use this strategy again and ignored it altogether in the all role play situations (7-12). On other hand, the Pashto respondents used this strategy only 7% in R 12 but like the British respondents, they also did not use this strategy in R 7, R 8, R 10 and R 11 respectively.

In table above, the internal modification strategy of 'downtoners' is compared both in the British English and in the Pashto language. The use of this strategy by the British respondents was up to 40% in R 7, 14% in R 8, 37% each in R 9 and R 10, 47% in R 11, but ignored it in R 12. The Pashto respondents also used this strategy but they comparatively used it less than the British respondents. The Pashto speakers used this strategy 14% each in R 7, R 8, R 9, R 10, R 11 and R 12 but ignored it in R 9 altogether. Respondents from both the languages were consistent in the use of this strategy. The Table comparatively depicts 'diminutive/determiner strategy' in both the British English and Pashto languages. The British respondents used this strategy 27% in R 8 and 60% in R 12 but ignored it altogether in R 7, R 9, R 10 and R 11. Similarly, the use of this strategy by the Pashto respondents was just 7% in R 7, 13% each in R 8 and in R 9 and 20% in R 12 but ignored it in R 10 and R 11. In Table above, 'the softening adverbial strategy' is depicted in both the British and the Pashto linguistic cultures. The British respondents used this strategy 46% in R 7, 7% in R 8, 33% in R9, 26% in R 10, 46% in R 11 but ignored it completely in R 12. The Pashto speakers used this strategy 7% in R 7, 13% each in R 8 and R 9, 26% each in R 10 and R 12, but ignored it altogether in R 11. The data shows that the Pashto speakers were a bit more consistent than the Britishers. The British respondents used the strategy of cajolers 13% each in R 7, R 8 and R 11, 7% in R 9 but 67% in R 12 and they ignored it in R 10 completely. The Pashto respondents used it only 7% in R 8 but ignored the strategy altogether in R 7, R 9, R 10, R 11. The figure 81 above shows the comparative analysis of the Hedge strategy in both the British English and Pashto language. The British respondents used this strategy 13% each in R 8, R 10 and R 11, just 7% in R 12 but ignored it altogether in R 9 and R 7. On the other hand, the Pashto language speakers employed this strategy just 7% in role play 10 but ignored it altogether in R 7, R 8, R 9, R 11 and R 12. Thus, the British respondents were comparatively better than the Pashto respondents in the use of this strategy and R 12. The comparison of politeness marker in both the British English and in the Pashto language is shown above. The British respondents made use of this strategy just 7% each in R 7 and R 8, 13% in R 10 but ignored it in R 9, R11 and R 12. On the other hand, the Pashto respondents employed this strategy 13% in R 7, 7% each in R 8, R 10 and R 11 but they ignored it in R 9 and R 12

altogether. In table above, it is also shown that this strategy was generally ignored by the respondents of the Pashto language speakers but they only employed it in the role play 7 and the percentage was only 7. Similarly, the British respondents used it only in role play 8 and 9 where the percentage was 40 and 6 respectively.

The table above exhibits the overall comparative analysis of the external and internal modification strategies in the role play situations (7-12) in both the British English and the Pashto language. The Britishers seemed to be consistent in the use of these strategies, but there were some other strategies which were ignored by them. The Respondents of the Pashto language also used them but there were some strategies that they ignored completely.

## **Conclusion**

As far as the external and internal modification devices of the requests were concerned, the British respondents made a more frequent use than the Pashto speakers. The Pashto language respondents also made a use of these internal and external strategies but their frequency was lower than the British respondents. The results of this study further show that not only a higher level of indirectness in the request pattern was noticed in the British English but they also showed a tendency towards the use of internal and external modification devices. The Pashto speakers also made use of CI and internal and external devices but they used them less than the British English respondents. The Pashto respondents showed their preference for the less tentative request patterns. They were also aware of their relationship to other speakers.

## **References**

- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University, William James Lectures 1955. Oxford: University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood: N. J. Ablex
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena*. In E. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1989). *Internal & external modification in interlanguage request realization*. In Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 221–247). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Fraser, B. (1975). *On apologizing*. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routine*, 259–271. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Koike, D. (1989). Requests and the role of deixis in politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 13: 187–202.
- Reiter's. (2000). book, "Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9: 145–198.