Request Speech Act of Indonesian English Learners and Australian English Speakers Through Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Perspectives

Hilmi Akmal[a], Alfi Syahriyani[b,*], Tuty Handayani[c]

[a] hilmi.akmal@uinjkt.ac.id, English Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia
[b] alfi.syahriyani@uinjkt.ac.id, English Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia
[c] tuty@uinjkt.ac.id, English Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia
[*] Corresponding author, alfi.syahriyani@uinjkt.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the differences in the realization of request speech act between the IEL (Indonesian English Learners) and the AES (Australian English-Native Speakers), as well as explain the factors influencing these distinctions. The descriptive-qualitative method and discourse completion task (DCT) were used to obtain data in various contexts. The results showed that the realization of request speech act of the IEL and AES were different based on the following, (1) Form of Speech, as observed in the use of the main and supporting actions. This indicated that the IEL and AES used indirect and direct speech acts, respectively, and (2) Different Speech Strategies, as observed in the mode of sentences and request strategies. This proved that the IEL often used interrogative sentences, with the AES using declarative sentences when seeking permission from work superiors,

and (3) Differences in the use of semantic formulas, where the IEL used attracters and honorifics more than the AES. This revealed that the linguistic and non-linguistic factors influenced the occurrences of these differences.

Introduction

Humans as social beings are reportedly inseparable from speech requests, which are parts of the directive acts that are highly productive and important in daily communication. This indicates the performance of various daily requests, to meet respective needs. Based on containing illocutionary power (intention), the performance of a request is often difficult, due to causing unforeseen misunderstandings between the speaker and the hearer. These are considered to be face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987), exerting much pressure (cost) on the interlocutor or hearer (Leech, 2016). Therefore, specific strategies are required to reduce the negative consequences.

In the performance of a request, errors are often found for the Indonesian English Learners (IEL). Based on the brief previous observations, the teaching materials in Indonesia did not deeply integrate language education with culture and intercultural interaction (Putra et al., 2020). Meanwhile, pragmatic knowledge was introduced to the students, such as 'apologizing, requesting, and refusing' (Meiratnasari et al., 2019). In non-native speaking countries, many English textbooks were also considered for grammatical functions, compared to communicative characteristics (Huang, 2019).

Language intervention and culture are then assumed to be the factors influencing the problematic nature of request speech for the native speakers of a foreign language. This explains that these influential factors and the different forms of speech between native and non-native English speakers need to be analyzed with cross-cultural pragmatics, an approach to explaining linguistic behaviors across distinguished languages. This is expected to be carried out by investigating the linguistics realization strategies and social-cultural context affecting the language choice (Blum-Kulka & Kasper, 1993; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; McConachy & Spencer-Oatey, 2021).

Based on these conditions, Hymes (1996) argued that different speech communities had distinguished speaking patterns and methods. Indonesia and Australia are two countries with distinct cultural and social backgrounds. According to Hofstede et al. (2010), Indonesia adhered to

social strata, while Australia adhered to social equality, which led to various implications for language utilization. Besides this, Indonesia and Australia have a long historical international relationship, which is hard and often shown by frequent misunderstandings (Abdullah, 2017; Beeson et al., 2021). However, most of the relationship studies of both countries only emphasized macro issues such as migrant workers, citizenship, or political context, but a few focused on cross-cultural communication. An example of the speech requests between Indonesians and Australians is as follows:

> For Indonesian,
> *Good morning, Sir. Sorry to bother you. I need to leave in the next Monday because I have a family wedding. May you allowed me to leave?*
>
> For Australian,
> *I need this day off for personal matters.*

In these data, the Indonesian speaker used the honorific expression, *Sir*, which indicated the consideration of the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. This proves that the use of honorific greetings is considered more polite for speakers. The Indonesians also comprehensively stated the reasons for applying for a leave irrespective of being a personal matter. This was not in line with the Australian English-native Speaker (AES), which directly stated the main problem without explaining the exact reason. The choice of this sentence mode showed that the two speakers had different politeness standards, as the indirect expression performed by the Indonesians through interrogative sentences, was considered more polite. However, the direct expression of the Australians did not reduce politeness to their hearer.

The pragmatic knowledge of the Indonesian English Learners has reportedly been highly conducted, although only a few investigated the speech act and compared the strategies with the native speakers. According to Widanta et al. (2019), the pragmatic errors and transfers of the IEL were only analyzed, with the confirmation that they were not pragmatically competent due to the production of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic errors. Furthermore, Wijayanti, et al. (2019) investigated the production of politeness in the request speech act of the Indonesian English Learners. It proved that power and social distance influenced the way they expressed politeness expressions. These studies are not in line

with the present study, where comparative analysis is being adequately evaluated.

Another research was conducted by Wijayanto (2016), where pragmalinguistic competence of Javanese English Learners was compared to the native speakers of British English, although only focused on the refusal strategies. This was in line with Handayani (2016), where the pragmalinguistics competence between the Indonesian EFL (English as Foreign Language) learners and the country-based Australians was compared. However, these are not in line with the present study aiming to compare the request strategies between native Indonesians and native English Australians in different situations and contexts, with the assumption that their local cultures are maintained for the reflection of distinguished results and deeper understandings. Therefore, this study aims to examine the pragmatic ability of the IEL (Indonesian English Learners) and AES (Australian English-native Speakers), using the theory initiated by Blum-Kulka (1989). This cultural exploration is interestingly analyzed due to being assumed as one of the factors causing speech differences.

Method

A questionnaire technique known as the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) was used for data collection in this report. This was introduced by Blum-Kulka (1982), to explore the information produced by the study participants (Blum-Kulka, 1982). Although this method differs from natural speeches, it still reveals the general patterns in language use, due to being the most commonly utilized data collection approach in cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics (Ogiermann & Bella, 2020). DCT also accesses the pragmatic knowledge in a specific setting, by obtaining the language learners' production of various linguistic formulations (Aufa, 2016).

The questionnaires were distributed to 20 respondents, with the first and second native groups (10 Indonesia and Australians) aged 18-45 years, assuming adherence to their respective cultures. They also mastered English at the intermediate level, while being asked to naturally fill out the provided questionnaires. Additionally, the data collection method considered two factors, namely the dominance (power) and the social distance (familiarity), which were important variables in determining the form of speech acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The distance variable was also divided into binary values, as familiar and unfamiliar speakers

were negatively and positively marked (-/+ distance). However, dominance was divided into three values, namely, the lower, similar, and higher interlocutors (-/=/+ dominance), respectively. The combination of these social variables led to six different situations, namely (1) + dominance and distance, (2) + dominance and - distance, (3) - dominance and distance, (4) - dominance and + distance, (5) = dominance and + distance, and (6) = dominance and - distance. To obtain various data, each situation was categorized into two conditions, leading to the development of 12 DCT criteria. An example of a situation plan is observed as follows,

> *Provided you are working at a company and have to attend a family wedding the next Monday, how do you ask for a leave from your boss?*
> Context: spoken to the superior to ask for leave (+Dominance, +Distance)

The factors affecting the differences in the request form between AES and IEL were obtained through a literature study. The linguistics were extracted from Kraft and Geluykens (2007) and Schauer (2012), while cultural factors were from Hymes (2012), Lewis (2006), and Hofstede et al. (2010).

Results and Discussions

The form and request strategies of the IEL and AES were differently exhibited based on the following, (1) Speech Form, as observed in the main and supporting actions, (2) Speech Strategies Utilization, as shown in the mode of sentences and request plans, and (3) Semantic Formulas Utilization, which were divided into three, namely the differences in the greeting selection, word address, and attracter choices.

Differences in Speech Form

The forms of speech were grouped into two subsections, namely structure and variations. According to structure, the completeness of the request utterance was analyzed based on the presence of the head act and supportive moves, while formal and informal languages used by IEL were evaluated for variation.

Speech Structure

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) broadly divided this variable into two parts, namely the head act and supportive moves. This head act is an utterance directly containing the interpretation of desired questions, through the speaker. Meanwhile, supportive moves are speeches only complementing and facilitating the delivery of the main action (Blum-Kulka, 1987). In this condition, five forms of request speech structures produced by IEL and AES are observed as follows, (1) head act, (2) head act accompanied by supportive moves, (3) supportive moves accompanied by the head act, (4) head act flanked by supportive moves, and (5) supportive moves.

a. Head Act
   Lucy, can you open the door? (IEL F.2)
   (The underlined is the head act)
b. Head Act accompanied by Supportive Moves
   Hello, can you please check if you have XX book instore? I've tried looking and can't find it. (AES B.3)
   (The underlined is the head act)
c. Supportive Moves accompanied by Head Act
   I'm sorry for the disturbance, sir. Next Monday, I have to attend my family wedding. Can I get an off-work permission? (IEL A.3)
   (The underlined is the head act)
d. Head Act flanked by Supportive Moves
   Hey Lucy, I hear someone is knocking on the door. Please check who it is and how we can assist them. Thank you, Lucy. (AES F.8)
   (The underlined is the head act)
e. Support Action
   I think it is clear enough to know who is responsible for this mess.
   (IEL K.9)
   (The underlined are the supportive moves)

For speech structure, only slight differences were observed between the IEL and the AES' utterances. Table 1 shows the utilization frequency of this variable by both groups.

From Table 1, both groups mostly used the supporting moves accompanied by the head act. This showed that the IEL and AES-based head acts had 10 and 20% responsibilities, respectively. Furthermore, the IEL and AES used 18 and 17% of head acts accompanied by supportive moves, which are found not to be considerably different. A slight difference in the speech structure was also observed between the IEL and

AES at 32 and 29%, based on the use of supportive moves accompanied by the head act, respectively. Approximately 30% (IEL) and 24% (AES) of utterances subsequently used the head act flanked by supportive moves. This was similar to the support action, which was observed not to be significantly different.

Table 1

The Frequency of the Use of Speech Structure by IEL and AES

Speech Structure	IEL		AES	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
Head Act	12	10%	24	20%
Head Act accompanied by Supportive Moves	23	18%	20	17%
Supportive Moves accompanied by Head Act	40	32%	34	29%
Head Act flanked by Supportive Moves	37	30%	28	24%
Support Action	13	10%	10	8%
Total	125	100%	118	100%

According to the speech structure, some differences were significantly observed in both groups' sentence lengths and densities. This revealed that the IEL performed requests with longer sentences, while and AES groups produced shorter sentences. These were in line with the culture of highly conversant Indonesians, with examples provided as follows,

> *I'm really sorry for this situation. I still don't know why my laptop does not work as usual. So, I really need to borrow your laptop for my presentation. Could you borrow it to me? I would be thankful to you. For the last, I say sorry about this bad situation.* (IEL, C4)

> *Hi! Sorry to bother you. My laptop does not work as usual, but I need to do a presentation now. Can you borrow me your laptop, please? I will bring it back to you as soon as possible. Thank you.* (IEL, C6)

> *Sorry! Technical fail. Do you have a machine I can hook up to?* (AES, C4)

My lap top has stopped working. Can I just borrow yours to do the presentation? Thanks. (AES, C6)

Context: spoken to a client in a meeting. When the speaker was about to give a presentation, the laptop suddenly turned off, leading to the process of borrowing that of the client (+Dominance, +Distance).

The difference in the length of the utterances was also found in other distinguished situations, as shown below:

Mika, sorry. Are you busy right now? I got a problem, I don't have a friend to accompany me to go to the wedding party. It would be nice if I go to that party with you. So, would you like to come with me? Thanks in advance. (IEL, E4)

Hello Mika, sorry, but will you be busy on next Sunday? I got invited to a wedding that will be held next Sunday, but I don't have anybody to accompany me, so I was wondering if you could accompany me if you don't have anything to do next Sunday. (IEL, E10)

Would you like be my date?!! Free champagne. (AES, E4)

Do you want to be my plus one at a wedding? Pls pls pls!! (AES, E7)

Context: Spoken to a close friend named Mika, based on accompanying the speaker to a party (=Dominance, -Distance).

Speech Variations

Speech or language variations are often used based on certain contexts and are divided into formal and informal varieties. The formal variety is the official variant known as the standard language, due to having a complete and clear structure. Meanwhile, the informal variety often has incomplete or redundant, inconsistent, syntactic structure, and non-standard dictions. This indicated that IEL and AES used both forms of language variety within different situations. The results also showed that both speaking groups used various formal language on speech partners, which had higher social status and distance. In the following example, IEL

and AES utilized a complete and clear structure when requesting permission from their work superior.

> *Excuse me, Mr.X. I deeply apologize in advance. Next Monday, I will have to attend a family wedding. Would it be possible for me to have a one day off on the next Monday?* (IEL, A10)

> *Sir, good day. I will be on leave next Monday to attend a family event. Thank you.* (AES, A8)

In the use of the informal variety, IEL only spoke to the speech partners with similar social status and closeness, whereas AES can use the informal variety on speech partners with different social distance. This is observed in the following examples:

> *Thanks, but as I mentioned, I don't like it want these products.* (AES I.7)

> *Thank you, but I am not really interested with the product.* (IEL I.2)

> Context: speak to a salesperson who offers products (-Dominance, +Distance)

In this context, AES used 'thanks' compared to 'thank you' and 'I don't like it want these products', which were informally uttered due to incomplete structure. Meanwhile, the IEL used 'thank you' and uttered with complete grammar.

Differences in the Use of Speech Strategies

The subsequent obvious differences were observed in the use of the speech strategies, which were divided into (1) sentence mode, (2) the request method, and (3) the request type.

Sentence Mode

This is the disclosure or description of the psychological behavioral atmosphere, according to the speaker's interpretation of the sentence's attitude (Chaer, 2013). It also includes declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences (Radford, 2016). Based on its function, **declarative sentences** ensure the creation of a statement, with the expected response

obtained from the speech partner (Radford, 2016). In English, these sentences syntactically have a subject preceding the verb (Quirk et al., 1985), as shown in the following example. Although the speech was declaratively delivered, it still contained an indirect request.

> *Sir, good day. I will be on leave next Monday to attend a family event. Thank you.* (AES A.8)
>
> Context: Spoken by AES to the superior, based on seeking permission to attend a family wedding. (+Dominance, +Distance)

Furthermore, **interrogative sentences** are used to ask various questions. These are conventionally associated with request speech acts, especially information command (Sophen, 2007). Based on the expected response, Quirk et al. divided interrogative sentences into three types, namely (1) polar questions, (2) information questions, and (3) alternative questions (Quirk et al., 1985). The following is an example of this sentence.

> *I'm sorry for my laptop seems to not work properly. Can I borrow your laptop, sir?* (IEL B.7)
>
> Context: Spoken by IEL to the client in a meeting. When the speaker was about to conduct a presentation, the laptop suddenly turned off, leading to the process of borrowing that of the client. (+Dominance, +Distance)

Imperative sentences are used to issue orders, with the utilization of 'please' in front of them (Radford, 2016). This explains that a response is expected as an action from the listener. In English, these sentences do not often have a subject, although possess an auxiliary base verb, with the second form being rare (Quirk et al., 1985).

Subsequently, this is divided into three types, namely actual, invitation, and prohibition imperative sentences. The following is an imperative sentence example:

> *Sir, please do not bother me, I'm not interested in your products.* (IEL I.5)
>
> Context: Spoken by IEL to a product marketer. This is because the person often forces the speaker to buy the product, although it has been severally rejected. Feeling annoyed, the

speaker tells the salesperson to leave" (-Dominance, +Distance).

Using the sentence mode, the total declarative, imperative, and interrogative utterances in the IEL and AES groups were slightly different at approximately 13/16%, 10/16%, and 68/68% respectively. Table 2 represents the sentence mode differences between the IEL and AES.

Table 2

The Frequency of the Use of Sentence Mode in IEL and AES

Sentence Mode	IEL		AES	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
Declarative Sentences	16	13%	19	16%
Interrogative Sentences	85	68%	80	68%
Imperative Sentences	24	19%	19	16%
Total	125	100%	118	100%

Based on these results, the AES used declarative sentences for the interlocutors with higher social status (superiors), although it did not statistically show a significant difference between both groups. Meanwhile, the IEL used the interrogative mode when speaking to their superior. The following sentences represent the different request strategies between the two groups.

The AES' Request Strategy using declarative sentences.

I need this day off for a personal matter. (AES A.6)
I have a family wedding to attend and need to take the following day/s off (AES A.9)
I would like to apply for leave to attend a wedding (AES A.10)

The IEL's Request Strategy using interrogative sentences.

I'm sorry for the disturbance, Sir. Next Monday, I have to attend my family wedding. <u>Can I get a off work permission?</u> (IEL A.3)

Sir, sorry if I bothered you. I'd like to say that the next Monday I have a family wedding that I have to attend. <u>Would you allow me, sir?</u> (IEL A.8)

Excuse me, Mr. XXX. I deeply apologize in advance. Next Monday, I will have to attend a family wedding. <u>Would it be possible for me to have a one day off on the next Monday?</u>
(IEL A.10)

Context: spoken to the superior to ask for leave (+Dominance, +Distance).

Request Method

The use of this method by both speaking groups was varied, with IEL using several approaches not visible in the AES' request. Despite this, an AES-based request method was observed, although not in the IEL group. Based on the data obtained through DCT, both groups of speakers used similar questioning patterns for sentences with imperative mode, explicit and hedged performative, locution derivable, scope stating, suggestion formula, preparatory condition, as well as strong and mild hints. It was also used with the requests related to solicitation, politeness, offers, grounders, permission, exclamation, promise, apology, praise provision, conditional sentence, gratitude, and threat.

However, a difference was observed in the questioning patterns used by IEL and AES. For example, IEL asked the listener by providing praise, while AES did not. Subsequent examples are observed as follows:

Sorry sir, you look like my father, so could you help me to call my father? Please sir... I have an urgent situation, <u>I know you are a kind person.</u> (IEL G.11)

Context: spoken to the father's office colleague being asked to help make a call (+Dominance, +Distance).

The result also showed that AES asked various questions using swear words, compared to the IEL group. The following is an example of the speech,

<u>Bloody hell</u>, clean up your mess. (AES L.1)

Context: spoken to a sister ignoring her cleaning schedules (=Dominance, -Distance).

Request Type

The types of requests include the direct and indirect speeches, which were observed from the imperative, interrogative, and declarative sentences being earlier explained. Based on a direct speech act, sentences are used according to their respective functions, due to being an action performed through speaking, such as the provision of thanks, greetings, invitations, requests, and orders (Collins, 2018). Meanwhile, indirect speech acts are the sentences not used according to their function, e g., to ask (Wijana, 1996). This is accomplished by implicature (Collins, 2018), which is implied with an utterance by the speaker. Wijana (1996) also divided these speech acts into two parts, namely literal and non-literal actions, whose interpretations are often similar and different to the meaning of their composed words, respectively.

Direct Request Speech. These are the utterances having a closed level of familiarity, due to being provided to the interlocutor with similar or equal social status, through imperative sentences.

> *Lucy, please open the door. I have a work on my laptop right now. I can't leave it. Thanks Lucy.* (IEL F.4)
>
> Context: Spoken by the working IEL to the sister, which was told to open the door after knocking (-Dominance, -Distance)

Based on this speech, an imperative sentence was used to ask the interlocutor to open the door. Regarding politeness, the direct request type was lowly considered due to having a high coercion level. However, the speech participants were observed as brothers based on the social context, subsequently indicating that the speaker did not feel shy and ignored politeness norms. This confirmed that direct requests were carried out by the speakers with similar social status as their interlocutors.

Indirect Request Speech. This is different from other speeches using imperative sentences, due to being realized with interrogative or declarative statements.

> *Hi, I'm looking for this book, do you have it in store?* (AES B.2)

> Context: Spoken by AES to an employee at a bookstore. The speaker wants to buy a book and confirm whether it is being sold in the shop.

From this example, the speaker did not request the store clerk to directly locate the book, as indirect utterances were conducted by asking the question. Despite the non-expectation of a yes or no answer, the speaker still expected the shopkeeper to indicate the location of the book. By making a question, an indirect order was performed towards the shopkeeper.

Literal Request Speech. In this condition, interpretations are similar to the compositional words (Wijana, 1996). This reveals that a literal request is often performed according to the aim of the compositional words. Meanwhile, the words containing the request element are spoken in a literal utterance.

> *Brother/sister please do your duty or there be consequences.*
> (IEL L.5)
>
> Context: Spoken by IEL to room-based relatives, which had agreed on a cleaning schedule. However, the speaker's brother never carried out the agreed task, prompting the instructions towards cleaning the room" (-Dominance, -Distance).

In this condition, the IEL request statement depicted an instruction to the relative towards carrying out the specified obligations. The arranged words also described the elements of the command desired by the speaker. This verified that the two groups used all three types of requests, including direct, indirect, and literal. Despite this, the difference still depended on the context of the speech. Based on the existing data, AES used direct requests through imperative sentences, by using the word *'please'*. However, the type of request was not found in the IEL speech as follows:

> *Excuse me, Miss. <u>Please check if you have this book on stock.</u> If the book is not on stock, <u>please also check for the earliest availability</u>. Thank you.* (AES B.8)
>
> *Excuse me. I'm sorry, I can't find the location of the book which is I've been searching for. <u>Could you help me to find it?</u> I would be feeling thankful to you.* (IEL B.4)

Context: spoken to a bookstore keeper (-Dominance, +Distance)

Differences in Semantic Formulas

In speech request, the differences between IEL and AES were also observed from the use of semantic formulas, which are the constituent elements of request speech. These differences were divided into several parts, for example, choice of greetings, addressing, and **attracters**.

The Choice of Greetings

The greeting is the opening utterance of the speaker when starting a conversation with the interlocutor. Based on the results, several forms of greeting were observed, with Table 3 showing the differences.

Table 3

Differences in Greeting Between IEL and AES

IEL	AES
Hi	Hi
Hello	Hello
Excuse me	Excuse me
Hey	Hey
Pardon me	-
Good morning	-
Assalamualaikum	-

In Table 3, the IEL used greetings more than the AES group, which did not exhibit any spoken performances. The utilized IEL speeches were 'pardon me', good morning', and '*Assalamualaikum*', which is a specific characteristic possessed by the Indonesian Muslim population.

The Choice of Addressing

Addressing is one of the opening conversations used to signal the involvement of a speaker to the interlocutor. This often refers to self-name, kinship, honorific greetings, scientific degrees, or related job positions. The following are the addressing forms produced by the IEL and AES groups.

Table 4.

The Differences in the Choice of Addressing Between IEL and AES

IEL	AES
Sir	Sir
-	Mate
Uncle	Uncle
Cousin	Cousin
Brother	Brother
Sister	-
Bro	-
Dear	-
Miss	-
Mister	-
Boss	-
(mention person's name)	(mention person's name)

Based on Table 4, the IEL group used more various greeting forms than AES. It also showed that most of the addressing only found in IEL speech were 'Sister', 'Bro', 'Dear', 'Miss', 'Mister', and 'Boss'. This was in line with the culture of the Indonesian people that cherish greetings and friendliness.

The Use of Attracters

Attracter is a term used by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), to describe an attractive opening speech to the listener, based on the involvement of the speaker in a conversation. These are often observed as the words describing a sense of surprise or excitement.

Table 5.

The Differences in the Use of Attracters Between IEL and AES

IEL	AES
Hi!	Hi!
Hello!	Hello!
Excuse me!	Excuse me!
Sorry!	Sorry!
I'm sorry!	I'm sorry!
Hey!	Hey!

Please!	Please!
Hi, I'm sorry!	Hi sorry!
-	Look!
-	Bloody hell!
Good morning!	-
-	Good day!
Pardon me!	-
Assalamualaikum!	-
Oh, dear!	-
Brother!	-
Oh my God!	-

Based on Table 5, IEL was observed to produce more attracters than the AES group. These included 'pardon me!', *'Assalamualaikum*!', 'oh dear!', 'brother!', and 'oh my God'. However, some **attracters** only spoken by the AES and group were 'look!', swearing 'bloody hell!', and 'good day!'. This confirmed that Indonesian people often begin and engage in conversation.

The Factor of Differences

Two factors were causing the differences in request realization between the IEL and AES groups, namely linguistic and non-linguistic. In linguistic factors, the lack of pragmatic understanding and limited vocabulary mastery by IEL triggered the differences in request speech. Meanwhile, different social cultures and learning environments contributed to the speech differences in non-linguistic factors.

Linguistic Factors

These are related to linguistic units and include the following (1) pragmatic understanding and (2) limited vocabulary mastery. Pragmatic understanding is the ability of IEL based on the practical system in the English language. This is closely related to social and cultural aspects, due to being the next level mastered by a learner after learning the grammatical system of the foreign language. Meanwhile, the limited vocabulary ability is purely a personal problem encountered by language learners, whose speech realization is often greatly affected when utilizing a foreign dialect.

Differences in Pragmatic Understanding

English and Indonesian had different pragmatic systems, which were reflected in the request speech acts of the two speaking groups. This showed that different patterns were observed in the speaking actions of IEL and AES. Although these differences were not significant, they were found to still exist. For example, AES utterances were shorter than the IEL group, leading to the expression of their wishes with longer speeches. This was most likely influenced by the differences in the pragmatic knowledge of IEL in the English language. It also explained that the group was influenced by the Indonesian pragmatic system, which is unconsciously transferred into the foreign language. These are in line with Kraft & Geluykens (2007), where the second-language learners exhibited the initial dialect effects on their present studies. This is subsequently referred to as a transfer by Schauer (2012), which is defined as the tendency for some second language learners. It is based on assumption that the rules, features, forms, and strategies in their first language are applied to a second dialect. Apart from the pragmatic transfer, the IEL respondents generally had good English skills.

Limited Vocabulary Mastery. The limited mastery of IEL's English vocabulary also affected the difference in the request speech realization between the two groups. This difference was observed from the diction distinction used by IEL and AES. Based on the results, the English skills of the IEL respondents were good, although some inappropriate dictions were observed in the context of the provided conversation. This was understandable because they were not better than the native speakers, irrespective of the excellent adaptability to master a second language.

Non-Linguistic Factors

The differences in the cultural system and IEL learning environment were two non-linguistic factors, which affected the distinction in the request speech realization. In this case, the cultural system was related to the social-cultural values, while the learning environment referred to the setting and the educational approaches.

Differences in Cultural Systems. Culture greatly influences the realization of utterances in the speech community, as supported by Hymes (2012), where a speaking ethnographic study was conducted. It confirmed that the

speech communities with different cultures produced distinguished utterance patterns and methods. Based on the data, some IEL English request utterances were similar to Indonesian speech patterns, due to the attached cultural values. The AES request speech was also influenced by the force conventions in Australia, whose comparison with Indonesia was based on different cultural dimensions.

According to Hofstede et al. (2010), Indonesian speakers are classified into a collective (collectivist) society, but Australians are catgorized into an individual (the individualist) community group. A collective society is one that always maintains harmonious relations, as well as has a high sense of shame, self-image, and togetherness. These were observed from the IEL's utterances, which maintained the interlocutor's face by using a fence, providing praise, apologizing and others. Meanwhile, the individualist societies are characterized by being more independent and inconsiderate of the social relations among the community individuals. This was subsequently more reflected in the direct and honest speech of AES. For example, AES mostly used directive sentences to seek permission from the work superior. However, it was not found in the request speech of the IEL group. Another example showed that the AES request speech was shorter and briefer, compared to that of the IEL group, which was longer and friendly. This proves that the Australian culture is very straightforward.

Lewis (2006) also divided the types of cultural models into three categories, namely, linear-active, multi-active and reactive. The reactive/multi-active category has various characteristics such as respect for face and age, politeness, willingness to please, friendliness, and confrontation avoidance (Lewis, 2006). Indonesia is included in the reactive/multi-active, while Australia is linear/multi-active categories. This was observed from the IEL's utterances considering the interlocutor's age, for instance (1) greeting superiors as 'boss', and (2) using greetings before starting a conversation. However, the linear/multi-active category is characterized as being agile in speaking, anti-emotional, recognized, and logically confrontational. This was observed from the AES' request for a logical confrontation.

Learning Environment Factors. These factors subsequently influenced the difference in the realization of the IEL-based request utterances. This proved that English education in Indonesia started at the elementary school level with some inclusions in the curriculum of kindergartens.

However, English was often taught in formal-setting to obtain and produce official utterances. This verified that the IEL had limitations in understanding informal English speech, including slang and other language variations. The English teaching materials in Indonesia also emphasized grammatical functions, which had not been deeply integrated with culture and intercultural interaction. In this condition, most of the country's English teachers are subsequently observed as native Indonesian speakers, which proved to be a challenge for the adaptability of the language. Therefore, the exposure of English learners is being highly eradicated from the native speakers.

Conclusion

Based on these results, the difference in the realization of IEL's and AES' request utterances was divided into three parts, namely (1) request form differences, (2) request strategy differences, and (3) semantic formula strategies. Based on the request form, AES mostly used the head act speech structures at approximately 20%, compared to IEL at 10%. Moreover, IEL used more supporting move structures than AES. This indicates that the IEL conveyed the request indirectly, while the AES spoke directly on the desired subject. For the utilization of a sentence mode, both speakers mostly used the interrogative sentences in making requests, although AES mostly utilized more declarative statements when interacting with a work superior. Meanwhile, the IEL group mostly used longer statements in the interrogative sentences when interacting with a work superior. According to the request strategy, both IEL and AES used 21 request methods. However, the AES used swearing method, while the IEL did not utilize the method. For the use of semantic formulas, IEL was more expressive due to producing more greetings and attracters than AES.

Based on the results, differences occurred regarding the observation of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. In the linguistic factors, the occurrence of request utterance differences was observed due to the distinctions in pragmatic understanding and the mastery of IEL English vocabulary. Meanwhile, based on the non-linguistics factor, the differences occurred due to the distinctions in the cultural systems of Indonesia and Australia, which belonged to an individualist and collectivist society, respectively. The learning environment for the IEL group was also in formal situations, such as school or college, so the speech productions of the IEL were often formal. In addition, more respondents and a role-

play method should be included and utilized in subsequent reports, to obtain more comprehensive and deeper results.

Acknowledgement

About the Authors

Hilmi Akmal: A Lecturer at Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta (UIN Jakarta). He is currently teaching in English Literature Department. His research interest covers pragmatics, discourse analysis, semiotics, and cultural studies.
Alfi Syahriyani: A Lecturer at Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta (UIN Jakarta). She is currently teaching in English Literature Department. Her research interest covers pragmatics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and cultural studies.
Tuty Handayani: A Lecturer at Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta (UIN Jakarta). She is currently teaching in English Literature Department. Her research interest covers pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and cultural studies.

References

Abdullah, A. (2017). Diplomatic relations between Indonesia-Australia since Whitlam, Fraser, until Hawke era in an attempt to establish political stability in Southeast Asia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, *5*(2), 237. https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v5i2.135

Aufa, F. (2016). The use of discourse completion task (DCT) as explicit instruction on Indonesian EfL learners' production of suggestion acts. *Journal of English and Education*, *5*(2), 22–43. https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol5.iss2.art2

Beeson, M., Bloomfield, A., & Wicaksana, W. (2021). Unlikely allies? Australia, Indonesia and the strategic cultures of middle powers. *Asian Security*, *17*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/14799855.2020.1846525

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second

language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, *3*(1), 29–59. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/III.1.29

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics*, *11*, 131–146. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Kasper, G. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

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

Chaer, A. (2013). *Pengantar Semantik Bahasa Indonesia*. Rineka Cipta.

Collins, J. N. (2018). Analyzing meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics by Paul R. Kroeger. *Oceanic Linguistics*, *57*(2), 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2018.0021

Handayani, T. (2016). *Tindak Tutur Meminta dalam Bahasa Inggris oleh Penutur Bahasa Indonesia dan Penutur Asli Bahasa Inggris Australia: Kajian Pragmatik Antarbahasa*. Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia.

Hofstede, G. H., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind, intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival.* McGraw-Hill.

Huang, P. (2019). Textbook interaction: A study of the language and cultural contextualisation of English learning textbooks. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *21*(1), 87–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.02.006

Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative, inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.2307/415909

Hymes, D. (2012). The ethnography of speaking. In J. A. Fishman. (Ed.), *Reading in the sociology of language* (p. 99–138). Mouton.

Kraft, B., & Geluykens, R. (2007). *Cross-cultural pragmatics of interlanguage English*. Lincom Europa.

Leech, G. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835976

Lewis, R. D. (2006). *When cultures collide: Leading across cultures*. Nicholas Brealey International.

McConachy, T., & Spencer-Oatey, H. (2021). Cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics. In M. Haugh., D. Z. Kadar., & M. Terkourafi.

(Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociopragmatics* (p. 733–757). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108954105.037

Meiratnasari, A., Wijayanto, A., & Suparno, S. (2019). An analysis of politeness strategies in Indonesian English textbooks. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *2*(4), 529–540. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v2i4.8393

Ogiermann, E., & Bella, S. (2020). An interlanguage study of request perspective: Evidence from German, Greek, Polish and Russian learners of English. *Contrastive Pragmatics*, *1*(2), 180–209. https://doi.org/10.1163/26660393-bja10003

Putra, T. K., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Supriyadi, S. (2020). Cultural representation and intercultural interaction in textbooks of English as an international language. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *10*(1), 163–184. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i1.1766

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of English language*. Longman Inc.

Radford, A. (2016). Analysing English sentences: A Minimalist Approach. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511980312

Schauer, G. A. (2012). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context.* Continuum.

Sophen, T. (2007). *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge University Press.

Widanta, I. M. R. J., Hudiananingsih, P. D., Sitawati, A. A. R., & Ardika, I. W. D. (2019). Pragmatic errors and transfer of foreign learners of indonesian: The case of refusals. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(3), 501–508. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1003.13

Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Dasar-dasar pragmatik*. Andi Offset.

Wijayanti, W., Wijayanto, A., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Politeness in interlanguage pragmatics of request performed by EFL learners. *8th ELTLT International Conference Proceeding* (pp.316–328).

Wijayanto, A. (2016). Variability of refusal in L2: Evidence of L1 pragmalinguistic transfer and learner's idiosyncratic usage. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)*, *26*(1), 99–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12081